



Dr.

Library of

^S
Wellesley



College.

Presented by

Mr. J. L. Sweet

Nº 53597

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOLUME V.

List of Contributors to Volume V.

- REV. PROFESSOR J. VERNON BARILET, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BLUNNETT, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. BERNARD, D.D.
REV. ARMSTRONG BLACK, D.D.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
RIGHT REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D., Bishop of Derry
and Raphoe.
REV. PROFESSOR CHARLES, D.D.
VERY REV. CHARLES F. D'ARCY, D.D., Dean of Belfast.
LATE REV. PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.,
D.Litt.
VERY REV. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of
Canterbury.
REV. PROFESSOR R. A. FALCÖNER, B.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. G. FINDLAY, D.D.
REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., B.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A.
REV. M. KAUFMANN, M.A.
PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A.
REV. JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A.
REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, B.D.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, B.D.
PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
REV. E. C. SELWYN, D.D.
J. Y. SIMPSON, D.Sc., F.R.S.E.
W. B. STEVENSON, M.A.
LATE REV. PROFESSOR D. H. WEIR, D.D.
REV. PREBENDARY B. WHITEFOORD, M.A., D.D.
REV. CANON WINTERBÖTHAM, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SIXTH SERIES.

Volume V.

London :
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MCMII.

53597

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SILLWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

DIALOGUES ON THE CHRISTIAN PROPHETS.

I.

Mason. By the way, Riddell, I met a man in the train to-day who was reading your book.

Riddell. You don't say so, Mason! I should never have thought it would become a rival to *Truth* and *Tit Bits*.

M. I can't say how he varied his browsing; but seeing your name on the cover, I ventured to ask his opinion of my friend's book.

R. This is interesting to me. And he said——?

M. Well, he declared he could not make head or tail of it. He could not tell what you were driving at.

R. And you helped him of course, and said what careful study the subject demanded.

M. I found he was an architect by profession, but he also professed an interest in theology, and he was a regular church-goer.

R. The last two do not always go together, and the church-goers are rarely fed with theology in church.

M. That is not what they go for. They like hearing what they have heard before. At least "the man in the street" does. The man in the train did not.

R. You mean, the man in the train moved faster?—even than the man in church!

M. Yes, but his mind was not fast enough for your remarks on Prophecy.

R. I was not aware of such rapid transitions.

M. There's the rub. Perhaps you go up and down the

line and forget how many points you pass over. Dangerous, rather!

R. Well, I have obeyed the signals, and the points will mind themselves. But pray, Mason, tell me some that I rattle over too fast.

M. I will tell you one or two as my interlocutor saw them. He understood them better than I do. You will recollect, please, that these are his criticisms and not mine.

R. He was an architect, you said; and you, I know, are a Freemason. I shall have something more for both of you. But where shall I begin?

M. One of his first observations was this: "We used to be told the Prophet's function was to foretell the future, and especially the Messiah's coming. Here is a writer who discovers that after the days of Jesus Christ there were numbers of Prophets still in active employment. This in fact is the subject of his book. Don't you think," he said to me, "that this is perversity itself? Priests we know, and Prophets B.C. we know, some greater and some less, but who are these Prophets A.D.? What use can there be in them?"

R. Do you remember your Acts?

M. Pray don't ask me? The man in the train said he knew there were some Prophets in the New Testament, but they had nothing to do with the old ones: they were preachers. I could confirm that, for I remembered how we were told at Eton that to prophesy was to forth-tell, which is quite as important as to fore-tell. The forth-tellers were preachers, who preached uncommonly straightforward. We want such now; we always shall.

R. That may be; but you will admit that a Prophet may be a preacher as well as a Prophet. In the last eight verses of Hebrews xi. you will find an eloquent encomium on the Prophets as a body with whom the active testimony of a practical life has quite eclipsed their qualifications as a

contemplative society of foretellers. Or when you read Isaiah have you observed how many pages of his writing are occupied with foretelling and how many with preaching?

M. No doubt they could preach, but their name arises from the fact that their business was to foretell.

R. That may be so. Their Hebrew name—and Hebrew was the language of the first Prophets—implies that they “bubbled over” with—inspiration, shall we say? or fervent zeal? For “fervour” also in its Latin original means “bubbling over.” I do not see that you can make *n’biim* mean always foretelling and nothing else. It implies an unusual and abnormal condition among men, a gift which was believed to be of God.

M. Yes, and the question was whether this gift was continued A.D. as we know it existed B.C.

R. The man in the train evidently found a sturdy champion in his interlocutor. And so have the Prophets. I cannot disguise the fact that A.D. is not the same as B.C. Can you?

M. No, but I can judge of the identity of a corporation at one period and at another of its existence.

R. That is not always so easy. Are the Greeks the same as 1,500 years ago? or the British? or the French? Or is any nation but the Jews the same?

M. The Jews are, and the Hebrew Prophets ought to be. If they were called Hebrew Prophets at first because they foretold, they ought to be so called 1,500 years later for the same reason and for no other.

R. Let us have a little regard for analogy. Race-identity is one thing and it can be tested by the question of blood. But corporate identity is rather different. Did you ever hear of a corporation performing exactly the same functions over a period of 1,500 years? I name this figure 1,500 because Moses was the first Prophet—“A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you from among your *brethren*

like unto me," is what he said in reference to Joshua—and at least the author of the Apocalypse about 70 A.D. was a Prophet—"I am of *thy brethren the Prophets*" (Rev. xxii. 9). There are your one and a half millenniums. Now you must admit that between the first Prophet and (let us assume) the last it was inevitable that some changes should occur in the procedure of the Prophets, in the mode of their prophesying, in the way of their organization, in their regard of their own office and in their relation to it, perhaps even their admission to it.

M. Perhaps it could not be otherwise.

R. The very greatness of individual Prophets at one time or another, the clear simplicity of the first Isaiah, the sublimity of the second, the fiery originality and precise thought of Ezekiel, the momentous turns of detailed imagery in the Book of Daniel, and above all the words and works of Him who taught as one that had authority—for He too was a Prophet—all these historical results bore directly upon the corporate life of the Prophets and could not possibly leave it as they found it. The same would be true of any human organization—the Roman Senate, the Vestal College, the British Parliament: you cannot expect the same name to connote the same functions at long intervals of time. The idea of Catholic practice in 1900 being the same as it was in 900 is equally preposterous. "All thy waves and storms are gone over me," might the Church well exclaim if she wished to excuse her failure to observe the ancient paths; but to deny that failure, to deny that the "strong hours indignant worked their wills," would be palpably absurd.

M. I am heartily with you there. The boast of "semper eadem" on the banner of any Church is neither "glorious" nor true except with the widest limitations. They are a very thick kernel to a very small nut.

R. But I am only illustrating the unity of the prophetic

body at one time and at another. I am not sure that you will find any less identity—forgive the division of the atom!—in the Prophets than you will in the Christian Church. They foretold in 700 B.C. and they foretold in 70 A.D. They preached in 700 B.C. and they preached in 70 A.D. They suffered martyrdom in 700 B.C. and the same in 70 A.D. They claimed the name in 700 B.C. and they claimed it in 70 A.D.

M. How is it then that your Prophets are not more like the old Prophets?

R. I have been thinking, on the other hand, how remarkably like they were. We have paragraphs of prophecy in the Revelation which are just like paragraphs in Isaiah in point of length and in kind of contents, have we not?

M. Yes; I suppose you mean a paragraph of about a dozen verses on one subject which then disappears like a dissolving view into another. But the character of *dissolution* is stronger in Revelation than in Isaiah.

R. Perhaps it is; but you will observe that the author of Revelation, although his position is not less that of a Prophet than Isaiah's was, is more of a Seer, who sees visions, which naturally dissolve. It is true that Isaiah was sometimes a Seer of visions (i. 2, ii. 1, vi. 1, xiii. 1, etc.); but he was sometimes a preacher (ii. 1 he preaches a vision, or sees a sermon—ix. 8, etc.); and often a poet (v. 1, xiv. 4, etc.); and we are meant to regard him also as even an historian (vii. 1, xxxvi. 1, etc.). The one function does not exclude various kinds of literary expression. Thus too, on the other hand, you will admit that the Revelation contains the elegy of a poet in xviii. verse 2 onwards—an elegy upon Rome.

M. An elegy on Rome! Why do you say that?

R. Because it is the plainest possible fact; but let us leave that question just now. I was saying that even the Prophet of 70 A.D. is able to diversify his strains, after the

ancient models of prophecy. His noble hymns are more conspicuous than his elegy, if not more poetical. Yet the bulk of the book is decidedly prose.

M. Yes; prose perhaps, but is it even literature? A friend of mine, a scholar of great discrimination, ability, and piety, thinks that some chapters of it read like an evil dream. It is a strangely unequal work, from the point of view of literature.

R. I am glad to find you admit the inequality. Some parts are not as vital as others. Just as life is not present so much in one's ear-tips as in one's heart, so inspiration is not so perceptible in one part of the Bible as in another, nor in one part of a Book as in another. Whatever inspiration is, we must accept the view that there are many different degrees of it. Some parts of the Old Testament could be spared, and some parts of the Apocalypse could be spared, without much loss to the modern reader.

M. I have noticed that it repeats itself sometimes, or seems to do so.

R. Certainly it does. The latter part is now to be read by us in two forms.

M. I confess the last two chapters of Revelation have often struck me as very beautiful, but with a fused and blended beauty like that of a shifting atmospheric effect upon the landscape after a storm.

R. I think if you will examine them carefully and write them out, you will find yourself inclined to write most of chapter xxii. parallel with most of chapter xxi. instead of underneath it.

M. How so?

R. If you still have any regard to time when you are reading accounts which deal with eternity, you will notice that the author has sometimes used the future tense. Thus in xxi. 3, 4, "He shall dwell with them," "They shall be His people," down to "pain shall be no more," there are

six future verbs. Now in xxii. 3-5, we come upon futures again—seven of them. There you have a clue. Here is my Westcott and Hort's text, which you know is the safest guide, though Dr. Hort most candidly admits "We are by no means sure that we have done all for the text of the Apocalypse that might be done with existing materials."

M. I think the plain man like myself may be quite content with the enormous gain in clearness alone which the Revised Version, especially with the marginal notes, affords him as compared with the Authorised Version. Why, only yesterday, a friend of mine told me that when the Revised Version first appeared, he read it at a sitting, and it came to him with a direct call to become a missionary: he obeyed the call and has now been a missionary in India for twenty years, and a very able man he is.

R. There you have an instance of the power of truth—that spirit (for power is spirit) that wrought in Zerubbabel. Perhaps you have read the first book of Esdras?

M. Apocrypha, isn't it? Alas, I never read the Apocrypha.

R. But you cannot understand the New Testament unless you do. In fact there are some parts of the Old that you can hardly understand without it. You remember that impressive passage in Zechariah, "Not by might, nor by power, but by *my* spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts"?

M. Pray don't ask me about Zechariah—one of the lesser Prophets—very much lesser, only read on Saints' days!

R. Well, read them every day. They are grand, in parts at least. "Who art thou, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain."

M. I thought Zerubbabel conducted a caravan across the desert from Babylon to rebuild the Temple after the captivity.

R. So he did. But what gave him the power? His love of *truth*. He was a sound man, a straight man, a true man, and therefore he awakened enthusiasm in his men, and so they built with a will. Before Zerubbabel, *and before his love of truth*, the mountain of rubbish and of difficulty became a plain. You see what sort of "plain" is meant?

M. I should think the plain of the great Arabian desert.

R. Not at all, for you notice that a few verses before this the prophet Zechariah has been speaking of the stone to be used in the rebuilding of the Temple—a work in which he and Haggai, his brother Prophet, were the most useful assistants to Zerubbabel the prince and Joshua (that is Jesus, as the Septuagint always calls him,) the high priest. We have previously crossed the desert (Zech. i. 8-15), and "are returned to Jerusalem with mercies," and now "my house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of Hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem" (Zech. i. 16). Then comes "the man with the measuring-line in his hand" (Zech. ii. 1), and the stones, as we have seen, and the golden candlestick (iv. 2) is ready. But the actual foundation is now laid by Zerubbabel's hands (iv. 9), and "his hands shall also finish it." You agree with me, Mr. Freemason, that we are witnessing "the stone well *and truly* laid" according to the plummet of the following verse, do you not?

M. I may not divulge the secrets of my craft.

R. Perhaps you will kindly note that many of those secrets made clear are in the Bible. If your heart is not of stone, you must respond, I think, to the many, the multitudinous and oft recurring references which are to be found in the New Testament to the Stone, the Corner stone, and to the other associations of the "building of the house of the great King in glory for evermore."

M. I do not recognize the last quotation. Is it in the minor Prophets?

R. No, it is in the most memorable passage of the Book of Enoch.

M. The Book of Enoch! What is that?

R. I will tell you another day. You should provide yourself meanwhile with the well printed modern translation of it by Dr. Charles. But I would not leave Zechariah just yet. Zerubbabel has to lay the stone well and truly upon a flat surface, a sure foundation, and that Zechariah calls a "plain."

M. I see that you are taking a practical view of the passage.

R. Yes, a practical view must be taken of all the original writings of the Old Testament Prophets. They really wrote sense, which their contemporaries understood. They were meant to understand them.

M. I must confess I thought they were always obscure.

R. Do you really mean that they *were always* obscure? or that you *always thought* them so? I can well imagine that the latter is true.

M. Perhaps I did not think about it. Most people find them obscure.

R. Most people are content to take their own point of view and no other.

M. What other point of view is there?

R. The writer's, especially if you are dealing with a writer of many centuries ago.

M. I do not find the commentators help me much to do that. They usually harp upon the references to the other parts of Scripture.

R. And rightly too, provided that they master the primary meaning before they proceed to the secondary.

M. Primary! and secondary! These are rather technical theological terms.

R. How then would you like "Eocene and Meiocene?" I dare say you know something of Tertiary strata, in geology, if I might delicately hint at the possible absence of good building stone in addressing a Freemason.

M. You are safe there.

R. Primary, then, is the original meaning which Old Testament Scripture bore for Old Testament writers and those who heard them speak. Their speeches and writings lay for many centuries in layers, and then they were taken up in parts, and handled and treated and used by a later generation for its own purposes, and this generation was like yourself, allow me to say, in that it did not use its imagination to complete the framework of its knowledge, and indeed its knowledge was far from complete.

M. Very likely.

R. We give, then, the name "secondary" to that meaning placed by the unimaginative later generation upon the original text which, you admitted, it did not perfectly understand. It found words in Scripture, holy and blessed, and it took and applied them to its own passing events and its own current ideas. You cannot blame or wonder at it.

M. No indeed, it was human nature.

R. Yes, human nature exercised upon words divine. These words would not have been less divine if rightly understood. Understanding cannot take away from divinity; but it takes away obscurity.

M. You think there *was* obscurity, then, in the original prophecies.

R. Pardon me, obscurity resides in the mind of the hearer or reader, not in the prophecies themselves.

M. But do you really maintain that there was not obscurity in the mind of the older Prophets?

R. I do. The primary meaning is clear: the secondary meaning is also clear, when you in the twentieth century see

what they of the first century thought of the prophecies of the eighth century B.C. But if you go and jumble up the three strata, what compound can you ever expect to result from the mixture, but mud?

M. Very severe. You hardly allow for human nature.

R. Human nature is like General Councils in the Twenty-first Article of Religion. "When they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God." That is admirably put.

M. We sometimes forget what good things there are in the Thirty-nine Articles. A pity they are so much reviled! They would not have been reviled if they had not been forced down so many throats.

R. Probably you are right. But I must hold you to the distinction of primary and secondary. Let us have one thing at a time.

M. You mean, I trust, no disrespect to the Articles.

R. I mean to suggest that we should take the primary meaning at one time and the secondary at another time. The old prophets were wont to preface their declarations with the appeal, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth" (Isa. i. 2 and reff.). Do you think it is conceivable that this should be the preface to words which the prophet could not understand himself? If you will look and see what sort of passage follows this appeal, you will find that it is such as does not always explain itself forthwith to your unaided intellect. Some little thought or imagination or reflection or comparison of other texts is required; but probably no commentary beyond the aid which the A.V. margin has supplied for your intelligent use. But if you cannot interpret every word, you can read that the Prophet is addressing the nation, or the congregation, or the mountainous land of Israel, or the people, that is, some large

gathering to whom he must—as your common sense tells you—above all things make himself plain and intelligible; he must therefore use no enigmas; he must avoid mystery; otherwise he need not speak at all. But if he can be understood by the common multitude, much more can he understand himself.

M. I suppose so. But now you seem to be labouring a needless point. Who doubts it?

R. Pardon me; but I thought you said just now that the Prophets were obscure. I am only saying that the obscurity was not in *their* minds, nor perhaps in their hearers'.

M. But perhaps I could produce you a text which even you would admit was obscure. If so, your theoretical objections to my statement, being of a general kind, will fall before my one particular stone in my Davidic sling. The general is always a sort of Goliath before a particular.

R. By all means quote one.

M. I will sling my stone at a venture and give you a text which has no reference against it in A.V. margin. Here is one: "Will a lion roar in the forest when he hath no prey?"

R. Causes always produce their effects—a truth which we are all apt to forget. I see no obscurity. Moreover, the parabolic illustration by Amos is *general* in this case!

M. The passage is, I admit, rather too familiar, being from the famous third chapter of Amos. Now take another: "But I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth: and there is none that holdeth with me in these things but Michael, your prince" (Dan. x. 21).

R. No, no; you wish to involve me in masses of particulars. If I told you who, in my opinion, is meant by "Michael, your prince," you would easily press and overwhelm me with many other details from Daniel. So, instead of being drowned in details, I shall be content to ask you whether you doubt for one moment that the writer of

those words had some particular person in his eye when he used them.

M. Yes, I admit that. But I am not so sure that Ezekiel is not obscure very often.

R. You will have to maintain that Ezekiel did not know what he was driving at.

M. I don't know that I could go so far as that.

R. Do not be afraid of putting your thoughts in plain language. The Prophets were not. And I may reassure you by saying that so great a critic and so justly revered a man as the late Dr. Hort is on your side; for in his lectures on 1 Peter i. 9, he says that even Prophets (i.e. the Old Testament Prophets, for he entirely ignores the New Testament Prophets), the receivers and vehicles of God's revelations, were in this respect themselves seekers and searchers like other men, only that they sought out the meaning of their own words! He goes on to say, not that there is evidence of this, but that "St. Peter *doubtless* found the evidence" of it in the prophecies themselves; and whereas Peter says that "the Spirit of Messiah which was in them was making (something) plain," Dr. Hort says this "making plain" may "naturally stand for *faint half-hidden suggestions* of the Spirit in the midst of its clearer notifications." What do you think of that?

M. I claim Dr. Hort for the obscurity of the Prophets, and I rejoice in the "half-hidden suggestions." That quite covers my meaning. It is a delightful compromise between the clear and the obscure. It possesses all the merits of a fine *chiaroscuro*. Yes, "half-hidden suggestions" is good.

R. But you have no evidence for it.

M. It is enough for me that Dr. Hort thinks that St. Peter had, and he is a great authority.

R. Dr. Hort cannot err! Must I then prove to you that he can? He was indeed a seeker and a searcher after truth,

if ever there was one, and I am quite sure, from personal knowledge as well as acquaintance with his books, that he would never have allowed such incense to be offered to his name and authority. I beg you not so to canonize any man. Here, for instance, on the same page from which I quoted, is a remark which I think you will yourself challenge. Do you remember some words of St. Paul to the Romans (ix. 33) about Israel not attaining to the law of righteousness because they (attempted) not by faith?

M. I do.

R. Do you remember that he quotes Isaiah (xxviii. 16) ?

M. Yes; you mean the words: "Behold I lay in Zion a stumbling stone and rock of offence; and whosoever believeth (why do they not say "trusteth"?) on him shall not be ashamed" ?

R. Would you be surprised, then, to find that Dr. Hort says this: "It is a remarkable illustration of this chasm in the Old Testament prophecy that, when St. Paul is wishing in Romans and Galatians to justify out of the Old Testament his doctrine of salvation by faith, *the one text from the prophets which he is able to adduce is Habakkuk ii. 4*; his other great proof-text being the Pentateuchal saying about Abraham" ?

M. Well, I must admit that Dr. Hort, like Homer, was caught napping there.

R. I hope, too, you will note that he avows a chasm in Old Testament prophecy just upon the very point on which he "cannot find," or, at least, in the course of his very voluminous commentary, does not produce, evidence, although he says St. Peter *doubtless* found evidence for it. The commentary, I admit, is a posthumous work, but those who edit posthumous works undertake a great responsibility, and they are bound to criticize and, if necessary, correct errors and indicate deficiencies. Don't you think so?

M. I do. I observe that so great an historian as Gibbon

has been edited again and again with footnotes and supplementary matter, and even he is not the worse for it; his lustre shines all the brighter.

R. But have you ever considered the meaning of that passage in 1 Peter?

M. I must confess that I have not. To tell the truth, I do not like the Epistles of Peter; at least, I dislike the Second so much that I have rather thought that the First was tarred with the same brush.

R. A most unfounded objection, but one which you share with those who call 2 Peter pseudonymous. The gods call it "pseudonymous," but the men say "forgery"; and the men are more correct than the gods in that term. But I will not argue the question of 2 Peter now; only let me give you what is plainly the meaning of that part of 1 Peter (i. 10). He says that the prophets (of whom he was one, and the Christian prophets were many when he wrote) had for their object to seek out and search out a certain time; if they could not ascertain the exact time, they could perhaps find the sort of time—namely, the time of Messiah. The expectation of Messiah was one which had ruled the minds of devout Jews for many years before He came in the person of our Lord Jesus. But though they expected the coming, they could not tell the exact time when He would come.

M. I should gather from my reading that the knowledge of the time, or even of the kind of time, would be something of a clue to the identification of Messiah when he did come.

R. Well, there you can easily see that Peter, in speaking of salvation, reminded his readers that the faith of many previous generations had now received its end (verse 9), and that they received the end of their faith in the appreciable sense of the salvation of their souls. But their faith did not cease because the end or object of it had come. It

continued to rest upon that object as before, and he dwells upon the previous stage or stages of it, in which the generations down to the present had listened to one prophet after another (verse 10), "seeking out and searching out," and then prophesying, concerning the grace or favour of God which He now extended to them (*eis*)—not to any previous generation, but to them.

M. I see your meaning. Their generation was favoured above all, for to it was vouchsafed the revelation of the Lord.

R. Yes, but not directly to it; rather to the Prophets (verse 12)—we may call them the Christian Prophets, for they became the first Christians—in order that, instead of keeping it to themselves (verse 12), they might minister the same to that generation. The Christian Prophets were separated by no chasm from the Prophets of old. So far from being separated, they were essentially one and the same order which had prophesied through the ages, most dimly at first, and indeed as regards their mouthpieces quite unconsciously, but with an increasing definiteness on the whole until the Desire of the Ages came. Thus the Spirit of Messiah (verse 11), which was in them as a historic body, was ever making plain the time at which He should come: it was ever foretelling by calling to witness beforehand the sufferings of all the Prophets, which, as it were, looked forward unto Messiah, and were destined to find their fulfilment in Him, to be followed by the glories which attend upon them. I wonder if I make my meaning clear?

M. It seems to me there are four parties concerned in this passage—(1) the writer, and (2) the readers, of course; (3) the Prophets, and especially one (4) party, those who preached to the readers. This last appears to be almost the same as Evangelists (1 Pet. i. 12, Eph. iv. 11).

R. I quite agree with you, except of course that preach-

ing was the common function of Prophets and of others who were not Prophets. A Prophet was one who received Apocalypses or revelations (verse 12), which he might or might not preach afterwards. An Evangelist was one who preached, but had not received Apocalypses first. The writer does not exclude himself from the number either of the Prophets or of the Evangelists. But I have a very clear idea that he belonged to the Prophets, and only the lateness of the hour keeps me from discoursing upon this point to-night. The Evangelists did not do the "seeking out and the searching out"; they did not receive the revelations; but they were the medium of the Prophets (verse 12, *αὐτοὶ*) in ministering to the converts and in announcing the Prophets' revelations.

M. I see your text has brought you to the point which we began by discussing—I mean the unity and continuity of the prophetic body, and I wish I had been able to produce your explanation, which seems to me clearly put, to satisfy the ravenous maw of my companion in the train.

R. Very likely it would not have satisfied him. I can tell you, without having seen him, that he would have said at once, The passage in 1 Peter, my dear Sir, refers to the Old Testament Prophets and no others. It has been taken so from time unknown; it is taken so by the able article on "Prophet," in Smith's Bible Dictionary; and every one else must take it so.

M. And what would you have replied to him yourself?

R. Merely what was said just now: that by his interpretation you have to picture to yourself the ancient Prophet, who has just delivered his message to the hearing heavens, and the listening earth and the vacillating multitude—picture him sitting down and asking himself, "What have I said? What meaning can it bear? What half-hidden suggestions can I find in it? What Messianic inklings?" That is what you must imagine. There is no

evidence for it, but you must say that if you yourself have none, still "St. Peter doubtless found the evidence for it." It would be quite true to say that the Christian Prophets sought out things in the Old Testament Prophets' writings; but it would not be true nor reasonable to say that any one Prophet sought out his own meaning in his own writings. Thus you are compelled to attribute to Peter a very remarkable ability—the power to find evidence in the works of the Prophets that they sought out and searched out Messianic suggestions individually from their own individual works; whereas, on the other hand, St. Paul was unable to find more than three texts—Dr. Hort said two—to justify out of the Old Testament his doctrine of salvation by faith.

M. I shall never accept this estimate of the relative powers of the two Apostles, Paul and Peter.

R. Nor need you do so, for St. Paul, you may be sure, has simply chosen and mentioned two of his texts as representative of his entire Old Testament, one in the first few pages of it and one in the last few, besides one in the middle, being confident that he could cite very many more when occasion required. You see, my dear Mason, that the blind following of authority is likely to lead you now and again into a snare. St. Paul's own maxim is better when he says: "Despise not prophecies—these were Christian prophecies—but put all things to the test; hold fast the good."

E. C. SELWYN.

*THE JEWS IN THE GRAECO-ASIATIC CITIES.*¹

IN a preceding article we attempted to describe the features common to the Greek cities of Asia Minor (and in particular those which were founded or refounded by the Seleucid kings of Syria, during their dominion over part of that land), so far as they conduce to the clearer understanding of the New Testament documents.

I. THE JEWS AS COLONISTS.

Among the motley population of those great and busy cities the most interesting for our purpose are the Jews. The Jews were especially favoured and encouraged by the Seleucid kings. The reason, of course, must have been that they were found to be specially useful as colonists. Not merely, as has been already pointed out, were they one of the two educated races fit to be organizers, and also formed a good counterpoise to the Greek colonists; the very fact that they were highly unpopular in the cities made them all the more useful to the Seleucid monarchs. The Roman principle "to rule by dividing" was not first discovered by the Romans. The Seleucid kings were quite well aware that the more unpopular the Jews were with their neighbours, the more loyal they must be to the interests of the kings, who supported them against popular riot and hostility.

The Jews were too clever for their fellow-townsmen. They regarded with supreme contempt the gross obscene ritual and the vulgar superstitions of their neighbours; but many of them were ready to turn those superstitions to their own profit; and a species of magic and soothsaying, a sort

¹ In the preceding article, EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1901, p. 413, l. 26, logical application of critical method will prove that the passage is the work of a second author, who believed that Philippi was a city of Asia. The allusions to Ephesus on pp. 403, 407 are incorrect, and the name should be deleted: it was Seleucid, and had Jewish citizens: see the following article.

of syncretism of Hebrew and Pagan religious ideas, afforded a popular and lucrative occupation to the sons of Sceva in Ephesus and to many another Jew throughout the Asiatic Greek cities. It was probably an art of this kind that was practised in the Chaldaean's holy precinct at Thyatira, as is revealed to us in an inscription of the Roman period.

There were among those Jews, of course, persons of every moral class, from the destined prophet, Saul of Tarsus, whose eyes were fixed on the spiritual future of his people, down to the lowest Jew who traded on the superstitions and vices of those Pagan dogs whom he despised and abhorred while he ministered to the excesses from which in his own person he held aloof. But among them all there was, in contrast to the Pagan population around them, a certain unity of feeling and aspiration bred in them by their religion, their holy books, the Sabbath meetings and the weekly lessons and exhortations. These made an environment which exercised a strong influence even on the most unworthy.

Of their numbers we can form no estimate, but they were very great. In preparing for the final struggle in western Asia Minor about 210 B.C., Antiochus III. moved 2,000 Jewish families from Babylonia into Lydia and Phrygia, and that was a single act of one king, whose predecessors and successors carried out the same policy on a similar scale. The statistics which Cicero gives, when he describes how a Roman Governor in 66 B.C., arrested the half-shekel tribute which the Jews sent to Jerusalem, show a vast Jewish population in Phrygia and a large Jewish population in Lydia.

Except in a few such references history is silent about that great Jewish population of Asia Minor. But inscriptions are now slowly revealing, by here a trace and there a trace, that nobles and officers under the Roman Empire who have all the outward appearance of ordinary Roman provincial

citizens were really part of the Phrygian Jewish population.¹ The original Jews of Asia Minor seem to have perished entirely, for the Turkish Jews of the present day are Spanish-speaking Jews whose ancestors were expelled from Spain by the most famous of Spanish sovereigns and sheltered in Turkey by Mohammedan Sultans. In the dearth of evidence one can only speculate as to their fate. Elsewhere I have tried to show² that a considerable part of that original Jewish population adopted Christianity, and thus lost their isolation and cohesion, and became merged in the Christian Empire of the fourth and following centuries after Christ.

And as to those Jews, very many in number, who clung unflinchingly to their own faith, what was likely to be their fate in the Christian Empire? The Eastern Empire was largely Greek in language and in spirit alike; and any one who has become familiar with the intensity and bitterness of the hatred that separates the Greek from the Jew, will have no difficulty in answering that question. There was no place and no mercy for the Jew in the Greek Christian Empire. The barbarous lands of Europe and the steppes and villages of Russia were a gentler home to them than the most civilized of lands.

II. THE JEWS AS RESIDENT STRANGERS.

When one realizes the character of the Hellenic cities, one must ask how and on what conditions the Jews were able to live in them.

When the Jews were present in such a city merely as resident aliens, their position is easier to understand. It was quite usual for strangers to reside in a Greek city for purposes of trade, and even to become permanent inhabitants with their families. But, as has been already pointed out, there was no ordinary way by which such inhabitants could attain the citizenship. They and their descendants

¹ *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia II.*, pp. 667 ff., 533, 649 ff. ² *Ibid.* p. 675 f.

continued to rank only as resident aliens. It was easy for them to retain and practise their own religious rites. Such strangers naturally brought their religion with them; and the regular custom was for a group of such strangers to form an association for the common practice of their own rites. Such religious societies were numerous and recognized by law and custom; and Jewish residents could carry their religion with them under this legal form.

It was in this way as a rule that foreign religions spread in the Greek cities. The foreign Asiatic rites, by their most impressive and enthusiastic character, attracted devotees, especially among the humbler and less educated Greeks. Thus oriental cults spread in such cities as Corinth, Athens, and other trading centres, in spite of the fact that those Pagan cults were essentially non-proselytizing, apt rather to keep their bounds narrow and to restrict the advantages of their religion to a small number.

Similarly the Jewish association, with its synagogue or place of prayer by seashore or river bank,¹ attracted attention and proselytes, though it repelled and roused the hatred of the majority, because it was "so strange and mysterious and incomprehensible to the ordinary Pagan, with its proud isolation, its lofty morality, its superiority to pagan ideas of life, its unhesitating confidence in its superiority." Thus the Jews became a power even where they ranked only as aliens.

III. THE JEWS AS HELLENIC CITIZENS.

It is much more difficult to understand the position of the Jews in those Hellenic cities where they possessed the rights of citizenship. Now, as a rule, in the cities founded by the Seleucid kings, the Jews were actually citizens.²

¹ Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xiv. 10, 23 (§ 258); Acts xvi. 13.

² The statements made in the recognized authorities are different; but we know that Jews were citizens in the cities founded (or refounded) by Seleucus I. and in the only foundation by Antiochus II., of whose principles any record is

But it was to the ancient mind an outrage and an almost inconceivable thing that people could be fellow citizens without engaging in the worship of the same city gods. The bond of patriotism was really a religious bond. The citizen was encompassed by religious duties from his cradle to his grave. It was practically impossible for the Jew to be a citizen of a Greek city in the ordinary way. Some special provision was needed.

That special provision was made by the Seleucid kings in founding their cities. It was a noteworthy achievement, and a real step in the history of human civilization and institutions, when they succeeded in so widening the essential theory of the Greek city as to enable the Jew to live in it as an integral part of it. The way in which this result was attained must be clearly understood, as it throws much light on the position of the Jews in the Graeco-Asiatic cities.

The Greek city was never simply an aggregation of citizens. The individual citizens were always grouped in bodies, usually called "Tribes" (*φυλαί*), and the "Tribes" made up the city.¹ This was a fundamental principle of Greek city organization, and must form the starting point of all reasoning on the subject. The city was an association of groups, not of individuals. It is certain that the groups were older than the institution of cities, a survival of a more primitive social system.²

preserved (Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xii. 3, 2, § 125 f. ; *Apion*, ii. 4), and this may confidently be regarded as proving the ordinary Seleucid policy. It is a mistake to take the examples quoted by Josephus, *c. Apion*, ii. 4, as a complete list, and infer that the Jews had the citizenship only in Alexandria, Antioch, and the Ionian cities. It would also be wrong to infer that the Jews had the citizenship in all Ionic cities.

¹ Various other terms were employed in different cities.

² One uses the term "certain" in the way in which alone it can be used in regard to the history of ancient institutions, where we are dependent on inference and reasoning of a rather elaborate kind. You cannot demonstrate to a determined opponent either that these groups are a survival, or that the earth moves round the sun.

The facts just stated are familiar to every scholar, and need no proof; but quotations from two standard works by two excellent authorities may serve to emphasize the principle. Mr. Warde Fowler¹ says "The early City-State, wherever we have anything like a full knowledge of it, invariably appears as subdivided into smaller groups, which look as if they had some historical relation to the original settlements out of which the city was formed." He is speaking of an earlier period than that which we are concerned with; but the same principle continued, and it is expressed with regard to the more developed period by Mr. Greenidge² in the following terms: "Simple membership of a State which was not based on membership of some lower unit was inconceivable to the Graeco-Roman world." In the Seleucid City-States that "lower unit" was generally called the "Tribe."

The "Tribe" was united by a religious bond (as was every union or association of human beings in the Graeco-Roman world): the members met in the worship of a common deity (or deities), and their unity lay in their participation in the same religion. It was, therefore, as utterly impossible for a Jew to belong to an ordinary Tribe, as it was for him to belong to an ordinary Hellenic city.

But, just as it was possible for a group of Jewish aliens to reside in a Greek city and practise their own religious rites in a private association, so it was possible to enrol a body of Jewish citizens in a special "Tribe" (or equivalent aggregation), which was united by the bond of their own Hebrew religion. That this must have been the method followed by the Seleucid kings is obvious; and, though the fact cannot everywhere be demonstrated in the absence of records, yet it may be regarded as practically certain (so far as certainty can exist in that period of history).

¹ *The City State of the Greeks and Romans*, p. 37.

² *Roman Public Life*, p. 66 (published in 1901).

It might seem to be a possible method to treat the body of Jews planted in any Seleucid city as equivalent to a "Tribe" but different from it in constitution: so that a Seleucid City-State consisted of a certain number of Tribes together with a body of Jews, who were possessed of Isopolity but were simply called "the Jews" or "the Nation of the Jews." Corroboration of this might seem to lie in the fact (which is established by clear examples in epigraphy) that the entire body of Jews in a Graeco-Asiatic city was commonly spoken of by these terms.¹ But at Alexandria, where that method of designating the Jews who lived in the city is the ordinary one, Josephus fortunately has recorded incidentally that the "Tribe" of the Jews was called "Macedonians," i.e. all Jews who possessed the citizenship in Alexandria were enrolled in "the Tribe *Makedones*": this "Tribe" consisted of Jews only, as Josephus' words imply,² and as was obviously necessary; for what Greek would or could belong to a Tribe which consisted mainly of the multitude of Alexandrian Jews with whom the rest of the population was almost constantly at war?

The example of Alexandria may be taken as a proof that, by a sort of legal fiction, an appearance of "Hellenism"³ was given to the Jewish citizens in a Greek City-State. It lay in the purpose and essence of both Ptolemaic and Seleucid cities that they were centres of Hellenic civilization and education.

In short, we come back to the assertion from which we started. Citizenship necessarily implied membership of one of the "Tribes," out of which the city was composed:

¹ See *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii, pp. 538, 668.

² μέχρι νῦν αὐτῶν ἡ φιλή τὴν προσηγορίαν εἶχε "Μακεδόνες," Joseph., *Apion*, ii, 4, giving definition and precision to the words of *Bell. Jud.* ii, 18, 7 (§ 488), χρηματίζειν ἐπετρῆσαν Μακεδόνας.

³ In the period after 300 B.C. the term "Hellenes" implied, not blood, but manners and education.

to "get a Tribe" was equivalent to becoming a citizen, and *vice versa*. The method which is recorded for the Jews of Alexandria was the regular method—in fact the only possible method—for introducing a new national element into a city: the new nationality was enrolled as a special "Tribe," and brought its religion with it as the tribal bond of unity. Many examples are known of this method of enlarging Hellenic cities.

But the other difficulty remained. There was a religious bond uniting the whole city. The entire body of citizens was knit together by their common religion; and the Jews stood apart from this city cultus, abhorring and despising it.

The Seleucid practice trampled under foot this religious difficulty by simply making an exception to the general principle. The Jews were simply declared by Seleucus, founder of the dynasty, and his successors to be citizens, and yet free to disregard the common city cultus. They were absolved from the ordinary laws and regulations of the city, if these conflicted with the Jewish religion: especially, they could not be required to appear in court or take any part in public life on the Sabbath. Their fellow citizens were never reconciled to this. It seemed to them an outrage that members of the city should despise and reject the gods of the city. This rankled in their minds, a wound that could not be healed. Time after time, wherever a favourable opportunity seemed to offer itself, they besought their masters—Greek king or Roman emperor—to deprive the Jews of their citizenship, on the ground that fellow citizens ought to reverence the same gods.¹

Therein lay the sting of the case to the Greeks or Hellenes. The Jews never merged themselves in the Hellenic unity. They always remained outside of it, a really alien body. In a time when patriotism was identified with community

¹ Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xii. 3, 2 (§ 126), ἀξιοῦντων, εἰ συγγενεῖς εἰσὶν αὐτοῖς Ἰουδαῖοι, σέβασθαι τοὺς ἰδίους αὐτῶν θεοὺς: compare xvi, 2, 5 (§ 59).

of religion, it was not possible to attain real unity in those mixed States. A religious revolution was needed, and to be effective it must take the direction of elevating thought. Then one great man, with the true prophet's insight, saw that unity could be introduced only by raising the Gentiles to a higher level through their adoption of the Jewish morality and religion; and to that man's mind this was expressed as the coming of the Messiah, an idea which was very differently conceived by different minds. Elsewhere we have attempted to show the effect upon St. Paul of this idea as it was forced on him in his position at Tarsus, which was pre-eminently the meeting-place of East and West.¹

It follows inevitably from the conditions, that there cannot have been any case of a single and solitary Jewish citizen in a Hellenic city.² It was impossible for a Jew to face the religious difficulty in an ordinary Greek city. He could not become a member of an ordinary "Tribe"; and he could become a member of a Hellenic city only where the act of some superior power had suspended the regular Greek constitution in favour of the Jews as a whole. It may be set aside as impossible, as opposed to all evidence and reasonable inference, either that an ordinary Hellenic city would voluntarily set aside its own fundamental principles in order to welcome its most hated enemies and most dangerous commercial rivals, or that the superior power would or could violate the constitution of the city in favour of a single individual. Where Jews can be proved or believed to have been citizens of a Hellenic city, the origin of their right must lie in a general principle laid down by a superior power, accompanied by the introduction of a body of Jewish

¹ *Contemporary Review*, March 1901, in a paper on "The Statesmanship of Paul."

² Here, again, one might quote from modern New Testament scholars flatly contradictory statements. They assume that Paul's case might be a solitary one in Tarsus. But such a view will not bear scrutiny.

citizens sufficiently strong to support one another and maintain their own unity and religion.

But might not a Jew occasionally desire the Hellenic citizenship for the practical advantages it might offer in trade? He might desire those advantages in some or many cases; but they could not be got without formal admission to a "Tribe," and if he were admitted to an ordinary Hellenic Tribe in some extraordinary mode, he must either participate in its religion or sacrifice the advantages which he aimed at. In fact, it may be doubted whether any person who avoided the meetings and ceremonies of the tribesmen could have retained the membership. The Jew must either abandon his nation and his birthright absolutely, or he must stand outside of the Hellenic citizenship, except in those cities whose constitution had been widened by the creation of a special "Tribe" or similar body for Jews.

The case may be set aside as almost inconceivable that any Jew in the pre-Roman period, except in the rarest cases, absolutely disowned his birthright and was willing to merge himself in the ordinary ranks of Hellenic citizenship. Prof. E. Schürer has emphasized the thoroughly Hebraic character even of the most Hellenized Jews who had settled outside Palestine;¹ and there can be no doubt that he is right. They were a people of higher education and higher thoughts and nobler views than the Gentiles; and they could not descend entirely to the Gentile level. Even the lowest Jew who made his living out of Gentile superstitions or vices usually felt, as we may be sure, that he was of a higher stock, and was not willing to become a Gentile entirely.

Moreover, the race hatred was too strong. The Greeks would not have permitted it, even if a Jew had desired it.

¹ *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*, etc., ii. p. 541 f. I quote the second edition, not possessing nor having access to the third.

The Greeks had no desire to assimilate the Jews to themselves ; they only desired to be rid of them.

IV. THE JEWS IN TARSUS.

Now let us apply these considerations to the case of Paul's family. His father was a citizen of Tarsus, yet a strict observer of the Jewish religion.¹ As a citizen of Tarsus he was necessarily a member of one of the "Tribes" (or whatever other name was applied to the groups) out of which the city of Tarsus was composed. This group or "Tribe" must have been united in the ceremonial of the Hebrew religion, and consisted of Jews. Those Jews must have been granted the privilege of citizenship and a "Tribe" by some higher authority, which interfered with the normal course of a Hellenic city. As the Jews received the citizenship of several Ionian cities, of Alexandria, of Antioch and all the new cities founded by Seleucus I., so they received the citizenship of Tarsus.

A passage in the Second Book of Maccabees enables us to fix the precise year in which the Jewish element was introduced into Tarsus ; and the circumstances which led to this introduction are very instructive as to the character and purpose of the Seleucid foundations of Jewish colonies.

In 189 B.C. a new period began in Cilician history. For more than a century previously Cilicia had been near the middle of the Seleucid empire, and was therefore in helpless subjection ; and its cities were treated accordingly. But in 189 B.C. the Seleucid empire lost all its western provinces ; Cilicia became a frontier land ; and its cities began to feel the approach and the inspiration of freedom. The Seleucid rulers had now to look carefully to their hold on Cilicia, and

¹ We pass over the "arguments" of those scholars who consider that there is no sufficient evidence to prove that Paul was a citizen of Tarsus : they are not really "arguments," but merely demonstrate that the scholars who have used them are ignorant of the fundamental principles of historical criticism. Further, Paul had inherited the citizenship : see EXPOSITIO, Nov. 1901, p. 334.

as usual they did so by new foundations or refoundations. Within the next twenty years many of the cities were renamed Seleuceia, or Antioch, or Epiphaneia, and began to strike coins as self-governing cities (whereas previously they had been enslaved, without the right of coinage).

In 170 B.C. "they of Tarsus and Mallus made insurrection, because they were to be given as a present to Antiochis, the king's concubine. The king (Antiochus IV.) therefore came to Cilicia in all haste to settle matters."¹ The disturbance arose because the king was treating those cities as slaves. It was settled without war by peaceful arrangement; and immediately Tarsus began to strike coins as an ordinary Greek city, but its name was changed to Antiocheia.² The course of events, therefore, is quite clear. A compromise was made. Antiochus granted constitutional government and sovereign rights to Tarsus, but refounded it as Antiocheia, which implied some addition of inhabitants, whom he might rely on as faithful to himself, counterbalancing the too democratic and rebellious spirit of the Greek part of the population.

It follows from the principles stated in the preceding and the present article that those added colonists were, at least in part, Jews. The constitution of Tarsus was thus settled on a wise and sound balance of western and eastern elements, of Greek and Semitic population; and it remained in this state until the latter part of the reign of Augustus, when the philosopher and statesman Athenodorus, offended by the insubordinate and ill-regulated spirit growing among the democracy, made an oligarchic revolution, narrowing the circle of citizenship on a timocratic principle.³ As it

¹ 2 Macc. iv. 30 f. The importance of this passage in the history of Tarsus seems to have escaped the notice of modern scholars.

² The port of Mallus, too, was refounded as Antiocheia.

³ See Dion. Chrys. *Or. ad Tars.* p. 321 (ed. Von Arnim), Kühn, *Städteverw. im rom. Kaiserreiche*, pp. 250, 470. The date when Athenodorus flourished in Tarsus (he returned there from Rome in old age) is given by Eusebius *Chron.* as 7 A.D.; modern authorities on his life have not observed this date.

cannot have been at this time that a Jewish body of citizens was introduced, they must have been brought to Tarsus in 170 B.C. (as we have already inferred from the circumstances of that time).

Incidentally we observe that the confining of the Tarsian citizenship to a small number of richer citizens confirms what we have said as to the rank of Paul's family in the *EXPOSITOR*, November 1901, p. 328 ff.

It is noteworthy that the Tarsian Jewish colony belongs to the period immediately preceding the rebellion of the Maccabees. At that time even in Palestine the Hellenization of the Jews was making rapid progress. As the writer of First Maccabees says, i. 11 ff., "there came forth out of Israel transgressors of the law, and persuaded many . . . and went to the king, and he gave them licence to do after the ordinances of the Gentiles. And they built a place of exercise (a gymnasium and palaesta) in Jerusalem . . . and many of Israel consented to his worship, and sacrificed to the idols, and profaned the Sabbath." From Second Maccabees iv. 9 ff. we learn that a body of young men trained in the gymnasium, and wore the Greek cap. This change was slowly coming over the Jews in their own land through the quiet force of favourable conditions. It was interrupted by the haste of King Antiochus to anticipate nature and force on the change too rapidly. He was eager to see Jerusalem take its place as another "Antioch"¹ among the ordinary Hellenic cities of his realm; and his haste caused a reaction. Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabaeus, killed with his own hand a Jew who was offering sacrifice at one of the new altars; and the revolt began. The rising Hellenism of Palestine gave place to a strong revival of Hebrew feeling, which grew only the stronger as force and persecution were called in to destroy it.

¹ 2 Macc. iv. 11.

The Jews had come, or been brought, into Asia Minor during the time when Palestine was growing Hellenized in the warmth of Seleucid favour. In their new homes they were even more kindly treated, and all the conditions of their life were calculated to strengthen their good feeling to the kings, and foster the Hellenizing tendency among them, at least in externals. They necessarily used the Greek language; they became accustomed to Greek surroundings; they learned to appreciate Greek science and education; and doubtless they did not think gymnastic exercises and sports such an abomination as the authors of First and Second Maccabees did.

But, as Prof. E. Schürer and others have rightly observed, there is not the slightest reason to think that the Jews of Asia Minor ceased to be true to their religion and their nation in their own way: they really commanded a wider outlook over the world and a more sane and balanced judgment on truth and right than their brethren in Palestine. They looked to Jerusalem as their centre and the home of their religion. They contributed to maintain the Temple with unflinching regularity. They went on pilgrimage in great numbers, and the pilgrim ships sailed regularly every spring from the Aegean harbours for Caesareaia.¹ They were in patriotism as truly Jews as the strictest Pharisee in Jerusalem. Doubtless Paul was far from being the only Jew of Asia Minor who could boast that he was "a Pharisee sprung from Pharisees."² Yet they were looked at with disfavour by their more strait-laced Palestinian brethren, and regarded as little better than backsliders and Sadducees. They had often, we may be sure, to assert their true Pharisaism and

¹ *St. Paul the Trav.* pp. 264, 287.

² *Ibid.* p. 32. It is strange that this translation, which the language of Asia Minor inscriptions makes quite certain, has not suggested itself to the commentators.

spirituality, like Paul, in answer to the reproach of being mere Sadducees with their Greek speech and Greek ways.

And there was, it is certain, great danger lest they should forget the essence of their Hebrew faith. Many of them undoubtedly did so, though they still remained Jews in name and profession, and in contempt for the Gentiles, even while they learned from them and cheated them and made money by pandering to their superstitions. Many such Jews were, in very truth, only "a Synagogue of Satan" (as at Smyrna and Philadelphia), but still they continued to be "a Synagogue." The national feeling was sound, though the religious feeling was blunted and degraded.

In such surroundings was Saul of Tarsus brought up, a member of a family which moved both in the narrow and exclusive circle of rich Tarsian citizenship and in the still more proud and aristocratic circle of Roman citizenship. In his writings we see how familiar he was with the Graeco-Asiatic city life, and how readily illustrations from Greek games and Roman soldiers and triumphs suggest themselves to him. In him are brought to a focus all the experiences of the Jews of Asia Minor. He saw clearly from childhood that the Maccabaeian reaction had not saved Palestine, that the Pharisaic policy of excluding Gentile civilization and manners had failed, and that the only possible salvation for his nation was to include the Gentiles by raising them to the Jewish level in morality and religion. Judaism, he saw, must gradually lose its vigour amid the sunshine of prosperity in Asia Minor and gradually die, or it must conquer the Gentiles by assimilating them. The issue was, however, certain. The promise of God had been given and could not fail. This new prophet saw that the time of the Messiah and His conquest of the Gentiles had come.

W. M. RAMSAY.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

INTRODUCTORY.

1. It has been said that the Reformation of the sixteenth century was a return from an infallible Church to an infallible Book, and that of the nineteenth from an infallible book to an infallible Person. The seat of authority has been shifted from the Church to the Bible, and from the Bible to Christ. But the modern movement is not, and cannot be so simple. The historical and literary criticism of the Old Testament has been one of the most potent factors in bringing about this change, in compelling the Church to turn from the Book to the Person; and yet an appeal has been made to Christ against some of the conclusions of criticism. If He refers to the Law as by Moses, or to the Psalms as by David, His infallible authority must be held as settling the question of authorship; if He illustrates His teaching by the story of Lot's wife, or of Jonah, His unerring judgment must put beyond all question the historicity of the narratives dealing with these persons. Thus runs this argument. Its finality is, however, denied by many reverent Christian critics, who do not doubt or deny Jesus' infallible authority and unerring judgment, but who maintain that all such questions do not belong to the moral and religious realm, in which Jesus chose to reveal truth to men, or going even a step further, in which under the necessary conditions of a real Incarnation, He alone had knowledge beyond other men. An issue, the importance of which can hardly be overstated, has thus been raised for Christian thought. Must we on the one hand deny the validity of some of the conclusions of criticism, and consequently bring its methods into discredit? Or shall we abandon the claim for Jesus of infallible authority and unerring judgment? Or can we

escape both these alternatives by so determining the range of the knowledge of Jesus, as will leave to faith the perfect revelation of God in Him, and at the same time avoid all conflict between His wisdom and criticism? This question cannot be answered on the one hand by an appeal to any Christological formulae, for these are too vague; nor on the other hand by an examination of the passages in which He refers to the Old Testament, taken by themselves, for these afford too narrow a basis for judgment. We must consider as a whole the relation of His consciousness as Son of God to the knowledge of the facts of nature and history, which varies from age to age, and is ever gaining in compass, content, and certainty. The problem is this. How far was He limited by, and how far did He transcend contemporary thought? This problem cannot be solved by a separate treatment of the mind of Jesus apart from His life, for the range and power of the intellect of any person is dependent on the character and development of the whole personality. In these Studies of the "inner life" of Jesus an attempt will be made to deal with this problem.

2. Christian theology has become, to use the common term, "Christocentric." Even the type of evangelicalism which is less ready to respond to the intellectual influences of the age speaks less now of *a plan of salvation* and more of *a saving person*. But in this movement there seems to be a double danger. It may end in substituting on the one hand a vague abstraction, the filial consciousness of Jesus, or His idea of God, for the vivid and vital image of His person, or in losing on the other the distinctive unity of His revelation in the multitude and variety of the words of grace and truth, which fell from His lips. His person must be concretely presented in order to preserve the manifoldness of His teaching in the oneness of His consciousness. While it must be a fundamental principle in Christian theology, that God must be conceived as Jesus thought of

Him; yet it must be recognized that we do not learn all Jesus thought of God by collecting, classifying, and drawing inferences from all His sayings about God. He lived as well as taught His revelation of His Father. His life is the most authoritative commentary we have on His thought. His teaching [on morality and religion loses much of its power and charm, when divorced from His person. The more adequate and distinct and consistent the image of Jesus, which is enshrined in our minds and hearts, the more intelligible and credible will His revelation become to us. As it is not a *Christ-idea*, but a *Jesus-image* which must be the centre of Christian theology, these studies may, it is hoped, prove a contribution, not altogether valueless to Christian thought.

3. Christian piety desires to hold communion with Christ. By faith it knows Him present, interested, responsive, and active, although it has no sensible tokens and no logical proofs that He here and now is, lives, loves, and works. What content can be given to this communion of the soul and the Saviour? How shall we conceive or represent the Christ whom we trust? Can the apostolic interpretation of His work, can our personal experience of His saving grace give us all we need and want? Surely not. It may be said with confidence that it is Jesus as presented in the Gospels, His divine human reality, His mental, moral, and spiritual perfection (although we know His humiliation has been changed for His exaltation), with whom the souls of believers desire to come into union. Such Studies of the "inner life" of Jesus, as are here attempted, may prove to some a means of communion with the living Christ.

4. But if for criticism, theology, and piety alike so decisive significance belongs to the person of Christ, the problem of that person becomes one of the most serious and pressing questions of the age. That the ecumenical

councils or the Church fathers have said the last word upon the subject cannot be admitted for a moment by any who believe that the Spirit of Truth is still guiding the church into all truth. The apostolic interpretations of Christ, the Pauline and the Johannine, are of abiding worth, but these deal primarily with Christ in His exaltation with the glory of that state reflected in His pre-existence, and only subordinately with Jesus in His humiliation. Paul and John assure us of the *fact* of an Incarnation, but to learn adequately and distinctly the *mode* of the Incarnation, the conditions and limitations under which the Word became flesh, we must fix our regard on the Gospel testimony (including John's Gospel as well as the Synoptics, in so far as his historical record is not modified by his theological reflexion). Instead of being content with vague generalities, we must seek to lay hold of the distinct details of the life and work. To treat Jesus' formal statements about His person and purpose as exhausting all the data for Christology afforded by the Gospels, and to ignore the light cast on His being and work by many incidental suggestions in word and deed is to court failure in dealing with this great theme. A necessary preparation for treating the problem of the person of Christ is to engage in Studies such as are offered here.

5. We cannot go far in this quest without being stopped by what many regard as an unsurmountable barrier. The question is forced upon us, can we distinguish the historical testimony from the theological interpretation in the Gospels? Are not the Gospels witnesses, not to what Jesus actually was, but to what the Early Church believed Him to have been? There have been signs recently, to which it would be folly to shut our eyes, that criticism will not be content to have its own way with the Old Testament, but will claim to get its say about the New Testament. Those who imagine that, as Westcott and Hort have said

the last word on the lower criticism of the New Testament, so Lightfoot has said what can never be gainsaid on the higher criticism, are doomed to a rude awakening, if they are still cherishing this fond dream. If there is a general tendency to assign earlier dates to the New Testament writings than there was formerly in the critical school, there is no evident inclination on that account to recognize unreservedly the historical trustworthiness. To state the final issue involved in this discussion briefly and, therefore, bluntly, it may be said that the controversy turns on this one point. Was the persistent remembrance of a past experience, or the potent influence of a present environment the decisive factor in the composition of the Gospels? Answering the question broadly, it may be suggested that, if Christ has for the race the significance and value which Christian faith assigns to Him, then surely the disciples were more strongly impressed by His personality than affected by contemporary tendencies of thought and life; and being so impressed did not neglect the means of perpetuating their remembrance of Jesus in the Church He had founded. We have a right to start with the assumption, that the Gospels are what they profess to be. If study of them disproves the claim, we must be ready to abandon it; but the writer would express his assured conviction that the image of Jesus reflected in the Gospels confirms their credibility. Criticism has not been ignored in these Studies, and, nevertheless, the conclusion to which they have led is that spiritual discernment of the grace and glory of the life of Jesus removes some of the difficulties, and disproves some of the objections of criticism.

6. Many talented and distinguished men have in recent years attempted to write the life of Jesus. Many subsidiary studies of the land, the people, and the times have been engaged in to set this greatest life in its proper surroundings, in the clearest light, and sharpest outline. The scenery, the

drapery, the upholstery of this drama have received, if not excessive, at least sufficient attention. The writer has not the capacity or the resources, still less has he the inclination, to essay the same task. To him the supreme interest is the personality of Jesus. What he wants to know is not how Jesus was dressed or housed; or what He ate or drank, but how He felt, what He thought,—His "inner life," is what he desires to understand. In these Studies interpretation will take the place of description; an attempt will be made to push through every incident and utterance to the mind and heart of Jesus.

7. So fragmentary are the narratives, and so diverse their arrangement in the Gospels, that a chronological treatment of the life must often rest on very unstable conjecture. We may be able with some degree of probability to distinguish the successive stages of Jesus' ministry, and to place the decisive events of His career in relation to these stages; but it seems quite impossible to determine with any certainty the order in time of all the individual incidents. Nor does it seem at all necessary. The ministry of Jesus covered so short a time, and there was so little room in it for any marked personal development, that a distinct image of Him can be gained by considering the diverse aspects of His ministry rather than the successive events. There are decisive events which must be treated separately with due regard to order of time, but there are many other incidents, the significance of which can be more easily reached by treating them in groups as illustrative of some distinctive feature in Jesus' life and work. In the order of these Studies some regard has been paid to what seems a probable chronology, but its tentative character has throughout been recognized.

8. The method of these Studies may be briefly explained. The teaching of Jesus in His discourses or parables is not dealt with. So many learned and able works on this sub-

ject already exist, that the writer has no desire to do what has already been often done before. The significance and value of many of Jesus' incidental utterances, as illuminating and illuminated by the events which were their occasion, however, does not gain sufficient recognition, especially for the purpose in which the writer is most deeply interested—the solution of the problem of the person of Christ. Much belongs to the self-testimony of Jesus, which has been entirely ignored in the traditional Christology, or even inadequately dealt with by some recent writers on the subject. The choice of incidents to be dealt with in these Studies has been determined by this consideration, How can we better know and understand Jesus? In connexion with each incident some utterance has been taken as of decisive significance, and has been adopted as the standpoint from which it is viewed. As many of the narratives are very incomplete, and do not give us all we need for getting at the full meaning of Jesus' sayings, the writer has ventured on extending the conception of "the context" of a saying which is to be taken into account in its interpretation. We must sometimes try to recover by sympathetic imagination the actual historical situation, when that is not fully presented to us by the narrative. Such a venture can be justified only by its results. If a difficulty is removed, if a fresh truth is discovered, it is at least not improbable that the effort has been crowned with success; and this probability approaches a certainty, if in this way the consistency of all Jesus' words and works is made more evident. The resultant portrait of Jesus will, the writer hopes, prove the justification of his method.

9. This series of Studies will begin with one dealing with the virgin-birth. As the "inner life" of Jesus is to be the subject of investigation the inclusion of this theme may seem out of place. But apart altogether from the most important question of the effect of the mode of the birth in

the physical constitution, and consequently in the mental, moral, and spiritual capacity of Jesus, this event has a significance for His inner life. His growth in wisdom and favour with God and man was conditioned by the teaching and training of the home in Nazareth, and surely that education was influenced by His mother's consciousness of His relation to God, and of her own grace from God in being chosen to be His mother. We must believe, however, that the influence of this event on His personal development was thus mediated by His mother, as it seems incredible that the fact could have been known to the youth even. Probably the secret was disclosed only when manhood was reached. A study of the mind and heart of Mary, so far as the narrative discloses her thoughts and feelings, belongs rightly to this series. But it may be objected, if we go back so far, should we not go back further, and begin with Jesus' consciousness of pre-existence. A summary answer, which will afterwards be justified, is all that can now be given. The writer confidently holds that the certainty of pre-existence did not emerge in Jesus' consciousness, until His personal development was well advanced. Although we may not be justified in assigning its mental emergence to as late a period as its verbal expression, according to John's testimony, yet it seems inconceivable that there could be growth of mind and heart in any intelligible sense if this certainty were possessed in clear and full consciousness from the beginning. As we seem justified in assuming that Jesus gradually attained the certainty of His divine sonship and His Messianic vocation, so we are warranted in concluding that only slowly did there dawn in His "inner life" the glory which He had with the Father before the world was.

10. In conclusion, a few words may be added on the writer's theological standpoint in these Studies. He holds that the Christian Church cannot without immeasurable spiritual loss abandon its confession of the divinity of Jesus

as God's "only-begotten and well-beloved Son." But he holds also that in much Christian thought the difference between the state of humiliation and of exaltation is ignored, and Jesus in the days of His flesh is thought of as in all points like the Lord in His glory. Thus justice is not done to His real humanity. Even when His humanity in some of the features of His earthly life is recognized, yet, as His divinity is not regarded as equally sharing in His humiliation, an alternation of human and divine parts is substituted for the living unity of His person. His person and character are through and through supernatural; many of His words and works are miraculous; no normal evolution of "resident powers" in the human race according to the "inherent laws" of its history can account for Him; He comes to the world from the being and life of God. Nevertheless He was man, growing in mind, and heart, and will, limited in knowledge, liable to temptation, subject to emotion, strained in effort, dependent on, and submissive to God. We must take account of all the facts, and must not secure simplicity and consistency of view by the sacrifice of the completeness of our knowledge. The writer has attempted to do full justice to every feature and factor in the person of Christ, in the firm conviction that only as with candour and reverence we seek the whole truth, do we honour Him who is the Living Truth, and gives the Spirit of Truth.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA.

THE words ascribed to our Lord at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel, "Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost,"¹ have been regarded by many recent writers as of doubtful genuineness. It is pointed out that this formula (as it is called) for the administration of baptism is not mentioned again in the New Testament. In the Acts the phrase used of those received into the Church is, "they were baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ"² (*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰη. Χρ.*), or "into the Name of the Lord Jesus"³ (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρ. Ἰη.*); and it has been supposed that this shorter and simpler formula was employed in early days, and that baptism in the Name of the Trinity was a later practice. At a time when it had become the established custom to use the longer and fuller formula, the Gospel according to St. Matthew assumed its present form, and it was then that the concluding words, containing the great missionary commission of the Church, were added.

Commentators have adopted different expedients for escaping this unwelcome conclusion. For instance, it was suggested by Cyprian, who seems to have perceived the difficulty, that while it was sufficient to baptize a Jew "in the Name of Jesus Christ," since he already confessed the true God, in the case of Gentiles the full formula reciting the threefold Name was essential. In the case of Jews, where the shorter formula was used, e.g. by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 38), he notes, "Jesu Christi mentionem facit Petrus, non quasi Pater omitteretur, sed ut Patri Filius quoque adiungeretur."⁴ This solution is ingenious, but it will not explain the language of the Acts,

¹ St. Matt. xxviii. 19.

² Acts ii. 38, x. 48.

³ Acts viii. 16, xix. 5.

⁴ Cyprian, *Epistles*, lxxiii. 17.

for in the account of the baptism of Cornelius and his companions, who were Gentiles, it is only said that it was administered "in the Name of Jesus Christ" (Acts x. 48).

Another attempted explanation is based on the view that baptism in the Name of Christ is virtually baptism in the Name of the Trinity, and that therefore it did not matter which formula was used. No disobedience to Christ's parting command was implied in substituting for the formula prescribed by Him a shorter formula which is equivalent to it. But whatever view may be taken of the "validity" of baptism accompanied by the shorter formula, it is extremely improbable that in such a matter the Apostles would have disregarded the direct command of Christ, supposing it to be really His, and that it enjoined the use of certain words.

A much better solution is that favoured by Dr. Plummer,¹ as well as by other recent writers. Dr. Plummer suggests that when St. Luke says that people were baptized "in the Name of the Lord Jesus," he is not indicating the formula which was used in baptizing, but is merely stating that such persons were baptized as acknowledged Jesus to be the Lord and the Christ. And he thinks that in all the recorded cases of baptism in the *Acts* the longer formula may actually have been employed, although it is not explicitly rehearsed in the narratives. This is a theory which deserves careful consideration, and it seems in several ways to co-ordinate the facts better than any other that has been put forward, although it is perhaps not entirely complete. It is, indeed, all but certain that the earliest forms of the baptismal confession of faith were single, not triple. The verse inserted in the Western text of the story of the baptism of the Ethiopian by Philip expresses accurately the profession that was demanded of those wishing to be baptized: πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν (Acts

¹ Hastings, *Bible Dictionary*, s.v. "Baptism."

viii. 37). In brief, they were required to say, "Jesus is Lord"; cp. Romans x. 9, 1 Corinthians xii. 3, Philippians ii. 11. So of the people of Samaria it is recorded: ὅτε δὲ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ Φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες (Acts viii. 12). And thus when St. Luke says, a few verses further on, that they were baptized εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (Acts viii. 16) he seems to mean no more than this, that they were incorporated into the society or kingdom of which the Lord Jesus was the Head. But it will be asked, Is this the natural meaning of the words βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομά τινος? Do not such words imply a definite formula accompanying the baptismal act? The question goes to the root of the matter, and it is the purpose of this paper to examine it afresh. The true solution, as it seems to me, was given long ago by Gerard Voss. He argued (*Disput. de bapt.*, Thes. v. p. 48) that if the Lord's intention was to prescribe a formula for recital during the act of baptizing, He would have put His command in the form, "Make disciples of all the nations, *saying, I baptize thee in the Name,*" etc. But as He said merely "Make disciples, etc., *baptizing them,*" etc., no form of words is prescribed. This view is adopted both by Neander¹ and, more explicitly, by Stier,² but it has not found acceptance of late years. Despite Stier's long argument it seems to be tacitly assumed by most commentators that the words of Matthew xxviii. 19 prescribe a form of words; and this assumption will be found, I believe, when tested, to lack evidence. It is the more desirable to examine the question *de novo*, as Neander does not argue the point at all, and Stier envelopes the discussion in such a mist of words that it is hard to discern his meaning. Besides, he does not seem to me to have put the case at all as forcibly as he

¹ *Planting of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 21 (Eng. Tr.).

² *Words of the Lord Jesus*, vol. viii. p. 311f. (Eng. Tr.).

might have done; and, further, evidence is now available as to the meaning of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, of which he did not know.

The usage of the Old Testament as to the meaning of the phrase "the Name of Jehovah" must first be scrutinized. Whatever the Hebrew word *שׁם* originally meant, it is used in the Old Testament as suggestive (i.) of the personality or character of the person named; cp. Isaiah ix. 6; (ii.) of the idea of authority, and so of ownership; cp. Amos ix. 12 (quoted Acts xv. 17), where "all the nations over which Jehovah's Name was called" are all the nations which had recognized Jehovah's authority; see also Jeremiah xiv. 9. Finally (iii.) the "Name" of Jehovah is used as equivalent to the Person of Jehovah; and in this, "its most characteristic and frequent usage,"¹ it is significant of Jehovah as manifested to men and as entering into relations with them; cp. 2 Samuel vii. 13, Isaiah xviii. 7, etc. The "Name" of God in the Old Testament "denotes all that God is for men" (Cremer). So Bishop Westcott observes on John i. 12: "The revealed Name gathers up and expresses for man just as much as he can apprehend of the Divine nature."

Before we go further, we must observe that a usage of *ὄνομα* identical with (i.) and (ii.) above is to be found in the Greek papyri of the early Christian centuries. Thus we have several times the expression *ἔντευξις εἰς τοῦ βασιλέως ὄνομα*, i.e. "a petition to the king's majesty," the *name* of the king being the essence of what he is as ruler.² This is like sense (i.) and is also comparable to sense (iii.) Again, in an inscription, probably of the end of the first century (*C.I.G.* ii. 2693 e), there is mention of the sale of certain objects being effected *εἰς τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄνομα*, i.e. they were sold so that henceforth they belonged to Zeus and became the

¹ G. B. Gray, in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*. s.v. "Name."

² Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 146 (Eng. Tr.).

property of the god. This implies the sense of *ownership* as in (ii.) above. Another illustration of the same usage is afforded by a second century inscription (*B.U.* 256₃) τὰ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς ὄνομα δυνεῖν. "that which belongs to the property of the two."¹

We have, then, abundant justification, both from the LXX. and from the papyri of the early centuries, for the suspicion that ὄνομα may be used in these metaphorical senses in the Greek of the New Testament. It *may* connote character or personality, or even authority and ownership, if the context permits us to translate it so. And, in fact, in Matthew x. 41, ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου μισθὸν προφήτου λήμψεται κτλ, the meaning of receiving a prophet "in the name of a prophet" is plainly "having regard to his prophetic character and calling," which is practically equivalent to sense (i.) specified above.² The employment of the word ὄνομα does not necessarily point to the recitation or invocation of any particular *name*.

We have next to determine the meaning of the phrase βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς τινά in the New Testament. Here we can get no help either from the Old Testament or the papyri, and our only course is to examine the New Testament

¹ *L.c.* p. 197. There are several instances in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Grenfell and Hunt, Part II. 1890) of ὄνομα being used in the sense of *property*. See, e.g., Nos. 247, 248, 249, 250.

² Matt. xviii. 20, οὗ γὰρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα is a difficult phrase. It probably means "where two or three are gathered together to meet Me," or "with thoughts of Me." But we cannot always distinguish εἰς ὄνομα from ἐν ὀνόματι. As Blass points out (*Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 122), in Hellenistic Greek εἰς with acc. is often used where we should expect ἐν with dat., e.g. ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην (Mark i. 9). And it is possible that εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα in Matt. xviii. 20 is equivalent to ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι ἐμοῦ, and means "in My Name," i.e. "with the invocation of My Name." But despite the looseness of the use of εἰς in the N. T., I believe that the phrase εἰς ὄνομα in all the instances of its occurrence in the N. T. is best rendered by giving to εἰς its strict prepositional force. To equate εἰς with the acc. to ἐν with the dat. may be permissible, but it is certainly not a sound canon of exegesis to lay down that the two phrases *must* always mean the same thing.

contexts where the phrase occurs. It may be premised that it is certain that the Jewish practice of baptizing proselytes on their admission to the covenant of Israel dates from pre-Christian times.¹ Thus the passage in which St. Paul says of the Israelites of the Exodus, πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ (1 Cor. x. 2), did not need explanation of its terms. "They were baptized unto Moses," i.e. they were baptized into the dispensation or polity of Moses; the Cloud and the Waters sealed the nation's adoption of Moses as leader and guide. So in Romans vi. 3 and in Galatians iii. 27, where St. Paul writes of baptism εἰς Χριστὸν, he means by that phrase incorporation with Christ:² "As many as have been baptized into Christ, they have put on Christ." Or, as he writes elsewhere, εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν (1 Cor. xii. 13). And, again, we miss the point of the question ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε (1 Cor. i. 13), if we do not perceive that to be baptized εἰς ὄνομά τινος is to be incorporated in a man's party and to be numbered among his followers.

Somewhat close parallels to this phrase are, indeed, to be found in Jewish treatises, and the little we know of the ritual of the baptism of proselytes on admission to the Jewish covenant is highly instructive. The essential requisite in that ceremonial was the presence of witnesses, who played a part afterwards taken up by Christian sponsors. There is no evidence that the person baptized then received a new name; this Christian practice was the natural out-

¹ See Schürer's *The Jewish People*, Div. II., vol. ii. p. 327 ff. (Eng. Tr.). The idea of ceremonial washings was familiar to the Jews, and the point in which John the Baptist's practice marked a new departure was that for him there was no thought of technical or ceremonial defilements. With him baptism was εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν: it was the outward symbol of purification from the moral defilements of the heart and conscience.

² Similarly of the heretical baptism of Menander. Irenaeus says, "Resurrectionem enim per id, quod est in eum baptisma, accipere eius discipulos, ut ultra non posse mori," etc. (*contra Haer.* I. xxiii. 5). His disciples were baptized in eum (εἰς αὐτῶν). Theodoret says the same thing, and notes that Menander's view was σώζεσθαι δὲ τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν βαπτιζόμενους (*Haeret. Fab.* i. 2).

come of the desire to put away every association of the old heathen life, but it is not the essence of the baptismal act, nor was it any part of the ritual of Jewish baptism. The Babylonian Talmud describes this very briefly: "They baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying, *"Behold he is an Israelite in all things."*¹ The person thus "baptized unto Moses" was thenceforth reckoned as a sharer in the covenant of Israel and as one of God's people. And we find an illustration of the phrase *εἰς ὄνομά τινος* in a curious Talmudic rule about the baptism of children found in the streets: "One finds an infant cast out and baptizes him *in the name of a servant*—do thou also circumcise him in the name of a servant; but if he baptize him *in the name of a freeman*—do thou also circumcise him in the name of a freeman."² The meaning of baptizing "in the name" of a servant or of a freeman is, clearly, baptizing "into a condition" of servitude or of freedom. So Maimonides in later times wrote of the baptism of slaves: "Even as they circumcise and baptize strangers, so do they circumcise and baptize servants that are received from heathens *into the name of servitude.*"³

I submit, then, that in the language of the New Testament *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομά τινος* is equivalent to *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς τινά*, and that the use of the word *ὄνομα* proves nothing as to the recitation of any special "name" accompanying the baptismal act. What Christ enjoined upon the Apostles was that they should, by baptism, bring the nations into His Church and so into contact, as it were, with God. As time

¹ See Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, xxii. 818.

² *Jerus-Yebamoth*, fol. 8. 4 (לֵיטב עֲבָד). I take the reference from Wall, *Infant Baptism*, Intro.; but have verified it with the assistance of my friend Dr. Abbott.

³ *Isuri Bta*, c. 11, *apud* Wall *ut supra*. לֵיטב עֲבָדוֹת are the words. So again in the Babylonian Talmud (*Yebamoth*, fol. 47b) it is said of the baptism of women proselytes that they were baptized לֵיטב שִׁפְחוֹת = *in nomen servitutis*. Note that in all these Talmudic quotations we find לֵיטב, not בֵּיטב, i.e. *in nomen*, not *in nomine*.

went on it was inevitable that the words of Matthew xxviii. 19 should be interpreted as a strict formula to be used at every baptism, and we can see how desirable and even necessary it was that they should be so used to secure a clear understanding of what was being done on the part of baptizer and baptized alike. No words could so clearly exclude heretical intention or innocent mistake. It is possible that the Apostles used them from the first, but of this we have no evidence. The two earliest notices of the explicit recitation of a formula at baptism are found in Justin Martyr and in Irenaeus, and they are worth citing in full.

In his first *Apoloogy* (c. 61) Justin thus writes: ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται . . . ἐν τῇ ὕδατι ἐπονομάζεται τῇ ἐλομένῳ ἀναγεννήθηναι . . . τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ ὄνομα, αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνου ἐπιλέγοντος (al. ἐπιλέγοντες) τοῦ τὸν λουσόμενον ἄγοντος ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρὸν (no other name can be given to God without impiety) καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος πνεύματος ἁγίου ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται. It seems to be quite distinctly implied in this passage that the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is invoked over the candidate for baptism. It will be noticed that the phrase used is ἐπ' ὀνόματος and not εἰς ὄνομα.

Next, Irenaeus, speaking of the heretical baptism of the Marcosians, records: οἱ δὲ ἄγουσιν ἐφ' ὕδωρ καὶ βαπτίζοντες οὕτως ἐπιλέγουσιν εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων, εἰς ἀλήθειαν μήτερα πάντων, εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα εἰς Ἰησοῦν, εἰς ἔνωσιν καὶ ἀπολύτρωσιν καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων.¹ This, again, by the word ἐπιλέγουσιν, asserts the use of a baptismal formula among the heretics, and so (by implication) among the Catholics of the late second century.

¹ *Contra Haer.*, I. xxi. 3.

I do not know of any clear statement of the use of a prescribed formula earlier than these two notices. It is generally asserted, indeed, that in the *Didache* the triple formula is ordered for use; but an inspection of the passage will show that this inference is highly doubtful: *περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος οὕτω βαπτίσατε ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι . . . ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τρις ὕδωρ εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος* (*Didache*, § 7). Here the words ordered to be said (*ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες*) are the previous exhortations about the Two Ways (if, indeed, we may take the *Didache* as a complete work), not the formula "In the Name," etc. The *Didache* orders no more than is ordered by Matthew xxviii. 19, viz. baptism "into the Name" of the Trinity. And it is clear from § 9, where it is said that communicants must be *οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου*, that the compiler of the *Didache* regarded it as all one to be baptized "into the Name of the Lord" and "into the Name of the Trinity." So, indeed, it is, if the significance of applying *ὁ κύριος* to Christ be apprehended; but the two phrases, if they were used as formulae of invocation, could never have been regarded as *identical*.

The only other quotation worthy of note is from *Hermas*, *Vis.* iii. 7, 3, *θέλοντες βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου*, which again gives no information as to the use of any formula.¹

The result of the whole investigation is that the words "baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" do not necessarily enjoin the use of a formula for recital. They set forth the purpose and effect of Christian baptism, whereby converts were baptized into the Trinity, i.e. taken into close covenant

¹ Cp. *Hermas*, *Sim.* ix. 16, 3, *πρὶν γὰρ φησι, φορέσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸ ὄνομα [τοῦ υἱοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ, νεκρός ἐστιν.*

relation with God, revealed in Christ as "Three in One." It was inevitable that the words should come in time to be used as a formula expressive of the intention of the Church in ministering baptism: but there is no evidence that they were so used when St. Luke wrote the Acts. On the other hand, St. Luke's phrases, "baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus" and the like are in no way inconsistent with his knowledge of the words in Matthew xxviii. 19; and therefore we cannot argue from the language of the Acts, as some writers have done, that the concluding words of the first Gospel are a later addition to the evangelical tradition of our Lord's commission to His Church.

J. H. BERNARD.

*THE NEW TESTAMENT AND JEWISH
LITERATURE.*¹

PART I.

JUST as Christianity is a development of Judaism, so the books of the New Testament start from Jewish thought and Jewish literature. Our subject therefore is a study in the method of Divine Revelation; of the way in which the new heavens and the new earth of the kingdom of God arose out of that ancient dispensation which, as the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, was becoming old and waxing aged, and was nigh unto vanishing away. We shall not, however, deal with the whole of this great process of the Divine working; we leave on one side abstruse questions of history, of doctrine, of sacred metaphysics, and confine ourselves to the humbler, simpler, and more concrete branch of the subject—the relation of the sacred books of the New Covenant to the literature of the Chosen People. We may say in passing that the influence of Pagan literature

¹ The inaugural lecture at New College, London, 1901.

on the New Testament is of the slightest. Here and there a sentence comes directly or indirectly from a Pagan author. The study of monuments and newly discovered papyri by Deissmann, Rendel Harris, J. H. Moulton and others has shown that some of the phrases of the Epistles are conventional formulæ found in the letters of devout Pagans or in their religious inscriptions. But when all this is taken into account, it is still true that the writers of the New Testament owe hardly anything to profane literature compared to their great debt to their Jewish predecessors, and perhaps we should also say their Jewish contemporaries. Let us consider for a moment what Jewish works were accessible in the period during which the New Testament was written. First and foremost there were the books which we Protestants know as the Old Testament, the books from Genesis to Malachi; secondly, there were the books which the Roman and other Churches, the majority I fancy of Christendom, include in their Old Testament, but which we call Apocrypha, viz. Esdras, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Books of the Maccabees, etc. The third class is the strange apocalyptic literature. There are of course apocalypses in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, viz. the Book of Daniel and the Fourth Book of Esdras. But besides these there is a numerous collection of books, written in the names of ancient worthies, describing history thinly veiled as prophecy; the history is mingled with marvellous visions of heaven and hell, and leads up to accounts of the last things and the Day of Judgment. Such are the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Books of Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Book of Jubilees, the Assumption of Moses, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Psalms of Solomon, the Sibylline Oracles. These are often known as the Pseudepigrapha, or books written in the names of persons who were not their authors. These

books are not now included in the Bible of any Church, but in the first century of the Christian era many regarded them as of almost equal authority with the Old Testament.

The fourth class comprises Jewish writings which were never regarded as canonical. There are the numerous commentaries of Philo, which are mainly devoted to allegorizing the laws and history of the Pentateuch. Moreover, the works of Josephus, his history of Israel, his history of the Jewish War, and his autobiography were in existence before the last of the New Testament books was written.

The fifth class consisted of what we may call, somewhat paradoxically, oral literature. The discussions, opinions, and decisions of the Rabbis concerning the Law, the observance of the Sabbath, the washing of pots and pans, the tithing of mint and anise and cummin and so forth, based on a curious exegesis of the Pentateuch, the whole combined with grotesque legends about the patriarchs. These were handed down from one teacher to another, and when years afterwards they were committed to writing with all the later additions they filled many large volumes. In the first century they were not yet written down, but there must have been a large collection of traditions known to different Rabbis.

The total amount of this literature was comparatively small. The average length of the books was much less than that of the books of modern times. In the Old Testament, for instance, *Obadiah* is not as long as a leading article in the *Times*, and many of the books are shorter than an article in a quarterly review, so that there were, even according to the Jewish reckoning, twenty-four books in the Old Testament; we make thirty-nine. Omitting the unwritten traditions, I should think that all the works I have referred to could be contained in a dozen

volumes the size of our Bible ; at any rate a very moderate bookshelf would hold them all. Of course there were books known to the Apostles that have since perished ; they sometimes quote works which are not now extant, but I imagine that if we had all the Jewish literature accessible to our Lord and His Apostles the whole of it would go into two or three shelves. Of this small collection only a part would be known to any one of the writers ; no one of them, probably, had seen all the works now extant, even omitting Josephus. Books were rare and expensive. Our Bible dictionaries, both new and old, do not even devote an article to the word " Book," but refer to the subject under " Writing." Apart from references to quotations as " in the book of Isaiah," etc., books and reading are rarely mentioned in the New Testament. We hear of a book in the synagogue,¹ of the book of Isaiah which the Ethiopian eunuch was reading,² of the books and parchments which St. Paul left at Troas,³ and of the books of magic which his converts burnt at Ephesus,¹ hardly anything else. Nevertheless the pious Jew was familiar with the Old Testament ; Timothy⁵ had known the sacred writings from a babe. The books that St. Paul left at Troas no doubt included copies of parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, and other Apostles would possess similar treasures. But the Jews of our Lord's time were not dependent upon books alone for their knowledge of the Old Testament. During their childhood they learnt many passages by heart, and they were constantly hearing it read and expounded in the synagogues ; thus their memories were stored with Scripture texts. We do not know how far the ordinary Jew knew Hebrew ; many of the Jews of Palestine who spoke Aramaic knew their Bibles through the Aramaic oral translation given in the synagogues ;

¹ Luke iv. 17-20.² Acts viii. 28-32.³ 2 Tim. iv. 13.⁴ Acts xix. 19.⁵ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

the Greek-speaking Jews knew it through the Septuagint or Greek translation, which included the Apocrypha.

Notice, too, the form in which the Bible came to the Jews. Our Bible is a book with contents clearly defined by being nearly always bound up in one volume or set of volumes. If a single book, *Psalms*, or a Gospel, or the New Testament, is published separately, we regard it as a part of a whole. But the Old Testament of our Lord's days was a library; each portion, written on a separate roll or rolls, had a distinct individuality of its own. Probably none of the Apostles had ever seen, almost certainly had never possessed, a complete set of these rolls. An Old Testament would have been a chest of rolls; there can have been few if any chests which contained all our Old Testament books and no more. There must have been many chests containing some of the books, and often other rolls as well. Our Bible too is usually marked off from other books by a special binding and arrangement. It has a special appearance which makes it an ostentatious display of religion to carry a Bible. Perhaps this was the case with the Pentateuch in our Lord's time; it was certainly not the case with all the other books. Popular feeling as to the uniqueness of just that collection of books which we call the Bible is largely due to familiarity with volumes which contain all these and no others, and which differ outwardly and visibly from all other books. The books of the Hebrew Old Testament were not marked off in this way.

Let us now consider for a moment, in the light of what we have been saying, the nature of our subject, which is the use of Jewish literature by the New Testament. The use by the New Testament means use by the authors of the books, and by the speakers whose utterances they record. We may forget the controversies as to the authorship of some of these books; such questions do not affect what I

have to say. These authors and speakers fall into three classes. One at least, St. Luke, was a Gentile, a professional man, a doctor, with literary tastes and gifts, who knew the Old Testament by reading it in the Greek translation. Others were Jews of the Dispersion, whose vernacular was Greek, and whose Bible again was the Greek translation of the Old Testament. Thus the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was a Hellenist of Alexandria, a disciple of Philo. The other Hellenist was St. Paul, of the Greek city Tarsus. He however had received what we may call a University training in Jewish theology at Jerusalem under Gamaliel. He was a Hellenist by birth and association, but he had come under the influence of the Judaism of Palestine and the Rabbis; he had a student's knowledge of the Scriptures in the original Hebrew, and delighted to call himself a "Hebrew of the Hebrews." The third class was composed of Jews of Palestine, St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. John, St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude, with whom we should include our Lord Himself. They were mostly Jews of Galilee, master carpenters, master fishermen, a tax collector; in a sense they were working men, but they correspond more truly to what we call the lower middle class. Their language was Aramaic, but they probably knew some Greek, just as, I believe, most people in Wales know some English. It is doubtful how far they knew Hebrew; there was no written Aramaic translation, and it is possible that their written Bible again was the Greek translation of the Old Testament; but they also knew the Aramaic translation, or perhaps the Hebrew, of many passages which they had learnt by heart as children, or heard translated by word of mouth in the synagogues. Both the last two classes, the Hellenists and the Palestinian Jews, had been taught portions of the Bible from childhood; they had heard it read and discussed from week to week at public

worship, and they daily recited passages from it in their private devotion and family worship.

Then, too, use by the New Testament means use in sermons or religious exhortations, of the discourses of our Lord, the speeches of James and Peter, Paul and Stephen; in histories of our Lord and of the founding of the Church; in letters to Christian churches and teachers as to life and doctrine; and in that magnificent symbolic picture of Divine things, the Book of Revelation.

The Jewish literature of which we have already spoken enjoyed various degrees of authority; the Pentateuch had a special and unique position; the Psalms and the Prophets, excluding Daniel and including Joshua, Samuel and Kings, were read in the public services, and came next to the Pentateuch; the other works were less revered. Thus our subject is the use made by these Greeks, Hellenists and Palestinian Jews, in their narratives and letters, of the various religious writings of Judaism.

You are already familiar with much that can be said on this topic, and I need only remind you of it very briefly. You may read a striking restatement of the general facts in Prof. G. A. Smith's *Modern Criticism and the Old Testament*. No one can read the New Testament without noticing that the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms especially, and in a less degree some other Old Testament books, are used even more frequently than in modern sermons and religious works, and that they are used in every possible way. Sometimes passages are quoted with the title of the book from which they are taken; sometimes expressly as Scripture; sometimes sentences and phrases are interwoven with the context without anything to show that they are quotations. Often a verse is appealed to as an authority; sometimes however an ordinance from the Old Testament is cited only to be set on one side; "It is said by them of old time . . . but I say unto you."

Very frequently phrases and sentences are used simply to express what the words of the Greek translation suggested to the inspired writer, without the least reference to their original meaning in the Hebrew Scriptures. An earnest and devout deacon once said to me that the authors of the New Testament used the Old "just as they liked."

Naturally the methods of different authors vary. Most of them follow the Greek translation even when it differs from the Hebrew, but the Gospels, including quotations contained in our Lord's discourses, St. Paul, and 1 Peter, very occasionally seem to correct the Greek by the Hebrew. Again, the direct use of the Old Testament is much less in *Colossians* than in most of the Pauline Epistles, much less, for instance, than in *Ephesians*. Then as to the Johannine books: large portions of the Apocalypse are almost a mosaic of phrases from the Old Testament; but comparatively little direct use of the older Scriptures is made in the Gospel, and perhaps none at all in the Epistles. Then as to literature outside of our Old Testament, the influence of the Apocrypha can be traced in almost all the books. Our Lord's discourses are said to show that he had studied the non-canonical Apocalypses. Thus Dr. J. E. Thomson, the author of perhaps the best defence of the authorship of the Book of Daniel by Daniel, and therefore not a revolutionary critic, has published a work on the apocalypses, which he entitles "Books which influenced our Lord," In a recent number of the *Church of England Ecclesiastical Review*, Prof. Henslow maintains that our Lord's teaching has been influenced by the *Book of Enoch*, from which book the short Epistle of St. Jude has borrowed many of its phrases and ideas; and indeed St. Jude expressly quotes Enoch as Scripture: "Enoch . . . prophesied . . . saying." Similarly the Epistle to the Hebrews is full of the phrases and ideas of Philo; possibly, though it is disputed, *Luke*, *Acts* and 2 *Peter*, or one or more of them,

make use of Josephus; and here and there we come upon traditions found elsewhere in Josephus or the later rabbinical writings; these traditions, no doubt, were derived from the oral teaching current in the schools and amongst the people.

Such details are interesting in themselves, and they have a bearing on the criticism of the New Testament, but the one outstanding fact is that the books in which God's Revelation to Israel reached its climax, the Pentateuch, Psalms, Isaiah, and the Prophets, occupy a position of unique authority for the writers of the New Testament. They have indeed only a few casual utterances as to the character of the ancient Scriptures; they do not formulate any dogma as to inspired writings; they neither state nor imply that their methods of quotation and exegesis are an authoritative standard for the Church throughout all time; but their example does commend the Old Testament as a supreme source of spiritual enlightenment and an unique means of grace. Their language and ideas were moulded by it, their doctrines took its teaching as their starting point, the history it records is recognized by Christ and His Apostles as a preparation for His coming; no one can understand the New Testament who has not some intelligent knowledge of the Sacred Books of Israel.

But more than this, the Old Testament has an independent position of its own, side by side with the New Testament. Portions of the more ancient Scriptures may record the elementary lessons which God taught the world in its childhood; but, even so, there will always be with us those who are babes in the things of God, and who need to be taught the alphabet and one-syllable words of the language of His kingdom. But the pages of the Old Testament have also ministered to souls in which the life of the Spirit was complete and mature; St. Paul and St. John, nay, even our Lord Himself, found life and light,

comfort and inspiration in prophets, psalms, and sacred story; we therefore have not reached and cannot attain to any height of spiritual experience where we can afford to neglect the Old Testament.

Turning to details: let us consider the relation of the New Testament to such technical questions as the Canon, the principles of exegesis, the criticism of the text, history, and of the date and authorship of the various books of the Old Testament. Providence has preserved for us in the New Testament much valuable information which we must use in the discussion of these subjects; but it gives no decisions on these critical problems, still less does it furnish an authoritative endorsement of traditional views. Our Lord and His disciples speak of Scriptures, but they nowhere provide a list of the books which make up these Scriptures; they do not tell us in which of our MSS. we shall find the correct text, for the very obvious reason that none of the extant MSS. of the Old Testament, whether in Hebrew or in Greek, had then been written. Their exegesis, on the face of it, seems to imply conflicting views as to the interpretation of the Old Testament; they do not try to combine them into any consistent system. They draw their illustrations from the narratives of Moses, David and Elijah, Jonah and Job; they do not tell us how far we are to regard these as literal history. They use all the more important books of the Old Testament, but they seldom connect an author's name with their quotations, and they never give the date of their authorities. Thus the Holy Spirit clearly indicates that the New Testament is not intended to give any inspired dictum on such matters, they lie within the scope of the ordinary powers of the human intellect, and they are left to be decided by devout and reverent research. It will be convenient to begin with a word or two about the text of the Old Testament used by the writers of the New. The documents in which the Old

Testament has been preserved to us fall into two main classes.¹ There are the MSS. of the original Hebrew, the oldest of which was written not earlier than 800 years *after* Christ, and there are the much older MSS. of the LXX. or Greek translation of the Old Testament, some of them written before A.D. 400. The differences between these two groups of MSS. are considerable, but they do not affect the substance of the Revelation. Now in the great majority of instances the New Testament writers and speakers, including our Lord Himself, follow the Greek translation; that was their Bible, not the Hebrew text. Sometimes they differ from both the Hebrew and the Greek MSS.; very occasionally they agree with the Hebrew against the Greek; but they constantly follow the Greek even where it differs from the Hebrew; and often the whole point of the quotation lies in something in the Greek translation which is not found in the Hebrew. For instance the Epistle to the Hebrews (x. 5), in speaking of the Incarnation, quotes Psalm xl. 6, as saying, "A body didst thou prepare for me"; this is from the Greek translation. The Hebrew has "Mine ears hast thou opened." If the usage of the New Testament were an example which we were bound to follow, we should be obliged to make the Greek translation our chief authority for the text of the Old Testament. None of us, I imagine, will accept this conclusion; we shall rather maintain that in such matters the inspired writers merely followed the conventional practice of their times, without the least intention of erecting the custom into a binding law for the Church in all ages.

Then as to the Canon, the question as to exactly what books are to be included in the Old Testament. Christians are not now and never have been agreed on this matter. The Church of Rome and other churches include a number of books which we exclude. We at any rate have the

¹ Space prevents our discussing the MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

satisfaction of knowing that those which we accept are unanimously recognized by all Christendom. But the New Testament does not decide this controversy between us and the Romanists. The Church took over its Canon of the Old Testament from the Jews; but in the time of Christ and the Apostles there was no agreement, either official or popular, among the Jews as to this Canon, i.e. as to the books, to be included in their Bible. Some, like the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Psalms, etc., were universally accepted, but there were many, including the Old Testament Apocrypha, Esther, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Enoch, which were accepted by some Jews and not by others. This diversity of opinion and practice amongst the Jews is reflected in the New Testament, and has continued in the Christian Church ever since. It has been pointed out that there were two differing texts of the Old Testament, that of the Hebrew MSS. and that of the Greek translation, and that Christ and His disciples mostly use the latter; now the Greek translation included the Apocrypha; so that their usage, if it is an authoritative example, would seem to endorse the Greek canon and these Apocrypha. It is true that our Lord does not quote any of these Apocrypha as Scripture; but neither does He thus quote other books as to which the Jews were doubtful, viz., Esther, Canticles, Ecclesiastes; if His silence excludes the Apocrypha, it excludes these also. When we turn from our Lord's utterances to the New Testament as a whole, we still find that neither the Apocrypha nor Esther, Canticles and Ecclesiastes are quoted as Scripture; but St. Jude quotes the Book of Enoch as Scripture; and there are eight or nine other passages quoted by the New Testament as Scripture—some of them by our Lord—which are not found in our Old Testament. For instance, Matthew ii. 23, "He should be called a Nazarene"; Matthew v. 43, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy"; Mark ix. 13, "Elijah is come, and they have

also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him"; John vii. 38, "As the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water"; 1 Corinthians, ii. 9:

As it is written.

Things which eye saw not and ear heard not,
And which entered not into the heart of man,
Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him.

These lines contain phrases from the Old Testament, and phrases which are not found there; and according to Origen the passage as a whole is from the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, a work not now extant. Thus the passages expressly quoted by the New Testament as inspired utterances are not confined to our Old Testament.

Further, Prof. Lumby in an interesting article on this subject in the EXPOSITOR for May, 1889, argues that because quotations from the different sections of the Jewish Canon, from the Law, the Prophets, the Hagiographa are combined in one passage, that therefore they were regarded as of equal authority. The same argument would show that works outside our Old Testament were also regarded as equally authoritative with its contents. The celebrated eleventh chapter of *Hebrews* gives us a review of the heroes of faith, in which incidents taken from our historical books are referred to in the same breath with the martyrdom of the Seven in 2 *Maccabees* and the sawing asunder of Isaiah in the *Ascension of Isaiah*; and the speech of Stephen, Acts vii., constantly follows the Septuagint or Jewish tradition when they differ from or supplement the Hebrew text.

Hence if the usage of our Lord and of the writers of the New Testament is to be taken as giving an authoritative decision as to the Canon, our Old Testament would have to include some or all the Apocrypha of the Greek Bible, together with the Book of Enoch and other known and

unknown works. Such a canon never has been and never would be accepted by any Christian Church. Our Lord and His disciples simply followed the customs of the times when they wrote and the societies to which they belonged; their usage was never intended either by themselves or by the Holy Spirit to be binding on us.

W. H. BENNETT.

SOME PROPER NAMES.

“Salute Asyncretus, Phlegon, Hermes Patrobas, Hermas.”—*Rom.* xvi. 14.

THE chapter which contains these names, and a great number more just as lifeless and unsuggestive as these, is in our Bible. It is sometimes read to us as the second lesson upon Sunday morning. When you hear them read, what thought do they suggest to you? Do you even take the trouble to think, *Why* are we asked to listen to these names which are only noises, which tell us no more than an auctioneer's old catalogue might tell? Or do you fail even of this, even to miss from your lesson its usual teaching or inspiration? Is it much the same to you whether the clergyman reads out “Philologos, Julias, Nereus and his sister,” or, “The God of all comforts comfort you”?

For if so, this is a lesson which the catalogue teaches; a very serious and alarming lesson.

But if you have noticed this apparent waste of force, you may have gone on to see that it is part of a much greater question: Why is the Bible written as it is? Even the Gospels, even the four Lives of Christ—how much would we prefer some more of His own wonderful teaching; as, for example, how upon the road to Emmaus He opened the minds of the two disciples concerning the Old Testament and Himself, until their hearts burned within them. Ah, tell us that, we might say, instead of the long wrangle

between the Pharisees and the blind man—"I told you before. . . . Will ye be His disciples too?" "Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost Thou teach us?" There is a good deal, I am afraid, which we would gladly exchange for more important matters unrecorded.

Yet we can see clearly that the choice, however strange, was not made to gratify our idle curiosity; for its problems are utterly ignored.

When, beside Nain, the dead man (as St. Luke grandly puts it)—"the dead man sat up and began to speak." What was it that the dead man made so much haste to say? And when, once, the only time of which we know, Jesus wrote, what were the words He traced with His finger on the ground, and whose foot rubbed them out again? And when Peter and John, looking into the tomb, saw the linen cloths and the napkin folded, what hands folded them, and what robes had those great hands brought with them to array Him who lived and had become dead, and was now the Living One for ever and ever?

On earth we shall never know; the aim of the sacred writers was not the curiosity of man.

Passing from the Gospels, far more surprising is the structure of the Epistles.

Why, why must we distil for ourselves our theology, our doctrine of God and Christ, of sin, the atonement, and the eternal priesthood in the skies, out of letters to ancient Churches concerning a state of affairs entirely unlike our own?

This Epistle to the Romans was written to stop the jealousies of Jewish and Roman converts in the same Church, in which the Jew said, "Mine are the promises"; and the Gentile said, "Branches are broken off that I might be grafted in."

But St. Paul said, "Abraham is the father equally of us all; as it is written, A father of many nations, not only of

one, have I made thee." And again, "God hath shut up all in disobedience that He may have mercy upon all."

But what have we to do with these contemptible jealousies eighteen centuries out of date?

The Epistle to the Galatians was written to prevent them from striving, after being justified by faith, to be saved by the law of Moses. But there is little danger of our supposing that shell-fish endanger our souls, or keeping the days of unleavened bread.

And the Epistle to the Hebrews was written because the dazzling ritual of their accustomed service was drawing back, half-hypnotized, the converts from Judaism to Christ. But now they have abode many days without a sacrifice or an ephod ; their services are not impressive to us.

How much priceless theology we might have had, in the same space, in the shape of theological essays upon the Trinity, the Christian Sacraments, the Ministry, and so forth!

Why not? Why must we read about the foolish Galatians who were bewitched, and the Corinthian who was weak and ate herbs, and the Hebrew who needed milk because he could not bear strong meat? This is just an extreme case, that a page of the divine Book should go to the saluting of Asynceritus, and Phlegon, and the rest, when many of us, perhaps, could write on the same amount of paper enough to reconcile the Eastern and Western Churches, to establish our orders, to put an end to transubstantiation and the usurpation of the Pope.

This has not been done ; and again I ask, Why not, do you suppose?

Clearly because the Bible does not aim chiefly at making sound theologians, but holy men and women. It does surely teach theology, but it does so because theology helps our life, and as far as it helps this.

But it is possible to know accurately, for instance, the

whole Roman controversy, and to throw texts about in exactly the same temper in which ruder controversialists throw stones. And then it does not matter how accurately such texts are chosen and aimed: as long as I am in such a mood, they are mere weapons in a party riot. Though I have all knowledge, and understand all mysteries, and have not love, I am nothing; I am noisy brass.

Therefore your Bible gives you, not theories, doctrines stated so as learned books define them, but the active, working, practical side of truth, truth actually applied to the errors of ancient Rome and Corinth, not because these very errors would be constant (though it is wonderful how small the variety in human error really is), not for this, but in order to exhibit the truth at work as it ought to be at work in us. And again it shows us truth grappling with the very failings and vices which assail us, and shall assail men to the end of time—idleness and indulgence, pride and intellectual scorn.

“Thy words were found, and I did eat them,” says the Prophet. Now men do not eat phosphorus, albumen, silica, and the various chemical ingredients of flesh and bone; they eat bread, which conveys nourishment in a form convenient for us to absorb. Ask yourselves, Do I eat? do I assimilate the truths I hold?

There are books which lads are never tired of reading, which tell them how to play cricket, how to sail a boat, and so forth. But no one ever, I suppose, became a batsman or a sailor merely by reading such instructions: it is by watching skilled operators that one learns what to do, and by practice that one succeeds in doing it.

So it is with the soul.

And therefore, at the cost of something which theory might value more, but which is sufficiently given elsewhere, Scripture exhibits that sturdy blind man, unabashed by the frowning authorities from whom he used to beg; and the

Apostle teaching and warning, applying the highest and most sacred truths to the humblest problems of everyday life, such life as yours and mine. And little is the Bible worth to any of us unless the truths we perhaps boast of holding really influence our lives, unless we are truer, gentler, more trustful by their help.

And now come back to the dull catalogue of names with which we started. With our thoughts thus set free from technicalities, they are not dull at all.

Think of the greatest and most lovable mere man who ever lived, wandering from land to land, homeless, very poor, sadly tried by the fickleness and thanklessness of his converts, and it will gladden and instruct you to know that he cherished so many friends. The list of them does one good to read over. I love to think that the heart of that strong and resolute man was as great as his great brain, and to see him treasuring in his memory so many names of obscure good people—so many, do you observe, in a city where he tells us that he had not yet preached, but into which folk drifted from all the world, into ancient Rome as into modern London. And he remembered that they were there. For many years, he said, he desired to come there, and now he is coming soon, and his heart has gone before him.

What a genuine man he is! How this chapter (which we began by half grudging to him) warms and brightens and puts heart into all the rest.

We are in danger of thinking of Paul as a sort of Napoleon in religion, founding Churches instead of kingdoms, and overthrowing superstitions instead of armies, an iron will, a purpose which trampled on its own heart, and every heart which obstructed it. It is nearer to the truth to think of him as an enthusiast, absorbed in the one sublime thought of the Master whom he saw once, and whom he should some day see again.

To speed thee on thy out-going race
 Christ shows the splendour of His face :
 What shall that face of splendour be
 When at the goal He welcomes thee ?

And what mattered to him, we think, anything between ? We are utterly wrong. Paul's love to Christ kept his heart fresh for all honest love. Some good woman, of whom we know nothing, not even her name, was kind to him, nursed him perhaps in illness, or soothed him when his heart was breaking ; and he remembers, and writes, " Salute Rufus, the chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine." You ought to read all that he ever wrote with more hearty, real, human interest, for the sake of that most exquisite touch.

But these names also remind us what his work was like, for what cause he endured so much.

" He founded Churches," we say. Yes, truly ; but his Churches consisted of living men and women whom he loved. His Churches were built, according to the Russian proverb, not of beams but of ribs. And what this chapter tells us most of all is the value of obscure lives, of the tradespeople like Lydia, and perhaps like Onesimus, the slaves of the first century.

As we read of the restless and splendid energies of the great first missionaries, we despair ; we feel that religion in our day, or at least in us, cannot spread as broad a wing nor soar as high.

But Asyncretus and Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas and Hermas, it is mere guess-work if of any one, namely, the last, one intellectual effort survives. Only their names are left—and this, that they loved the great Apostle, and he loved them ; that they lived holy lives, though silent, obscure, uncultivated, save with the rich culture of souls which are taught of Christ ; and that in their simple bosoms swelled the tides of a nobler emotion than ever Seneca felt.

Listen to what is said of two of them—of whom, however, we know somewhat more: “Salute Prisca and Aquila, my fellow-labourers in Jesus Christ, who for my life laid down their own necks, unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the Churches of the Gentiles.” Would you not rather have that record than have spoken the Philippians or won the battle of Pharsalia?

But you may be sure that the great unknown exploit which thrilled with gratitude all the best and noblest hearts of that age was not due to superior ability—that is not required for laying down one’s neck—nor yet to a momentary impulse, though it may well have been the act of a moment. They had learned of Christ; and He had gradually made them, not eloquent or clever (about which he shows little comparative concern), but good, noble, and self-sacrificing. The splendour of that lightning flash was the revelation of electricity, stored up through many summer days of heat.

He can do the same for you, if you accept Him as your Teacher, here as in Rome, at the end of the nineteenth century as at the beginning of the first. For He, the Sun of Righteousness, whose glory alone makes radiant the faces of all the saints, He is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.

G. A. DERRY AND RAPHOE.

THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS.

I.

ACCORDING to the evidence of our oldest source, which is closely followed by the other Gospels, Jesus began His public ministry with the proclamation of the Kingdom of God or of Heaven.¹ And this being so, the question at once arises, In what relation does Jesus represent Himself as standing to this Kingdom? Or, in other words, What is the nature of His Messianic consciousness?

It is a question obviously that can only be answered by observing closely His own self-revelation, as evidenced in His words and deeds. And here we are at once met with the significant fact that during the early part of His ministry at any rate Jesus observed a studied reticence with regard to His Messianic claims. For not only did He avoid advancing any such claims Himself, but He imposed silence with regard to them upon others who sought to make them known, as when He forbade the demons to speak (Mark i. 34, iii. 12), or charged the leper whom He had healed to say nothing to any man (Mark i. 44).

Nor is the reason of this far to seek. For Jesus to have begun by openly proclaiming Himself the Messiah, without first of all preparing the way by showing the true nature of the Messianic Kingdom, would have tended only to confirm the false expectations that were then current amongst the Jews, and so have precipitated the very crisis that He wished to avoid. But this is very far from saying that the full consciousness of His Messiahship was not meanwhile constantly present to Jesus' own mind. And though, with the evidence before us, it is impossible to decide whether He arrived at this consciousness all at once or whether it was the result of a gradual development in His own

¹ Mark i. 14; comp. Matt. iv. 17, Luke iv. 43, John iii. 5.

mind, it is now very generally admitted that from the time of His Baptism at any rate, not only was Jesus the appointed Messiah, but that He knew Himself to be so.¹ Then, as the Synoptists are all careful to note, “*the Spirit of God,*” which had always been regarded as the peculiar Messianic endowment, descended upon Him:” and the full significance of the immediately succeeding Fasting and Temptation can only be realized when we see in them the testing and defining in Jesus’ own experience of the truths alike of His Messianic calling, and of the nature of the Kingdom He had come to found.²

We are not surprised therefore to find Jesus from this time onwards dropping various scattered hints of this aspect of His Person, as when He identifies Himself with the Bridegroom of Old Testament prophecy (Mark ii. 20; cf. Hos. ii. 21, etc.), or describes Himself as the Coming One, by whom are wrought the wonderful works currently associated with the times of the Messiah (Matt. xi. 4 ff.; cf. Isa. xxxv. 5 f., lxi. 1). But without dwelling upon any such general intimations as these, we may pass at once to the evidence that is afforded regarding Jesus’ Messianic consciousness by His two most significant titles, Son of man and Son of God. The consideration of these should

¹ Dr. Martineau’s assertion (*Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 331) that “the Messianic theory of the person of Jesus was made for him, and palmed upon him by his followers, and was not his own,” so far from being “a reasonable inference,” can only be regarded as an ingenious paradox in view of the general evangelic tradition. Harnack, for instance, whom Dr. Martineau himself quotes, says, “Dass Jesus sich selbst als den Messias bezeichnet hat . . . scheint mir auch die schärfste Prüfung auszuhalten” (*Lehrbuch d. Dogmengeschichte*, i. 57, 58 note).

² Matt. iii. 16; Mark i. 10; Luke iii. 22, cf. Luke iv. 18 ff.; Isaiah xlii. 1, lxi. 1.

³ In this connexion it is interesting to notice that on the first occasion when Jesus announced that it was in Him and His ministry that the Kingdom was actually fulfilled, He pointed out that this ministry among the people must have been preceded in His own experience by a conflict with Satan, out of which He had come victorious (Matt. xii. 27 ff., Luke xi. 19 ff.). See Weiss, *Life of Christ*, E. Tr. ii. 279.

help to bring home to us not only the reality of that consciousness, but also the light in which Jesus Himself regarded His Messianic claims.

I. THE SON OF MAN.

The title occurs over eighty times in the Gospels, or more than fifty times without reckoning the parallels, and on every occasion it is used by Jesus of Himself and never put into the mouth of others.¹ This alone is sufficient to show not only that it was not a current designation at the time, but that it must have been deliberately adopted by Jesus to express some truth He was particularly anxious to convey. When however we proceed to ask what that truth was, we are immediately surrounded by difficulties. Probably no other single phrase of the Gospels has called forth a greater variety of interpretations; nor can we be said even yet to have reached definite conclusions on many of the questions which it raises.²

On one point however there is a steadily growing consensus of opinion, namely, that the origin of the phrase is to be sought in the apocalyptic vision of Daniel vii. The prophet, it will be remembered, has been permitted to see four beasts coming up out of the sea, typifying the four great world-kingdoms that are to bear rule over the earth. But not with them is dominion to rest, for, as he gazes in perplexity, "*I saw,*" so he tells us, "*in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, . . . and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him*" (vv. 13, 14). It is true that not even here is there any mention of a personal Messiah.

¹ John xii. 34 can hardly be regarded as an exception.

² A thorough discussion of the title and of the history of its interpretation is contained in Lietzmann's tractate, *Der Menschensohn* (Freiburg, i. B. 1896), but it is impossible to acquiesce in the writer's own conclusion that the title was never used by Jesus Himself, but found its way into the Gospels from a Christian misconception.

The original reference, as *vv.* 18, 22, 27 show, is rather to "the saints of the Most High"; that is, the ideal Israel, for whom in the counsels of God the empire of the world is designed.¹ But while the immediate prophetic sense did not go beyond this, the evidence alike of the "Book of Similitudes" of Enoch and of the Second (Fourth) Book of Esdras proves that from an early date the title had come to be interpreted personally of the expected Messiah:² and, even if this had not been the case, is there any reason why Jesus should not have so understood it of Himself, putting Himself in the place of the nation, on the ground that in Him its attributes culminated? Certainly no one can read such passages as Matthew xxiv. 30: "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory"; or Matthew xxvi. 64: "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven," without feeling that in both cases Jesus had the Daniel passage directly in view, even while He read into the title a deeper and more precise meaning than was there contained. For no longer, it will be remarked, is it merely "one like unto a son of man" who is described, but "the Son of man."

But while thus the origin of Jesus' favourite self-designation is to be sought in Daniel vii. 13, this is not to say that other passages from the Old Testament may not also have contributed to the sense He attached to it.³ In this

¹ Driver, *Comm.* in loco: cf. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, book ii. c. vii. A personal Messianic reference has however found many supporters, and is still favoured by Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, E. Tr. ii. 439, and more recently has been advocated by Boehmer in his *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn im Buche Daniel* (Leipzig, 1899).

² Enoch, cc. xxxvii.-lxxi.; 2 Esdr. c. xiii. The date of this portion of Enoch is much debated. Its latest English editor places it between 95-80 B.C. or 70-64 B.C. (Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 30), but the possibility of later Christian interpolations must be admitted.

³ Bousset, in his *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum* (Göttingen,

connexion two passages from the Psalms are specially instructive.

The first is from Psalm viii. 4:—

*“What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?”*

where, though again there is no evidence that the Psalm was ever accounted by the Jews to be directly Messianic, we can easily understand how in the vivid picture it presents of man rising through frailty to glory and honour Jesus would find a description of the destiny awaiting Himself.¹

The same may be said of the striking words of Psalm lxxx. 17:

*“Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand,
Upon the son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself;”*

words which, unlike the preceding passage, were interpreted Messianically in the Targums, and obviously point not merely to humanity in general, but to “an individual, chosen from the mass and endowed with special gifts and graces for God’s work.”²

So far then as we have come it would seem that Jesus’ favourite designation, whatever else it implied, contained at least a clear Messianic reference. This is by no means however generally admitted, and more particularly in recent times strong objections have been raised against it on the ground of the supposed Aramaic original of the phrase. This, it has been said, would be *bar ’ēnāsh*, contracted into *bar-nāsh*. And as in Aramaic this could only

1892) has done good service in emphasizing that not only does Jesus use the title in an altogether original manner, but that with Him the idea underlying it is no “*einheitlicher Begriff*,” pp. 104 ff.

¹ Keim in particular has laid great stress on this Psalm as encouraging Jesus to adopt the title, *Jesus of Nazara*, E. Tr. iii. 87 f. See also Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps*, p. 115.

² Stalker, *The Christology of Jesus*, p. 52.

mean "man" or "mankind," the same general sense, it is argued, must be given to the title "Son of man" when it occurs in the Gospels. The Messianic sense is thus either got rid of altogether,¹ or the title is treated more or less impersonally.²

But against this reasoning, to which Holtzmann attaches the merit of a "discovery"³ perhaps the most eminent Aramaic scholar living, Professor Gustav Dalman of Leipzig, has entered his protest on the ground that the assumption on which it rests is by no means a necessary one. The phrase "the Son of man" (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), determined as it is by two articles, is rather, he points out, the product of great perplexity on the part of the Evangelists to reproduce the impression which the Son of man with the articles conveyed in Aramaic, and which was certainly equivalent to more than "the man" as man.⁴ And even if this were not the case, and "Son of man" in Aramaic was equivalent to no more than "man," may we not again ask what reason there is that Jesus should not have imparted to the old phrase a new and original sense? On the whole therefore we venture to think that no valid objection has been established against its Messianic reference, and how well this official sense suits the passages in which it occurs a hurried glance at them is sufficient to prove.

With regard to the passages that deal with Christ's coming to judgment there can at least be no doubt, for here it is obviously in virtue of His Messianic authority that Jesus, as *the Son of man*, claims the right to bring

¹ See Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn*, p. 41 ff.

² Holtzmann thinks it impersonal in the earlier passages, and only personal after Peter's confession, *Neutest. Theologie*, i. 256 ff. According to A. Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache*, 1896, pp. 91 ff., Jesus in many places, e.g. Matthew xi. 19, meant by it no more than "jemand."

³ "Entdeckung," *Neutest. Theologie*, i. 256.

⁴ *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898, p. 196.

in the Messianic kingdom and to “*render unto every man according to his deeds*” (Matt. xvi. 27; cf. x. 23 etc.), just as before by the same authority He had forgiven sins (Matt. ix. 6), and decided as to the fulfilment of the Sabbath law (Matt. xii. 8).

And even when it is the lowly, rather than the exalted Jesus who is referred to, as for example in the familiar passage in which the true nature of the Messianic rule is so clearly laid down, it is noteworthy that it is as *the Son of man* again that Jesus speaks of Himself as coming “*not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many*” (Mark x. 45).

Nor is it different with those passages in which at first sight the title seems to be little more than a self-designation. The Messianic sense, though hidden, may still be found lurking. For was it not the demands of His calling and not merely natural exigences that determined Jesus' homeless mode of life—“*The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head*” (Matt. viii. 20); or from another point of view that led to the contrast with the Baptist—“*For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold, a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!*” (Matt. xi. 18, 19).

While however this is the general sense of the phrase in Jesus' own consciousness, it is a wholly different question whether it was so understood by the disciples. And indeed, in view of His own repeated declarations, to which we have already referred, that He wished no one to know that He was the Messiah, it is clear that Jesus could never have used the title as He did had it been a currently accepted Messianic title. If so, the natural conclusion seems to be that the title, while corresponding to Jesus' own inner sense of His Messianic dignity, was intended to conceal

that dignity from the people until such time as they were prepared to receive it.¹ It served in fact the purposes of an incognito, and was, as Beyschlag calls it, "a title which was no title,"² allowing the Person of Jesus to recede as far as possible, in the first instance at any rate, behind the Divine Kingdom He had come to establish, and at the same time indicating the essential character and dignity of that Kingdom.³

But while the phrase was thus primarily an official designation on the lips of Jesus, it is equally certain that by its very form it must have suggested to Him certain truths regarding His Person, which specially fitted Him for the discharge of His Messianic functions. And popular interpretation has rightly laid hold of the most obvious of these in the emphatic reference to the true humanity of Jesus, which it finds underlying the phrase; just as it is in virtue of his human likeness, in contrast to the brute creation, that there is "given" to the ideal figure of Daniel's vision his Kingdom at the hands of God. At the same time we must be careful not to press this aspect of the phrase too far. To speak of Jesus as presenting Himself in this way as "the realized ideal of humanity," as Neander does,⁴ is not only to put too abstract and philosophical an interpretation on the simple language of the Gospels, but is also unsuitable to the large class of passages where the sufferings of the

¹ The passages from Enoch and Esdras already referred to offer no real contradiction to this; for, apart from the uncertainty of date attaching to the former, we have no evidence that these books were sufficiently widely known to give anything like general currency to the use of "Son of man" as a Messianic title.

² *New Testament Theology*, E. Tr. i. 66.

³ Dalman thinks that it is possible that before the great confession of Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus may never have used the title at all (*Die Worte Jesu*, p. 216); but this is to do unnecessary violence to such passages as Matthew viii. 20, ix. 6, x. 23, etc. See Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, iii. 80; Stauton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, p. 245.

⁴ *Life of Christ*, E. Tr. (Bohm), p. 99; and to the same effect Reuss, *History of Christian Theology*, E. Tr. i. 198, "the normal or model man."

Son of man are predominant. Nor, on the other hand, must attention be directed too exclusively in this connexion to these sufferings, as if in the title we are to see nothing more than Jesus' expression for the weakness of His human nature,¹ or even his equivalent for the suffering Servant of Jehovah.² The title rather touches both poles, the glory and the humiliation, or, perhaps we should rather say, it unites them, for it was, as we have already seen, through humiliation that the true Messianic glory was reached. And Christ's favourite designation becomes thus a brief compendium of the central truth of His whole Gospel, glory through shame, life through death.

In general use however we can easily understand how it would be always the thought of Christ's oneness with our humanity that the title would most readily suggest, and hence probably the exceedingly sparing use made of it by the Apostolic writers.³ They had come to regard their Master so exclusively in the light of the exalted Lord, that any such name as Son of man was felt to be utterly inadequate in expressing their idea of Him.⁴ That notwithstanding this feeling the Evangelists should in their narratives have so constantly preserved the title on the lips of Jesus may thus be taken as an additional proof of their reliability and desire to reproduce as closely as possible the very words of their Master.

G. MILLIGAN.

¹ As Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, E. Tr. ii. 139 ff.

² As Bartlet, *THE EXPOSITOR*, 4th ser. vi. 427 ff.

³ In the New Testament outside the Gospels it occurs only in Acts vii. 56 (in Apoc. i. 13, xiv. 14, there is no article in the Greek): and in early Christian literature, according to Stanton, it is not found unless in actual quotations of Christ's own words, except in Euseb. ii. c. 23 (*Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 243). Cf. also Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn*, p. 57 ff., 86.

⁴ "Dem Zuge der Zeit entsprach die Verherrlichung, die Vergöttlichung des Auferstandenen und Erhöhten; den Menschensohn empfand man dabei eher als ein Hemmuiss." Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie*, i. 258.

THE MINOR PROPHETS.

I THINK that the Minor Prophets are less generally known than any other part of Holy Scripture. This may partly be owing to the name given them, which many take to imply that they are of less importance than the other Prophets. This, however, is a complete mistake. They are only called *minor* Prophets from their smaller size, and from the fact that, owing to the costliness of vellum in ancient days, they were not written on separate rolls, but in one complete volume. The name Minor Prophets is in fact due only to St. Jerome and St. Augustine, more than three centuries after Christ. However, be the cause what it may, ninety-nine clergymen out of a hundred would probably be unable to tell you, without referring again to their Bibles, what is the main theme of Obadiah, for instance, or of Zephaniah. My object, therefore, in this paper is a very simple one. It is merely to give the characteristics and main subject of each of the Minor Prophets in a form which may be easily remembered, and which may perhaps lead some readers to study their writings more carefully for themselves.¹

The order of the Minor Prophets in the Hebrew and in our versions is entirely unchronological. The exact epoch at which some of them wrote is still a matter of controversy. The majority of critics, however, think that they follow each

¹ In this paper I naturally go over the same ground as in my little book on the Minor Prophets in the Men of the Bible series. I may also refer to Dr. G. A. Smith's book on the Minor Prophets as full of the most valuable information.

other during three periods—the Assyrian epoch, the Chaldean epoch, and the period after the Exile. It is certain that to the first epoch belong Amos, Hosea, Micah, Nahum and Zephaniah. The only prophet who seems to have written in the Chaldean epoch was Habakkuk. Obadiah, Zechariah, Joel, Haggai, Malachi, and the book of Jonah belong to the post-Exilic age.

I. AMOS.

Turning now to the Prophets separately, the earliest written book of prophecy is that of Amos. The headings at the beginning of each book were probably added by post-Exilic editors, and some of them are decidedly erroneous. It is, however, certain that Amos wrote in the days of King Jeroboam II., probably about B.C. 755. The date given in the first verse, “two years before the earthquake,” does not help us, as there is no record of the year in which that earthquake took place. It has been said of Amos that “he towers like an earthborn Atlas on the confines of light and darkness”; and that his sudden appearance is one of the most wonderful in the history of the human race. He is the first prophet whose utterances were committed to writing, and his book therefore marks a memorable epoch. We know nothing about him personally except what he tells us of himself. He says that he was among the herdmen of Tekoa, and the word used for herdman occurs in only one other passage of Scripture, where Mesha, King of Moab is also called a *noked*. But the position of Amos was not that of an *owner* of flocks, but of a simple shepherd. The *nakad* was a kind of sheep with short legs and very ugly, but specially valuable for the quality of its wool. Amos also tells us that he was “a dresser of sycamore trees,” which was a very humble occupation. The word *dresser* is in the Septuagint “*knizōn*,” and in the Vulgate “*rellicans*,” which would mean perhaps a “pincher” of

sycamore fruit, which can only be ripened by puncturing it. Tekoa lies at the summit of a desolate hill, about twelve miles south of Bethel, and when this peasant of the South was summoned by the voice of God to carry His warnings and denunciations to Bethel, Samaria, and the northern kingdom in general, he had doubtless become aware of the corrupt condition of the northern tribes on his journeys to sell wool or sycamore fruit.

In the days when Amos prophesied the kingdom of Israel was at the very summit of earthly prosperity. Jeroboam II. was much the greatest, most warlike, and most prosperous of all the kings of Israel. But Amos was not deceived by the signs of outward prosperity, and he foresaw and prophesied that the ten Tribes had awakened God's anger by their sins, and that their doom was nigh at hand. There have been many other instances in which nations have seemed to reach the summit of their greatness on the very eve of their final ruin. Persia never seemed to occupy a more lordly position than in the days of Artaxerxes II.; nor Papal Rome than at the Jubilee of the year 1300, under Pope Boniface VIII.; nor Spain than in the days of Philip II.; nor France than under Louis XIV.; and yet in each instance those kingdoms were on the very verge of fatal disaster. It is curious to find that in the reign of our great Plantaganet Edward III., the poet of the people, Langland, in his *Vision of Piers Plowman*, saw through the veil of external prosperity exactly as the prophet Amos did.

Amos narrates for us the little episode in his history when Amaziah, the lordly high priest of the calf-worship at Bethel, took to the king an exaggerated report of his prophetic utterances, which had produced a profound impression on the people. The king did not deign to interfere; but the high priest contemptuously ordered the peasant seer to go back to his native Tekoa and there to prophesy as much as he liked. After this event we know

nothing of Amos except through unauthorized legends ; but the prophecies, which he probably wrote down at Tekoa, have come to us in all their magnificent force, and they inaugurate that reign of written prophecy which has been of such vast importance to the human race.

The book of Amos falls into well marked divisions. He begins (chaps. i. and ii.) with eight prophecies of doom against Syria, the Philistines, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab, Judah, and finally Israel. In each instance he says that the doom shall fall for three transgressions and for four. But in each instance, except the last, he only mentions the fourth offence. I have no space to dwell on the chief sins for which the other nations are denounced, but the four crimes of Israel are trade in men, greedy oppression of the poor, idolatrous and licentious feasts, and ruthless luxury. The second division (iii., iv., v., vi.) is the great condemnation, rendered more overwhelming by the neglect of repeated warnings, which brought on the final doom.

After this there follow (vii. to viii. 3) five Visions—in the midst of which the little personal episode (vii. 10-11) is interposed. The first vision is of destroying locusts ; the second of consuming fire ; in the third, the prophet sees Jehovah standing on the city wall with the plumb line of destruction in His hand ; in the fourth vision a basket of summer fruit indicates that the end is at hand, and this vision is partly dependent on a play of words between “*kaitis*” (summer) and “*kits*” (the end) ; the fifth vision (ix. 1-6) is one of irremediable destruction due to the neglect of many warnings. The prophecy ends (ix. 7-15), as is the case with many others, with a final word of hope and promise ; but many critics regard this as a later addition to the genuine “*oracle*” of Amos.

The sins denounced by Amos are those of greed, rapacity, cruelty, idolatry, drunkenness, and licentiousness, which are also denounced by all his successors. But all the earlier

Prophets alike insist on the necessity for *spiritual religion*, and on the emptiness of all ritual and external formalism.

Amos puts into the mouth of Jehovah the words (v. 21-24), "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt offerings and meal offerings I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream." The Rabbis also said that Amos had reduced the 613 commands of the Mosaic law to one, namely, "*Seek ye Me, and ye shall live.*"

There is but one direct quotation from this remarkable and impassioned peasant prophet in the New Testament. That is found in Acts xv. 15-17, where St. James quotes the prophecy that the fallen tabernacle of David should be restored and that the Jews should "possess the remnant of Edom." The Apostle, however, seems to have read "Adam" (man) for "Edom," since he says "that the residue of *men* might seek after the Lord."

II. HOSEA.

Of Hosea, as of most of the Minor Prophets, nothing is known except what he tells us of himself. He was the earliest prophet of the North who committed his prophecies to writing, and he certainly wrote in the later days of Jeroboam II. and in the reigns of his immediate successors. That he was a northerner is certain. He is influenced by the language of the beautiful northern poem "The Song of Songs," and all the places which he mentions—Gilead, Tabor, Bethel, Gilgal, Shechem, Samaria, Jezreel—belong to the land of Ephraim. His book falls into two divisions. The first three chapters turn mainly on his own domestic misery. All the remainder of the book deals with the sins

and punishment of Israel. These chapters may be arranged under five divisions, although they are not very distinctly marked. The first division (iv.-vi. 3) was probably written in the miserable reign of Zechariah; the second (vi. 4-vii. 16) in the reign of Menahem, after the assassination of Zechariah and Shallum; the third (vii. 1-ix. 9) was written after Menahem had become the vassal of Tiglath-Pilezer II.; the fourth (ix. 10-xi. 11) was written after Hoshea, the last king of Israel, had been carried captive to Babylon; the fifth (xii. 1-xiv. 9) was written before the final crash of ruin, but while hope was still possible,—for Gilead and Galilee are still alluded to as parts of the kingdom of Israel.

Hosea differs widely from his predecessor Amos. Amos, it has been said, “identified God with *law*, and is the prophet of Conscience,” but Hosea saw that *love* transcends law, and he is the prophet of Repentance. Both prophets denounce the sins of swearing, lying, killing, stealing, drunkenness, robbery, and licentiousness, but in Hosea there is none of the terrible sternness of Amos. It seems as if his voice was constantly broken by sobs while he bewails the vileness and hypocrisy and cruel marauding violence of the wicked priests and the corruption of religion at its very source.

The whole history of Hosea was decided by the tragic events which he narrates in the first three chapters. His wife Gomer turned out to be a woman of most immoral character. Since her second and third children were not *his* children, he called them Lo-Ruhamah (not pitied) and Lo-Ammi (not my people). After their birth Gomer deserted him to live with her paramour, who, after a short time, sold her in the open market-place as a slave. Hosea, however, still loved her and bought her back, at a slave’s price, to live in his house, though no longer as his wife. In his relations to Gomer he saw an analogy of God’s relation to guilty Israel, and he learnt the lesson that if the love of man can be so deep, the love of God is unfathomable and eternal.

Hence he is the first of the Prophets who "rises to the sublime height of calling the affection with which Jehovah regards His people by the name of *Love*." It has been said that if "Amos is the prophet of *mortality*, Hosea is a prophet of *religion*." We find in his book a mingled despair and hopefulness: despair when he thinks of the idolatry and wickedness involved in the moral and political decay brought on by the wickedness of the kings, princes, and priests, and the tremendous punishment which it involved, which, he saw, would ultimately lead to their disastrous overthrow by "King Jareb" (i.e. King *Combat*), the ruthless king of Assyria. Nevertheless he sees a final hope of deliverance, and again and again, in language of marvellous beauty, he expresses his conviction that God will ultimately pardon. He makes Jehovah say, in words of deepest significance:

I will not execute the fierceness of my anger,
I will not again destroy Israel,
For I am God and not man.

Owing to the depth and impassioned conviction with which Hosea wrote he is more quoted in the New Testament than almost any of the Prophets. Our Lord Himself twice quoted the memorable words, "*I desired mercy and not sacrifice*," of which he bade the Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, to go and learn the meaning. St. Paul (Rom. ix. 25, 26) and St. Peter (1 Peter ii. 10) both allude to the names *Lo-Ruhamah* and *Lo-Ammi*. Our Lord (Luke xxiii. 30) and St. John (Rev. vi. 16, and ix. 6) quote Hosea's powerful metaphor, "They shall say to the mountains, 'Cover us,' and to the hills, 'Fall on us.'" St. Matthew applies to Christ the words (Hosea xi. 1) "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." St. Paul also (1 Cor. xv. 55) quotes the grand passage:

O Death, I will be thy plagues;
O Grave, I will be thy destruction.

Hosea, like other prophets, after many passages of mingled despair and hopefulness, ends with the words of a triumphant hope, which found its fulfilment only in the Messianic age.

III. MICAH.

The name Micah means "who is like Jehovah" and was not an uncommon name; but the only fact which we know about the prophet is the instructive story told us by Jeremiah (xxvi. 8-24). When the life of Jeremiah was endangered by the sternness of his prophecies, he was able to point to the precedent of Micah, whose still sterner prophecies, so far from bringing him into peril, had only brought about the reformation in the reign of Hezekiah, and had thus postponed the threatened doom. We learn from this that all prophecy was regarded as *conditional* and that the events predicted might be averted by timely repentance.

Micah calls himself a Morasthite, that is an inhabitant of Moresheth Gath in the Shephelah. He was a humble provincial, and became a sort of tribune of the people, who denounced in burning words the sin of greedy aristocrats—princes, priests, and false prophets. His message was to Jerusalem and Judah, and he points to the Assyrian, and the land of Nimrod, as the source of impending vengeance. His book may be arranged in four divisions:

- I. The threat of judgment (i.);
- II. The necessity of the judgment (ii. iii.);
- III. The promise of blessing (iv., v.); and
- IV. (vi., vii.) a dramatic colloquy of marvellous force.

Micah has several very remarkable passages. No prophet taught the nature of spiritual religion more powerfully than in the question addressed by the conscience-stricken people to Jehovah:

Wherewith shall I come before the Lord,
Bow myself before the High God?
Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings,
With calves of a year old?

Taketh Jehovah pleasure in thousands of rams,
 In ten thousands of rivers of oil ?
 Shall I give my firstborn for my guilt ?
 The fruit of my body for the expiation of my soul ?

To which appeal, showing an utter misconception of God's nature, Jehovah answers :

He hath showed thee, O man, what is good.
 And what doth the Lord require of thee.
 But to do justly, and to love mercy,
 And to walk humbly with thy God ?

Micah, in i. 10-16, has a remarkable series of plays upon words, which here there is no room to explain, but which is due to the fact that the old Prophets regarded language as frequently indicating the omens of destiny. It should, however, be pointed out that Micah's *Messianic* prophecies are remarkable for their distinctness. St. Paul, in Romans vii. 26, alludes to his prophecy of Messiah's kingdom (ii. 12, 13), and three of the Evangelists (Matt. ii. 5, 6, John vii. 42, and Luke xxiv. 47) refer to his remarkable prophecies that Migdal-Edar, "the tower of the flock," and Bethlehem-Ephratah were to be the scene of the advent of the promised Davidic King.

IV. ZEPHANIAH.

Zephaniah, unlike most of the other Minor Prophets—who were of origin so humble that they sometimes do not even mention the name of their father—was of royal descent. He was a great-great-grandson of Hezekiah and prophesied in the days of Josiah, king of Judah. The name of his father Kushi seems to point to the days in which Judah was seeking an alliance with Egypt against Assyria. The picture which he draws of the state of Judah is one so apparently hopeless that it was probably written before Josiah's reformation, which began in the twelfth year of his reign. His menaces are vague and general, and he is the prophet of

inevitable laws. It has been said that there is no hotter book than his in the Old Testament. He probably began to prophesy as a young man, for King Josiah was only the great-grandson of Hezekiah, and Zephaniah belongs to a generation later. This, however, is accounted for by the long reign of King Manasseh, who had no son till he was forty-five years of age. In Zephaniah, as in his predecessors, threatening, exhortation and promise are interwoven, and he shows little originality except that the result of advancing civilization makes him rather more cosmopolitan in his views. His book falls into three divisions :

- I. The menace (i. 1-18) ;
- II. The admonition (ii. 1-iii. 7) ;
- III. The promise (iii. 8-20).

I. *The Menace* begins with the singularly sweeping threat, "I will utterly consume all things from the earth, saith the Lord" (i. 2), but the threat is mainly aimed at Jerusalem and Judah. Jerusalem was evidently the home of Zephaniah, for he shows an intimate acquaintance with its topography. He speaks of the Fishgate, the New Quarter or Mishneh (see 2 Kings xxii. 14), and the Maktesh (i.e. the mortar), possibly the valley of the Tyro-Pæon. In Jerusalem he denounces (1) the *Idolaters*, the remnant of Baal worshippers, with their *Chemarim* or black-robed priests, together with the false priests of Jehovah (*Kohanim*) who worshipped the stars on their house tops; (2) the *Waverers*, who swore both by Jehovah and by Moloch; and the open *Apostates*. To all these is threatened a day of distress and darkness in which they shall stagger like blind men and be destroyed.

II. *The Admonition*. In this section he denounces the crimes of Gaza, Ashdod, Askelon, Ekron, the Cherethites, Kanaan, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, and the Ethiopians; but his main denunciation is against Nineveh, of which he says that "pelicans and hedgehogs shall pass the night upon her

capitals; the owl will sing in the windows, and the crow upon the threshold, Crushed, desolated." Jerusalem also, because she is a rebellious polluted city, shall suffer God's judgements with her fierce princes, her ravening judges, her treacherous prophets, and her hypocritic priests.

III. *The Promise* (iii. 8-20). The book closes with a promise to the remnant of the faithful, who shall be brought back, even from beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, and shall offer to God a pure offering. Thus the bitter and sweeping menaces end with a word of hope in which even heathen nations are partly included. On the whole the main part of Zephaniah's book might be summed up in the words "*Dies irae, dies illa*"—"that day of wrath, that dreadful day."

V. NAHUM.

Of Nahum—whose name means "compassion"—we know nothing except that he was a native of Elkosh, which is by some placed in Galilee near Capernaum (which means "the village of Nahum"); by some in Assyria; and by some, with less probability, in Judah. He probably began to write in the days of King Manasseh before the final destruction of Nineveh. His whole prophecy might be summed up in the words, "*Woe to the city of blood.*" He has nothing to say of the sins of Israel or Judah, but is filled with intense abhorrence of the brutal and ruthless cruelties of the Assyrians. This is not astonishing, since no conquering power which the world has ever seen was more useless, more savage, or more terrible than Assyria and her kings, who filled the world with carnage, and depict, in long lines of sculpture, the frightful nonchalance with which they committed their diabolical atrocities.

The prophecy falls into three main divisions, which deal with God and His enemies; the fall of Nineveh; and the guilt which drew down the vengeance.

The prophecy of Nahum is full of lyric beauty and pictorial

vididness, and it found its fulfilment in the fearful catastrophe which overwhelmed the guilty city, when, on the last night of the siege, which was spent in drunken orgies, a breach was made in the walls by an overflow of the Tigris, and the effeminate king burnt himself alive in his palace. Nineveh disappeared so utterly that the army of Alexander the Great marched over its debris without knowing that a world-empire lay buried beneath his feet. In point of fact the remains of Nineveh first began to be revealed to the world by Layard and Botta after the year 1842.

If the prophecy of Nahum seems to be less directly spiritual than those of such prophets as Hosea, Micah or Habakkuk, we must remember that it forcibly brings before us God's moral government of the world, and the duty of trust in Him as the avenger of wrongdoers, and the sole source of security and peace to those who love Him.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE JEWS IN THE GRAECO-ASIATIC CITIES.

II.

It will help to illustrate the position of the Jews in Tarsus, if we bring together the scanty facts known about the Jews in some other cities of Asia Minor.

V. THE JEWS IN EPHEBUS.

Incorrect views on this subject are widely accepted.¹ The Ephesian constitution was settled by the Seleucid Antiochus II., 261-246 B. C.; and this settlement was appealed to by the Ephesian Greeks as authoritative in 15 B. C. There had, therefore, been no serious modification introduced after the time of Antiochus. Now a body of Jews were dwellers in Ephesus in 15 B. C. and the Greeks of

¹ Shared by the present writer, *EXPOSITOR*, December 1901, p. 403; corrected January 1902, p. 19.

Ephesus tried to induce Agrippa to expel these from the state on the ground that they refused to participate in the city religion.

On what footing did those Ephesian Jews stand? Some, of course, were merely resident aliens, who had been attracted to the city in comparatively recent times by its great commercial advantages. But were there not some Jewish settlers of a different class with better rights? Ephesian inscriptions throw no light on this: they only prove that there was a Jewish community at Ephesus (see Canon Hicks' *Inscr. of Brit. Museum*, Nos. 676, 677). From Josephus we learn that the Ephesian Jews were granted freedom from military service by Roman officials in repeated acts (evidently because the attempt had been made to force them to service), on the ground that their religion, and especially the requirements of their Sabbath, prevented them.

The most distinct evidence as to the status of the Ephesian Jews lies in the arguments used by the Ephesian Greeks, when they appealed to Agrippa in 15 B.C.¹ They claimed to possess the sole right to the citizenship, which was the gift of Antiochus II. These words are useless and unnecessary, unless there was a body of Jews claiming to be citizens of Ephesus, whom the Greeks desired to eject from the citizenship. They came to Agrippa asking permission not to expel Jewish strangers from the town, but to deprive the Jews of their participation in the State.

This conclusion seems inevitable; and Professor E. Schürer has rightly held it. But even so recent and competent an authority as Professor Wilcken adopts the prevalent view² that Antiochus II. merely gave freedom to the Ionian cities, including Ephesus.

¹ Josephus. *Ant. Jud.* xii. 3, 2, § 125 f., and xvi. 2, 5, § 59.

² In Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclop.*, art. "Antiochus." Shared formerly by the present writer: see first note.

Moreover, the next words quoted from the Greeks' argument constitute an even stronger proof: they put the case that the Jews are kinsmen and members of the same race with themselves.

The word "kinsmen" (*συγγενεῖς*) is conclusive. The Greeks argue, "If the Jews are kinsmen to us, they ought to worship our gods." The only conceivable kinship was that which they acquired through common citizenship. The idea that common citizenship implies and produces kinship is very characteristic of ancient feeling and language. We find it even in St. Paul, *Rom.* xvi. 7, 11, where the word "kinsmen" will be understood as denoting Tarsian Jews by those who approach the Epistles from the side of ordinary contemporary Greek thought. It can hardly mean Jews simply,¹ for many other persons in the same list are not so called, though they are Jews. Different classes and shades of meaning in the list are indicated by the various terms *συνεργοί*, *συγγενεῖς*, *συναιχμίλωτοι*, etc. Andronicus and a few others are characterized as members of the same city and "Tribe" as Paul.

The Jewish rights, therefore, must have originated from Antiochus II. Now, throughout his reign, that king was struggling with Ptolemy king of Egypt for predominance in the Ionian cities; and the constitution which he introduced in Ephesus must have been intended to attach the city to his side, partly by confirming its rights and freedom, partly by introducing a new body of colonists whose loyalty he could depend upon; and among those colonists were a number of Jews.

Those resident aliens who had helped in the war against Mithridates had been granted citizenship by the Ephesian State.² But such persons would have to accept enrolment in one of the pagan groups or "Tribes," out of which the

¹ As *συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα* does in *Rom.* ix. 3.

² See the inscription Lebas-Waddington 136a, Michel 496, Dittenberger 253.

city was constituted; and this we have seen that Jews could not accept. If there was a body of Jewish citizens in Ephesus (as seems certain), they must have been settled there by some external authority; and, as we have seen, the constitution was permanently settled by Antiochus II.

The accession of colonists required a new Tribe; and to this period we must attribute the institution of a sixth Tribe, which was afterwards renamed Augusta, in honour of the Emperor Augustus.¹ In Ephesus the Tribes were divided into "Thousands." The Jews were evidently formed into a "Thousand" by themselves, just as about 286, when King Lysimachus added a number of colonists from Lebedos to the population of Ephesus, he made a "Thousand" in the Tribe Epheseis for them.²

VI. THE JEWS OF THE LYCUS VALLEY CITIES.

The Jews in the cities of the Lycus Valley, Laodiceia, Colossae and Hierapolis, form an interesting and important group. That valley was one of the early centres of Christianity; already there were at least three Churches in it, about A.D. 60-61 (*Col.* iv. 15); and it may be regarded as practically certain that those first Churches originated within the synagogue or the surrounding circle of "the God-fearing." In attempting elsewhere³ to bring together the evidence about the Jews of those cities, I found very little; but the subject has been greatly advanced by the newly discovered evidence published among the inscriptions of Hierapolis by a German party of exploration.⁴ The

¹ Σεβαστή. Similarly at Athens the eleventh and twelfth Tribes, which were created to bear the names of Antigonus and Demetrius, were replaced by the tribes Ptolemais and Attalis.

² The words used above, p. 24, do not mean that the Hellenic "Tribes" in a city were always older than the city: they were often late institutions, but some such groups existed before the city and constituted the original city.

³ *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. p. 545 f. and ch. xv.

⁴ *Altertümer von Hierapolis*, by Humann, Cichorius, Winter and Judeich, 1898, pp. 46, 96 f., 138, 174 f.; the inscriptions are edited by Dr. Judeich; see review in *Class. Review*, 1900, p. 79.

bearing of the evidence, however, has not been as yet correctly apprehended.

At Hierapolis a settlement of Jews is several times mentioned in the inscriptions. The body of the Jews there was called either "the Settlement (*Katoikia*) of the Jews who are settled in Hierapolis," or "the Congregation of the Jews."¹ They formed a corporation sufficiently distinct and legalized to have a public office of their own, "the archives of the Jews," in which copies of their own legal documents were deposited. The "Congregation of the Jews" was empowered to prosecute persons who violated the sanctity of a Jewish tomb, and to receive fines from them on conviction.

A most important question is whether those Hierapolitan Jews were citizens or merely resident aliens. This is easily answered. The expression "the Jews who are settled in Hierapolis" might seem indeed to suggest that they were not citizens of the Greek city, but mere residents: the same formula is frequently used of the Romans resident in a Hellenic city. But it must be remembered that the Romans, after the Roman conquest, did not rank among resident aliens in a Hellenic city. They were in their own subject land, and they had definite rights and the position of an aristocratic caste in such cities: they were mentioned along with the body of Hellenic citizens, and frequently even before those citizens, as one of the orders or classes of the population who united in authorizing the acts of the city. The technical term "Settlers" (*Katoikoi*) therefore points naturally to the rank and legalized position of the Jews in Hierapolis.

Moreover the same term is regularly and technically used to designate the settlers planted in a city of Asia Minor

¹ ἡ κατοικία τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει κατοικοῦντων Ἰουδαίων No. 212, ὁ λαὸς τῶν Ἰουδαίων No. 69.

by the Seleucid or Pergamenian kings.¹ On the whole, analogy strongly and conclusively points to the view that a settlement of Jews had thus been made authoritatively in Hierapolis by one of the kings: the settlers had definite rights and a recognized legal position in the city. Possibly there may have been in the earlier period some difference between them and the citizens proper; but this difference was certain to evaporate as Roman customs gradually destroyed the delicate mechanism of the Greek City-State, and must have entirely disappeared by A.D. 212, when all free Hellenic citizens were made Roman citizens; for this higher status, common to all, overrode the minor status of Greek citizen or settler.

Moreover, Hierapolis seems to have preserved its pre-Greek character as a Lydian (afterwards a Phrygian) city, in which there were no "Tribes," but only the freer grouping by Trade-guilds.²

We must conclude then that the distinction as regards citizenship between the old Lydian population and the Settlers (*katoikoi*), planted there at some period before Christ, was not a serious one. The two classes constituted in common the population of the city.³

¹ M. Radet has discussed clearly and convincingly the connexion of the term *κατοικία* with the colonists planted by the kings in the Graeco-Asiatic cities (*De coloniis Maced.* p. 17f): the same use is now well known in Ptolemaic Egypt, where the term *κάτοικοι* lasted through Roman times. But he seems sometimes to narrow the term too much by restricting it to Seleucid military colonists; it was much wider (*Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. p. 583). Dr. Buresch would attach even more independence to a *Katoikia* (see footnote ³ below).

² This, which is pointed out in *Cities and Bish.*, i. p. 105f., is disputed by Dr. Judeich, *Alt. von Hierap.* pp. 97, 175; but he has failed to observe that the terms *Μοσαλίδος*, *Μακλονίδος*, *Μαρωλίδος*, which he regards as denoting Tribes, are really formed from names of villages (*κῶμαι*) into which the wide territory of the city was divided. On the village-constitution of Hierapolis see Anderson in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1897, p. 411.

³ Dr. Buresch, *Aus Lydien*, pp. 1-3, would regard a *Katoikia* as a large and flourishing village (*κῶμη*), not possessing the constitution of a Hellenic City-State. If that were so, then the *Katoikia* of the Jews at Hierapolis would have to be regarded as even more completely independent and separate from the city. But though *Katoikia* does occur as apparently equivalent to *κῶμη*, yet

It was natural that the Jewish settlers, with their commercial aptitude, should form themselves into one or more Trade-guilds, similar to the older Lydian guilds. As has already been pointed out, it was by such unions that ancient religions were usually maintained in foreign lands. If the Jewish settlers were numerous or scattered, they would need more than one synagogue, and more than one union (as, for example, was the case in Rome).

After these preliminary remarks, which seem incontrovertible, we approach a difficult inscription, often published and commented on, which has been a subject of controversy, because the preliminary considerations were not clearly stated and valued by those who have written about it. This document is the epitaph copied more than thirty years ago by Dr. Wagener from a sarcophagus, which seems to have disappeared soon after, as it has never been found by any subsequent explorer. The tomb belonged to P. Aelius Glycon (who numbered among his ancestors a person named Seleucus). By his Will, engraved on his coffin, Glycon provided for a distribution of money to "the most reverend Presidency of the Porphyrobaphoi" ¹ at the Feast of Unleavened Bread; and "to the *Synedrion* of the Kairodapistai" at the Feast of Pentecost.

That Glycon was a Jew is admitted by all, and seems indisputable. His father or grandfather, Seleucus, must also have been a Jew. That the two Guilds were Jewish is maintained by Dr. Ziebarth, *Griech. Vereinswesen*, p. 129; that they were either Jewish or Christian is urged in *Cities and Bishoprics*, pp. 545, 676.²

the meaning of "a body of *Katoikoi*, or colonists," is far more common and important; and it alone suits the situation in Hierapolis.

¹ τῆ σεμνοτάτῃ προεδρίᾳ τῶν Πορφυροβάφων, *Cities and Bish.*, ii. p. 545. No. 411; *Judeich*, No. 342.

² In the first place, I inclined to the view that they were Christian; in the second passage, after having observed the difficulty of distinguishing between Christian, Jewish-Christian, and Jewish proper in Phrygia, I tended to regard them as Jewish, and therefore strongholds of Christianity. See further below.

Both views are disputed and denied by Dr. Judeich, *Altert. von Hierap.*, p. 174. But his reasons seem hopelessly inconsistent with Jewish nature and character. He supposes that Glycon wished to secure that his tomb should be always adorned by his business friends on the Jewish festivals. It seems a sufficient answer to this to state what it means. It means that a Jew left endowments to two pagan trade societies in order that those pagans might regularly through all future time practise at his grave certain ceremonies, which were not devoid of a pagan religious character, on the two great Jewish feast days. This seems so unnatural that we can only suppose Dr. Judeich did not really clearly realize all that his words implied. That a Jew should bequeath money to pagan societies, united in the worship of pagan deities; that he should invite pagans in endless succession, through generation after generation, to perform at his grave the ritual which they performed at the graves of their pagan friends; that he should expect and invite those pagans to observe the Jewish feast days for that ritual; all these are equally improbable, almost impossible, ideas.

The Jews had their own associations and guilds; and Glycon went to them to ensure that his grave should be permanently cared for and adorned, just as other Jews trusted the duty of punishing violators to the entire body of Hierapolitan Jews.

The Porphyrabaphoi and the Kairodapistai, therefore, were Trade-guilds of Jews, as Dr. Ziebarth declared. The supposition that they were old pre-Jewish Trade-guilds, in which some Jews had acquired membership, cannot be maintained: the reasoning stated in § III. (EXPOSITOR, Jan. 1902, p. 23 ff.) is conclusive against it. The older Trade-guilds were united in the worship of pagan deities, and Jews could not be members of them.

But the Jewish Trade-guilds, undoubtedly, go back to the

time when the Jewish colony, the *Katoikia*, was brought to Hierapolis; and the name Seleucus, which remained in at least one Jewish family,¹ is a sign that the foundation of the *Katoikia* took place under one of the Seleucid kings, i.e. not later than about 200 B.C., and possibly under the founder of the dynasty, 301–281 B.C. Such Jewish bodies were intended to wear an appearance which agreed perfectly with the surroundings in which they were placed.² There was no thought of any esoteric meaning. The Jews adapted themselves to their position as citizens of, or *Katoikoi* in, a Hellenic city. They formed their Trade-guild of Purple-dippers, which has to be distinguished from the older native pagan Trade-guild of the Dyers (*Bapheis*). The other Trade-guild, the *Kairodapistai*, on the same analogy, must be interpreted as bearing a purely trading or manufacturing name.³

It forms no argument against the Jewish character of the Trade-guild of the Purple-dippers, that they erected statues or passed decrees in honour of Roman officers.⁴ There can be no doubt that Jewish associations habitually did so.

Further, it is probable, and even certain, that the Jewish associations took part in the ceremonial of the Imperial cultus, and that Jews even became high priests in the worship of the Emperors. Of course, they palliated and explained away such acts as being simply expressions of loyalty to the sovereign; and such they really were. The Imperial cultus was an artificial creation, with nothing of the real character of religion about it, which held the whole Empire together in loyal service by the tie of a common ritual and festivals.⁵ Hence the same Jews, who would have scorned to merge themselves among the heathen

¹ See above, p. 93.

² See above. EXPOSITOR, Jan. 1902, p. 25.

³ Dr. Cichorius, *Alt. von Hierap.*, p. 48 f., suggests *καίρος* yarn, and *δάπης* carpet, probably rightly.

⁴ Judeich, *Alt. von Hierap.*, Nos. 41, 42.

⁵ *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 190 ff.

by participating in the religious ceremonies of a pagan "Tribe," were ready to show their loyalty to the sovereigns whose cause they always supported.

The Jews had begun at an early time to fall into this course even in Palestine. When in the opening of First and of Second Maccabees we read that altars of Zeus Olympios were set up in Jerusalem, and that some of the Jews offered sacrifice on altars of idols, there can be little doubt that, primarily, the altars were erected to the deified king, who was identified with Zeus;¹ and that the sacrifice was exacted as a proof of loyalty, and not from any desire to interfere with the Jewish religion (which the kings protected and favoured). Of course, as bitterer feelings were excited by revolt, the kings began to proscribe and insult the Jewish religion for its own sake, as the cause of revolt; but, originally, what they desired was merely to secure proof of loyalty and to spread Hellenic civilization.

On the same principle, many of the Jews in the Graeco-Asiatic cities, doubtless, complied with the requirements of loyalty under the Seleucid kings, and still more under the Roman Empire. Doubtless the Pharisees from whom Paul was descended had always refused to conform to that requirement of the Imperial cultus; and, as we know, the organization of that cultus was not nearly so complete and thorough at that early period as it soon afterwards became.

It is, of course, not to be thought that this was the sole point in which the Pharisees of Asia Minor differed from the less strict Jews around them. It was only a peculiarly striking and obvious mark which differentiated the class, though along with it went many other points of difference from the common Jews. But the important thing to observe is that the Pharisee of a Jewish colony in a Graeco-

¹ Such identification of the reigning Seleucid monarch is a well known fact from at least the time of Antiochus Soter (281-261) onwards. The worship of the founder, Seleucus Nikator, persisted long after his death.

Asiatic city is not to be taken as thinking exactly the same with a Pharisee of Jerusalem. The views of the former were inevitably far wider, he was far more open to education, far less hostile to foreign rulers and government, than the latter.

Various examples—mostly of a probable but still only hypothetical nature—have been given elsewhere¹ of the Jewish habit of conforming to Roman loyal customs. A Jewish citizen in a city of the Empire could enter on a public career only by thus conforming, and it might be taken as certain, even without any exact evidence, that many Jews engaged in the career of office either in their own city or in the Imperial service. In addition to the examples elsewhere quoted, a newly discovered proof may here be stated. It belongs to Sala, a city which lay only a little way north of the Lycus valley on the borders of Lydia and Phrygia. Two magistrates are mentioned on the coins of Sala bearing the names of Meliton (under Trajan, A.D. 98–117), and Andronicus (under Antoninus Pius, A.D. 138–161). Nothing could be less Jewish than these names. Andronicus and Meliton were evidently ordinary magistrates of the city, striking coins with pagan religious types, and taking part in the ordinary State ceremonial, which necessarily and unavoidably included performance of the ordinary loyal sacrifices and offerings to the Imperial divinities, the reigning Emperor and his deified ancestors. But in the proof sheets of Mr. B. V. Head's forthcoming work on the coinage of Lydia, I observe that his more correct reading of certain coins shows that both Andronicus and Meliton were sons of Salamon,² which puts their Jewish birth beyond question.

¹ *Cities and Bish.*, ii, pp. 610, 618 ff., 672 ff. One of these has recently been much strengthened by a fuller copy of the inscription on a stone formerly hidden in great part. Its Jewish character is now practically certain: see my paper in *Revue des Etudes Anciennes*, 1901, p. 272.

² In the case of Andronicus the father's name is contracted Sala(mon).

The great difficulty in tracing the Jews of Asia Minor lies in the fact that they so completely Hellenized or Romanized themselves. If we had only the names, who would recognize that Paulus and Silvanus and Andronicus were Jews? Very rarely does such an evident name as Salamon occur in inscriptions. In one Hierapolitan epitaph a Jew named M. Aurelius Alexander Theophilus with the added name Asaph occurs. The purely Jewish name Asaph is introduced with the formula ἐπίκλην, which we have noted as common in Jewish and Christian names, and rare in names of ordinary Greeks and Romans.¹

Names of the kings or Roman officers who had shown favour to the Jews were often used by them, especially Alexander: Seleucus has been quoted above. Names containing the element "God" (Θεός) were also much used by them, as Theophilus just quoted (Eldad, Jedidiah), Theodorus (Matitya), Theodotus or Dorotheos (Netanya, Nathanael), etc. Where several names of this class are found in one Phrygian inscription, there is a presumption that it may be Jewish. Several other names, which are obviously translations of Hebrew names, were also favoured by the Jews, as Eirene (Salome), Justus (Zadok), Boëthos (Oser, Ezra), etc.² All these classes passed into Christian usage also.

Dr. Cichorius has remarked on the frequency of the names Glycon, Glyconianus, Glyconis, among the Jews of Hierapolis; and he adds that some other inscriptions, in

Meliton may have been either brother or, more probably, uncle of Andronicus. The name Salamon is rightly given in M. Imhoof Blumer's recent work *Kleinasiatische Münzen* (1901, p. 183).

¹ See *Cities and Bish.*, ii. pp. 522, 539, 547 note; EXPOSITOR, 1888, viii. p. 416ff.

² On Jewish names as represented or translated in Greek, see Zunz, *Namen der Juden*, 1837; Herzog, in *Philologus*, lvi. p. 50 ff.; Th. Reinach, *Revue des Et. Juives*, 1893, p. 126 ff.

³ They occur also in Christian or Jewish-Christian inscriptions of neighbouring districts: *Cities and Bish.*, Nos. 356, 360, 368.

which those names occur, may perhaps be Jewish. In all probability the names are renderings of the Hebrew Naam, Naaman, Naomi, Naamah.

The name Maria occurs often in the Lycus valley and neighbouring towns.¹ In some cases it may be the feminine of the Latin Marius, but generally it must be taken as Jewish or Christian, or Jewish-Christian.

The whole subject of Jewish-Greek names needs a thorough study: the beginning would be to collect in one list the names which are certainly Jewish, and in another list those which are indubitably Christian.² These two classes are closely related to one another, which is in perfect accordance with the historical fact that the early Christian congregations originated in the synagogues and the circle of "God-fearing" proselytes around them.

One other inscription of Hierapolis deserves and demands mention. M. Aurelius Diodorus Koreskos, with the added name Asbolos, leaves a bequest for an unexplained purpose³—the burning of Pappoi—to the Board of the Presidency of the Purple-dippers. In the EXPOSITOR, 1888, viii. p. 416, this inscription was published and recognized as Christian.⁴ I still think that its Christian character must be accepted; but the explanation there given of the name Porphyrabaphoi as adopted by a Christian congregation for concealment must be abandoned, as has been stated above. The name originated long before Christ among the Jews.

Diodorus Koreskos, surnamed Asbolos, was a Jew, but

¹ *Judeich*, Nos. 80 and 225; *Cities and Bish.*, Nos. 365, 413, 439, 440.

² Contributions to these lists will be found in the notes to the Christian inscriptions of Central and Southern Phrygia (*Cities and Bish.*, ch. xii., xvii.); but till the inscriptions are completely published, the lists cannot be made.

³ (ε)ἰς ἀποκαυσθῆν τῶν ΠΑΠΠΩΝ.

⁴ The corrected text given there is confirmed by the copy of *Judeich*, except that he reads with Waddington *Κορήσκων* for my *Κοράσκων*. The strange reading, ΠΑΠΠΩΝ, scouted as an obviously false reading by M. Th. Reinach, *Revue des Etudes Grecques*, 1895, p. 461, is confirmed by Dr. Cichorius.

a Christian Jew ; and it still seems probable that the burning of Papoi on the wonted day, and the bequest in the second instance to the *ἐργασία θρεμματική*, must be understood with reference to this fact, the latter being an institution for bringing up foundlings (*θρέμματα*).

VII. POSITION OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN THE CITIES.

Only by carefully observing the scanty details that have survived regarding the Jews of Asia Minor can we appreciate the position of St. Paul in his childhood. Among those Jews we see that the narrow Palestinian Pharisaic views, which some scholars attribute to Paul, could not originate or exist. He himself knew well that the surroundings amid which he was born and brought up had made him the one suitable man to carry the Gospel to the Roman world, or, in other words (as he says to the Galatians), that God had set him apart from his mother's womb to preach Him among the Gentiles. He was the man to carry the Jewish faith to the Graeco-Roman world, because he knew both and understood both, because he saw from the beginning that the fulness of time was come, i.e. that not merely was the Roman world ripe for and in need of the Jewish faith, but also the Jewish faith was ripe for and in need of the wider sphere of the Roman world. As has been stated in previous paragraphs, it had come to this, that either Judaism must lose its hold on its own people amid the enervating and seductive atmosphere of the brilliant Roman world, or it must take that world into itself and ennoble it in the true faith.

In the course of his career Paul learned that Judaism must modify and perfect itself before it could take into itself the Roman world, and, finally, in a sudden flash of inspiration, it was made manifest to him that the Messiah had come, and that Christianity was the new and perfect form of the Hebrew religion.

It is necessary to repeat and to insist from many points of view on this truth, that Paul's education was the growth of centuries of Jewish experience in the Gentile world, that his mind was the fine product and mixture of all that was best in Greek learning and in Jewish religious thought, that he was the widest as well as the clearest and subtlest thinker of his time. In short, there was only one land where St. Paul could have been produced, viz., the Seleucid regions of Asia Minor, and in that land only one city could bring him forth, viz., Tarsus.

As we have seen, it would be a mistake to think, even as regards those Jews who yielded most to the temptations which their brilliant prospects of wealth and influence in that pagan world held out to them, that they sank to the level of the common pagans around them. Morally they stood on a higher platform, and intellectually they were fully on an equality with their Greek rivals. It is quite evident that pride of race was strong among them all. The Asian and Phrygian Jews were an aristocracy of mind even more than an aristocracy of wealth; and they could not, except in rare cases, let themselves fall to the pagan level.

But in the religious point of view, to the eye of the prophet and the thinker, the people was in a dangerous condition. It was not merely that they were necessarily less scrupulous about the minutiae of the Law than the Palestinian Pharisees; that was inevitable in their position among the Gentiles, and was really a higher, not a lower, stage of thought. But the religious feelings of the people were being sapped and enervated by prosperity. They had ceased to develop in morality and religion; and a people that has ceased to develop must decay.

In every stage of their history, the Jewish people, as they began to lose hold of the divine idea, found a prophet

to keep before their eyes the truth of God, to enforce and reiterate that truth, to denounce the backsliding which necessarily resulted from the relaxing of their eager aspirations. So, in this case, at the due moment the prophet Saul appeared.

We must compare and contrast the position of the earliest Christian congregations with that of the Jews in the cities of Asia Minor. Both were exposed to the same dangers and the same temptations; but the Christians were far more completely exposed than the Jews. If the influence of pagan surroundings was strong among the Jews, fenced off as they were from them by their own Law and by their political privileges, how much more difficult must it have been for the pagan converts to disengage themselves from the environment in which they had been born and bred, and amid which their life must necessarily be spent to some extent even after they became Christians.

Well might the Corinthians write to Paul that, if they interpreted literally his orders to keep no company with idolaters and so on, they must needs go out of the world amid which their lot was cast. It was, in fact, impossible to obey him literally; and he wrote to explain that he had not contemplated this too literal interpretation of his words (1 *Cor.* v. 9-11).

But, further, the Christians newly converted from paganism commonly were in the position which (as we have shown)¹ would have been impossible for a Jew, and was never occupied by Jews. They were citizens enrolled in Tribes or Trade-guilds among pagans; they were members of religious associations and benefit societies of pagans; they were bound by their position to take part in meetings and ceremonies of purely pagan character, encompassed all day long from birth to death with a constant succession of pagan

¹ See EXPOSITOR, Jan. 1902, p. 23 f.

observances, from which the Jews of the same cities, citizens and residents alike, were entirely free.

It was hard to save the Christianized pagans from sinking back to their former level. The whole of First Corinthians is an illustration of the difficulty. Only one thing could permanently save them, and that was the persecution of centuries. That persecution was inevitable, after Paul, Peter, and John had agreed in forbidding them to remain as members of pagan societies. Their withdrawal from the social life of the city was more conspicuous, and provoked more hatred than was the case with Jews, because the latter had always had their own societies and guilds and political classification, while the new Christians (if they were not of Jewish birth) had been hitherto mixed up with the pagans in all things. The hatred of the mob was always a force pushing on Roman governors and officers, even against their will, to put the law in force.

Moreover, many and probably the majority of the Jews outside Palestine were willing to accept the tests of loyalty proposed by the Imperial religion, while the Christians were absolutely forbidden to do so; and this provoked and challenged the Roman Government, which proscribed necessarily those who placed themselves outside the pale of loyalty.

Thus persecution was inevitable; and persecution alone could have kept Christianity in life and vigour.

In conclusion, it is necessary to reiterate what we have elsewhere emphasized,¹ viz., the essential identity of view on this point between the Epistles of Paul and the Revelation of John. It is true that Paul was still hopeful of toleration in the Empire and of a peaceful conquest, while John had learned that toleration was impossible, and that the Empire

¹ EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1900, Feb. 1901.

would be conquered only by the blood of the Church. But Paul had taken the steps which made persecution inevitable: on no vital point of teaching could he differ from John: their reply to every serious question regarding the relation of the Christians to the pagan world, its customs, and its rulers, was identical. When one sees this, it is disappointing to read in an article in this magazine¹: "Had Paul the Aged survived to read the Apocalypse, it would have broken his heart. He was spared that piercing thrust, that 'wounding in the house of his friends' (Zech. xiii. 6)." Such an exaggerated and ungoverned statement is a typical example of the way in which preoccupation with one single thought (even one true in itself and fruitful, as in this instance) and neglect of all other considerations may lead into the extreme of errors—an error that in this case ought to be vehemently combated as distorting the view of early Christian history.

W. M. RAMSAY.

DIALOGUES ON THE CHRISTIAN PROPHETS.

II.

Riddell. I am now at leisure, Mason, to hear another criticism from your fellow-traveller in the train, who did not think there ever were such people as the Christian Prophets.

Mason. No, Riddell, and I am not sure that he would think so even if he had heard your observations to me. I ought to have told you that he had got hold of some old Jewish Rabbi's statement, that all the Jews knew very well that there was not to be any Prophet more in the days of Messiah; and this statement he flourished round his head in a sort of ferocious way of challenging the first man who should assert that there was a Prophet in the days of Jesus.

¹ EXPOSITOR, August 1901, p. 117.

R. I am afraid your friend will hurt himself with his own sword. He seems to have forgotten how "the multitude said, This is Jesus, *the Prophet* of Nazareth, of Galilee." (Matt. xxi. 11).

M. No, no. The Master is a Prophet in a special sense. He is unique, and you must not complicate the question by making Him in any sense one of a class.

R. We cannot too carefully and reverently guard the Saviour's own person in our discussions, and I should be the last to wish to import into them any approach to that heated volubility which in ancient times is known to have blazed forth in physical encounters, *Tantaene animis caelestibus irae!* But while the Person of Christ is better left out of controversy, the position which He held among men is a lawful and profitable subject of inquiry, and as you and I are disciples, anxious to learn, we cannot do better than discuss whatever questions arise in the path of learning. I take it that you prefer *dialectic* to *eristic*.

M. I am no Platonist, Riddell, as *you* should be if your name is a token.

R. I only follow where the argument leads, as Plato says. I am sure you would not wish merely to score a victory over an adversary in discussion.

M. No, I only wish to get at the truth, of which no man has the monopoly.

R. Very good. Then you love dialectic, which is the method of conversation leading to the discovery of truth; and you dislike eristic, which aims at the victory in argument. But you have not yet delivered your vicarious shaft of criticism, or rather the attack with many bolts which I hope you are going to make.

M. You shall have it in somewhat blunt and cold delivery from me. Listen! The man in the train considered that your remarks were very *far-fetched*.

R. I can well understand that, for I was not born a

Prophet myself, and my language is that of a mere Gentile. Like M. Jourdain, in *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, who had spoken prose all his life without knowing it, I found after many years that, while I used my own language, the Prophets used a different language, a prose of their own. and at first I mistook it for mine.

M. And are you sure that you are not mistaken now?

R. Quite sure. I will give you an instance. When you and I talk of Babylon, we usually mean Babylon. But when I converse with the Christian Prophets, I mean Rome when I say Babylon.

M. Very strange. May I ask you why?

R. Because it is evident that the Mesopotamian Babylon is out of the question under that name. Babylon was a city (Rev. xviii. 10) whose judgment came upon her suddenly, and this judgment is described in the Revelation as it was then expected by the author.

M. "Then expected"—do you mean in the Old Testament times?

R. No: I mean by the author of the Revelation when he wrote, himself. He was not so devoid of originality as you would represent him to be. Being a Prophet, as I have already observed, he spoke in prophetic language; but however much he used the language of his predecessors, the language and the imagery of the Old Testament, he was alive to the needs of his own day, and he delivered his message to his fellow-creatures in what to them were unmistakeable terms.

Every burning word he spoke
Full of rage and full of grief.

I am glad to find Dr. Milligan laying down that "nothing has been more conclusively established by recent Biblical inquiry than that even a prophetic, to say nothing of an apocalyptic, book must spring out of the circumstances, and must directly address itself to the necessities of its original

readers.”¹ “Those into whose hands it is first put must feel that they are spoken to. It may be designed for others, but for them it must be designed, or the very idea of revelation is destroyed.” That is good.

M. And does Dr. Milligan, whose name is not unknown, agree with you that Babylon is Rome?

R. No, there is a strange thing. He does not seem to be aware of such men as the Christian Prophets, nor of such a thing as Christian prophecy. And yet how could he hope to understand the book without understanding the author, and his point of view, and the class to which he belonged?

M. Probably he considered him as a class by himself.

R. At least the author of the Revelation—let us call him the Seer—must have held some relation to the Apostles of the Lord, for according to Milligan he was one himself—such is the inference which Milligan leaves his readers to draw. No writer, however great a genius, ever was a class by himself. Milligan considers that “Babylon” stands for the “faithless” or “degenerate” Church. He does not allow, however, that this is the Church of Rome.

M. Rather a fine point that. Is it that the Church of Rome is not “faithless” or “degenerate”? Or is it that the faithless or degenerate Church was the Church in St. John’s day? and if so, when did it become faithless and degenerate?

R. I am afraid I cannot enlighten you on this difficulty. I conjecture that he means that the whole of the passage about Babylon is a warning to the Seer’s generation; for he has said that the book “must directly address itself to the necessities of its original readers,” who are the members of the Seven Churches (Rev. ii. 3). He means that all Revelation xviii. is a warning for the men of the near future, and affects them closely.

¹ Milligan, *Lectures on the Apocalypse*, 1892, p. 129.

M. Which, then, of the Seven Churches, on Dr. Milligan's hypothesis, do you think is chiefly meant? Ephesus itself? Smyrna? Which?

R. No, you do not get at it that way. Milligan says: "We must distinguish in the book between the whole Church as an organized body and the faithful remnant within the body, the Church within the Church, the "elect" within the "called." The Church as a whole degenerates. She repeats the experience of the old Theocracy, becomes false to the trust reposed in her, yields to the influences of the world, and eventually falls beneath judgments as much greater than those which overtook Israel after the flesh as the position she had occupied was higher, and the privileges she had enjoyed more exalted. You see how clear that interpretation would be to the reader then?

M. I cannot honestly say that I do. You told me just now that Milligan's claim is that the Revelation "must directly address itself to the necessities of the original readers." And now you say he "distinguishes in the book between the whole Church as an organized body and the faithful remnant within the body, the Church within the Church." I confess I cannot see the clearness of that. You must be jesting, my dear fellow. Or can you assure me that the reader was led to make this wonderful distinction, and was certain to make it for himself? If so, we should see it stated clearly in the book of Revelation itself.

R. I only wish you to give your mind to this theory, which is entitled to consideration more than some others. Here is a Revised Version. Now kindly look into it with me and let us be quite candid. "A Church within a Church," "A faithful Remnant," "The elect within the called."

M. Rather a Plymouth-brethren notion that!

R. Yes, but it may be partly true, all the same. I am going to champion Milligan's theory just now. Let us look

and see if we cannot find the distinction laid down in the book. "Many are called, but few chosen." Those words of the Master were running in Milligan's mind when he propounded this view, but they do not occur in Revelation. They do not help us at present, because we may not assume, we may not even fancy, that they were delivered in the hearing of the author along with the Twelve Apostles: we may not even assume that he was one of the Twelve at all, as I shall presently hope to show you. Nor can we tell whether the Seer had those words of the Master before him in writing. They must be put aside just now, and our business is solely with the Revelation. "Remnant"—I see it in my Romans (ix. 27, xi. 5) A.V. and R.V. Yes, but that is St. Paul. Again I see it in Revelation (xi. 13, xii. 17, xix. 21, A.V.) three times, but none of these passages is of any avail for our purpose, and R.V. rightly translates "the rest" instead of "the remnant."

M. Altogether, you think there is no trace of the term "remnant" being used by the Seer.

R. I am sure of it. I am contending, you see, for Milligan, but I have to try to supply his theory with weapons of defence, or at any rate with means of mobility.

M. You will have to admit that if the Seer meant that when Babylon was destroyed, or rather "fell," a Remnant was saved or snatched out of it, a Remnant homogeneous with the fallen—homogeneous materially though not spiritually, and potentially though not morally,—he has certainly succeeded well in dissembling his meaning. If there is one feature more marked than another in his picture of the fall of Babylon, it is its entireness, its utterness. "In one day she shall be utterly burned with fire" (Rev. xviii. 8). "In one hour so great riches is made desolate" (*ib.* 17). The whole thing is swept away. "It shall be found no more at all" (*ib.* 21).

R. Are you not forgetting that the Seer has expressly

said first that something like a Remnant has been summoned to “come forth out of her, that they have no fellowship with her sins”? (Rev. xviii. 4.)

M. No, I know that, but I cannot see how the Remnant are to know *when* to come out of her unless it be *now*, in an eternally everpresent *now*. If this degeneration of a Church—I beg pardon, of the Church—is to take place in the uncertain future, the Remnant would never know when to come out of her that they partake not of her sins. If they were summoned to come out of a city, or a state, or whatever could be called πόλις, I could easily understand the summons: it is immediate—“Up, get you out of this place; lest ye be consumed in the punishment of the city” (Gen. xix. 14, 15). That is how the two “men” or “angels” summoned Lot to leave Sodom, and Lot summoned his sons-in-law, and I think the parallel is rather suggestive.

R. It is indeed suggestive, but it does not happen to be exactly the origin of the words used; for they *have* an origin in the Old Testament, like nearly all the words in the Revelation. They come from Jeremiah (li. 45).

M. Let me just refer to that. Yes. It is there a summons to come out of a city, out of Babylon. I see that the whole chapter (Jer. li.) is the basis of this passage of Revelation.

R. You are right. It is so, but along with it there is inwoven the description from Ezekiel (xxvii.) of the lamentation or elegy over Tyre.

M. Another city, very different from Babylon—Tyre, the seapower of the West, as Babylon was the landpower of the East! But a city!

R. Yes. You are quite as critical as you can accuse me of being.

M. I was going to observe how remarkable it was that the Seer should resort to the descriptions of two of the

greatest cities of the world in order to draw forth imagery for something which Milligan says is "no pagan city of the past, no world-metropolis of the future." Instead of being a city, Babylon is for him a degenerate Church. Now, a degenerate Church is one of the most difficult things in the world for any one to be sure of. When is a Church degenerate? Or when is not a Church degenerate? The Jew of old would certainly consider that the Christian Church was degenerate. The highest Jewish authorities instructed their counsel, Tertullus, pleading before Felix, to describe the Christian Church as the sect of the Nazarenes (Acts xxiv. 5). That is at one end of the history, and here are we at the other end, in which a Roman Catholic writer does the Church of England the honour to write for Cardinal Vaughan, and Cardinal Vaughan to print, that "there may be heresies more fundamental than Anglicanism, there is none more contemptible." On the other hand, we have not forgotten that Protestant writers of various kinds have discovered in Babylon, not the then city, but the present Church, of Rome. Thus you will hardly get people to agree as to what is a degenerate Church: certainly, you will not find agreement between all the people who have ever left a Church because they considered it degenerate. In fact, it comes to this, that Milligan's term is wholly subjective as regards men.

R. But suppose it is so—he would say that God sees not as man sees.

M. Yes, but then the objection comes in that the book must, as he said before, "directly address itself to the necessities of the original readers," and so I take it that this obscurity, which is not only local and temporal of that age of the first readers, but universal and permanent, could never have been allowed in this book, let alone the obscurity in the supposed case of a Christian treating the

Jewish Church as degenerate. It would have been against the Seer's principles to allow it.

R. There is a good deal in what you say. But have you noticed some of the particulars in the description of Milligan's Babylon-Church?

M. Which do you mean?

R. Have you noticed how some of them suit the idea of a degenerate Church? Incense is mentioned for one!

M. My dear Riddell, you are trying it on! I am but a layman, but my Protestantism is not so obfuscated as not to see that where incense is mentioned (Rev. xviii. 13), a mention which might perhaps refer to the Church of Rome, there is mention of a score of other articles of merchandise which do not so refer, "oil and fine flour and wheat and cattle and sheep." These all apply to a city, but there never has been a Church, and there is never likely to be a Church, which deliberately entered the domain of commerce so far as to deal in the kinds of merchandise described in Revelation xviii. 11-13. The mediæval Church of Rome trafficked in livings and licenses and sees and cardinals' hats, but it never went to the length of constructing warehouses and shops, which the traffic as described by the Seer would require; nor, if it did, was it visited by a sudden overwhelming doom such that "in one hour so great riches is made desolate" (*ib.* 17). Milligan's picture would on such a hypothesis be over-drawn entirely.

R. I grant you, we could not allow that.

M. I must say that I like his interpretation less and less the more I consider it. The description suits a city, but does not suit a Church. No Church ever was, or ever will be, such that "in it were made rich all that had their ships in the sea by reason of her costliness."

R. The Span——

M. The Spanish Armada will not do any more than the

Mayflower. My dear Riddell, you and I shall quarrel! You know that Rome was the seapower in the first century A. D. I am in earnest, and I draw your attention further to the fact that Revelation xvii. has many details which require equally with those of xviii. to be harmonized with the idea of a Church and cannot be harmonized. The woman Babylon (xvii. 5, 6) sitteth upon seven mountains. If the degenerate Church were the mediæval Church of Rome, there would be much to be said for identifying this with the Septimontium—the Seven Hills of Rome; but you recollect that Milligan has debarred himself from that explanation when he says, “Babylon is not the Church of Rome in particular.” Thus all these helps and hints which the Seer has offered him are in vain. The Seer says: “The angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou wonder? I will tell thee the mystery”—which means a thing formerly secret and now made plain to all—“of the woman and of the beast which carrieth her.” He further says: “Here is the mind that hath wisdom.” (In other words here is the clue.) “The seven heads are seven mountains: and there are seven kings: the five are fallen, the one is, the other is not yet come . . . And the ten horns are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet.” But Milligan has no eye for these particulars, encouraging as they are meant to be to “the mind which hath wisdom,” and which would understand and apply the prophecy to itself and its own time. All that he says is: “The degenerate Jewish Church had then [in the life and death of Jesus] called in the assistance of the world power of Rome, had stirred it up, and had persuaded it to do its bidding against its true Bridegroom and King. An alliance had been formed between them; and, as the result of it, they crucified the Lord of Glory. But the alliance was soon broken; and in the fall of Jerusalem by the hands of her guilty paramour, the harlot

was left desolate and naked, her flesh was eaten, and she was burned utterly with fire. The quarrel of the fallen Jewish Church and the Roman power was *consummated* in the fall of Jerusalem. But the beginning of the quarrel took place *as soon* as our Lord was delivered up. St. John notes it in the words of Pilate (John xix. 22): 'What I have written, I have written.'

R. Thank you for the quotation from Milligan. You will observe that he does here, after all, identify the seven mountains with Rome on the seven hills. Whether the "quarrel" is the same as the degeneration, and thereby is said to have lasted forty-one years, I cannot tell. However he does admit the city of Rome.

M. Yes, I see he does, but why does he not carry out that idea which indeed is too self-evident for discussion? Why does he not say this is a city, the only one that ever was on seven hills? Why does he not advance to the identification of the seven Caesars and the ten aspirants to the imperial purple?

R. I am so much interested in your last remark that it almost puts me off my championship and defence of Dr. Milligan.

M. Be of good cheer, Riddell; play the man, and maintain your adopted cause. There you have the degenerate Jewish Church seated on the Roman beast; whether she rides it as Europa rode the Bull, or Ariadne the leopard, I leave it to you to decide. It is true that the degenerate Jewish Church is half a city in order to get in the merchandise; yes, and in order to get in the ships and the shipowners of the Jews, of whom we have not yet heard very much in the Old Testament, though to be sure there are "they that go down to the sea in ships." It is true that the seating of the Jewish Church upon the beast of Rome is a novel idea, but it may be a true one, as you observed just now. It is true that the degenerate

Jewish Church is not commonly said in the Old Testament, or commonly believed to be a "great city which reigneth" (or even "hath a kingdom," R.V. margin) "*over the kings of the earth.*" It is true that half the elaborate imagery, the carved work thereof, is broken off and thrown aside. But can you not speak out on behalf of your client and save what remains of his property from the devastation of hostile argument?

R. I was just thinking how many times I could recollect when the Jewish Church, however degenerate it might be, when it numbered a Gamaliel and a Saul of Tarsus among its members, had "guided the beast, Rome, in perfect harmony," to use Milligan's phrase, "with its designs."

M. How many times? or how few?

R. My Josephus does not record many.

M. Does any one else?

R. There is no other authority which could, except the Talmud.

M. Can you honestly say that you know of a single instance in which "the degenerate Jewish Church" "seated upon the Roman beast" "guided it in perfect harmony with its designs"?

R. The Sanhedrin took advantage of Pontius Pilate's weakness, as Roman Governor, or Procurator, under the Legatus of Syria, in order to compass the death of our Lord.

M. Quite so, and this one successful stroke on the part of the degenerate Jewish Church is to be exaggerated into a long course of successful policy. When did this policy begin? and when did it end?

R. You say "exaggerated"?

M. The grossest exaggeration. Milligan vouchsafes no historical support whatever for his statement. You, in his defence, can provide none.

R. Now let us see. From our Lord's ministry to the

fall of Jerusalem the High Priest was, as before, the political head of the Jewish nation as well as of the "degenerate Jewish Church." There were during those forty years fifteen High Priests, as you may read in Whiston's Josephus.

M. When each High Priest lasted less than three years on an average, and presided, while in office, over a distracted assembly like the Sanhedrin, and an unruly and agitated country like Palestine, having been appointed, and often deposed, by the Roman Procurator or by the Herods, is it conceivable that the Jewish Church over which they presided one after the other could be described as "sitting as queen" (Rev. xviii. 7)? The idea is preposterous. Joseph Caiaphas was the strongest and the longest of these rulers, and he is represented by St. John in the very year of the single recorded triumph of the "degenerate Jewish Church" as afraid of the Roman power—"the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation" (John xi. 48), and as acting so "that the whole nation perish not" (*ib.* 50). Caiaphas at any rate was not then conscious that his Church "sat as a queen." Again, can you tell me which "kings of the earth lived wantonly with" this Jewish Church (Rev. xviii. 9)? and where, and when?

R. Perhaps Milligan would say the Herods.

M. Are they to be called kings of the earth? I trow not; they were barely kings of Palestine. They were kings on sufferance of the Caesars, who valued them and kept them in place as a means of holding the key of the East, especially of Parthia, of which power Rome was very much afraid and had been for a century and more before 70 A.D. In this policy Rome was wise. But do you think they allowed them even a coinage? I have seen coins that were stamped in Jerusalem under Agrippa I., but do you think they bear Agrippa's head? They bear none.

Some minted in other cities of Palestine have the image of Agrippa, and others that of Caesar. "Whose is this image? They say unto Him, Caesar's." "King Agrippa" is a common superscription, indeed, and the title was shared by other vassal kings of Rome. "King Great Agrippa, *friend of Caesar*," is another. The image of Caligula, with or without his name, is also common. Rome took care to use the coinage as a reminder to the people of the nature of its rule. There was no fear of the Jewish Church boasting that it "sat as a queen." You will probably then admit that here is another exaggeration.

R. I am waiting till you have finished.

M. My criticisms are nearly at an end. But I cannot help expressing a doubt whether the notion of a degenerate Jewish Church was or ever could be present to the Seer.

R. Is not the verse "Rejoice over her, ye prophets" (xviii. 20), for instance, and "In her was found the blood of prophets" (*ib.* 24), rather like our Lord's lamentation, "O Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets"?

M. No, they strike me as essentially unlike, in fact as unlike as they well can be, for two reasons: First, the Master is lamenting, and the disciple is exulting, or inviting to exult. Secondly, the Master laments over the city, and the disciple exults over what Milligan calls a degenerate Church, though he is evidently conscious that he glides into the description of a city, and tries therefore to guard himself by the following words: "Babylon is no pagan city of the past, no world metropolis of the future." After which Milligan does go on to use the word "city"! The description is too much for him after all! Now suppose he had only said throughout "degenerate Sion," he would then have used a term, "Sion," familiar in the Old Testament, though "degenerate" is not. "The virgin daughter of Sion" was, if I remember right, the commonest term.

R. Yes, but I fancy I see why Milligan did not use this term in his identification. The seer is about to describe in Revelation xxi., xxii. the new Jerusalem, the holy city, which certainly could not be called a renovated church; it is a new *city*. But there is an obvious difficulty in describing the “degenerate Sion” as destroyed in full detail, and then in the very next chapter but one describing the new Jerusalem or Sion, which is not left *in heaven* but is clearly said to “*descend out of heaven* from God.” Now if the new Jerusalem had been meant to take the place of the degenerate Sion, then it is impossible to suppose that this important fact should not have been stated. The last thing that we hear of this “degenerate Sion” is that it disappears like a millstone cast by a strong angel into the sea, “and shall be found no more at all” (xviii. 21). I confess I am rather surprised to be told that this disappearance is only for the space represented by two chapters of Revelation. On the whole I am satisfied that Milligan was prudent in using the term “degenerate Church” which at least draws a veil over this crude transition. But I fear that I cannot defend his main thesis very warmly again.

M. What passes me is how he could imagine that the Prophets could ever exult or rejoice over the desolation of their Church. The Seer, like other Prophets, only more than they, has used the language of his Church and his Church’s prophets throughout the whole of his book, literally in almost every line; he has written as a member of that Church; he has complained of certain people at Smyrna, who claimed the proud privilege of being Jews when they were not; he has shown that the whole cast of his mind is Jewish—Jewish first and Christian next. How then could such an one ever rejoice or ask his fellow prophets (xxii. 9) to rejoice over the fall of his Church?

R. In point of fact you may go even further, and you

may demur to his Church being called a Church at all. We in these days speak of the Christian Church and of the Jewish Church in contrast with it. But this is a convenience of language and terminology. The Old Testament speaks of "people," "inheritance," "congregation," "assembly," as you may read in Hort's book, *The Christian Ecclesia*, but none of these words expresses what we mean by a Church. The Jewish Church is unique in history and very properly the word "Church" is not used once in the Old Testament (A.V.).

M. You surprise me. I have seen it so often on the headlines of my Bible that I can hardly believe it.

R. To return to Milligan's theory, for which I throw up my brief.

M. I will only give you one more exaggeration, which I now observe in it. Granting that it could possibly be said that in the Jewish Church was found the blood of prophets and of saints—I know what St. Matthew's Gospel says of Zechariah, son of Barachiah (Matt. xxiii. 35)—how could the next words be added—"and of all that have been slain upon the earth"? (Rev. xviii. 24). Truth is great and Justice is her sister. But, good heavens! what justice have we here? If that be the charge laid upon the unhappy degenerate apostate Jewish Church I can only say that my sympathy goes with it. It had not killed all that had been slain upon the earth. There was one power, and one only, of which the statement could be made with justice. That power was Rome.

R. I am sure Dr. Milligan would never have wished to be unjust to any one or to any body of men.

M. Of course not; but the effect of injustice, even in theory, eventually tells against its author. Fancy if the Seer of Revelation had been unjust to the Jewish Church. It is supposed by many, I am given to understand, that St. Paul was more than any of the Apostles opposed to the

Jewish Church, whose law, and the works of the law, he is supposed to have denounced in no measured terms. But I cannot forget the earnest and even enthusiastic accounts of that passage in the Romans (ix. 3): "I could wish that I myself were anathema from Messiah for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Messiah as concerning the flesh, who is over all. God be blessed for ever." And again (x. 2): "I bear them witness that they have a zeal for God; but not according to knowledge." Alas, he says in tones of regret, "They were hardened" (xi. 7), or "blinded." They were a "disobedient and gainsaying people." But St. Paul has no idea of the destruction and annihilation of the degenerate Church. Very different is his future for the Jews, whom he calls by their true name of Israel. "Did they stumble that they might fall? Perish the thought. Nay, by their trespass salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. And if their trespass is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?"

R. Yes, the contrast between St. Paul on the one hand and the Seer according to Milligan on the other is striking indeed. One wonders how they could, at that rate, have both been Apostles together. On matters of policy or behaviour one can understand a wide margin of difference, but on the question of relation to the people of God, to which by birth they both belonged, we cannot. St. Paul is pitiful, the Seer is truculent, and, with whatever limitations, revengeful. I agree with you there.

M. Moreover I notice that Milligan is very deliberate in his remarks on the importance of the picture of Babylon in relation to the book. In it, he says, and here I agree

with him, "one supreme aim of the Revelation of St. John is reached. To the interpretation of this picture the efforts of every student of the book ought to be chiefly directed. *Until we understand it all our labours in other directions will prove vain.*"

R. And now, my dear Mason, let me congratulate you on the attack which you have delivered upon a theory which still has considerable vogue and which you have dealt with on its merits. You have quite taken the argument out of my hands, and yet you have only filled them with another, though so far, perhaps, only of a negative kind; for in assailing Milligan's view you have, I think, come round to see that the only interpretation of Babylon is that it is a city, and that the only city which satisfies the conditions is Rome. This was the contention with which I began my observations to you to-day, and when we next meet, all being well, I will venture to supply, to the best of my power, the positive reasons in favour of that view. I am certain that they are conclusive, but you and I know that a man's certainty were but a breath in the balance when set against Truth.

E. C. SELWYN.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

II. THE VIRGIN-BIRTH.

1. THE virgin-birth presents two closely related problems, the one critical, the other theological. Criticism must estimate the value of the evidence and decide whether we are dealing with fable or fact. Theology must investigate the significance for Christian faith of the fact, if it is proved to be a fact; but, if fable, theology need not concern itself with the matter any further, but may leave to criticism the task of showing to what local

and temporary influences, mental, moral, or religious, the fable owes its origin. These two questions cannot, however, as is often taken for granted, be dealt with separately. We cannot leave to criticism the settlement of the question of fact or fable, altogether regardless of the light which theology may be able to throw upon the subject. An important factor in the settlement of even the critical question must be the theological interpretation of the character and consciousness, function and influence of the person, to whom this miraculous mode of birth is assigned. An experience or an action which in relation to one person might seem altogether incredible, may in regard to another seem quite intelligible. If a miraculous mode of birth were narrated of a person who had in no way been distinguished from his fellows, it would require very full and very clear evidence to convince us that the story was true, whereas the evidence which should be regarded as sufficient to prove an ordinary fact should satisfy us of the reality of an extraordinary event related of an extraordinary person. It is reasonable to believe about Jesus what there would be room for doubting about any other man. If, however, it must be conceded, an extraordinary event narrated of Him could not be brought into any intelligible relation to His life and work, but appeared as a foreign element without any meaning or worth for our understanding of Him, the probability of the truth of the record would be very much lessened. But if, on the contrary, the fact recorded helped in any way to explain what otherwise would appear more inexplicable, this probability would be greatly strengthened. What this study will attempt is to show that the virgin-birth, accepted as a fact, helps us to understand better than otherwise we could the "inner life" of Jesus. In this way it may enable some to decide the question who feel that the evidence for and against is for them indecisive.

2. It is not the writer's intention to discuss at all the critical problem, as so much has already been written on both sides that to treat the question again would be but a thrashing over of straw, out of which the grain has already been beaten. Suffice it to say that he himself is quite convinced, after candid and unprejudiced investigation, that the difficulties of accounting for the fable are greater than the difficulties of accepting the fact, making due allowance for the consideration already insisted on, that the person of whom this witness is given is Jesus. In reaching this conclusion he is sure that he cannot be justly charged with *reasoning in a circle*, for he has not first treated the virgin-birth as a proof of divinity, and then dealt with the divinity as a reason for the virgin-birth. A personal confession in this connexion may be pardoned; for him the virgin-birth was a burden and not a help to faith long after all doubt and difficulty about the divinity of Jesus had been removed. It is his belief in the divinity which renders credible, and his interpretation of the divinity which makes intelligible, the fact of the virgin-birth.

3. If the virgin-birth is to be accounted for as a fable, then the critic who undertakes to explain its origin must necessarily confine himself to the contemporary modes of thought and life which may have given rise to it, such as the mythological impulse to ascribe a divine descent to heroes, or the ascetic tendency to depreciate marriage and to exalt celibacy, although it may be remarked in passing that the undoubtedly Jewish origin of both narratives of the infancy seems to exclude both of these influences; he has no right to bring into the discussion any considerations drawn from a later age or a distant land. If, on the other hand, it is fact with which we are dealing, then the explanation which one age may give does not limit the freedom of a following age to discover, if possible, a more adequate

interpretation. The progress of human knowledge should enable us to understand the person of Jesus better than any previous age has done. Accordingly we may on the one hand frankly reject older explanations which seem defective, and on the other avail ourselves in our interpretation of any help which modern thought may afford.

4. Without any hesitation or reservation does the writer reject the accretions which in course of time have been added to the simple fact recorded in the Gospels, the immaculate conception of the virgin herself ("ab omni originalis culpae labe praeservatam immunem"), her miraculous parturition as well as conception of Jesus ("partus clauso utero"), and her perpetual virginity. The Gospel narratives, taken in the plain sense, teach that Jesus was the firstborn of Mary, that she and Joseph afterwards lived together in wedlock, and that there were other children in their home. There is no reason why we should seek to force an unnatural sense on their language. These narratives give no hint that the intention of the virgin-birth was to discredit marriage, or to commend celibacy, although there can be no doubt that the ascetic, monastic tendency in the Church afterwards sought and found encouragement in the fact. Still less can we regard the virgin-birth as affording any justification for the monstrous theory of Augustine, "that children possess original sin because their parents have procreated them in lust," and that "Christ has sinlessness because He was not born of marriage" (Harnack's *History of Dogma*, v. 211, 212). This view is due not only to his Manichaeism, of which he never entirely got rid, but still more to the effects left on his mind by the sensual bondage in which he so long lived before his conversion. It is blasphemy against God, who is responsible for the existence of sex, and the continuation of life by the union of the sexes. It is a libel on man, in whom the sexual impulse does not need to

sink to sensual passion, but may soar to moral love. For any such pernicious inferences the Gospels are in no way responsible, and Jesus' own teaching on the indissoluble union in marriage, on parental affection and filial obligation, clearly condemns such a view. It is necessary so emphatically to repudiate these superstitions in dealing with this subject, as it is to be feared many are prejudiced against the simple fact, because it has so often been presented along with these parasitic growths.

5. The starting point of our interpretation of the fact must be the moral character and conscience and the religious consciousness of Jesus. It is admitted by very many, who doubt and deny the virgin-birth, that He was sinless and perfect. No accusation could be proved against Him, and He never made any confession of guilt. In Him all the virtues of moral holiness, and all the truths of moral wisdom were combined. He was conscious of Himself as the beloved and approved Son of God His Father. Yet He was "in all points tempted even as we are," and He ever lived by faith in God's grace. He was the subject of a moral and religious development, which must have been from the very beginning without fault or flaw. Had there been any defect, even in his childhood, before the moral conscience and the religious consciousness were awakened, a record of it would have remained in His character and convictions. The perfect development presupposes a perfect origin. Every personality is the resultant of three factors—the individuality, in which lies the possibility of an original, independent development, the heredity, and the environment. When this individual possibility begins to be realized in consciousness and volition, it has already been in some degree determined in its direction and tendency by hereditary impulses and environing influences. The relation between the individual endowments and the hereditary bequests is as yet an unsolved problem ; but this at least is certain, that no human

personality presents itself which has not been affected by inherited tendencies. But we may go one step further. It is also certain that there is no other human personality, except Jesus, in which a hereditary tendency to sin and distrust has not appeared. It is a fact beyond question that all children are born members of a sinful race, and have been tainted from their source. A sinless and godly development appears impossible for all who are completely, by natural generation, incorporated in the human race. While we must deny that it is the mode of connexion through two parents, which is the reason for the sinful inheritance, for in that case sex itself would need to be essentially evil, yet we must admit the fact. What made Jesus so absolutely unique ?

6. We do not solve the problem by a simple affirmation of His divinity, as that was revealed and realized in a humanity which was its adequate organ. The question we must attempt to answer is, What made the human soul of Jesus a fit tabernacle for the Divine Word, so that He lived a perfect life without sin in faith on God? While it would be rash and bold dogmatism to affirm that, had Jesus been born naturally, He must needs have displayed the inherited defects of the race, as we can conjecture that Divine grace might have acted prior to thought and will so as to suppress all hostile elements to a perfect moral and religious development; yet as a supernatural mode of birth is ascribed to Him in records, the witness of which to His words and works secures our credit and commands our respect, it is not a vain imagination, but a good reason to connect these characteristics of His personality with this unique feature of His birth. It seems to the writer unfortunate that the term virgin-birth throws so great an emphasis on the absence of the paternal function, as though the maternal function, under normal conditions, were not as liable to be the channel of hereditary taint, or as though it were the union of the two

functions, that caused the transmission of evil. What it seems desirable to throw into prominence is this, that the supernatural mode of birth makes the Divine activity initial and regulative, and the human receptivity dependent and submissive. It was surely fit that He who was not an offering of mankind to God, but came as a gift from God to man, should not be born by the will of man, but should be sent in the fulness of the times from God. We shall, however, miss the full significance of the fact, if we are content to marvel at a physical miracle of the Divine omnipotence; we must seek to apprehend and appreciate the spiritual conditions in dependence on, and subordination to, which the physical miracle took place. As in the miracles of Jesus, Divine grace claimed and called forth human faith, so in His miraculous conception His mother's faith received and responded to God's grace. The revelation of God's purpose came to Mary not only as promise claiming trust, but also as command asking obedience. God's gift brought both a task and a trial. She was "not disobedient to the heavenly vision," distrustful of the heavenly voice. "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it to me according to Thy word." It is an inadequate conclusion that the faith and surrender of the mother was only the preliminary condition of the Divine miracle, and that once secured, the conception was afterwards altogether unaffected by the spiritual condition thus inspired by God's revelation. We only do full justice (it seems to the writer at least) to all the narrative suggests and the whole problem demands, when we recognize that the mother of Jesus was in her maternal function, by God's Spirit dwelling and working in her, so isolated from the sin of the race, and so elevated by faith in, and surrender to, God, that Jesus, as true man as well as very God, did not need to be totally exempted from heredity, but inherited from his mother, not sin, but faith in, and surrender to, God, as the dominant tendency of His life. But as Mary's faith

and surrender had a history, the history of Divine revelation and human religion in previous ages, which had become her inheritance, Jesus through His mother is thus connected with the believers and saints of old.

7. This interpretation of the fact seems to offer us several advantages. First of all, it disposes of the objection that it is materialism to explain the sinlessness of Jesus by a physical miracle, as the virgin-birth is shown to involve a great deal more than a physical miracle, and spiritual conditions are assumed for its spiritual effects. Secondly, it enables us to regard Jesus as a member of the race, incorporated in its history by His moral and spiritual inheritance, and not as a stranger among men, isolated from their development. God's previous preparation is not ignored or denied, but is recognized in His mother's dependence on, and submission to, God, which she imparted to Him as well as the substance of her body. Thirdly, it is more honouring to her, to whom God showed so great favour, for we regard her not as the passive instrument of a physical process, but as an obedient and trusted agent in a Divine purpose, communicated in grace and accepted in faith. Fourthly, it is more in accord with God's general methods of working, as He uses as far as possible natural forces and human efforts, even when His purpose demands the exercise of His supernatural divine power along with and through these subordinate means.

8. There is one serious objection to the view of the sinless nature of Jesus here advocated, which claims fuller attention. It may be said that, if Jesus' moral nature was, by a supernatural act of God, exempt from all sinful tendency, then His sinless moral development loses for us its significance and value as example and encouragement. Firstly, it may be said in explanation that there was moral struggle, although there was no sinful tendency. As morally free, and not merely as naturally sinful, is man exposed to

temptation. Moral perfection has to be attained by struggle. Thus the reality of Jesus' moral development is in no way lessened by its sinless beginning unless we are prepared to affirm that sin is a necessity to moral development. Secondly, it ought not to be forgotten that His moral development was not simply exemplary, that is, to give us immediate guidance in our present moral difficulties, but it was typical, as according to the Divine intention for man, in which sin has no place. Thirdly, it cannot be supposed that He would understand our difficulties better, and sympathize more tenderly with our failures, if He were Himself conscious of sinful tendency. It is a common mistake to assume that sin begets insight and pity, whereas sin only darkens the mind, and hardens the heart. Only the sinless knows clearly all that sin means, and feels fully all that sin costs. He who has not saved himself from sin cannot save others. Fourthly, let it be remembered that we are not required alone and at once to reproduce the perfection of Jesus in our lives. God knows all the moral hindrances which are in our natures, and He lays upon us not the moral task of the sinless, but of the sinful becoming by His grace sinless.

9. The interpretation of the virgin-birth here offered does not pretend to be an exhaustive or adequate explanation of the moral and religious perfection of Jesus. His personality is, to use Harnack's words, "His secret, and no psychology will fathom it"; and yet it is both our right and duty to go as far as our data will allow in trying to discover the meaning as well as the worth of His person. That His divinity and God's creative act, even in His humanity, must be taken into account in any complete statement about His character and consciousness, is not here ignored or denied, in calling attention to, and laying emphasis on, a factor in the problem which is generally disregarded when its solution is attempted. An interesting confirmation of the view of the Virgin here offered is afforded by Dante's description of her

as an example of humility, grace which blends faith and surrender.

The angel (who came down to earth
 With tidings of the peace so many years
 Wept for in vain, that oped the heavenly gates
 From their long interdict) before us seemed,
 In the sweet act, so sculptured to the life,
 He looked no silent image. One had sworn
 He had said "Hail!" for she was imaged there,
 By whom the key did open to God's love,
 And in her act as sensibly imprest
 That word, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord."
 As figure sealed on wax.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND JEWISH LITERATURE.¹

PART II.

TURNING to the question of the authorship of the books of the Old Testament—this was a subject in which the inspired authors of the New took little interest. Apart from the numerous phrases embedded in the text, there are about 286 express quotations from the Old Testament, only in about 51 cases, less than a fifth, is a personal name connected with a quotation.² *James* and *1 Peter* contain several, but never give the author's name; *Jude* is chiefly made up of references to the Old Testament, and to apocalyptic literature, but the only quotation it connects with a personal name is a passage from the Book of Enoch as spoken by Enoch. Often, especially in *Hebrews*, passages are quoted simply as the utterance of God or of the Spirit—"He saith," "the Holy Ghost saith"—the name of the human author is immaterial.

¹ The inaugural lecture at New Coll., London, October, 1901.

² Hühn, *A. T. Citate*, p. 269; the "about" is necessitated by uncertainties as to text, etc.

Even in the comparatively few cases in which the title of a book is given we cannot be absolutely sure that the author's name was actually mentioned by our Lord in His discourses, or written by the author of a book. It is, of course, a perfectly innocent thing to add to a quotation a reference to the book from which it is taken; such an addition merely provides useful information without affecting the substance of the speech reported, or of the document copied. We freely add references to our Bibles. In ancient times it was not usually felt necessary to distinguish such additions by placing them in brackets or footnotes, or by providing any special style of writing corresponding to our printed italics; sometimes indeed they were written on the margin or between the lines. But even when a note was marked off in any such way, the marks were usually omitted by subsequent scribes, and the marginal or interlinear additions got copied into the text. Even in the records of our Lord's discourses the Evangelists do not clearly mark off their own comments from the words of Christ; in St. John especially it is often difficult to say where the latter end and the former begin. *A fortiori* St. John, for instance, would not have felt it necessary to tell his readers that the title "Isaiah" in connexion with a quotation was an addition of his own. As it happens, the same verses illustrate the tendency both of evangelists and scribes to insert references. The passages in question are parallel reports of the same utterance of Christ; Mark xiii. 14, the oldest record, and Luke xxi. 20 refer to the "Abomination of desolation" or to "desolation," and give no reference to any Old Testament book; but Matthew xxiv. 15 introduces the reference "which was spoken of by Daniel the Prophet"; later on the copyists added this reference to the text of Mark. In the records of another discourse of our Lord's in Mark vii. 10, Christ introduces

a quotation with the formula "and Moses said," but in Matthew xv. 4, the formula He is said to have used is "and God said." While, therefore, we may maintain the substantial accuracy of the text of the New Testament, and of the record of our Lord's teaching, we cannot always be sure that the references to titles of books are part of the original discourses or documents.

Bearing in mind this important consideration, let us see what titles of Old Testament books are used in the New Testament. Let us take first the reports of our Lord's utterances. We have seen that the mention of Daniel must be ascribed to the Evangelist or to a copyist; but there is no doubt that Christ used the title "Moses" for the Pentateuch, and "Isaiah" for passages taken from the first part of the Book of Isaiah, and spoke of Psalm cx. as an utterance of David. In no other case does He use a personal name as the title of an Old Testament book. It is doubtless merely an accident that, though our Lord quotes passages from *II. Isaiah*, He does not quote them as "Isaiah."

Taking the New Testament as a whole, including our Lord's discourses and other speeches, we have the following personal names used as titles of Old Testament books: Moses, David, Isaiah (for both *I. and II. Isaiah*), Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel,¹ and Enoch. In some instances, as we have said, the insertion of the name may be due to the copyist and not to the original author. The use, however, of these personal titles does not always agree with the Old Testament. Anonymous psalms are quoted as "David," because, in spite of the variety of headings, it was the custom to use "David" as a title for the whole Psalter; Revelation xv. 3 ff. gives the Song of Moses and the Lamb, yet this poem has no connexion with the Old Testament Song of Moses, or with anything

¹ The text is doubtful.

ascribed to Moses in the Old Testament, but contains certain phrases from psalms, some anonymous, some Davidic. Further, a passage from the Book of Zechariah is quoted as Jeremiah,¹ and a passage from Malachi is quoted as Isaiah;² and a passage from the Book of Enoch is quoted as Enoch.³ Hence if the use of a personal name by an inspired writer in connexion with a passage from a book binds us to believe that the whole of that book as now extant was written by the person in question; if for instance the references to Moses and Isaiah bind us to believe that the whole of the Pentateuch was written by Moses, and the whole of Isaiah by Isaiah—if this is a necessary item of dogmatics, then we must believe that the whole of the Psalter was written by David, that the Book of Enoch was written by Enoch, that the Book of Zechariah was written by Jeremiah, and the Book of Malachi by Isaiah—which, as Euclid would say, is absurd. Here again we easily escape from all difficulties by recognizing that our Lord and His disciples left us no inspired message as to the authorship of Old Testament books. Nothing was further from their minds than any intention to decide controversies as to how many psalms were written by David, or as to how much of the Pentateuch was written by Moses, or whether the Book of Enoch was written by Enoch. Probably they shared the common belief that these books were written by Moses, Isaiah, and Enoch respectively, but they make no explicit *ex cathedra* utterance on the subject; they say nothing which can be meant to bind the Church for all time. They merely use the names of individuals as conventional titles of books.

Such a usage has always been common. To-day for instance, a writer who refers to “Esther” or “Matthew,” or “Titus,” does not necessarily mean that the books in question were written by Esther or Matthew, or Titus, as

¹ Matt. xxvii. 9.

² Mark i. 2, 3, R.V.

³ Jude 14.

the case may be. The Revised Version affords a remarkable example of this use of titles. You may read at the head of the Epistle to the Hebrews this title, "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews." Now if anything is certain in New Testament criticism, it is that St. Paul did not write the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Revisers were perfectly aware of the current opinion of scholars on this subject. This apparently explicit statement is a mere conventional phrase. The Revisers did not mean to express any opinion on the subject, much less to give an authoritative decision that St. Paul wrote the book, or to stake their own authority as scholars or Christian teachers on the Pauline authorship. If critical scholars in the critical nineteenth century thought it right in a popular book to keep a conventional title, a title clearly wrong if understood literally, can we wonder if our Lord and His disciples used conventional titles of books whose authorship was never discussed by them, and had no essential bearing on their message?

Next as to the attitude of the New Testament to the narratives contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. Here again we must remember that it is possible that references to ancient history may have been added as illustrative notes to our Lord's discourses by the Evangelists, or to the original documents by copyists. For instance, in Matthew xii. 40, the Evangelist gives, apparently as spoken by Christ, the words "as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster," but these words are absent from the parallel passage in Luke xi. 29-32, and may be an illustrative note of Matthew's.

Our Lord's references to the history of Israel are comparatively few: He refers to the flood, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, the transformation of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, the swallowing of Jonah by a sea monster, and the episodes of the brazen serpent, of David and the

shewbread, of the Queen of Sheba, of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath, and of Elisha and Naaman. Even in making these few references, His words are three times at variance with the statements of the Old Testament. In Matthew xxiii. 35 the father of the murdered Zechariah is said to be Barachiah; in 2 Chronicles xxiv. 21 the father's name is Jehoiada; in Mark ii. 26 the name of the priest who gave David the shewbread is Abiathar, in 1 Samuel xxi. 1 it is Ahimelech; in Luke iv. 25 it is said that the famine in the time of Elijah lasted three years and a half, according to 1 Kings xviii. 1, it lasted less than three years. It is possible that these names and dates are due to evangelists or copyists; but if so, of course, it is also possible that where there is no discrepancy names, dates, or references may have been added or altered. If we take the New Testament as a whole, the references to the ancient history are more numerous; the discrepancy as to the duration of Elijah's famine reappears in *James* and *Revelation*, and there are many other new discrepancies. In some cases the New Testament follows current Jewish tradition when it differs from the Old Testament. Moreover the New Testament uses illustrations taken from non-canonical apocalypses and other apocryphal works. *Hebrews*, as we have seen, includes in its survey of Sacred History the sawing asunder of Isaiah, from the *Ascension of Isaiah*; and the martyrdom of the seven from the Second Book of Maccabees; and the *Epistle of Jude* refers to the contest of Michael and Satan for the body of Moses, an incident said to be taken from the *Assumption of Moses*. Hence is impossible to say that a New Testament reference to an incident from an Old Testament historical book guarantees the accuracy and historicity of every incident mentioned in that book, or even of the particular incident mentioned; this is impossible for two main reasons: first, because the New Testament sometimes agrees with and sometimes differs from the Old. Secondly, because if we

maintain that the New Testament guarantees the historicity of every narrative in the Old Testament, we must on the same ground maintain that it guarantees the historicity of every statement in the *Assumption of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Book of Enoch, and 2 Maccabees*. Now *2 Maccabees* states that after the capture of Jerusalem the tabernacle and the Ark followed Jeremiah to Mount Sinai, and the prophet hid them in a cave.

Even if we confine the guarantee to the incidents actually mentioned, we must accept not only the episode of the Brazen Serpent, the transformation of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, and the swallowing of Jonah by the sea monster, but also the sawing asunder of Isaiah, and the contest of Michael and Satan over the body of Moses.

Such facts are clear warnings, given us by the Holy Spirit, against supposing that the New Testament was meant to teach us the history of Israel. These references are purely conventional, they were not intended either to confirm or contradict; the authority of the inspired writers is in no way involved. Thus, to-day, if a preacher who is not an expert in ancient history uses some narrative by way of illustration, and a later discovery shows that the narrative is inaccurate, the preacher is not in the least discredited as a spiritual authority. If any one charged him with making a mistake about Sesostris or the Pharaoh of the Exodus, about Cleon, or Mark Antony, or Constantine, he would have a right to reply, "It was not *my* mistake; I merely meant it to be understood that these statements were made by standard authorities, and such was then the case." In His spiritual teaching our Lord spoke from the inspired experience of His own unique personality. His doctrines were not dependent on precarious arguments of which the details of Old Testament history were indispensable data; Jonah and Lot's wife were picturesque illustrations.

The attitude of the New Testament to such technical

matters as the text, canon, introduction, detailed historical criticism, and exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures is best defined by a saying of Christ's in Matthew xxiii. 2. This saying refers to the external observances of worship, which are, to say the least, closely connected with religion. He said, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat; all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe." Other passages show that our Lord did *not* approve of all the rules of the scribes; but the principle involved may be stated thus: "It is not *my* work to be a casuist, to instruct you in the details of Sabbath observance, of the tithes of mint and anise and cummin, of the washing of pots and pans; these things I leave to the established authorities, whom it is your duty to obey in their proper sphere." In the same way, Christ left matters of scholarship to the scholars. He would have told the common people that He had no message on the subject, they would do well to accept what they were told by the best scholarship of their day. The views which much of the New Testament language, if taken literally, seems to imply about the Hebrew Scriptures are as much things which the scribes and Pharisees bade as the rules for washing and paying tithes. Christ did not mean to bind on the shoulders of Christians for ever the rabbinical exaggerations of the ceremonial law; neither did He mean to fetter the Christian intellect throughout all ages by the absurdities of rabbinical exegesis or the mistakes which the scribes made about the composition of their sacred books. Imagine some one—singularly lacking all sense of fitness or proportion—asking Christ or St. Paul, "Are we to understand that it is part of your inspired message that every word in the current text of the Book of Isaiah was written by that prophet, and every word in the Pentateuch by Moses? You claim to speak in God's name, and you say you are inspired by His Spirit, do you stake your authority on the exact and literal accuracy of your

language in these matters?" One can imagine Christ's indignant answer, "Man," He said once, "Who made Me a ruler or divider?" "Man," He might have answered, "Who made Me a higher critic?"

Space will only allow me to touch very briefly on New Testament methods of exegesis; and I am glad to feel that here I may confine myself to some of the more positive aspects of the question. The teaching of our Lord and His disciples shows that Revelation once given is not fixed, rigid, dead, but unfolds itself, develops, and grows. They use the words, statements, and phrases of the Old Testament in senses quite different from those of the original writers, and often still more different from those in which they were commonly understood at the beginning of the Christian era. They took phrases like "the Messiah," "the Hope of Israel," "the fulfilling of the law," "the coming of John the Baptist" which had a recognized meaning both in scholastic theology and in popular language, and yet did not feel in the least bound to use them in their established meaning. When our Lord spoke of Himself as the Messiah, He did not mean the conquering King whom His fellow-countrymen and even His disciples expected. The coming of Elijah meant with Him not the re-incarnation of the ancient prophet but merely the appearance of another person in the spirit and power of Elijah, a "second Elijah." In these and other cases He asserted the right to go back from the unworthy usages of scribes and Pharisees, to all that He, with His unique understanding of God's truth, could see was involved in and implied by the Revelation made to prophets and psalmists. The great words and ideas of Scripture had been appropriated for sectarian purposes, they had been given a narrowed and distorted meaning, and made the tools of human ignorance and error. Christ reclaimed them for God and His Revelation. He asserted the right to use them, not in the sense which error had for the time

imposed upon them, however current such meaning might be, but in all the depth and fulness which was rightly theirs. He claimed that they meant more than those who first used them had ever dreamed of, and His disciples followed in His footsteps.

It was no question of putting new wine into old bottles. Do you think our Lord would have used for the Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament the figure of an old wine-skin, something dead, shrivelled, worn and dry, torn and patched? The inspired books are living and life-giving. Even the formulæ of science grow continually in meaning as we discern for them a wider range of application, as we combine them with fresh discoveries, and look at them in the light of growing knowledge. The New Testament helps us to realize that the phrases and formulæ of the Hebrew Scriptures are not less fertile and pregnant. It has been said that the inspirations of one generation become to the next "current coin worn away in the handling," and in contrast to this that "no fire is dead whose sparks strike new matter, and burst into new flame." It is this latter figure which applies to the Old Testament or rather to the whole Bible; again and again its sparks strike new matter and burst into new flame.

Another feature is the use made of prophecy. We sometimes meet with the idea that certain predictions corresponding, as we think, to events of the Gospel history, can be used as evidence that those events really happened. In the New Testament we find the argument stated differently. The Apostles started from the events; they asserted, as in St. Peter's speech on the Day of Pentecost, that Jesus of Nazareth had risen from the dead, and ascended to heaven; they maintained that the Resurrection and Ascension corresponded to certain marks and signs of the Messiah as given by the prophets; therefore, they maintained, the Jews were bound to believe that Jesus was the

Messiah. St. Paul, indeed, writing for the Coriathians, thought it necessary to adduce the evidence for the Resurrection; but here and elsewhere St. Paul and the other Apostles speak of these events as absolutely certain, as accepted facts which can be used as premisses of an argument to establish further conclusions. They unconsciously reveal the strength of their convictions. They do not use prophecy to reinforce a wavering faith; but find in these events the links which connect Jesus of Nazareth with the Messiah. To us the correctness of their logic and exegesis are of small importance, what we do care about is that which is absolutely clear, their certainty as to the great facts of the Gospel.

Another feature in the use of the Old Testament by the New is the Messianic application of many passages. We draw a distinction between what is Messianic in the older Scriptures, and what is not. The New Testament is hardly acquainted with this distinction; for it all positive, forward-looking passages are Messianic. Foremost are the pictures of judgment, of an ideal future for Israel and for mankind, of a coming Deliverer. Then whatever is said of the Israelite king, whatever good is said by David or of David and of his house, whatever promises are made to them, are unhesitatingly applied to Christ. Not only so, but Christ is also regarded as the fulfilment of sayings concerning Israel and mankind; and, most striking of all, verses which originally referred to God are cited as speaking of Christ; Jehovah the God of Israel and Jesus of Nazareth are treated as convertible terms. Christ, according to the New Testament interpretation of the Old, is the realization of all ideals, personal and social, human and divine; He is the true Prophet, Priest, and King, the true Israel, perfect Man and perfect God.

Doubtless the Jewish teaching had prepared the way for such doctrines; they followed at once from the recognition

of Jesus as the Messiah. But the more divine and wonderful the Messiah had become in Jewish theology, the more marvellous is the identification with that Messiah of a working man who was put to death as an impostor and a criminal. We feel how unique must have been the impression which His personality made upon men, how convincing was the testimony which the Holy Spirit gave concerning Him to the first generation of Christians. I have never been able to understand how any one could deny that the New Testament teaches the deity of Christ. Its writers did not reflect on all that was involved in the doctrine, nor did they work it out in technical terms, as an item in systematic theology; but their use of the Old Testament, apart from anything else, is a profession of faith that God was incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth.

The principles which this lecture has been intended to illustrate may be summed up thus: we must not look to the New Testament to decide our controversies as to the literary and historical criticism of the Old; but the use which our Lord and His disciples make of the Jewish Scriptures reveals their permanent spiritual value, and throws a flood of light on the Person of Christ, and the character, faith and enthusiasm of His followers. Such principles are now widely held amongst scholars who differ as to the results of criticism. You may find them, for instance, in the article by Prof. Lumby which I referred to, and in the works of George A. Smith, Toy, Clemen, Hühn, Briggs, and many others.

I have brought them to your notice in this lecture partly because they remove many stumblingblocks. It is sometimes suggested that the authority of Christ and of the New Testament is discredited in these days. There is very little truth in this; but if their influence has suffered somewhat here and there, it is largely because we have put them to uses for which they were never intended, and have taken

our Lord's authority as a weapon in scholastic and sectarian controversies with which He was in no way concerned. Charles Dickens once wrote that, "half the misery and hypocrisy of the Christian world arises from a stubborn determination . . . to force the New Testament into alliance with it [the Old]—whereof comes all manner of camel-swallowing and gnat-straining." We should not endorse such a view, the *alliance* between the two Testaments is a fundamental article of our faith. But the statement becomes true if we say that these evils have arisen from the attempt to force the Old Testament into exact and complete verbal agreement with the New. Recently Prof. G. A. Smith has told us that not only his own experience but also that of the late Henry Drummond show that such an attempt is a fatal stumblingblock to many. He says of a large class of correspondents who consulted Drummond on religious difficulties: "One and all tell how the literal acceptance of the Bible—the faith which finds in it nothing erroneous, nothing defective, and (outside of the sacrifices and Temple) nothing temporary—is what has driven them from religion."

One great difficulty to many has been the supposition that the authority of Christ was committed to views about the Old Testament, which were demonstrably mistaken. By showing that this august authority is in no way concerned with our critical controversies, we leave both Testaments free to assert their influence over heart and conscience.

As I am delivering this lecture within a mile of Lyndhurst Road Church almost on the eve of its coming of age, I will conclude with a quotation from the volume of the *Century Bible*, which contains Dr. Horton's commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. He writes:¹ "The use made of the Old Testament by the apostles . . . is often allegorical

¹ p. 164.

and apparently arbitrary. Passages are quoted out of their context, and with reference to things which the writers never dreamed of; frequently the force of the quotation is found in the Septuagint . . . and not in the original Hebrew, and sometimes words are quoted as Scripture which are not found in our Old Testament. But the Scriptures are not the less able to make wise unto salvation through faith in Christ because allegorical and other methods of interpretation are applicable to them. In proportion as faith in Christ Jesus transforms, by possessing, the interpreter, it has been found . . . that the Old Testament from beginning to end forms a textbook for the preaching of Jesus . . . Directly men turn to the Lord . . . all the Scriptures are found eloquent of Him."

W. H. BENNETT.

THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS.

II.

IN a previous paper we examined Christ's favourite self-designation, the Son of man, with the view of discovering what light it throws upon His Messianic consciousness; and we found that not only is the title best understood in a Messianic sense, but that by its form it draws emphatic attention to the human side of Christ's Person in relation to His Messianic work. This side does not however stand alone, and we have now to supplement what was then said by the consideration of a second title.

II. THE SON OF GOD.

At first sight indeed it may seem as if this title could have little to tell us regarding the inner consciousness of Jesus, for, in direct contrast to the title the Son of man, which was constantly on His own lips, there is only one passage

in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 43) and a few passages in St. John (John v. 25 ; x. 36, without article ; xi. 4), where it is even hinted that Jesus ever described Himself as " the Son of God." But the title is so freely given to Him by others,¹ and is so obviously implied in the manner in which He speaks of God as His " *Father*" (Matt. vii. 21, x. 32, etc.), and of Himself as " *the Son*" (Matt. xi. 27 ; Mark xiii. 32 ; cf. Matt. xxi. 37, xxii. 2), that we may safely accept it as a convenient summary of a large part of His self-revelation. The exact nature of the personal consciousness underlying it is by no means, however, easily determined, and in proceeding to investigate what this is, it may be well to begin by noticing the use of the phrase in the Old Testament.²

That use points to a gradually narrowing application. Thus we find the title applied generally to all mankind as the creatures or children of God (Gen. vi. 2), and then more particularly to the nation of Israel (Exod. iv. 22 ; cf. Deut. xxxii. 6-10 ; Hos. xi. 1 ; Jer. xxxi. 9), from which the transition is easy to the theocratic kings of Israel, as representatives of the people, as when Jehovah says of David :

*" He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father,
My God, and the rock of my salvation.
I also will make him my firstborn,
The highest of the kings of the earth."*

(Ps. lxxxix. 26, 27.)

And of Solomon :

" I will be his father, and he shall be my son."

(2 Sam. vii. 14.)

¹ By a voice from heaven at the Baptism and Transfiguration (Matt. iii. 17¹⁷, xvii. 5) ; by Satan in the wilderness (Matt. iv. 3³ ||) ; by the demoniacs (Matt. viii. 29) ; by the disciples (Matt. xiv. 33) ; by Peter (Matt. xvi. 16) ; by the high priest (Matt. xxvi. 63) ; by the scoffers at the Cross (Matt. xxvii. 40).

² Nothing is to be gained by the attempt to trace it to a Hellenistic source, as Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 166 f. ; see Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 224.

Nor is this all; but in at least one passage it seems hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that the title is used with direct reference to the expected Messiah, when in Psalm ii. 7 we find the Psalmist announcing:

*“I will tell of the decree:
The Lord said unto me, Thou art my son;
This day have I begotten thee.”*

Certainly the Psalm as a whole is generally understood in a Messianic sense by the Jewish writers,¹ while this particular verse is found to have been fulfilled in Christ both by St. Paul (Acts xiii. 33) and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. i. 5, v. 5). At the same time we must be careful not to press the Messianic reference too far, for, as Dalman has shown, if the Psalm had been of any real importance for the Jewish representation of the Messiah, it could hardly fail to have been oftener quoted than it is. And in any case it is by itself insufficient to prove that “the Son of God” was a general Messianic designation.²

Nor is it different when we pass to the extracanonical use of the term. It is customary indeed to find here a growth in its Messianic usage, and Schürer³ appeals to such passages as Enoch cv. 2, where Jehovah speaks of “I and my son” uniting with the children of earth “for ever in the paths of uprightness in their lives”; and 2 Esdras vii. 28, 29, where we read: “For my son Jesus shall be revealed with those that be with him, and shall rejoice them that remain four hundred years. After these years shall my son Christ die, and all that have the breath of life.” But the language of such passages is too general to carry any great weight. And on the whole it must be admitted that the usage of the phrase alike in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature

¹ See the references in Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 716.

² *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 219 ff.

³ *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, E. Tr. div. ii. vol. ii. p. 159.

is vague and indeterminate,¹ and that certainly, even when applied Messianically, the title has not yet received any metaphysical sense.² It points simply to one uniquely loved, chosen, and endowed by God for some particular purpose.

This is not to say, however, that in the Gospels "the Son of God" may not have attained a more definite meaning. And what we have now to do is to examine its usage there with the view of seeing how far this is the case; and, if so, what is the exact application and force of the phrase.

As to its general Messianic reference there can at least be no doubt. For not only is it evidently so used by the demoniacally possessed (Matt. viii. 29, etc.), but it is also found united with the specific Messianic designation *ὁ Χριστός* in such a way as to suggest that the two titles were very closely related, as when in his great confession Peter addresses Jesus as "*the Christ, the Son of the living God*" (Matt. xvi. 16³), or as when at His trial the high priest adjures Him to declare whether He is "*the Christ, the Son of God*" (Matt. xxvi. 63).

But while this is so, it is hardly possible to weigh the passages just adduced impartially without feeling that something more than a merely official designation underlies the use of the term. This is especially clear in the latter instance, where Jesus' avowed claim to be the Son of God is immediately made the ground of a charge of blasphemy against Him. For in what did the blasphemy consist, if the claim amounted to nothing more than to a human Messiahship? Some reference at least to Divine being must

¹ "In relation to this most essential characteristic of the Messiah, the traditional attribute 'the Son of God' denotes only an incidental notion of very indefinite contents." Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, E. Tr. ii. 131.

² "Niemand wird aber aus dem Ausdruck gottheitliches Wesen des Sohnes gefolgert." Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 223.

³ Even if the shorter forms in Mark and Luke are considered more original, we have still the significance of the first Evangelist's combination to consider. See Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 59 note.

be thought of as underlying it. Beyschlag indeed has tried to get rid of this conclusion by pointing out that "the Jews understood by blasphemy, not merely blasphemous utterances in themselves, but every assumption of a prerogative or privilege which could only be conferred by God, the right of forgiving sins for example, or, as in the case of Jesus, claiming to be Messiah."¹ And with the same end in view Holtzmann says that "the 'blasphemy' could only have been found in this, that a man belonging to the lower classes, one openly forsaken of God, and going forward to a shameful death, should have dared to represent himself as the object and fulfilment of all the Divine promises given to the nation."² But is not all this, to say the least, most unnecessarily to weaken the full force of the passage? Certainly no one can read it in its whole context without feeling how immensely it gains in significance when we attach to the phrase "the Son of God" the deeper personal meaning that in our traditional theology we have come to associate with it.³

And in this conclusion we are confirmed when we come to regard the evidence of the Gospels as a whole. Thus if we were right in believing that the full consciousness of His Messianic vocation was brought home to Jesus at His Baptism, we cannot fail to notice that this consciousness rested upon a definite personal basis. It was because He was the "beloved" Son in whom His Father was "well pleased" that Jesus came also to recognize the full extent of the work to which He had been called in the world. Or, to put it generally, not only are the Messianic and the filial

¹ *New Testament Theology*, E. Tr. i. 69.

² *Neutest. Theologie*, i. 266.

³ Schleiermacher pronounces this affirmative *Yea* of Christ (Matt. xxvi. 64), in view of the surrounding circumstances, "das grösste Wort, was je ein Sterblicher gesagt hat, die herrlichste Apotheose; keine Gottheit kann gewisser sein als die, welche so sich selbst verkündigt" (*Reden über die Religion*, 4te Aufl., 1831, p. 292; quoted Schaff, *The Person of Christ*, p. 163).

consciousness inseparably associated in Jesus' mind,¹ but the former springs from the latter. He is "Messiah," because He is first "Son."

And so too when we pass to notice the manner of Jesus' application of the term "sonship" to His disciples, it is very noteworthy that He nowhere represents it as standing on the same footing as His own. On the contrary, He is always careful to distinguish between "*my Father*" (Matt. vii. 21, x. 32, etc.) and "*your Father*" (Matt. v. 16, 45, 48, vi. 1, 14, etc.), and, so far as we know, on no single occasion unites Himself with others in common prayer to God.² At most men "*become*" sons (γένησθε, Matt. v. 44, 45), whereas He is not merely "a son," but "*the Son*" in an altogether pre-eminent degree (Mark xiii. 32, etc.). Or, as the distinction is drawn in the Fourth Gospel, believers are τέκνα θεοῦ (John i. 12, xi. 52), Jesus is ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός (John iii. 16, 18).

It will probably be objected to this last distinction that, occurring as it does in the Fourth Gospel, we cannot be sure that it is due to Jesus Himself, and is not the result of later Apostolic reflectiveness. But if so, it is sufficient to point by way of corroboration of its underlying truth to one remarkable passage in the Synoptic Gospels, whose authenticity can hardly be denied, and whose Christology is as advanced as anything we find in the Johannine writings.³ The passage is found in close parallelism both in the First and Third Gospels, and forms part of Jesus' exaltation over

¹ "Es füllt also sein messianisches mit seinem Sohnesbewusstsein wesentlich zusammen" (Titius, *Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, Freiburg, i. B., 1895, p. 116).

² The Lord's Prayer is no exception. It is a prayer for the disciples' use. Cf. Matthew vi. 9: "*After this manner therefore pray ye*," and note the fifth petition, which Jesus could never have used. On the significance of Jesus' abstention from common prayer, see especially Forrest, *The Christ of History and Experience*, pp. 22 ff., and the same writer's reply to criticisms of his view in *The Expository Times*, xi. p. 352 ff.

³ Cf. Sanday, *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 109.

the triumphant return of the Seventy. "*All things,*" so He is represented as saying, "*have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son ('who the Son is,' Luke) save the Father; neither doth any know the Father ('and who the Father is,' Luke), save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him*" (Matt. xi. 27; Luke, x. 22).

The importance of the words is unmistakable, and has been freely admitted by critics of all schools,¹ even while the individual clauses have been subjected to a great variety of interpretations.

Thus the first clause, "*All things have been delivered unto me of my Father,*" has been taken to mean no more than Christ's control of all things essential to His Messianic work, or the whole of God's revelation in the Gospel that has been entrusted to Him. But the terms are too general to be thus limited, and, when taken along with the words that follow, can hardly point to less than perfect, absolute intercommunion between the Father and the Son, an intercommunion of knowledge so close that it can only be described in strictly parallel terms, and which, further, is clearly distinguished from that revelation of the Father which it is in the Son's power to make to whomsoever He willeth. But if so, can any interpretation involving a merely humanitarian view of this consciousness of the Son be regarded as sufficient? Or have we not rather evidence of the clearest kind that Jesus both knew and declared Himself to stand in a so altogether unique relation to God, that it can only be explained by the oneness of essence between Himself and God, to which later Apostolic theology points. "It is open to the radical theologian to say," as

¹ "The most distinct and weighty passage in which Jesus declares his filial consciousness." Baur, *Neutest. Theol.*, p. 113. "This sublime utterance of Jesus, into which he threw all his self-consciousness regarding his Messianic work and person." Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, E. Tr. iv. p. 65.

Dr. Stevens has shown, "that the positing of a metaphysical union with God as the basis of the unique consciousness and character of Jesus is a subsequent explanation which Paul and John have given. But," as he well adds, "it *is* an explanation, and the mere assertion that Jesus' consciousness was 'purely human' *is not*."¹

We cannot, however, pursue this line of thought further at present, and in closing we would only draw attention to the light which the Apostolic explanation, derived as we believe it is from Jesus' own self-testimony, throws upon a whole chain of well-attested facts which it is otherwise very difficult, if not impossible, to understand—such as the attitude of Jesus to the Old Testament (Matt. v. 21, 22, etc.), His bestowal of the forgiveness of sins (Mark ii. 10, etc.), His own sense of sinlessness (John viii. 46), His demands upon men's consciences and lives (Mark i. 17, x. 29), the reward that He promises for all deeds done in His Name (Mark ix. 41), and the assurance that He will come again to judge the world (Matt. xvi. 27, etc.). It may well be that our very familiarity with such claims as advanced by Jesus may at first blind us to their full significance, but no one can weigh them carefully in connexion with the whole consciousness of Him Who made them without recognizing that He at least must have known Himself to be more than man, or how could He have thus usurped the attributes and functions belonging to God alone, or claimed the right to exercise such authority over men?

Not until we see in Jesus "the Son of God" in the highest sense of the title as well as "the Son of Man," "*in all things . . . made like unto His brethren*" (Heb. ii. 17), do His Person and work appear in a consistent light, or can we understand the truth to which the writer of the Epistle to

¹ *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 64. The reference is more particularly to Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*, E. Tr. i. p. 75.

the Hebrews gives such striking expression that, " *though He was a Son, yet learned [He] obedience by the things which He suffered; and having been made perfect, He became unto all them that obey Him the author of eternal salvation*" (Heb. v. 8, 9).

G. MILLIGAN.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE PSALMS.

[THE following notes are taken from the manuscripts dealing with the Psalms amongst those left by Dr. Weir, formerly Professor of Oriental Languages, Glasgow, and now lying in the University Library. Many of them are conjectural emendations of the text, and, where later critics have made the changes suggested, the fact is noted in square brackets. Similar notes but fuller were occasionally contributed by Dr. Weir to the *Academy*.—T. H. W.]

PSALMS.

15. 4c. For להרע ולא read להרע לו ולא.

16. 2-3. For עלִי : עלִיךְ : לֵי read עלִי : כל ; and for עלִי cf. 2 Samuel 18. 11 and Koran ii. 286.

16. 3. Read : כל קדושים אשר בארצה כה יאדירו כל הפצי במ [כל קדושים, so Wellhausen] בארצה, LXX ; כה יאדירו, LXX and Psalm 8. 2.

17. 15. תכונתך ; Syr. אכונתך.

20. 10. יעננו ; read יעננו as LXX [Baethgen, Wellhausen, Kirkpatrick, etc.].

21. Consists of two parts : 1. What God does for His king ; 2. What God (or the king) does to His enemies ; each part separated by *v.* 8.

22. 17. כארי ידי ורגלי ; כארי never occurs in Psalms, always אריה. Read אסרו as 2 Samuel 3. 34.

22. 18 (17). "I may tell all my bones" (עצמותי); read עצבותי, 'Do I tell all my sorrows?' It is contrasted with v. 23, 'I will tell Thy name.'

22. 26 (25). "My praise shall be of Thee" (כיאתך); read אמתך, 'Thy faithfulness is the subject of my praise.' [Wellhausen rejects כיאתך; Duhm באתו.]

24. 6. For this use of 'Jacob' cf. Isaiah 44. 5.

25. 22. The use of אלהים instead of יהוה shows this verse to be a later addition for liturgical purposes [so Baethgen, Wellhausen, Kirkpatrick, etc.].

26. 2. בהן and צרף are both used of metals, but the latter is the more emphatic.

26. 9. אסף עב, cf. 1 Samuel 15. 6.

27. 4c. Perhaps, in bright days to behold God's glory; in dark, to inquire as to the cause of His displeasure.

27. 8. בקשו פני; read for בקשו, בבשו or בבשת or בקשו (Deut. 9. 27). קשי פנים, Ezekiel 2. 4 of obstinacy, but קשת רוח, 1 Samuel 1. 15, 'of a sorrowful spirit'; so קשה יום, Job 30. 25.

28. 5. After ידי some words have fallen out parallel to לא יבינו, perhaps לא יראו from resemblance of יראו to ידי.

29. 2. הדרת קדש; cf. נאדר בקדש, Exodus 15. 11.

29. 3. על הכים may mean 'above the clouds'; cf. 18. 12.

30. 13. כבוד; read כבודי as LXX and A.V. 'lost before ולא.

31. 3. כהרה as Joshua 10. 6, 1 Samuel 20. 38 with imperative; or read כהרה imperative as 1 Samuel 23. 27.

32. 8. איעצה; Mr. Henry Bradley, 37, Occupation Road, Sheffield, May 27, 1873, suggests איעצה, Proverbs 16. 30, in the sense of 'fix steadily'; so LXX [cf. Delitzsch]. Most commentators think the Psalmist is the subject, but 'mine eye upon thee' seems to point to Divine guidance, and 'thee' seems distinguished from 'you' of v. 9.

33. 15. כבין; read ככין.

33. 16. For the first ברב read ברכב, as 2 Kings 6. 14.

34. 4. *גדל* *pīel*, only here with ל, equivalent to *הבו גדל* (Deut. 32. 3). *גדל* is chosen for the sake of the initial letter.

34. 18. Some such word as *גדיקים* has fallen out; so LXX, Ewald [others transpose *vv.* 16 and 17].

35. 14. *פָּרַע*; read *כָּרַע*, parallel to *קָדַר*.

35. 15. *נָכִים*; perhaps *נִכְלִים* (Num. 25. 18).

35. 17. *כִּישָׂאֵיהֶם*; read *כִּישְׁנֵיהֶם*, 'from their teeth.'

36. 2. *נָאֵם* may be for *נָעַם* as *תָּאֵב* for *תָּעַב*, *שָׂאָה* (Gen. 24. 21) for *שָׂעָה*. For *לְבִי* read *לְבוֹ* with LXX, Syr., Jer., some MSS. and some editions of Targum. This would give: 'Sweet is transgression to the wicked within his heart.' Cf. Prov. 9. 17.

36. 3 (2). Instead of "until his iniquity be found to be hateful," translate, 'he hateth to find out his iniquity.'

37. 20. *כָּרִים*; perhaps *הָרִים*, as 83. 15; 104. 32; 147. 8.

37. 23. *כּוֹנְנוֹ* *pōlal*, elsewhere only Ezekiel 28. 13. Read *חֹנֵן* (the *י* being a repetition of the next letter) as *vv.* 21, 26; Psalm 112. 5. Still *צַעַד* is connected with *הַכִּיָּן* in Proverbs 16. 9 and Jeremiah 10. 23; and yet we would expect some epithet with *גִּבּוֹר*, as A.V.

37. 37. *אֲחֵרִית לְאִישׁ שְׁלוֹם*. Peace is so much more often represented as the reward of righteousness than as characterizing the righteous man that one would suppose some word had fallen out, as *תָּם* (*לְאִישׁ*). So A.V.

37. 40. *יִפְלַמֵּם* repeated as *נִאֲסַפּוּ* in 35. 15.

40. 5. *שָׂטִי*; Syr. read *שִׁפְתֵי*?

40. 8. For *עַל כְּתָב* cf. 2 Kings 22. 13.

42. 7. *וְהִרְכֹּנִים*; read *וְאֲרוֹכֵיכֶן*, which occurs frequently with *אֱלֹהֵי* and *אֹדָה*.

42. 8. There may be a contrast between the voice of the Divine judgments and the voice (*v.* 5) of the joyful crowd of worshippers.

42. 10. *לִכְהָ*, pointed as emphatic. Cf. 43. 2.

43. 1. This verse differs from the rest. Perhaps 42 and

43 were originally one, but 43 may have been altered (in *v.* 1) and separated.

44. May not the occasion be the Assyrian invasion in the time of Hezekiah?

44. 5. צוה; read שוה.

44. 6. קם, revolters from below; צר, oppressors from above.

45. 5. ענוה צדק; read עָנּוּ הַצֶּדֶק, cf. 82. 3; 76. 10. In that case דבר אמת will be the *word* of truth, as 119. 43, etc.

46. 6. לפנות בקר; cf. השכם in Jeremiah.

47. 3. This verse explains the use of אלהים in *v.* 2. It is as if the Psalmist had said 'יהוה is אלהים indeed.'

48. 3. רכבה, is always of inanimate things. קריה, almost always in poetry.

48. 4. נודע, 'proved to be.'

48. 10. דכינו; we have compared—endeavoured to discern some comparison which might give a just view of God's mercy.

49. 6. עון עקבי יסבני, 'Iniquity (עון) encompasseth me as to my heels or footsteps.' See Psalm 17. 11, where same construction exactly.

49. 12. אדמות might mean 'clouds.' Cf. 104. 29; 146. 4.

49. 14. ואחריהם בפיהם ירצו; for אחריהם בפיהם read בניהם: 'and their sons go willingly after them.'

49. 15. כצאן, i.e. unresisting.

שתו; perhaps נהתו or [as Baethgen] יחתו; Job 21. 13, וברגע שאול יחתו.

נות ירעם; כות רעה with suffix never means 'to feed on'; perhaps ירעם as 2. 9; Job 34. 24.

צורם; perhaps צורם, 'their rock, strength,' as 73. 26.

55. 3. אריד בשיחי; read אנרר as Isaiah 22. 4.

55. 13. אויב הרפני; read אויב הרפני.

This Psalm seems somewhat confused in arrangement. The sense would be better brought out by some such order as this: 1-12; 16; 13-15; 21; 22; 17-20; 23; 24.

56. 6. יִעֲצְבוּ ; perhaps יתעבו (Am. 5. 10) or יִעֲקִיְשׁוּ .
57. 2. עַד יֵעֲבֵר הַיּוֹת ; perhaps עַד עֵבֵר or עֵדֵי עֵבֵר .
57. 12. Cf. Aeneid i. 379, 'fama super æthera notus.'
58. 8. יִתְהַלְכוּ לָנוּ ; for לָנוּ read לֵים , 'which flow to the sea.'
60. 8 (6). Translate, 'God has spoken. In His holiness I will exult.'
61. 3. בְּצֹר יְרוּס כִּמְנִי ; read בְּצֹר יְרוּסִי as 27. 5 and LXX.
62. The leading idea is, 'None but God.'
62. 3. לֹא אֲכֹוֹט רַבָּה ; perhaps רַבָּה should be כֹּלָּה .
64. 6. יִחֻזְקוּ לָנוּ ; cf. 1 Chronicles 26. 27, לְחֻזְקָ לְבֵית יְהוָה .
65. 2. The 'paying of vows' is preceded by *praise* in 22. 26 ; 50. 14. Perhaps רַכִּיבָה should be רַכִּיבָה or some form connected with רוֹכֵם , 'to extol.'
66. 2. שִׁירוּ כְבוֹד תְּהַלְלוּ ; read כְּבוֹד .
66. 9. שֵׁם ; read שִׁיר as also in 50. 23.
66. 12. רוּיָה ; read רַחֲבָה as 119. 45.
68. 11. הִיתָ יֹשְׁבֵי בָהּ ; read הִיתָ יֹשְׁבֵי בָהּ . Or 'Thy wild animals' might mean the heathen as הִיתָ הָאֲרָץ , Israel being צֵאן הַנְּחָלָה .
68. 14. This verse seems to describe the awaking of the people inspired by the Divine word.
68. 15. פֶּרֶשׁ *p'el*, always with 'hand' except Zechariah ii. 10.
69. 4. כִּיחַל ; read כִּיחַל as LXX.
69. 6. A difficulty has been felt in connecting this verse with the rest of the Psalm, but this difficulty is removed by taking 'Thou knowest' as equivalent to 'I have made known to Thee,' i.e. 'acknowledged.'
69. 9. כִּיזֹר ; read כִּיזֹר as Hosea 8. 12. The Syr. still had זֹר .

PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON.

ON the morning of Sunday, January 26, a great light was quenched in Scotland. For wellnigh half a century it had burned with undiminished brightness; at its warm flame was kindled a host of other fires. In A. B. Davidson passed away a grand master of the Old Testament, whose work it is for other scholars to attempt to estimate if they can, whose influence they cannot. Fortunately, if some acquaintance with the Hebrew language was necessary to appreciate his special knowledge, the lack of it proved no barrier to knowing the man himself. And when in after years his students met in recollection of their college days, it was not of his learning that they loved to speak, but of the man.

Of course we had all heard of him long before we entered the Hall. Even when we were undergraduates in the University, the talk of friends who had preceded us into New College tempted us to accept their invitation to come and hear this man who thrilled them, for ourselves. And when, under their proud escort, we climbed the weary flights of stairs that led to the Rabbi's lecture-room, we shared their anxiety lest after all it might not be "Saul" to-day. For the master sometimes seemed to find amusement in upsetting the careful calculations of his scholars as to the precise day on which they might miss other classes to hear once again his famous sketches of Old Testament characters.

As the door of the retiring-room opened, the class sank into silence. The gowned figure walked slowly to the desk, and after gazing for a moment with upturned eyebrows at the

class, engaged in prayer—such prayer as you might have heard with difficulty had you been seated in the front bench, the prayer of a man talking in great humility and reverence with God, prayer punctuated oftentimes with deep-drawn sighs. During the roll-call you had a moment in which to study the keen spectacled face, with the nose slightly awry, the thin lips, and the scant steel-grey hair. The roll called, there would perhaps follow certain remarks about the Theocracy in Israel, interspersed with the shuffling and turning over of leaves of manuscript, for the Rabbi only read us selections out of his great store. This naturally led up to Saul and the turning-points in his career, and when he reached the well known sentence, "There are incidents in Saul's life which induce us to look at it," there was a general murmur of expectancy, and even some of the younger men would lay down their pens prepared only to listen.

I suppose that if the most of us had any definite conception of Saul up to that moment, we pictured to our minds a disobedient, jealous king, who wrought his own undoing. From that hour we learned to think of him more charitably as a man thrust into a position that he had not sought, called to a destiny that was above him, struggling with a task that was beyond him, feeling his inability and so taking it to heart that his mind became unstrung, and "all was harsh and out of tune." Verily he became a hero to us. The effect was tremendous, for the Rabbi suffered himself to be carried away by the intensity of the situations he depicted, and his words, accompanied by an upward movement of the pencil which he continually held in his right hand, rose high and shrill, gathering speed till he reached a climax, when as suddenly his voice would fall to a low, soft, lingering, meditative emission of the final words. "The story of Saul's rejection¹ is told in

¹ It is not pretended that these are more than a student's notes which can at

1 Samuel xv., in connexion with the affair of the Amalekites, when he was directed to destroy everything. . . . Saul, when he came to meet Samuel, said he had done the will of the Lord, as he thought. He was expressing his honest belief. He was not a vulgar hypocrite detected in the act and trying to brazen it out. He fancied himself obedient to the word of the Lord and Samuel. Hypocrisy was not one of his faults ; it was rather religious incapacity, a characteristic of mind. He might know that religion implied a full surrender to God, but his moral sense was too blunt to really understand what full surrender was. He knew that Jehovah demanded obedience, but he could not penetrate to know how minute and particular obedience to God must be. He thought a general compliance was obedience. . . .”

Thereafter it was suggested that “perhaps his religious incapacity goes to explain his madness, which was a mere mania with a religious origin. He had an ill-balanced mind which his circumstances completely overthrew. He certainly was jealous, but his mania shewed itself long before the appearance of David. The shepherd boy was brought to quell the unquietness of the king’s mind. This unquietness must have come from a thought, a feeling, that things were not right around him. He was disappointed ; he knew that he was unsuccessful. Samuel haunted him ; he was like a blind man told to look, like a lame man told to walk. He would do right but he could not ; this Kingdom of Jehovah was beyond him. He felt his incompetence, and the feeling preyed on him to madness ; the hollowness of his position upset his understanding. . . .

“He could not understand the cause of his failure. No one who does not succeed ever understands why he failed. He lays the blame of failure on others. We were not

the best give but an imperfect shadow of the original, a demand for which and other originals it is, however, hoped that they may help to stimulate.

suites, we imagine, to catch the popular vote. We say our music did not fall upon sympathetic ears. We have an inner refined sense, we think, which others cannot understand. Upon Saul there came a feeling of profound resentment, and when he knew that he was to be supplanted he became furious. He sought to slay David, and his son had to flee from him. But before Samuel he always took the shoes from off his feet, however cruel he was to others. The majesty of the king bowed before the majesty of the prophet of the Lord. Samuel brought back to him the days of his youth when he had set out to fight the battles of the Lord. The king thought of his past victories which seemed as yesterday; he recalled in thought his first meeting with the prophet Samuel. The struggles between his higher and lower self came back to him, and in the wilderness of his present life streams broke out, and he was again something of that other man. But it must have been hard to bear the incessant depreciation of Samuel, who said that his greatest virtues were but splendid vices. . . .”

Then followed a wonderful portrait of Saul,—“a man of honour, gallant, brave, liberal, chivalrous.” One touch in particular appealed to students of the Rabbi. “Consider his modesty, how he told his relatives about the asses, but said nothing about his election to the crown, how when they went to seek him, he had hid himself among the stuff.” And so through every trait in the character of this perplexed life.

“‘Then Saul said, I have sinned: yet honour me now, I pray thee, before the elders of my people, and before Israel, and turn again with me that I may worship the Lord thy God. So Samuel turned again after Saul, and Saul worshipped the Lord.’ It was a strange scene. Samuel and Saul were friends; they knew each other. They were the two highest men in the commonwealth of Israel. Saul was Samuel’s brother in all the big purposes

of Israel. When Samuel announced his rejection, Saul asked him to come back and sacrifice with him. Was the act of either a little one? Was it merely a piece of good nature to propose it on the part of the one, and to gratify it on the part of the other? Saul knew that all that Samuel said was true, and Samuel knew what it conveyed to the ambitious mind of the king. No one though he may crush out a mind but feels it all his life through as the weightiest thing in his existence. Samuel had done this to Saul his brother; he had crushed out the kingdom of God in his mind. His first instinct was to abandon Saul, but the fellowship of a lifetime cannot be smothered in a moment of religious excitement, and Samuel turned back on this reprobate in his rejection and went with him. He could not let Saul down to the vulgar stare of the people; he would not have been the calm, compassionate, righteous judge of Israel as we know him if he had. It was like Saul to ask this of Samuel, and yet why did he do it? Was it to keep up appearances? Partly, although this keeping up of appearances in more serious things is but a confession to the depth of life and therefore beautiful, a confession to tragedy and that which we wish to hide. Saul's request was due to his sense of propriety and his dignity. He was not unnerved by Samuel's denunciations. The very awfulness of the sentence strung every nerve in him; the greatness of the calamity made him rise above what was personal. He did not go through the camp of Israel lamenting his fall. He had duties as well as interests and he rose above himself, feeling that there were interests wider than his own . . .

“A moment came to Moses on the border of the promised land when he saw that he was not to get that upon which he had set his heart. Such a moment comes to many men—when it is made clear to us that we are not going to make that out of life which we had wished, when

we are told as if by a voice from heaven that we shall not take part in that great movement of which we had dreamed, shall not rise to that position in the Church of God to which we had aspired, shall not lead that movement in thought; when the advance is made no one will think of us. And although others do not know, God shows us what incapacity, what false step it is which loses for us the harvest of our hopes. Yet are we not therefore to go paralysed through life, with our hands hanging down, but accept what God adjudges, and our smaller part in life's interests, even if it be not that for which we had hoped . . .

“The mysteriousness of Saul's life derives its real tragical interest for us by its connexion with a Higher Power. We have not our destinies entirely in our hands; we cannot do everything by mere force of mind. There is something above our wills using us for purposes beyond ourselves, beyond our own immediate failure or success. In God's providence Saul was put upon a throne which he did not desire; it was thrust upon him, incapable though he turned out to be. Perhaps his very incapacity fitted him for the office more than ability would have done. His failure drew attention to the loftiness of the office. Saul fell and broke himself to pieces, and men could not help looking up to God; they saw how far he had fallen. So God shows us the demands of Christianity by letting us see the little way that the best go to fulfil them. By being chosen king, religion was forced on Saul's attention; he had to face the question in some measure. What might he have been had he been left in his father's house! He might have died an untouched, unawakened, secular-minded man, wholly without godliness, interested only in mundane affairs; such a man might he have remained, following the plough. But the hard soil of his mind was torn up, and though experimented upon he was not merely a warning to others . . .

“There is a gleam of returning light in Saul’s last act. After his rejection he loyally clung to his post. He did not pettishly renounce the kingdom. He did not renounce the claims of life although life had nothing now to give him. Think of his last act. We do not speak of the chivalry, the self-denial of it. The old fire was not dead. On his last battlefield he was chivalrous as ever. What blending of rare kingliness, generosity, and greatness of mind—Jonathan and he in one last act of self-immolation for their country!

“Even that act the night before the battle had its noble though pathetic side. We smile at it—smile at the display of great moral qualities because we see them combined with some superstition. The king sought his old friend Samuel—sought him who had first spoken to him from God. He thought of old times, of what he might have been. He strove to go back to other days and try to be that other man which the spirit had made him in the earlier years. And even as that which he might have been again made effort to assert itself, stars shone out of the clouds. Perhaps it was in vain. Often on deathbeds visions of youthful resolves and aims come up before men’s minds. The dial goes back forty or fifty degrees, and the resolves of early youth strive to shine out again. But they come back as shadows, lost possibilities, reflections of early visions, phantoms of youth bright and filled with promise, phantoms uttering with hollow voice one sound—It might have been. Yet there may be other ways of it. What we look on as the throes of death are often but the pangs of a new birth. Scripture passes no censure upon Saul; it simply states, ‘God took the kingdom from him.’ And we are fain to believe that the first king in the kingdom of God, holding such a place as he did, was not cast away. We read our faults in his, and leave both his and ours at the feet of the King of kings, who did not leave

the kingdom as Saul left it, but established it for ever and ever, and who is the propitiation not for our sins only but for the sins of the whole world.”

At frequent intervals, and especially towards the close, it was impossible to continue to take notes because the paper seemed blurred. The Rabbi spoke as if every phase depicted had been a personal experience, as if he had lived through and known the situations he described. Perhaps in a measure it was so. The circumstances of his life led to much introspection, and he discovered strange personal affinities with men like Saul, Elijah, Isaiah, Amos and Hosea. Hence the perfection and the palpitating life of his interpretations.

With Elijah he had been in the backside of the wilderness; there, broken and dejected, he had been comforted again, and returned to even greater victories. It was, perhaps, this note of personal experience, constituting the burden of his interpretations, that so brought his hearers into sympathy with him. Thus, on another day, we were shown Elijah in the moment of his triumph, when the people, stung by his words, slew the prophets of Baal. But his triumph was of short duration, and when threatened by Jezebel he fled. “He fled into the wilderness where we should expect him to flee. In any moment of his life its waste was congenial to him: its bleakness and desolation were the counterparts of his mind. There he and Jehovah could be alone. In its solitude he could best meditate on the great questions that surged up in his mind, and thence rush into the conflict once again. He felt himself alone among men: he was too great to be the companion of any at Ahab’s court. His greatness lay in the mysteriousness and profundity of his thoughts of God, and he was solitary because of his greatness. Some men are solitary for other reasons. Circumstances alienate them from their fellow-men. Thus some hills stand alone, though not so very great, because the others that stood around them have been

carried away ; and some men are left, unsought by their fellow men. Others are solitary because of their grandeur, like Mont Blanc towering into regions of cloud into which the mountains around it cannot rise. So is it with those who dwell in lofty regions where only Heaven is ; hidden in dense clouds of divine light they are solitary. The loftiest minds can be followed to a certain distance, and then they part company with other men, leaving them behind.

“Elijah fled into the wilderness of Sinai. He longed to be near the place of Jehovah’s revelation of Himself, where the law was given with thunderings. It was a natural longing. Some men, wearied by the indifference and laxness of those around them still find rest in Sinai. Their spirit craves to be set face to face with truth and God ; it seizes the service of God in its simplicity. They have an asperity, a fierce earnestness that will not be satisfied with half measures. They have no love for half truths, and are distasteful to those who with more mildness wish to rub off the sharp corners of truth. Law, righteousness, justice, God’s service—these they desire unmixed. With those who say ‘This here is mystery ; this ends in God ; this certainly is good, but we can only hope, we do not know,’ Elijah and those like him have no sympathy. It may be truth, but it is only truth so far. . . .

“And yet we cannot wholly analyse the complex longing that impelled Elijah to Horeb. It was an unconquerable wish to see the face of that Jehovah before whom he stood, to realize his God. He felt what the prophets felt—that Israel had abandoned God : he wished to be with Him.

“The way to Horeb seemed long. On the road occurred that breakdown for which we are thankful. It was the day after his triumph. Yesterday the wells of life were full ; to-day they had receded and seemed dry. Yesterday a people stood by him, a kingdom seemed gained for Jehovah ; to-day no one would raise a finger for him. Alone, famished,

crouching under a bush, forsaken of men, his life a failure, the memory of his might and influence eclipsed, wishful to die,—‘Take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers.’

“It is a hard moment, such as this which fell upon Elijah now, when he had given the energy of his life to one cherished purpose, thinking continually of it, foreseeing the day when victory would come, enduring much, waging a weary warfare, refusing to think of defeat; and then some terrible miscalculation, some unworthiness on the part of others snatches away the desired object, and defeat ensues when victory seemed secure. He judged it truth for which he struggled; the means that he had taken seemed to him worthy. And now his life is like a vanquished host: the purpose of his life is broken like the fragments of a regiment. But God remains to him, who will judge his cause and remove him from the unequal strife. His cause, though now dishonoured, shall yet be honoured and his name be lustreful. And so people continually misjudge and mistake. The modern martyr can but die appealing to posterity, believing that his name, though now dishonoured, shall yet shine with a perpetual lustre; and after-generations look back with wonder on the misjudgment of past times. But this thought did not appear to comfort the prophet; his prostration was so complete. All seemed lost, and he longed to die for very weariness. The most powerful minds fall into the deepest dejection. He was like a warrior who has fought all day, and now after receiving a mortal wound retires to die. But God first removed the bodily weariness of his servant and then satisfied his spiritual longing. . . .

“He took him to his desired Mount, and in the revelation there conquered and taught him. There in that strange contrast of wind, earthquake and fire to which his nature would be profoundly responsive, and in which God was not, He comforted and taught him. What meaning all

this conveyed to Elijah we do not know ; we are at a loss to interpret. Perhaps he was taught the meaning of his own failure, although he could hardly have used another way. He had wondered that people should be fanatical one day and sunk into indifference the next. All his life Elijah had used force and compelled obedience ; he had made use of law and deified it. He had made the heavens appear as brass. The experiment he had tried on others was being tried upon himself. God repeated the terrors of the law, but God was not in them. ‘And after the fire a still small voice,’—and God was there. So perhaps, was he shewn prophetically in a parable of another more excellent way, when the thunders of Sinai shall die away and give place to the still small voice of Christ, the power and wisdom of God—Him who did not cry aloud nor lift up His voice in the streets, and who is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

“Thus he was sent back to his work comforted. He thought he had only saved himself, but God spoke of seven thousand which had not bowed the knee unto Baal. The assurance was given him that his work had not been a failure ; he had not laboured in vain. No work done is lost. Deep and lasting had been his career, although he thought it superficial. In later years his desire was accomplished, for when Jehu came to the throne, a thorough political and religious revolution followed, and this was but the expression of Elijah’s monotheistic, ascetic spirit, which is omnipotent when it arises in the hearts of the people.”

Two days a week the Rabbi lectured to us, and on the other three we read portions of the Old Testament in Hebrew. In his exegesis of a passage we learned to appreciate the eminently judicial character of his pronouncements. In a sense there seemed to be a certain unsatisfactoriness about much of his criticism and exposition, for continually he presented us with alternative views, and even when

pressed refused to declare in favour of one or other. But sometimes—it might be long afterwards—we came to see that this just represented the excellence of his scholarship, inasmuch as it was not possible to have given an absolute decision at the time upon the point in question. Again and again his sentences opened with a “many consider,” or “some think,” to be followed by a “but,” behind which was concealed an objection that, ram-like, with a single blow demolished the flimsy structure of some hasty immature worker. His negative work in particular was continually enlivened by sallies of keen wit. Thus we were told that the sixth and seventh verses of the eleventh chapter of Isaiah represented “simply a picture of peace. Lagarde’s observation, however, is interesting: ‘This represents a physical impossibility, for the alimentary canal of the lion is not adapted to straw.’” And again on *v.* 10, where the last clause reads (R.V.), “And his resting-place shall be glorious”: “Jerome thought that his ‘resting-place’ referred to his grave; this is beautiful but not true.” Many will recall in this connexion a sentence in his little book on *The Exile and the Restoration*: “It has been said by some one that Ezra, when driven to extremities, plucked his beard, while Nehemiah in like circumstances plucked other people’s beards.”

Himself imbued with the poetic spirit, he was always severe upon literalists who missed the poetry of a passage. Thus, of Isaiah xl. 3, 6 we were told: “Verse 3 is poetry. It is prose to ask whose is the voice. ‘Hark one saying, Cry.’ It is another voice which the prophet hears. The world is filled with voices proclaiming the advent of Jehovah. ‘And another said, What shall I cry?’ It is more lofty not to refer it to the prophet.” The depth of his insight into the prophet’s meaning was revealed to us in such a note as this (on Isa. xli. 22): “A general description of prophecy. ‘The first things, what are they? Tell us,

etc.' The choice is not between near and far future events as some scholars think. The point is they cannot prophesy at all." I do not know how far the following dictum represented his attitude to textual criticism in general; it is reproduced simply because it contains one of his favourite adjectives: "The rhythm has got out of order, and it is probably vain to attempt to restore it." Occasionally, with a sharp backward toss of his head and a peculiar smile flitting across his face, he would jerk out a casual reference to "Hebrew poetry—whatever that is," while one time we were amazed as well as amused with the following declaration: "The translation of the Prophets in the Septuagint is very badly done, because it was done by a Greek Jew who did not know his own language, and only knew his adopted language badly."

If there was one characteristic that impressed itself upon those who knew him, apart from his reverence and scholarship, it was his humility: he had the spirit of a little child. Modest and shy to a degree, he was certain in any gathering to be found hidden in some corner or even behind a door: those who served him at Communion seasons in Free St. George's, where he sat under the ministry of Dr. Candlish and Dr. Whyte till declining years caused him to seek some nearer place of worship, invariably found him in a back pew. Possibly this trait was partially instrumental in restricting his output of literary work. On the other hand, when on one occasion, six years ago, the writer ventured to ask if that winter would see the publication of his long expected lectures on Old Testament Theology, the Rabbi replied, "No, no, Mr.—, I prefer to keep them for my daily bread."

The Rabbi seldom preached, and could only be prevailed upon to do so in some small town or country church, mainly because he felt himself unable to fill a large building with his voice. It was commonly reported that his stock of pul-

pit material was slender, but that every sermon was a gem. Those who heard him in the "seventies" still speak with wonder of a remarkable study of Thomas from the words, "My Lord and my God," for which a search might well be instituted, since on being asked on one occasion in recent years to re-deliver that address, he replied with the most absolute indifference that this was impossible, as he had left it in the Bible of some country pulpit.

The last time I heard him preach was at Kelso three summers ago. In any service that he conducted there was always a marked contrast between the preliminaries and the sermon. He would enter the pulpit and after curtly giving out the opening psalm with an appearance of the greatest unconcern, resume his seat, which he maintained the while, now raising his left hand to his forehead, now gazing around on the people, now looking first at one cuff, then at the other. Even the reading of Scripture, apart from his peculiar intonation, appealed but to a few. He never raised his eyes from the book; there was the same air of nonchalance. His rendering of the passage—it happened to be Isaiah xxii.—was only broken by one short sharp ejaculation at the mention of Shebna's name—"Probably would be a foreigner." Those who heard the Rabbi pray, however, can never forget it; the slow measured petitions seemed wrung from his very heart. When he reached the sermon, all was movement. His face flushed and glowed; his thin hands were raised in eloquent insistence; his voice rang out shrill and clear, or sank again to gentle earnestness. His subject was "one or two of the points" in the message to the Church in Philadelphia,—“almost the only Church of the seven to which no blame is attached, which is indeed not greatly praised, but on the whole all that is said of it amounts to praise.” It is impossible to reproduce the effect of his sympathetic study of those who were “eternally entering and never getting

in," or his continued return with undissembled joy to the promise that those who were so weak and so afraid of other men around them would yet actually be made pillars in the house of God.

This man, then, made us love him : possibly no teacher ever won so easily the affectionate regard of his scholars. There was a glamour about this man of God ; there likewise was granitic strength. He drew us to him all unconsciously, and that which drew us never played us false. We followed him afar off, and where he led, our halting feet found a sure foothold. Right to the end he laboured ; indeed it is probable that latterly he had overworked himself. The evening before he died he retired to rest, specially contented because he had finished the proofs of the "Temple" *Isaiah*, for which he had been pressed. On Sunday morning, shortly after eight o'clock, he suddenly complained of sharp pain in the back, and in a moment was translated.

Standing in his severe and simple study, where nothing was more conspicuous than the photograph of Ewald on the mantleshelf, one could not help recalling the closing words of his lecture on the Hebrew conception of that peace which latterly in weariness of body he had sought and now had won : "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life : in thy presence is fulness of joy ; in thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore."

J. Y. SIMPSON.

*JACOB AT PENIEL.*¹

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., D.LIT.

WE are accustomed to consider Jacob one of the most commonplace of the saints of former times. Abraham is greater than ourselves, but Jacob is like ourselves; and hardly like the nobler, but almost like the meaner of us, with a coarse, ignoble nature, not pursuing its ends by open, avowed, and direct means, but by underhand expedients, and crafty, crooked wiles.

This judgment on Jacob may be too severe. The features of his character were certainly strongly marked, and they were not such as seem very lofty. And when we consider this, we are surprised to find the wonderfulest revelations given by God in all Old Testament times bestowed upon him. To him, the lowest nature, the highest things were shown. If it were so, it would be but what we see in the world daily. The narrowest natures are often most broadly blessed by fortune. Wealth, and social rank, and family felicity are given, not only where they are not deserved, but where they are not understood. But perhaps we should wrong Jacob if we called his nature shallow. Coarse it may have been, but it was intense and abundant. There were materials enough in it: passion, affection, business capacity, even a vein of the ideal—resource enough of all kinds it contained. And though a little harsh in youth, and perhaps somewhat soured by opposition in mid-life, yet under the sunshine of prosperity, and beside his favourite child, it mellowed to a rich and exquisite sweetness in old age.

Some may think the revelation given to Jacob at Bethel, on his way to Padan-aram, the most interesting event in

¹ The above will be read with deep interest as a specimen of Dr. Davidson's pulpit expositions.—ED. EXPOSITOR.

his history. And to those beginning life it may be. There is an ideal brilliancy in it attractive and fascinating. But that sombre, stern conflict, beyond the Jordan, in the gray, unromantic days of mid-life, is a profounder study, and there will always be found gathering round it those who know the imperfections of life, and the bright hues of whose early expectations have been toned down by the pale cast of experience.

The time when this revelation was made to Jacob was when he was returning from the east, in very different circumstances from those in which he had gone to it. He went out with his staff in his hand; he came back increased to two bands. He went out alone, with life before him, somewhat hopeful perhaps of happiness, and full of anticipations, fresh and eager to run the race of life; he came back an altered man, with life behind him, with what was to enjoy of it mainly enjoyed, and perhaps the cup did not now seem so sweet and intoxicating to him as he believed it would be before he put it to his lips. At any rate he had drunk it fully. He had lived a many-sided life. Of sensual enjoyments he might seem to have had his full,—and he was not averse to using the petty passions of others as the means of gratifying his own larger ones. In business he was always fortunate. And in those higher things which men's hearts crave, though like to be foiled at first, he was at last victorious. And thus he had lived a busy, clever, various life—a keen, competitive, successful life; and with the fruits of it now reaped and gathered he would return to rest in the home of his fathers—to live and then to die amid the scenes and traditions of his early years. It is sweet to dream in a foreign land of the place of one's childhood. Imagination gilds the sordid hovel of our birth. The meanness and the squalor, and the upbraidings and the bickerings, which we remember, are elevated into the struggles and the not unnatural discontent of honest but

pressing poverty. We remember but the good; we forget the evil, or change it into good. And Jacob too was using the necromancer's art. The sunshine and shower of his early days he now remembered but as sunshine. All the good stood out bright before him, and all the evil had disappeared. His own evil too was forgotten; or if remembered, was excused and peremptorily forbidden to intrude itself. About to set foot on the old country once more, what was to be looked for but happiness, the happiness of twenty years before, now secured against break or vicissitude!

We almost fancy, when reading the narrative after this point, that it is unreal. It is so true to nature that it cannot be fact. One with keen psychological insight and great dramatic power has invented it. He wishes to teach us a profound lesson—that youthful treachery, that advantages gained by questionable ways, cannot profit or allow of a happy old age: and he has permitted himself to dramatize events—to bring Jacob's youth and age together—to put Esau, the defrauded brother, again upon the stage—to bring this wayward, wilful man, who will always attain his ends by his own, and not by God's ways, into a last decisive conflict with his Maker, that he may show him utterly worsted. It is a stroke of the highest art to bring Jacob to Jordan surrounded by wives and sons, and laden with the earnings of his lifetime, and even there to bring down upon him the wrath of Esau and the opposition of heaven. Or rather, it is above human art. The narrative is no piece of skilful composition. It is somehow real. It must be a dream—a moral dream—a dream of the conscience—but a dream confounding old and new together. In life there is not old and new, we carry all our past always with us; it needs but the occasion to awaken it and make it as much real as what transpired an hour ago. Jacob was now again on the border of his native land, after twenty years of exile.

The thought of it called up other thoughts—his youthful treachery, his terrified flight, the angry form of his injured brother,—bitter, regretful, self-upbraiding thoughts ; for years bring softening, and the harsh, antagonistic acts of youth, are grieved over and mournful. And to this was added the thought of what he had vowed at Bethel, and how ill his vow had been kept. And when the darkness came down upon him these memories of the past mingled in his heart with the relations of the present ; and there rose before his conscience that wonderful dream in which the gigantic height of his wild brother again seemed menacing him and all that he had ; and that Form that once stood above the ladder, in divine light, had become a dark shadow with which he must wrestle for his life.

We have suggested that the events had no outer reality, but were a dream, a projection of the conscience ; not of course seriously, but as the best way of expressing our view of their profound meaning, and particularly of the truth which they teach, which is the *moral unity* of life. Perhaps life has many unities. It may be an intellectual unity : much more may it be a unity of feeling ; for perhaps a man's life is greatly shorter than it seems. Rarely any of us lives more than twenty or five-and-twenty years. By that time we have become all we shall ever be, and have felt all we shall ever feel. It is the moral unity that Scripture teaches. And this is a unity both all through, from end to end of life, and one all round, embracing both the external and the inward life.

Jacob had not calculated on finding the beginnings of his life so vividly unaltered. Twenty years had passed since he did the evil ; surely the evil must have worked itself out of things long ere now. But it had not. It stood now before him just as it stood when he fled from it twenty years before ; only more formidable, grown in bulk and terror, with greater power to do him hurt, in proportion as he was

now more susceptible of hurt. Then it was Esau seeking Jacob's life ; now it is Esau with four hundred men, seeking not Jacob's life merely, but all those lives into which his own had been partitioned, and every one of which he feels to be his own, and would give his own many times for it. The time and space get pressed out of life, and the great turning-points come close together. It seems, after all, even with its bewildering complexity, almost a simple thing life ; one or two large acts, hardly more than a single great decision, go to make it up. In boyhood, perhaps, the sketch is drawn in simple lines, though all the after years be employed in filling up and minutely colouring. But the character of the picture is in the primary sketch. Not only were the outward circumstances of his early days repeated again to Jacob, but the very feelings were renewed. It is said that he was "greatly afraid and *distressed*." It was the same feeling under which he had fled twenty years before, and which he remembers his life long as the day of his *distress*. Our evil finds us out. Hindered by opposing circumstances, counter-worked by happy influences, retarded by distance, delayed by time, it is an influence that works its way towards a man, moving on after him unseen through a lifetime, till it finds him. In some way or other it meets him, and he recognizes it. He and it parted company in boyhood, in youth, a lifetime ago, and he thought it neutralized, buried and forgotten ; but it yet lives, and will rise like a spectre beside him. It may not interfere with affection, with trade, with prosperity, with fortune ; it will stand beside all these neutral, but its time will come. It will find him out either actually, in the usual recognized penalty, or in the fear that it is going to find him out ; or else in bitter compunction and sorrow for the wrong he has done. The law is constitutional, deeper down than all remedial schemes. Christianity does not obviate this law ; rather in some ways it aggravates its action. The conscience that is tender will

suffer most acutely from this law. What sorrow was like to Paul's, when he remembered how he had persecuted the Church? God had mercy on him, because he did it ignorantly; but God's mercy could not hinder the persecutor's sin finding him. Mercy itself is unable to deal with this fundamental law. It cannot administer relief to the evils it produces immediately; it but *reduces* them gradually. If sin only carried fear with it, and not sorrow also, mercy could cure it at once. And sometimes, when the sinner, hunted like a wild beast by men, hears these words from the lips of Christ, "Neither do I condemn thee,"—he may, in his thankfulness, feel that all pain is now for ever over, and only joy before him. But is it so? Does not the pain return—the pain of having sinned against One who thus forgives—the self-upbraidings, the over-mastering, breaking sorrow for the sin? Rather, sometimes, would we choose to face the penalty of the offence than this bitter compunction for it when forgiven. Against a judge we could steel our heart, and nerve ourselves to bear whatever he might inflict; but against the miseries of self-reproach we have no resource.

If the oneness of life all through be illustrated by the part of this story that speaks of Esau, it is even better illustrated by that part of it which narrates Jacob's wrestling with the Angel; and both its oneness all round is illustrated by the connexion of these two things with one another. Jacob would have had no wrestling in the darkness with the Angel, had he not beforehand wrestled in the broad day with Esau. His mind passed from outward evils down to the feeling of deeper evils. From being excited with terror for his children, there fell on him a great personal agitation. We do not lead two lives, one external and another inward. We cannot draw lines in our life, and call that of it on one side of the line secular, and that on the other side holy. God's shaping and leading of our life embraces it all; outward troubles lead to inwardness; profound human emotion

is nearly allied to profound religious emotion. Go down in your nature anywhere deep enough, sink a shaft in it at any point, you come to God. Formerly Jacob reached God through his loneliness, now he reaches him through the multiplicity of his connexions; and it is something to see how, in this way, he reached God so much more firmly and permanently than he had been able to do through the narrower passage of himself. Men engrossed in the business of life, in the uncertainties of speculation, with many risks, with exposed places all about them on which misfortune may plant her arrows, whose all may many times be staked on a single hazard, seem more in the way to reach true and great thoughts of God than the contemplative recluse; because the sluggish stillness of their nature is broken up, and the heart out of its very necessities leaps forth to grasp the truth.

Like a wary gamester, who, though playing a desperate game, does not lose his presence of mind, Jacob made the needful dispositions for his safety. He was like a speculator who suddenly finds that all his accumulations of twenty years hang upon the turn of fortune or the wind, and makes all the dispositions that reason or even acuteness can suggest. This is remarkable in the mind, that it is steadied by extreme danger, while it is thrown into confusion by a little trouble. The physician's hand which trembles when an insignificant sore has to be lanced, is steady and firm when an operation that may be fatal has to be performed. A petty encounter worries and excites the great military genius who is serene and master of himself in the thick of the conflict on which the fate of empires hangs. In this greatest trouble of his life, Jacob's mind comes forth with a grandeur and decisive clearness that is scarcely credible in one habitually crooked, and timid almost to cowardice. He so arranges, that if the stroke fall, it will not fall on all at once; if it smite some, it will spare some, perhaps,

and these the dearest. And these dispositions made—made for those for whom he never thought to need to make any such dispositions at all, and while they were ignorant of the menace hanging over them, and though he knows how unavailing all may be—he leaves all in higher hands. But unwittingly this care about others, this more earnestness for them than ever he had felt for himself, and this entrusting of them more sincerely into God's hands than ever he had yet committed himself, has brought him nearer to God than ever he has yet been, or, perhaps, than he cared to be. And now he must wait in God's very presence for the issue, like one beside the sick who waits for the turning of the disease. He lies under a forced inactivity. Thankfully would he act; it would help him to escape thought. But all is done, and the issue is with God; and deeper thoughts crowd in upon him, and an indescribable terror seizes him—there wrestles a man with him till morning.

What premonitory approaches his adversary made, if any, we know not. Suddenly Jacob felt himself carrying on a great struggle—wrestling in the darkness with an unknown adversary. His whole nature was stirred. The struggle is the main thing for a time, not the adversary. That he should know his adversary at first was not meant; it was the Unknown that he must wrestle with. It was meant that he should be troubled, opposed, wrestled with, shaken to the very deeps of his nature; flung into a vague, dim, dark conflict with a power but indistinctly known. His adversary did not seek to oppose his advance, his passage forward; there was no such definiteness in his purpose, nor any such definiteness in Jacob's resistance. It was a wrestling match pure and simple; not for advantage, but for victory; not willingly entered upon by Jacob, but of necessity: for men do not invite such encounters as these, but when they feel them coming would gladly flee from them. Yet they cannot put them

off; they must separate themselves and fling off from them wives and sons, and go alone into the darkness, to meet that mysterious Form and behold that face.

We discuss this wonderful event, and take sides as to whether it was a real, outward thing, or only a transaction in Jacob's soul. Some think it important to hold it literal and outward, and unsafe to regard it as mental. It is characteristic of very many of the views for which men fight, that they are excellent things to fight about, because there is no means of deciding them. It is also occasionally a characteristic of them that no interest whatever attaches to their decision, one way of them being quite as good as another. If God presented a real, outward form to Jacob, so that he entered into a physical wrestling with it, it was very wonderful and divine. If God's Spirit of revelation and holiness so touched the conscience and the memories of Jacob's heart that the agitated spirit deemed itself wrestling through the body, and did indeed in its own awful agony agitate and dislocate the bodily frame, was it less wonderful or less divine? The balance of probability perhaps lies on the side of the external reality of Jacob's adversary. Many a time in dreams the whole frame is agitated and wrestles. Men do rise weary after nights of conflict. They rise awestruck and terror-laden. Perhaps it cannot be shown that they have risen with bodily ailments, with sinews wrenched and joints displaced. Rather is the event to be held literal. An Angel entered Abraham's tent. He let his feet be washed;—the same who in after days washed his disciples' feet. He allowed meat to be set before him;—as in after times he asked, "Children, have ye any meat?" And a *man* he wrestled with Jacob; as now man for ever he wrestles with us all in love, though we oppose him in earnest.

Gradually, from being vague and dim and in the darkness, the encounter passed on to greater clearness. Jacob,

who had apparently sustained the combat with dogged, speechless tenacity, as was natural to him, came to know something of his adversary. From the first he knew that it was a man that wrestled with him. It was a person,—it was with a personal will that he was grappling. But after a time both adversaries stand out more clearly. The morning began to break, and with the light the spell of the Unseen over the patriarch will break too. The conflict must cease, lest its advantages be lost. The heavenly wrestler seeks to depart. He said, “Let me go, for the day breaketh.” And Jacob said, “I will not let thee go, except thou bless me.” Ere now there had begun to break upon Jacob’s mind some consciousness of the rank of his adversary; and perhaps to complete it he touched the nerve of his thigh and paralyzed it. And then the conflict quite changed its nature, from using force, to mere supplication. And here the details supplied by Hosea come in: “He had power over the Angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication to him” (xii. 4). God had put out His hand upon him at last, having allowed him to wrestle with him for a night,—a symbol of that obstinate struggle which, in his confident, unsubdued strength of nature, he had been waging against him all his lifetime. His Spirit cannot always strive with him: some decisive stroke must be put forth upon him, to break him once for all, to touch him in the vital part, that, utterly disabled, he may know whom he has been opposing, and how vain such a conflict is. And, altogether helpless, he can but throw his arms about his adversary and hang on to him—“I will not let thee go.” And then, that he might bless him, the Angel asked him his name. “What is thy name? And he said, Jacob.” God first broke his power, and then brought well home to him what he was. As if the locality, and the circumstances, and the terror of his brother had not enough brought him

before his own self, he asked him his name. He worked him back through his whole past life to its starting-point; drove him down to its old beginnings, and to the confession that it was even now much as of old. God does not name him Jacob. He takes it out of his own mouth. He merely put it to him: "What is thy name?" Jacob was in no mood, and would hardly venture to evade the question. However unwilling his tongue was to utter it the divine demand drew it forth; it cannot be withheld. Before the new name be conferred the old must be fully confessed—the old name and the old nature,—the old opprobrious, shameful title, and the old cunning, crooked, scheming, unmanly nature, that always gives to force, and seeks again to retrieve itself by fraud.

A common history surely this of Jacob's, repeated in the life of many a man returning from a foreign land. Long ago going abroad, like Jacob, he had experiences on which he was founding much. God seemed to offer Himself to him as to Jacob at Bethel, saying, "I am the God of thy father; I will be with thee in all places whither thou goest." And he vowed that the Lord should be his God. It is true the youthful vision of romantic purity and nobleness has hardly been lived up to; the high resolutions of an enthusiastic young mind have often been forgotten, and the mind itself has not been left altogether undebased by passion and craft and the competitions of life; and after so many years the outlines of that vision can hardly be recalled, and the fair ideal of life then set before him is scarcely now to be hoped for;—yet what took place then cannot be forgotten, and he thinks it cannot have been altogether in vain. It may not have been quite in vain. And it is needless raising subtle questions over it, whether it was but a preparatory influence of grace, deep it might be, restraining sin all life through, but yet not effectual; or whether it was the sowing of the true divine seed in the

heart, which the cares of life grew up rankly over and blanched and wellnigh choked. Whichever of the two it was, it was not enough. It needs to be renewed. And now, after twenty years, he knows it is not enough; and when, amid the old scenes, and with the old feelings again in his heart, God puts to him the question, "What is thy name?" who art thou? he falters out his old birth-name; he must confess he is but little, if any, altered from what he ever was. But this confession made, he is blessed, and receives a new name.

And now the struggle is over, and Jacob passes on; but it is said that "as he passed over Peniel the sun rose upon him, and he *halted*." These struggles leave their mark upon a man. God's touch abides. You cannot go through conflicts with Him and show no scars from them. You go through life *halt* from them. Men see the difference, and remark on it, and speculate on its cause. Those are not what they were who have passed through such a wrestling as Jacob did. There is a brokenness of the old elasticity. The self-confidence is gone, and reserve takes its place. Forwardness, or even promptness, is away, and patience is in its stead. There is often a mysterious weakness to men's eyes, that comes from such struggles, though it may be inward strength; a want of positiveness, sometimes even a halfwayness and irresoluteness, an inwardness and self-inspection that begets uncertainty, and a drawing back even after moving forward. Men *halt* after such wrestlings with God. Jacob was weak somehow after this in outward things; more subdued and feeble before difficult undertakings than formerly—in guiding men's passions, governing his turbulent and mutinous children—weak before misfortune, with no resolution to meet an emergency, with no promptitude to resent an indignity—he *halted* his life long through. And when that great calamity befell him through his daughter, it is said of him that he was *silent*;

and when an almost sorer grief came to him through the misconduct of his eldest son, it is said merely, that Israel *heard* it; and when his beloved child was sold, so ready was he to look for evil, that the falsehood invented by his sons seemed probable to him: "An evil beast hath devoured him. Joseph is without doubt rent in pieces. And he refused to be comforted, for he said, I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning"—a man with a broken, irresolute, unhopeful spirit henceforth. This great struggle had been too much for him. To subdue him, it had been needful to break him. No doubt he had an inward strength. All his own passion was burned out. He was himself nobler and more straightforward and patient, having learned the secret of strength with God. And his life, though feeble outwardly, had a calm, mellow, evening light around it.

A CURIOUS BEZAN READING VINDICATED.

THE recent publication of Dr. Hort's lectures on the Clementine Homilies has revived the interest in those references in the early Patristic writers which have to do with the person of Simon Magus. It is well known that in the Clementine Homilies, if not elsewhere, Simon is an effigy or mask of the Apostle Paul, considered as the antagonist of St. Peter and the enemy of the true Jewish or Judæo-Christian faith; and the main question for the critic who occupies himself with the interpretation of the Clementines is the determination of the meaning and extent of the hostility between the Apostle Peter and the one whom we may call his Anti-Peter. That this hostility runs far beyond the limits of any reasonable interpretation of the Scriptural accounts of the parties in the Early Church may be taken for granted; but it is not so easy to frame a theory of the relation of parties in the Early Church which shall serve as an adequate base for the highly developed diatribes which make the substance of the Clementines. And it is not surprising that some students have come to the conclusion that the accounts of the internal differences between the leaders in the Acts of the Apostles are as much undercoloured as they are heightened and exaggerated in the pages of the Homilies, while others have pushed the matter even further, and have contended that even in the Acts of the Apostles the figure of Simon Magus must be explained by the Clementine method, as a survival from an early form of Anti-Paulinism which found in the great Apostle of the Gentiles a wizard, a deceiver and an enemy.

Now, with regard to this question whether Simon Magus ever existed at all, Dr. Hort speaks somewhat contemptuously, as though the discussion were a mere waste of time. He regards the story in the Acts as decisive, quite apart

from any question of Biblical authority, and in this most of his readers will agree with him. But in discussing the matter he has to deal with a curious passage in Josephus, which seems to contain a distinct reference to the great magician, and might conceivably be taken as the appropriate confirmation of the Biblical record. We will transcribe his own words on the question :

Besides these Christian accounts there is a *possible* allusion to Simon Magus in Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 72), who says that Felix sent to Drusilla one, Simon by name, one of his own friends, a Jew, but by birth a Cyprian, who pretended to be a magician (Σίμωνα ὀνόματι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλων Ἰουδαίων Κίπριον δὲ γένος μάγον εἶναι σκηπτόμενον), to induce Drusilla, by means of promises, to forsake her husband and marry *him* (Felix). It would be conceivable that Josephus, hearing Simon Magus called a native of Gittha or Gitta, mistook the guttural, and supposed him to be called a Kithian, by which, as we know from his language elsewhere (*Ant.* i. 6, 1; *ep.* ix. 14, 2), he would naturally understand either a man of Cyprus (see especially *Ephraim*, p. 150 B. παντὶ δὲ τῷ δηλῶν ἐστὶν ὅτι Κίτιον ἢ Κυπρίων νῆσος καλεῖται· Κίτιοι γὰρ Κύπριοι καὶ Ῥόδιοι) or a man of Citium, a town of Cyprus. But then it would be necessary to assume also a second error, or at least laxity of language, that of calling a Samaritan a Jew. On the whole it seems most likely that Josephus' mock-magician Simon is not the true Simon Magus. The name Simon was extremely common in Palestine at this time.

From the foregoing it will be seen that Dr. Hort resisted the temptation¹ to support the accuracy of the Acts of the Apostles by a reference to Josephus, and preferred the conclusion that there were two Simons, both magicians, one of them a Samaritan from Gittha, and the other a Jew from Cyprus. If the reader will now look at the footnotes which the editor (Mr. J. O. F. Murray) has added to Dr. Hort's posthumous lectures, he will find a reference to the actual text of Josephus in the following form :

Σίμωνα. [So Codd. M.W. and Lat. vers. But the Ambrosian MS. A has Ἀπομων (with Σίμωνα in marg.): this reading is also found in the "Epitome," and is adopted by Niese].

¹ As Whiston had done before him,

On the evidence, then, of the eleventh century MS. at Milan, *plus* the Epitome of Josephus at Vienna, *plus* the much abused canon of the harder reading (which must surely be right this time), we expel Simon Magus from the text altogether, and restore an unknown magician, whom we may call, following Josephus,

Atomos the Mage.

Dr. Hort's suspicion was, therefore, justified when he declined to change Samaritan into Jew, and Gittha into Citium. He was, however, wrong in falling back upon the theory that Simons were plenty at this time and in this region, with which it was involved that magicians also were plenty, at least sufficiently so for two of them to be called Simon, nearly at the same time, and not far removed from one another in place. It was an easy lapse. How many errors are still extant in the Christian history through duplication of Simons, Johns, Judases, and Maries!

Meanwhile, then, between the delivery of the lectures and their publication, Simon Magus has dropped out of Josephus, and Atomos Magus has come in. Who was he? And can we find any clue which shall rescue him from the shadowy existence which he shares with Simon, as if he were the shadow of a shade. We remind ourselves that he is to be a Jew, a Cypriote, and a magician, and his name is to be Atomos.

Now turn to the Acts of the Apostles (chap. xiii.), and to the story of St. Paul's conflict with Elymas the sorcerer. According to the text of Westcott and Hort, we are told that Paul and Barnabas, on arriving at Paphos,

εἶρον ἄνδρα τινὰ μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαίων ᾧ ὄνομα Βαρμησοῦς.

This Jewish magician and false prophet opposed their teaching, and sought to hinder the influence which they were gaining over Sergius Paulus, the proconsul. The language in which the conflict is described is as follows :

ἀνθίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐλίμας ὁ μάγος οὗτος γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ζητῶν διαστρέψαι τὸν ἀθύριον ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως.

It is generally supposed that the name of the magician is Elymas Bar-jesus, and that it is implied by Luke that Elymas is a translation of some Semitic name, by a method which was common enough at the time; but what that name was has never been satisfactorily conjectured.

The remarkable thing to be noticed at this point is that we have in Acts xiii. an account of a magician who was also a Jew, and who from his habitat may certainly be described as a Cypriote; he is like Josephus' mage, an intriguer in high places, and has a position of privilege at the local Roman court. Only his name is at fault. Why is he called Elymas and not Atomos? The parallel would then be perfect. Suppose we turn to the Western text of the Acts and see how the passage reads. For instance, here is Codex Bezae:

ἀνθίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐτ[ο]ίμας ὁ μάγος,
resistabat autem eis etoemas magus,

and the peculiar form of the name as given in Codex Bezae is confirmed by several Western authorities, such as Lucifer and the Gigas MS., who give us either the form ἔτοιμος, or its Latin equivalent *paratus*. We may say that the Western form of the name is either the *ετοιμας* of D, or *ετοιμος* of its companions. Here then we have made a remarkable approach to the perplexing Ἄτομος of the passage in Josephus. The identification of the two names is not to be resisted, especially in view of the agreement noted above under the descriptions of *Mage*, *Jew*, and *Cypriote*. The editor of Josephus is abundantly justified in the form which he has printed. But what are we to say of the editors of the Acts of the Apostles?

I must say frankly that it has always seemed to me to be extremely improbable that the reading of D could be

the best reading in this perplexing passage, and I never expected to see anything approaching to a justification of it; and when my good friends, Ramsay and Blass undertook the patronage of it, I took it to be a case of undue bias provoked by excellencies which they had elsewhere discovered in the Western text, and not a case of sound editorial judgment.

Dr. Blass has edited the form *Ἐτοιμᾶς*, following Codex Bezae closely, and only making a slight transposition, for which there is some authority, in the order of the sentences, so as to make the text more intelligible; accordingly he gives us as follows:

ἔβρον ἄνδρα τινα μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαίου, ὀνόματι καλούμενοι Βαριητονα(ν), ὃ μεθερμηνεῖται Ἐτοιμᾶς . . . ἀθέσφατο δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐτοιμᾶς ὁ μάγος, ζήτων διαστρέψαι κτέ.

There may be some doubt about the details of the critical restoration of the passage; there can be little doubt that the name is now substantially right.

Ramsay, too, appears to be in the main correct when he says of the incident, that "among these [the *comites* of Sergius Paulus] was a man, Etoimas Bar-jesus by name, a man skilled in the lore and the uncanny arts and strange powers of the Median priests or *Magi*."¹

It follows, of course, that the justificatory explanations which have been made of the form Elymas in the received text are no longer to be considered. For example, Dr. Chase's attempt to prove that *Etoimas* is due to a misreading of a badly written Syriac text, which has affected the Western tradition, is, like so many of his ingenious but impossible guesses, definitely out of court.

We now turn to the history involved in the text, and ask ourselves how it stands between Luke and Josephus and the facts. If our identification is correct, then the

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 76.

magician referred to must have left the Roman court at Cyprus, and attached himself to the Roman court at Caesarea; he must have abandoned Sergius Paulus, and joined himself to Felix the Roman governor. Is there anything impossible in this? The date of the mission to Cyprus lies between the limits 45-49 A.D. Felix came into office, according to Eusebius, between January 51 and January 52; the intrigue for the possession of Drusilla may well have taken place soon after this; and the dates are so close together that there is no reason why Etoemos should not have secured his position at Caesarea while Paul was making his earliest missionary journeys. There is, however, no clear trace of his presence there when Paul is made prisoner; Felix does not appear, on the superficial view of the story, to have any cause for treating Paul unjustly besides his own cupidity. On the other hand, the Western text tells us plainly, in a passage which is commonly reckoned as an aberrant gloss, but which must surely have a historical foundation, that the reason why Felix left Paul bound was that Drusilla wished it.¹

This is replaced in the received text by the explanation that Felix wished to show the Jews a favour, which looks like an explanation of the foregoing. Is it possible that, after all, the influence of Etoemos had been used against Paul through Drusilla? Here we are wandering, perhaps without due caution, into the region of historical conjecture. We will, therefore, content ourselves with repeating that there is nothing incredible in the belief that the Cypriote magician had migrated to Caesarea. He may even have been there for a length of time.

In any case the Western text stands, and it helps us, as in so many other instances, to a better position for historical research. We are also in a better position for

¹ I can make no other sense out of the curious expression—*τὸν δὲ Παύλον εἶασεν ἐν τηρήσει διὰ Δρούσιλλαν*.

philological inquiry into the reason for the name that was given to the magician, for we have rid ourselves of Elymas ; and although there is some variation in the spelling of the name that replaces it, we ought to be able to decide whether Etoemos is a genuine Greek word, translating an Aramaic name, or whether it is a mere transliteration of some such name.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

DIALOGUES ON THE CHRISTIAN PROPHETS.

III.

Babylon the city of Rome—The *reda*—The number of the Beast—
Irenaeus on the number—Salmon and Zahn on Irenaeus.

Mason. Since we last met, Riddell, I have looked up two or three authorities, to see what interpretations they adopted concerning Babylon.

Riddell. Are you engaged in writing a dictionary, Mason, or only an encyclopaedia ?

M. Not yet, thanks.

R. Then why such extravagant devotion on your part to necessary evils ?

M. I suppose you admit that there is room for diversity of opinion on the solution of the great riddle of the Bible ?

R. Dear me, yes, that I do ! By all means let us have every possible opinion put forward, and let the best prevail. "A life without discussion is not worth living," as Plato observes : and we may add, "Not even for the junior clergy." But I cannot quite admit that the question now before us is the great riddle of the Bible. The Synoptic Gospels, and their mutual relations, are a greater riddle, to name only one. And I cannot agree either that much good is to be gained from consulting authorities, as you call them.

M. Why not ?

R. I have consulted several, and I find that a lifetime would not suffice to read them all. They have been classified (without being read, I should think, ever in their entirety by one man) under four serious-sounding heads: 1. The Preterists who find the interpretation in the past, the seer's own time. 2. The Futurists, who find it in the time still to come. 3. The Continualists, who find it in the continuous history of the Church from 70 A.D. to the present day. A lively branch of this class may be called the Papalists. 4. The Spiritualists, who find it in spiritual allegory. But this would not be a complete arrangement of all the writers on Revelation, for you must not suppose that many interpreters are consistent and accommodating enough to settle down under one of your four heads and remain there. They will keep running across and taking shelter under another screen, and then running back again. Far be it from me to deny them that right!

M. You seem to say that authorities are no authorities, and that classification of interpretations is useless.

R. You put it rather bluntly, Mason. I would prefer to say that life is too short to test the value of every so-called authority, and that even classification of interpreters is very imperfect, and does not help us very far; and I wished to suggest that you should make up your own opinion for yourself rather than rest upon what others have said. Too much has been said and written, and yet not enough. Too much upon the limited lines of the past, when men knew no Hebrew, or no Greek, or no Copernican system; not enough, upon modern lines, of comparative research.

M. There is a chance for us yet, then. "Some work of noble note may yet be done."

R. Yes, indeed. But if it is to be

Not unbecoming men that strove with gods.

it must be done for and by ourselves. We must not

“quench the Spirit,” but trust it; we must “despise not prophesyings.” It is no use, believe me—or rather, believe the living Word—it is no use to pray for guidance and then creep about and in and out of the devious paths of “authorities,” agreeing with one here and with another there, and calling this *your* path. Look at things with your own eyes, and you will find your sight interesting enough, and probably powerful enough, for your own purposes. But do not spend your time in trying to find an old pair of another man’s spectacles to suit your eyes. There is no fear of your seeing everything, or even every point of view, but you shall see light.

M. Right valiantly said. I hope to leave you less bewildered than I came.

R. Now, then, to close quarters with our subject. We may start almost anywhere with the meaning of Babylon, and we shall find that it is Rome.

M. “All roads lead to Rome.”

R. Yes, but this is Rome the city, not Rome the Church, remember. I have written out a short passage for you from the famous elegy on Rome, and parallel with it some verses from Ezekiel, in order to show you how very closely the seer of the Revelation has followed the lines of the ancient prophet. You will see presently what bearing it has upon our question, though I fear that readers are so sick of the idea that Babylon means Rome the Church, and of its explosion, that they are scarcely prepared to listen to the identity of Babylon with Rome the city. Here is the parallel:

REV. XVIII.	EZEK. XXVII.
10 Woe, woe, the great city, Babylon, the strong city! for in one hour is thy judgment come.	2 Now, thou son of man, take up a lamentation for Tyre.
11 And the merchants of the earth	12-25 (Many places named) were thy merchants.

weep and mourn over her, for no man buyeth their cargo 12 any more; a cargo of gold, and silver, and precious stone, and <i>pearls</i> , and fine linen, and purple and <i>silk</i> , and scarlet; and all <i>thyine</i> wood, and every vessel of ivory, and every vessel made of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and <i>marble</i> ; 3 and <i>cinnamon</i> , and spice, and <i>incense</i> , with ointment, and <i>frankincense</i> , and wine, and oil, and <i>fine flour</i> , and wheat, and cattle, and sheep, and of horses and chariots and slaves; and lives of men.	32 In their wailing they shall lament over thee. 33 Thou didst fill the nations with Thy fulness. 12 silver and gold (LXX.). 22 precious stones. 16 fine linen. [Silk, <i>sericum</i> , was unknown to LXX.] 7 purple and scarlet from the isles. 6 benches (holy things LXX.) of ivory. 15 ebony. 12 iron and tin. 13 vessels of brass. 19 calamus (elsewhere classed with cinnamon). 17 ointment and cassia (cheap spice) and oil. 18 wine. 17 wheat. 20 cattle. 21 rams and lambs. 14 horses. 20 chariots. 13 lives of men.
---	--

M. There is no possible doubt as to the origin of the description. I can see that the seer, when he wrote his picture of "Babylon," had been inspired with the picture of Tyre by Ezekiel.

R. There is much more in the same context of Revelation which agrees with the same context in Ezekiel, but I thought this was enough by way of a sample, and you will see what a few articles of merchandise have been added to those of Tyre by the seer in his picture of Babylon. They suggest a useful exercise in the study of civilization. *Pearls, silk, marble, flour*, mark the principal advance since Ezekiel's time. There is some confusion in the LXX. of this chapter in more than one verse, the names of places being confused with the merchandise in which they deal, and so forth; this is common in the Septuagint. But what I would draw your attention to especially is this.

When the LXX. wants to describe "*chariots*," it uses the word *ἄρματα*, a very common Greek word, used by every writer, including the seer himself in this book. But the seer has not used it here; he has used, instead of it, *ῥεδῶν*, a peculiarly Roman word, which no other Greek writer has used anywhere, if we believe Liddell and Scott! This *reda*, or *raeda*, was a four-wheeled post-chaise. Horace—you remember—

M. "Quem tollere *reda* Vellet iter faciens." Do I not recollect my old saying-lessons now and again? Maecenas would sometimes offer Horace "a lift."

R. Good man! It was a remnant—both thing and name—of the Gallic invasions of Italy, but, marvellous to relate, the *reda* seems not to have travelled very far outside Italy; otherwise the Greek writers would have used the name. In and about Ephesus, that pampered minion of Rome, that ultra-Roman eye of Greece, that first and farthest follower of Roman fashions at Ephesus, the four-wheeled post-chaise in which

The Roman drove in furious guise
Along the Appian Way,

had become habituated, and was known to the seer as a symbol of overweening Gentile insolence and luxury. At Ephesus the roads were good. Elsewhere out of Italy the *reda* was a useless article in the absence of engineered roads for which Rome, alone of ancient empires, was ever famous. Imagine Tyre, or Babylon, or Jerusalem, as ever having been famous for its roads! Impossible!

M. You make a good point there. Every one knows that the presence or the absence of a road is the clue to the course of all history in Roman times. I have sometimes thought that a pretty volume might be made in showing how the battlefields must follow the highways, whether there was an engineered road, a *via munita*, as at Philippi

and the Milvian Bridge, or only a track, as at Carrhae or Megiddo.

R. I am pleased to find that you agree with me. Old as the identification is of Babylon with Rome, I do not remember seeing this point made before. But, you know, when the Papalist fever takes hold of a commentator, he is quite capable of agreeing with all this, and yet proceeding to say, "Yes, yes, it is Roman upholstery, Roman carriage factory, Roman commerce, but it means *Papal* Rome all the same! These *redae* are the carriages in the Papal stables, in which the Pope used to drive out to his summer residence at Castel-Gandolfo."

M. A kind of interpretation, this, "against which the gods themselves contend in vain."

R. There is a verse rather later which the Papalists might revel in. Let us put it alongside of the original in Jeremiah.

REV. XVIII. 22 E.

And the voice of harpers and minstrels, and flute players and trumpeters shall be heard no more at all in thee; and no craftsman shall be found any more at all in thee; and the voice of a millstone shall be heard no more at all in thee; and the light of a lamp shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee.

JER. XXV. 10.

I will cause to perish from them the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones (but LXX. has *the scent of myrrh*, *μύρον*, rohka'gh for *μύλον* reh'chev) and the light of the candle.

(Evidently the seer is here, again, following the Hebrew and not the LXX.)

It is a strange thing that the LXX. knew the words for *harp*, *flute*, *trumpet*, but have never used the words for *harp*, *flute player*, *trumpeter*, though they were very well known. These three words, then, are introduced by the seer; they specify in a graphic manner the professional

musicians of his time, as employed in Roman civilization. But the interesting point is that he gives the first mention to the favourite instrument of Nero, who had no sooner assumed the purple, as Suetonius tells us, than he sent for Terpnus, the leading harper, or rather lute player, of the time, and kept him beside him by day and by night to teach him the arts of playing and voice production.

M. Yes, that is a minor detail, not without interest of a kind. But I thought you said the Papalists would find some pleasure of their own in it.

R. They would delight in saying that here we had a reference to Raphael's pictures in the Stanze of the Vatican! You remember the beautiful *Parnassus*, with its Apollo and the Muses. Let me get out my portfolio, and you shall see the photographs of the *Segnatura*. There are their musicians, you see!

M. I seem to remember Apollo playing the violin! Is that their lute?

R. No, the lute is with the exquisite figure of Poetry just above. The flute, they would say, is in the hand of the Muse to the left of Apollo.

M. And the trumpet?

R. That was a difficulty. It had to be put in the next room: but there, you see, in the *Attila*, there are the trumpeters! The identification is complete.

M. A fair caricature of those worthy Papalists. But now, to return to a serious discussion on Rome as the object of Revelation xvii. and xviii.—what is your view, Riddell, of Dr. Salmon's remarks upon the Roman solution of Babylon? For my fellow traveller in the train was very full of Salmon, who, he said, had upset all that view long ago. He saw that you had mentioned Salmon, but did not see how you overcame his objections.

R. Dr. Salmon is to me a name renowned and venerable. I do not wonder at any one being fascinated with the lumi-

nous and masterly lectures which form his *Introduction to the New Testament*. They have all the racy freedom and freshness of an Irish touch: they are playful yet careful, sunny yet serious. But I shall be very glad to answer your question, and feel bound indeed to do so. For no one treating of Dr. Salmon's subjects can pass him by on the other side, though space may forbid him to combat any but the most recent writers. My edition of the *Introduction*, the fifth, is 1891, and since then several Germans have written, and even a few English have found time to spare from cricket matches and parochial engagements in support of voluntary schools, but you cannot expect *them* to write much. First of all, then, I think Salmon is rather anxious to refute Renan.

M. Have you read Renan?

R. No, I have not. I possess *L'Antechrist*, but have only cut the pages the other day; so that where I agree with him, the agreement is independent, and now I am naturally much more interested in discovering how far that agreement extends. My knowledge of him is due to reading those conclusions of his which have been handled by Dr. Salmon, or by Mr. Simcox in his commentary in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*. With many of these I need not trouble you. For bear in mind that Salmon agrees that "the Beast" denotes Rome and its emperor, though he is unable to regard "Nero Caesar" as the solution of "the number of the Beast" 666.

M. Why does he not allow that Nero is 666?

R. He says that in order to get 666 you have to write it NRON KSR, whereas it ought to be written NRON KISAR, since the proper spelling requires an I.

M. I do not understand you; I am no Hebraist.

R. Each letter of the Hebrew alphabet had to serve for a numeral as well as a letter. Thus if I in Hebrew wrote NRO, I should mean 256, because N = 50 and R = 200 and O = 6. So NRON = 306.

M. But NRON is not Nero.

R. No, but it is the usual way in which a Greek would write Nero's name in Hebrew.

M. But Nero himself would not add the final N.

R. True. But the vast majority of Nero's subjects would write it in Greek. For Greek was the universal language. Even in Rome itself it was the prevalent language.

M. Yes, I remember Juvenal's protest a bare generation later: "Non possum ferre, Quirites, Graecam urbem," "Sons of Quirinus (i.e. Romulus), I cannot bear my city to be Greek."

R. It is so. At any rate we are dealing with the public as did the Apostles and all writers of the New Testament. Greek was their one language. Therefore the Greek for Nero had a final N. But the strange thing is that there is another reading in Revelation xiii. 18 of the number of the Beast, which makes it to be 616, and that this reading 616 was known to Irenaeus in 177 A.D. If therefore you prefer the writing NRO (only it must be in Hebrew characters), you can still have your Nero. Now, it is hardly possible that the two readings 616 and 666 should have been in existence a century after the Apocalypse was written unless there was some very deliberate reason for this fact. No reason has been given, nor can any reason, I think, be conceived, so clear and palpable as this, that the true solution was a name that might be spelt in two ways, one representing 616, and the other 666. To my mind, the solution is proved as absolutely as anything in the past ever was proved. The chance of any other solution ever being produced so as to compete with it on anything like equal terms is infinitesimal. Neron Caesar is 666, Nero Caesar is 616.

M. But I have looked it out in Alford, and he will not have it *Nero* or anything but *Lateinos* written in Greek characters. He is quite certain too! Why do you bring in the Hebrew characters at all? You have just said that

the New Testament is written in Greek and for the Greek public who knew no Hebrew.

R. Capital! You may well ask the question. It brings us to the question of the antecedents of the seer of the Revelation, which must certainly be discussed, but time would fail us to embark upon that question today. You will perhaps allow that he was of Palestinian descent, and was well versed in Hebrew, and that he shows his interest in Hebrew names, and also shows his readers' interest—mark this carefully—in Hebrew names, when he says (ix. 11), “ His name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in the Greek he hath the name Apollyon ”; and (xvi. 16), “ The place called in Hebrew Har-magedon.” After these references, not to say any more, it would be hard to say that he must not use a name in Hebrew. The holy language must surely be allowed to express the antipodes of what is holy.

M. That quite satisfies me. But now as to the KSR. What of Salmon's objection that KAISAR must in Hebrew be spelt KISR?

R. Salmon insists that it would have been KISR because though Hebrew had a vowel sound (though the Hebrew vowel marks were unwritten then and for many centuries after) for A, it had none for AI, and therefore the I, or “ Jod ” must be written with the other characters. I have no doubt that the more correct and careful spelling would be KISR, with the I.

M. How then do you overcome his objection?

R. I used to think it was serious, but now I think very little of it. For apart from the fact that we find many words in Latin containing cae- spelt sometimes ce-, such as *caerimonia*, *caena*, *scaena*, and we may add *saeculum*, the conclusive fact is that Buxtorf in his *Lexicon* gives from the Talmud two instances of the spelling of *Caesar* in *Caesarea* without the I. It is very interesting to find the seer providing us with a close parallel to this spelling in

ῥεδῶν (all uncial MSS. Rev. xviii. 13), where, according to the more correct Latin spelling, we should expect ῥαιδῶν with an *ι* for *raedarum*.

M Supposing the I had been inserted, what difference would that have made to the number?

R. It would have made 676. Now just imagine the difference to the seer. To you and me it would be as easy to say 676 as 666. But the seer has been using 7 throughout his book as a holy number. Do you think that after using the number 7 in the Apocalypse fifty times in a holy sense he would choose to use it as the central digit of a number to denote the most disgusting and degraded and abominable thing in creation? Of course not. When in doubt he would choose to avoid the 7 just then. But there was another reason why he should prefer 666 for its own sake. It was already a base and degraded number, for it was the number of Mammon.

M. How do you mean? Mammon is not in the Apocalypse.

R. No, but when you read in the Bible of the wealth of the idolatrous King Solomon (1 Kings x. 14), "the weight of gold that came to him in one year was 666 talents of gold," you may see that this gold of the idolater is Mammon; this number must be a bad number, unholy and therefore to be held in abomination.

M. I think there must be something in what you say; but why does it not satisfy Dr. Salmon?

R. That is a question which you should address to Dr. Salmon himself. But though I cannot answer it, I can tell you what he has done. He has resorted to the usual plan of the advocate in distress, not exactly to abuse plaintiff's attorney," but to knock the heads of his opponents together. The effect of throwing together a miscellaneous crowd of eminent men of various centuries and tendencies and costumes, and representing them as all jostling together in competition, more or less, for a post of which they never

dreamed themselves, but which certain enemies of theirs long after their death think them fit to occupy, is comical, and must be so. The papal crimson, the Geneva fustian, the archiepiscopal lawn, the Roman emperor's greaves, and Bonaparte's cocked hat, are jumbled together by Salmon in a very fine medley. Salmon affects to think that all these are equally probable solutions of the number 666. He knows they are not.

M. A capital rhetorical artifice. But has he no rule of his own?

R. Oh yes, he is very funny over that too. He offers three rules: First, if a proper name will not make the number required, add a title. Secondly, if Greek fails, try Hebrew, or even Latin. Thirdly, do not be too particular about the spelling!

M. The best way to treat his rules is to ignore the vein of irony and apply them in good earnest.

R. Quite so. Then they are not bad rules at all. We have seen why the seer should deliberately prefer 666 to 676, and that his spelling was good, if not the very best. The seer's spelling, I can assure you, is far better than his syntax or even his attempts at the simplest concords.

M. Are they so bad?

R. Simply atrocious. Scratch the Apocalypse anywhere you like, you will find the Hebrew author underneath. But I think Salmon would have you forget the remarks which he himself had made a few pages earlier about the bad Greek of the Apocalypse. But then he really seems to persuade himself that if a lock can be opened by two keys, neither key can be the right one. "We cannot," he says, "infer much from the fact that a key fits the lock if it is a lock in which almost any key will turn." Note the words "a lock in which almost any key will turn."

M. Rhetoric! Such a lock would be almost no lock at all.

R. Very like it. If two different keys *open* the lock, then for the purpose of that lock either key is right ; though there may be other reasons which we must examine for preferring one of these two to the other. So if there are more than two. Our present key is Nero Caesar. There is no need to trouble about Mahomet, Titus, Parnell with two r's, (this is one of Salmon's mock solutions), and Luther and the rest, until some one takes them up and makes them part of one consistent view for the understanding of Revelation and other books related to it. One would really think Salmon had no interest in doing so, although he writes an Introduction to the New Testament !

M. How so ?

R. Salmon actually says : “ Irenaeus, I think, drew a very sensible inference from the multiplicity of solutions which he himself was able to offer. He says (Iren. v. 30) : ‘ It is safer, therefore, and less hazardous to await the event of the prophecy than to try to guess or divine the name, since haply the same number may be found to suit many names. For if the names which are found to contain the same number prove to be many, which of them will be borne by The Coming One (the Beast) will remain a matter of inquiry.’ ” Fancy Dr. Salmon with his knowledge taking shelter under Irenaeus with his ignorance of Hebrew !

M. Do you mean to say that Irenaeus knew no Hebrew ?

R. Certainly, Irenaeus knew no Hebrew. That is quite clear. The proof of it is given abundantly in Irenaeus ii. 24. The fact is of vast importance for understanding the value of Irenaeus as a commentator on Scripture. But now you may fairly ask whether Dr. Salmon will say that Irenaeus drew an equally “ sensible inference ” in the same chapter when he says : “ There shall follow another danger too, of a very serious kind, for those who falsely presume to know the name of the Antichrist. For if he shall come with a name different to that which those persons suppose, they

will be easily seduced by him." The penalty, he says, is that of "adding to or taking from the Scripture," which is so clearly stated in Revelation xxii. 18, 19. A very serious matter indeed!

M. Irenaeus was more earnest than intelligent.

R. Probably he was intensely earnest. Let us credit him with that. He lived in continual expectation—of a kind—of the coming of Antichrist. And yet his ignorance was so great that he could not approach the true solution.

M. But I thought you said that he did essay a Greek solution?

R. Yes, so he did. A Greek one, which Alford follows.

M. The desire to begin an *Introduction to the New Testament* was too much for him!

R. At any rate he was not consistent. He might have been wrong, and might have led others wrong, and caused them to be seduced by Antichrist. But he did it! The solution of his which Alford follows is *Λατεινος* in Greek letters, *Latinus*, "the man of Latium." I think it of no value, except that, like Nero Caesar, it points to Rome. But with a perversity absolutely provoking and defiantly dangerous, in view of his previous remarks, Irenaeus proceeds to give two others. *Euanthas* is one; "but," he adds, "we affirm nothing about it"—not even a warning. "But we will not boast of *Latinus* only," which comes second, "but *Teitan* is most worthy of credit of the current names. It makes 666, it has 6 letters, it is an old name, but not too common, no existing king is so named, no idol has it; many think it is divine, they call the Sun Titan; it suggests vengeance" (*τίνομαι*, *avenge*). He thinks it a very probable solution; but then he adds the words: "But we do not hazard a positive statement; for if it had been necessary for his name to be publicly proclaimed at the present time, it would have been uttered by the seer's mouth. For the Apocalypse was not seen so long ago, but

almost in the time of our generation, at the end of the reign of Domitian."

M. That would be twenty-five years later than you represent.

R. Yes. But leave the Domitianic date aside for the present, please. It is a fact that Domitian was on the throne in 70 A.D. for some months. I want you to think of Irenaeus and the enormous weight which Salmon attributes to some of his statements, and to consider whether they deserve it. Is Irenaeus right when "he looks on the Apostle as having designedly left the matter obscure, since if he had wished the name to be known at the time he would have spoken plainly"? I quote Salmon's words (p. 205).

M. I remember that you have already said that the Seer designedly gave a clue when he said in Revelation xvii. 9, "Here is the mind (or meaning) which hath wisdom," and also, Revelation xiii. 18, "Here is wisdom. He that hath understanding, let him count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man: and his number is 666" (or 616).

R. Irenaeus says, you recollect, that if you guess the name wrong you pay the awful forfeit of "receiving the plagues which are written in this book," and losing part in "the tree of life," and being excluded "from the holy city" (Rev. xxii. 18, 19). But does *the seer* say anything like this?

M. Oh dear no! Nothing so preposterous. The seer had said: "He (the Second Beast) causeth all to receive a mark, and that no one should buy or sell without the mark, the name of the Beast or his number." How were people to know how to avoid this mark? All were to have it, if the Second Beast could make them, all—"the small and the great, the rich and the poor, the free and the bond"—all who wanted to buy or to sell. Yet it was wrong; it was abominable in the sight of the seer and his readers. They must not buy nor sell under these terms; they must

avoid the number of the Beast. But in order to avoid it, they must exercise their wisdom. They must have a clue, and a clear one withal.

R. Irenaeus then reduces the careful provision of the Seer to an absurdity.

M. Yes, I can see that he does, in making it a matter of guess work at all.

R. It is not so much his ignorance of Hebrew, which is palpable elsewhere, nor yet his inconsistency, as his hopeless want of ordinary imagination, which strikes us. When the seer falls into the hands of Irenaeus, he might well exclaim, Save me from my friends! And yet, I can assure you, you would be surprised to hear what astonishing inferences have been drawn by learned modern commentators from the remarks of Irenaeus upon St. John. They are possessed of the idea that Irenaeus was almost in the same generation with the seer, as Irenaeus himself pretends in the sense that if the seer lived to "the end of Domitian's reign" (96 A.D.), his death would have fallen perhaps about thirty years short of Irenaeus' birth. Then they go on to disregard the fact of Irenaeus' literary career beginning a generation later still, and they ignore the years between the composition of the Apocalypse and Domitian's death (I assume that this part of the statement means 95 A.D.—a point we will discuss later), and thus they forget that two generations at least had passed between the seer's writing and Irenaeus' writing. Then they make much of the historical chain, *Irenaeus—Polycarp—"St. John,"* whom they identify with the seer. Then they sometimes end by prefixing "St." to Irenaeus, which prefix diminishes his fallibility by one-half in the estimation of many readers. However, I was going to say that the German theologian, Zahn, has welcomed in a most cordial embrace the ideas, first, that Irenaeus knew something worth knowing on this question; next, that Irenaeus says that the Beast's number

must be reckoned in Greek, *and not in Hebrew*; then, that the readers of the Apocalypse would in any case require the Hebrew words to be translated, since the only Hebrew words intelligible to them were such as Amen, Hallelujah, which they knew in their liturgies; then, that it was traditional in Asia Minor in the circles of John's disciples to take the Greek characters as the base of the solution: lastly, that the attempt to make the Beast mean Caligula instead of Nero was made upon this principle of a Greek solution.

M. We have seen how much Irenaeus knew on this question. At least I take your word for it that he knew no Hebrew. Therefore I infer that Irenaeus was not qualified to say that the Beast's number could not be reckoned by the Hebrew letters, whatever he might be able to say in favour of the Greek solution.

R. I think you are right in your inference. But if it does not bore you, I should like to read you what Irenaeus says in the context of his remark upon the tradition in Asia Minor. For I am going, if you will allow me, to defend Irenaeus on one point presently. He has been saying that the Beast is a *recapitulation of wickedness*, "summing up in himself all the wickedness which took place before the Deluge, being due to the apostasy of the angels." Noah was 600 years old at the Deluge, Nebuchadnezzar's image was 60 cubits high and 6 cubits broad. Those three digits indicate the recapitulated apostasy of 6,000 years, which is the duration of the world, because it was created in six days, and one day is with the Lord as 1,000 years.

M. Really wonderful reasoning! Will you champion that?

R. No. But listen. Irenaeus now proceeds: "Such, then, being the state of the case, considering that this number is found in all the most approved and ancient copies [of the Apocalypse], and that those men who saw John face to face bear their witness [to it], and that reason tells us that

the number of the name of the Beast, according to the Greek mode of calculation—i.e. the tens equal to the hundreds and the hundreds equal to the units—by means of the letters contained in it will amount to 666, for the number which is the digit six being equally observed throughout, indicates the recapitulations of the universal apostasy which was in the beginning, is now, and shall be at the end, I do not know how it is that some have erred, through following a private fancy” . . . so as to read 616.

M. It is plain that Irenaeus is very strongly in favour of 666 as against 616. The latter figure would upset all his calculations.

R. That is the chief point which comes out clearly. But what I was going to observe, in justice to him, is that he does not venture to disparage the Hebrew reckoning *in comparison with* the Greek. There is no question of such comparison at all. He did not profess to know much Hebrew, and we must not accuse him of making the pretence. There is a Latin version of Irenaeus, I should tell you, which is about 200 years later than the Irenaeus whose original is fragmentary and in Greek. For most of the passage here quoted we have the Greek as well as the Latin, but the Greek fails us just before the words *will amount to 666*, and Eusebius, a century and a half later, in quoting the Greek, has not put the italicized words, but says instead, *becomes manifest*.

M. How does that alter the case?

R. I think it alters it somewhat. We know that it did not become manifest in any precise sense, for Irenaeus admits that he did not know the true solution. But it has seemed to commentators—who, by the way, read their Eusebius more often than they read their Latin version of Irenaeus, and do not trouble to notice the difference between the two—as if Irenaeus (177 A.D.) were already giving his deliberate verdict *here* upon the way in which we

were to find the Beast's name. That is not so; he attempts the mode of solution two pages later. But here, I take it, he is only saying that the mode of *writing the number* is by means of Greek letters, *and not Roman*. He is here, in fact, limiting the field of vision to the Greek language. He does not say that those who saw John face to face handed on the tradition to "Use Greek notation instead of Hebrew, *and you will solve the problem*," as Zahn maintains. He says, "Those who saw John have borne witness to the number being 666," and he adds, "reason tells us that as the book is all in Greek, this part of it is in Greek, even if we write the six hundred and sixty and six in the Greek literal form $\chi\xi\varsigma'$, at the risk of its being corrupted into 616, $\chi\iota\varsigma'$."

M. How would it be if written in Roman letters, DCLXVI.? There too you have the ominous number of 6 digits.

R. Seeing that you have no *single* letter for 6, or for 60, or for 600, in Latin, this would not suit Irenaeus' remarks on the digit six being equally observed throughout. It would rather upset his reasonings from Noah and Nebuchadnezzar. I should underline the passage in Irenaeus thus: ". . . numerus nominis bestiae secundum Graecorum computationem *per litteras* quae in eo sunt sexcentos habebit et sexaginta et sex (hoc est, etc. . . .) ignoro quomodo erraverunt quidam . . ."

M. You mean that the contrast is between writing in words at length and writing in letters of the alphabet which serve as numerals in Greek (as in Hebrew also).

R. Yes. Irenaeus is proceeding to show how the error 616 arose out of 666 by explaining (however absurdly, it matters not) that the ξ for 60 was flattened out into ι , and further on in the same chapter he is about to offer what is really a Latin name, *Λατρεῖος*, Latinus. However, I admit that just in this small particular I am holding a brief for

Irenaeus; and for taking *computationem*, or its original Greek $\psi\eta\phi\omicron\nu$, to mean *a mode of writing a number*, and not *a mode of solving a numerical riddle*, I think you will admit that there is much to be said. But if so, it follows that a good case is made out for Irenaeus against Zahn's hasty translation of his words. It follows naturally that the tradition in Asia Minor, of which Irenaeus speaks, is limited to the testimony that 666 is correct and 616 wrong; and that Zahn is wrong upon the Greek solution on which he lays so much stress as against the Hebrew. This is a mere matter of grammar in understanding Irenaeus. The clause which follows, with its broken Greek, is not very clear either way.

M. Neither, at this late hour, is my head very clear, Riddell. Like the Greeks of whom you were speaking, I could write a number down, but I cannot now attempt to solve a riddle. *Au revoir!*

R. It is not much of a riddle, Mason, but, like other riddles, it can wait. Good-night.

E. C. SELWYN.

*THE TWELVE LEGIONS OF ANGELS IN THE
VALLEY OF JEHOSHAPHAT.*

(ST. MATT. XXVI. 53.)

THERE is always a special interest in acts or phrases of our Lord reported by one only of the Synoptic Evangelists. The reason why particular facts or sayings are confined to one Gospel may be sometimes that the special report reached one Evangelist only, sometimes that that Evangelist alone regarded it as too precious or significant to be lost to the Church, or else that he discerned in it an allusion or a fitness for the spiritual instruction of his destined readers, which did not present itself to the minds of the other sacred writers. Any one of these motives may have weighed with St. Matthew in his report of the words which we are considering.

In the crowded and agitated moments of our Lord's arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane, it is quite possible that some only of the words uttered would be remembered and recorded. St. Matthew was present on that momentous occasion, and had himself probably heard those words of Jesus addressed primarily to St. Peter, "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and He shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?" They were words which may have meant more to St. Matthew, with his keen appreciation of prophetic parallelism, than to the other bystanders, more even than to St. Peter himself. This Evangelist would vividly realize that the awful scene before him was taking place on prophetic ground. His feet were standing in the valley of Jehoshaphat, the valley of the judgment of the Lord, the valley of decision, as the prophet Joel had called it. The hope suggested by that ancient prophecy might well have occurred to his mind, and when our Lord's words fell upon his ear.

They would thus respond to a thought working in his soul. The saying is in itself deeply important and interesting as a revelation of Divine possibilities in the mind of Jesus, still more so if it can be associated with any definite word of prophecy, for which the time of fulfilment might seem to have arrived. Was then the suggested possibility of the intervention at that moment of twelve legions of angels an intentional answer to the unspoken hopes of St. Peter and the other disciples resting on a definite prediction associated with the very spot on which they stood?

The circumstances of the hour make this extremely probable. It was a decisive moment of history. The powers of evil were gathered to do their worst to the Son of God. In a true sense the nations were stirred up, and had come to the valley of Jehoshaphat; the harvest was indeed ripe, and the press full, and the vats overflowed, for their wickedness was great. Surely it was time to put in the sickle, to tread the grapes. Surely now the day of the Lord was near in the valley of decision.¹ One thing only was needed to complete the fulfilment of the prophetic picture. Would the Christ now, in accordance with the prophet's appeal, "cause His mighty ones to come down" (Joel iii. 11)? If such were His disciples' hopes, they were doomed to disappointment. Almost in the words of Joel, and certainly, we believe, with reference to them, Jesus affirms His power to beseech the Father to send the hosts of heaven to His aid in that dark hour, but at the same time teaches that not in that way would the Scriptures be fulfilled.

The Master's words came as a crushing blow to the hopes of His disciples. The effect was immediate: "They all forsook Him and fled."

The closeness of the parallelism of our Lord's words with Joel's prophecy depends of course on the interpretation

¹ See Joel iii. 11-14.

given to the expression in chapter iii. 11: "Hither cause Thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord." Although Ewald and others refer "the mighty ones" to the men of Judah, Pusey, Driver, Orelli, Delitzsch, Keil, and most commentators interpret "Thy mighty ones," or "warriors," to mean the angels of the Lord. "The mighty ones of God," says Dr. Pusey, "whom He is prayed to cause to come down, i.e. from heaven, can be no other than the mighty angels, of whom it is said, they are mighty in strength (Ps. ciii. 20, still the same word), to whom God gives charge over His own to keep them in all their ways" (Ps. xci. 1). So also Dr. Driver: "The mighty ones are no doubt the angelic hosts (Ps. lxviii. 17; Zech. xiv. 5) whom Joel pictures as the agents of Jehovah's will."

The concluding words of this incident: "But all this is come to pass that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled" (St. Matt. xxvi. 56), are almost without a doubt the words of Christ, and not a comment by the Evangelist. As such they are an instructive guide in the interpretation of prophecy. To the disciples at that moment the intervention of the heavenly host would have seemed an exact fulfilment of an ancient and cherished prediction, and a realization of the Messianic hope. The Lord Jesus, on the contrary, affirms that prophecy, which is the interpretation from age to age of the eternal purpose of God, could not at that moment be fulfilled by any startling intervention of Divine force, but by the passion and death of the Son of man, the first stage in which was submission to arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane.

ARTHUR CARR.

*THE CHRISTIAN "NIL DESPERANDUM": A
STUDY OF ST. LUKE VI. 35.*

A COMPARISON of the rendering here of the A.V., "hoping for nothing again," with that of the R.V., "never despairing,"¹ indicates an agreement as to the variant, and a difference as to the translation of the participle. Both points deserve notice. First, are we to read *μηδέν* or *μηδένα*? The canon as to the *brevior lectio* would predispose the student in favour of the neuter; and though the masculine is not without support, it is slender in comparison with that given to *μηδέν*,² which may be with good reason accepted as the true reading. More hesitation will be felt as to the rendering of the participle. One feels a reluctance to part with the familiar translation "hoping again." It fits in with the sense of the passage, and supplies the expected antithesis to "doing good and lending," but it must be abandoned in favour of "despairing," for the idea of expecting repayment has been already condemned as sinful. The verb *ἀπελπίζειν* is used here only in the New Testament.³ Some light may be thrown upon its meaning by St. Paul's famous passage in praise of love in the phrase *Ἡ ἀγάπη πάντα ἐλπίζει*.⁴ Both the Master and the Apostle are drawing pictures of a loving heart. Christ sees its outcome in conduct and action, and here negatively warns His own against pessimism. St. Paul marks one of its tenderest and most characteristic features, and declares positively that "love hopeth all things." The conclusion, however, that the preposition in *ἀπελπίζειν* is a negative is much strengthened by references outside the New Testament. The verb is not in use by the best authors. It belongs to Greek of the transitional period between the

¹ R.V. margin "despairing of no man."

² So A B D L Δ.

³ The variant *ἀπηλπικότες*, Eph. iv. 19, has no good support.

⁴ 1 Cor. xiii. 7.

classical and the so-called Hellenistic. Polybius not only uses the verb not unfrequently but also the noun ἀπελπισμός in the sense of "despair." It may be added that the classical equivalent to the later ἀπελπίζειν is one which resembles it in prefix, viz. Ἀπογινώσκω = to give up as useless, to abandon; and it is singular in this context to note that this verb is found linked with τὴν ἐλπίδα as with τὴν σωτηρίαν in Aristotle.¹

From these considerations the pregnant meaning of the formula comes out more fully. The presence of the variant is not doctrinally significant, it scarcely affects the thought. Here then is perceived a weighty caution from the lips of the Master against despair either of circumstance or of persons. He will not allow a pessimistic attitude in His followers. For every enterprise upon which His Name can be invoked, for every individual on whom His love rests, there is Hope. In His hands hope does not merely lie at the bottom of every cup—rather it fills the cup.

It is sometimes urged in depreciation of the Christian ethic that undue prominence is given to the merely passive virtues. The objection may hold good if the student only glances hastily at the catalogues of Christian graces given in the New Testament. But from the nature of the case it was imperative that the members of the Early Church should be taught the duty of a wise passiveness. On the other hand, the characteristic hope with which the Gospel message was and is charged prevented and still prevents those who accept it from that pessimism which spells inaction and sterility.

The hope which is so pathetically expressed by prophet and psalmist in the Old Testament is confidently and exuberantly proclaimed in the New. The Incarnation, Resurrection and Ascension are enough for Christians; they "cannot be disappointed of their hope." The promi-

¹ Arist. *Nic. Eth.* iii. 6, §11.

nence of hope in the literature of the New Testament is striking in regard to frequency of employment, the limits of its localization, and its spiritual and ethical significance. The noun, and verb *ἐλπίς*, *ἐλπίζειν* occur just a hundred times in the New Testament. The noun never occurs in the Gospels; and though the verb is found five times in the Evangelic record, it is never employed in a religious reference. Both verb and noun are absent from the Apocalypse; and while the verb is used twice in St. John's letters, it is the noun only which is employed in a religious sense.¹ Neither is found in the Epistle of St. Jude. The noun is used but six times by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Hence the employment of verb and noun in a spiritual application is nearly confined to Pauline or Petrine literature, for it is a singular fact that when met with in the Acts it is St. Paul who is the speaker. These facts—not uninteresting in themselves—point to the conclusion that hope received a new birth at the new dispensation. The Hope which Israel shared² was at once purified and intensified by the whole action of human redemption. St. Paul and St. Peter taught an unquenchable hope in God manifest in the flesh, crucified, risen, triumphant, pleading for men in heaven. With them our Lord's sentence against despair became a passionate plea for waiting still on Him. He was their Hope;³ they scarcely needed words from Him to tell them it was so. Through Him and His completed work lay other happy expectations, their calling, their righteousness, their salvation, and life eternal. This hope was characterized by security of possession, by happiness, and by joy.

That which was forecasted dimly in the Psalter, as St. Peter declared,⁴ was in a true sense applicable to Chris-

¹ 1 John iii. 3.

³ 1 Tim. i. 1.

² Acts xxviii. 20.

⁴ Acts ii. 26.

tian believers on earth, they tabernacled in hope. The figure of hope in its spiritual aspect, as portrayed in the New Testament, is a splendid and exhilarating one. Like Sir Joshua Reynolds' famous design in the window of the ante-chapel at New College, Oxford, it has the Excelsior look about it; but while it looks to the things that are above, all that lies on the earthly plane appears transmuted—transfigured.

For those that are possessed of this radiant expectancy, no cause and no individual can be reckoned as lost. For the Christian, despair is impossible because it must be a mistrust of the Omnipotent.

Much then is directly revealed as to the nature and strength of Christian hope in the New Testament; but if we pass from the letter to the spirit of its pages, the devout student will see its rays everywhere. Hope as well as joy penetrates such a letter as that to the Philippians. Hope was the great sustaining power of the Church under persecution, hope made the expectant proto-martyr's face beam like that of an angel. And ever since that age the Church has been in herself, and to the world, precisely what she is through this eternal hope.

Yet the question arises, Is despair as a mind and temper plainly pagan? With these words of the Master before His disciples the answer must surely be in the affirmative; for not only here are the purest morals taught, but He shows how opposite ideas and contrary actions are base and sinful, and thus that to despair, whether of a situation or of an individual, is an attitude not of His own but of the Gentile world. And what wondrous knowledge in Him does this reveal of the tendency of pagan sentiment before and since His Incarnation. Any careful and competent student of Greek or Latin literature will have but one answer to give as to the testimony which each furnishes on the issue.

Take Latin literature: with the standing exception of his Pollio, Vergil's message to his countrymen, in striking contrast to his greater follower Dante, was not a message of hope; and who can really hear it even when Horace is in his gayer moods? It is much the same with the greater prophets of Greek literature. Euripides cannot be cleared of melancholy, even if it is not permanent in him; while most critics would regard Sophocles as frankly pessimistic. Pessimism was in the air, and these great writers, feelers after God as they might be, not only sympathized with it, but expressed it, and in expressing it gave it what nobility it could receive, but a nobility only of diction and phrase.

Hope, then, is at once the symbol and safeguard of the Christian life. It is to the soul what good health is to the body; when its possession is fitful and precarious, then decay has set in.

Nor must it be supposed that the acute and final state of despair is reached in a moment. It has its preliminary stages both for individuals and nations. It is not at once wild, passionate, suicidal. In normal experience it is precluded by a thousand haunting doubts and uncertainties, by misgivings, suspicions, by those *μερίμναι* against which the Master also warned His own. Gradually resistance against these forces becomes weaker and weaker until the pessimist drifts into the backwater of a sluggish and stagnant morbidity, and this way lies despair. Hence the motto for Christians in this regard must be *obsta principiis*. They must needs set a watch not only upon lip, but upon mood and temperament. They must look to springs of thought and will, and shun as a fatal and ominous sign what they flatteringly describe as religious depression. They have also to beware of the surroundings and influences of an age which to-day is once again pessimistic, and whose most fatal note is an increase in suicide. Modern thought is tinged with pessimism. If it is too negative to serve as a

doctrine, it is insinuated as an idea. Modern fiction, by which people to-day learn at once so much and so little, is largely pessimistic. It is so with the two chief novelists still with us. Life and character in the North of England and in Wessex have been severally delineated for us by them with a power which rivals, and now and again transcends that of George Eliot; and while the one writer exposes, as with the hand of a man, the weakness of human nature, the other as pitilessly sets out its evil passions. Where in either is the fair vision of hope? It is the same in the poetry of the day. Critics describe it as decadent, but they are not to be blamed for so doing. Pessimism, like a creeping paralysis, has caught hold of our singers, and their listeners love to have it so. They pass by the lark; it is only the raven to which they are responsive. It is a happy thing for the welfare of our national existence that the patriotic feeling, in the present sorrowful crisis of English history, has come upon us, acting like an antiseptic upon these maleficent influences.

The rendering of R.V., "never despairing," wisely covers the possibility of either variant in this passage.

It remains, therefore, to consider whether Christians worthy of the name act up to the Master's command. What doubt, what gloom often besets them as they reflect upon themselves, on their influence with others, on the great cause which is not theirs but His!

Upon themselves. The inward monitor, when permitted to speak out, declares to them shortcomings, inconsistencies, faults and sins. All imply failure to advance, and then, instead of nerving themselves to further struggles onward, knees become feeble and hands slack, the gloom of despondency settles about them; hope is no longer sure and strong, they are on the edge of despair.

So in regard to others. We often give up others, not only because they sometimes seem to us hopelessly bad,

but because they are often to us hopelessly uninteresting. Thus the area of our influence narrows to a smaller and yet smaller radius.

So in regard to Christian enterprise. It is so often that Christians imagine that the general success of the great cause of the Lord is to be measured by the personal success at their command. Rather it is their single title of honour, whether success comes or goes, to be fellow-workers with Him. Meanwhile, how is a dark and dismal pessimism consistent either with a full belief in His message or with His Divine Person, for the one is the word of hope, and the other is the Hope Himself?

Now when they were gone over the stile, they began to contrive with themselves what they should do at that stile, to prevent those that shall come after from falling into the hands of Giant Despair. So they consented to erect there a pillar, and to engrave upon the side thereof this sentence: "Over this stile is the way to Doubting Castle, which is kept by Giant Despair, who despiseth the King of the celestial country, and seeks to destroy His holy pilgrims." Many therefore that followed after read what was written and escaped the danger.

So wrote the immortal author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. It was Hopeful who this time saved his brother. One of Bishop Westcott's last utterances was, "I am full of hope." The spirit of all whose faces are set to the Celestial City must be the same, and their battle cry a nobler one than any dreamt of by the poet's imagining.

NIL DESPERANDUM, CHRISTO DUCE ET AUSPICE
CHRISTO.

B. WHITEFOORD.

THE LISTS OF THE TWELVE TRIBES.

THE twelve "sons" of Jacob, or the twelve tribes of Israel, are mentioned together and by name some twenty times in the Old Testament and once in the New. The contents of these lists vary slightly. At times Levi is one of the twelve, at times not. When Levi is omitted from the list as a tribe apart, the number twelve is completed by dividing Joseph up into Manasseh and Ephraim. This is well known. It is less generally observed that in Genesis we have another early variation: Levi and Joseph both appear, but the twelfth place, subsequently occupied by Benjamin (as yet according to the story unborn), is filled by Jacob's daughter Dinah—a small tribe, as we may conclude, whose misfortunes, related mainly in the form of a personal narrative¹ in Genesis xxxiv., were followed by early extinction.² In Revelation vii. the place left vacant by Dan is filled by Manasseh, though Joseph occurs later in the list. Another curious method of completing the number twelve is found in the book of Jubilees xxxviii. 5 ff.; the place of Joseph, who is absent in Egypt, is there taken by Hanoch, the eldest son of Reuben (cf. Gen. xlvi. 9).

The first of the more familiar lists is obtained by combining Genesis xxix. 31–xxx. 24, and xxxv. 16 ff. These are the well known narratives of the births of Jacob's children; and in them the children are naturally mentioned in the exact order of their birth. They are never again mentioned in this order in the Old or New Testament.³ The twelve children fall into four groups—the children of Leah, of Rachel, of Bilhah, and of Zilpah.

¹ But note that the tribal character of Jacob comes out clearly in *v.* 30.

² Cf. Steuernagel, *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan* (1901), p. 3.

³ Nor so far as I have observed elsewhere, except of course in other stories of the births (Josephus, *Ant.* I. 19⁷ 21³; Jubilees xxviii. 11 ff., xxxii. 3.

Into the interpretation of the narratives of the births, into the historical conditions which occasioned the theory of the order of births of the tribes and their distribution among different mothers, I do not propose to enter here. The subject has been quite recently discussed afresh by Dr. Steuernagel in the extremely suggestive essay cited above. My purpose is different, and is entirely independent of any particular interpretation of the meaning of the birth stories—be they the stories of the births of individuals or of the early fortunes of tribes.

I intend to limit myself to the examination of certain literary phenomena—the variations, not so much in the contents as, in the *order* of the contents of the various lists. The correct understanding of even this limited subject appears to throw some light on various critical and exegetical matters.

I have already said that the twelve tribes of Israel are never mentioned in the order in which the twelve sons of Jacob are said to have been born. But further, though the twelve tribes are not mentioned more than about twenty times altogether in the Bible, there are some eighteen different orders in which they are mentioned, and we find yet fresh differences of order when we turn to the Pseudo-epigrapha, Philo and Josephus. There is, indeed, but one arrangement that is ever repeated in the Bible, and that only occurs thrice, viz. in Numbers ii., vii. and x. 14–29.

And yet the arrangement of the names is very seldom, possibly never, haphazard. My purpose is to tabulate the various arrangements, to consider the rules that govern them and to indicate certain conclusions to which they point.

The lists¹ fall roughly into two classes; there are, first,

¹ Some of the lists are confined to the Western tribes. But for our present purpose neither this nor the omission in some of Levi calls for any further specific reference.

lists for the particular arrangement of which the immediate context suggests no reason (grouped below under A). There are also lists (grouped below under B) in which the tribes are divided into two or more groups; in some cases certainly, in others possibly, this division is a determining factor in the arrangement. An obvious instance is afforded by the list of Joshua xxi. 4-7: here the tribes are divided into four groups which are to furnish cities to the four classes of Levites. The first group consists of the tribes resident nearest to Jerusalem, who are to give cities to the *priestly* section of the family of Kohath, the tribes neighbouring on these are to give cities to the remaining Kohathites, while the Northern and Eastern tribes give cities to the other Levitical clans. I have also included under B the orders in which the tribes are mentioned in Joshua xiii. xv. ff. and 1 Chronicles iv.-viii.; these are not lists proper, but are included for the sake of completeness. Since the distinction between the two groups is not sharp, I have numbered the lists throughout.

Included in the tables are certain lists in Philo, Josephus, the book of Jubilees and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.

The two factors most regularly influential in the arrangement of the various lists are (1) the order of birth, (2) the theory of the "mothers" of the various tribes. In order to bring out the extent of this influence at a glance and to reduce comments on the tables, I have adopted the following symbols for the several tribes, instead of giving the names in full:

L = Leah; l = Leah's handmaid (Zilpah); R = Rachel; r = Rachel's handmaid (Bilhah). The index figure denotes the child according to the order of birth from the same mother in Genesis xxix. 31-xxx. 24, xxxv. 16 ff.; and thus

L ¹ = Reuben.	R ^{1a} = Manassch.
L ² = Simeon.	R ^{1b} = Ephraim.
L ³ = Levi.	R ² = Benjamin.
L ⁴ = Judah.	r ¹ = Dan.
L ⁵ = Issachar.	r ² = Naphtali.
L ⁶ = Zebulon.	l ¹ = Gad.
R ¹ = Joseph.	l ² = Asher.

Adopting these symbols, the various lists appear as follows, with the source (JE = Jehovistic, P = Priestly sections of the Hexateuch) whence they are drawn, and the references.

A.		
ORDER.	SOURCE.	REFERENCE.
i. L ¹²³⁴ r ¹² l ¹² L ⁵⁶ R ¹² . . .	JE	Gen. xxix. 31—xxx. 24, xxxv. 16 ff.
ii. a. L ¹²³⁴⁵⁶ R ¹² r ¹² l ¹² . . .	P	Gen. xxxv. 23—26 (cf. Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> II. 7 ⁴ .)
b. L ¹²³⁴⁵⁶ R ² r ¹² l ¹² . . .	P	Exod. i. 1—5.
iii. L ¹²³⁴⁵⁶ r ¹² l ¹² R ¹² . . .	Jubilees	xxxiv. 20; also Test. xii. Patriarchs.
iv. L ¹²³⁴⁵⁶ l ¹² R ¹² r ¹² . . .	P	Gen. xlv. 9 ff. Jubilees. xlv. 13 ff.
v. L ¹²³⁴⁵⁶ r ¹ R ¹² r ² l ¹² . . .	Chronicles	I. ii. 1 ff.
b. L ¹²³⁴⁵⁶ r ² R ^{1ba2} r ¹ . . .	Chronicles	I. xxvii. 16 ff.
vi. a. L ¹²³⁴⁶⁵ r ¹ l ¹² r ² R ¹² . . .	Early poem	Gen. xlix.
b. L ¹²³⁴⁵⁶ r ¹ l ¹² r ² R ² . . .	Philo	<i>Dreams</i> , Bk. II., c. v.; cf. <i>Alleg.</i> Bk. I., c. xxvi.
vii. L ¹⁴³ R ^{21ba} L ⁶⁵ l ¹ r ¹² l ² . . .	Early song	Deut. xxxiii.
viii. L ⁴¹ l ¹² r ² R ^{1a} L ²³⁵⁶ R ¹² . . .	Revelation	vii. 5 ff.
ix. L ¹²⁴⁵⁶ R ^{1ba2} r ¹ l ²¹ r ² . . .	P	Num. i. 5—15.
x. L ¹²⁴⁵ R ^{1b2} L ⁶ R ^{1a} r ¹ l ² r ² l ¹ . . .	P	Num. xiii. 4—15.
*xi. a. L ¹² l ¹ L ⁴⁵⁶ R ^{1ba2} r ¹ l ² r ² . . .	P	Num. i. 20—43.
†b. L ¹² l ¹ L ⁴⁵⁶ R ^{1ab2} r ¹ l ² r ² . . .	P	Num. xxvi.

* In the LXX. the order is L¹²⁴⁵⁶ R^{1ba2} l¹ r¹ l² r².

† In the LXX. the order is L¹²⁴⁵⁶ l¹² R^{1(ab)2} r¹² = no. iv. Both in Numbers i. 20—43 and xxvi. the Samaritan agrees with M.T. against LXX.

B.

	ORDER.	SOURCE.	REFERENCE.
xii.	L ⁴⁵⁶ L ¹² I ¹ R ^{1ba2} r ¹² r ² .	P	Num. ii., vii.,
xiii.	L ²³⁴⁵ R ¹² L ¹ I ¹² L ⁶ r ¹² .	Dent.	xxvii. [x. 14-29.
xiv.	r ¹² r ² R ^{1ab} L ¹⁴ R ² L ²⁵⁶ I ¹ .	Ezek.	xlvi. 1-7, 23-29.
*xv.	L ¹² R ² r ¹ R ^{1ab} L ⁶⁵ I ² r ² .	P	Num. xxxiv.
†xvii.	L ¹ I ¹ R ^{1a} L ⁴ R ^{1ba2} L ²⁶⁵ I ² r ²¹ .	P	Josh. xiii. xv. ff.
	b. L ¹² R ^{21ba} L ⁵⁶ I ² r ²¹ .	Joseph.	Ant. V. i. 22.
	c. L ¹² R ^{21(ab)} L ⁶ I ² r ²¹ .	Judg.	i. 17-34.
xvii.	L ¹² R ² R ^{1b} r ¹ R ^{1a} L ⁵ I ² r ² R ¹ L ¹¹ L ⁶	P	Josh. xxi. 4-7 †; cf. I Chron. vi. 54 ff.
xviii.	L ¹²¹ I ¹ R ^{1a} L ³⁵ R ² r ² R ^{1ab} I ² .	Chron. I.	iv.-viii.
xix.	L ⁴ r ² I ¹ L ³ r ¹ L ² L ¹⁵⁶ L ² R ² Hanoah	Jubilees	viii. 5 ff.

In spite of the many variations, the arrangements under A are, without any reference to the passages whence they are drawn, obviously governed by certain principles or conform to certain rules. Any such rules are much less obvious in B, though not altogether, as a matter of fact, without influence. The more effective principles governing the B lists are, as noted above, to be found in the several contexts.

For convenience of reference, I number the sections into which I throw my comments on the lists.

1. The order of birth is not in general the main principle governing the order in which the tribes are mentioned, for the simple order of birth nowhere occurs except in the story of the births (i.). It is, however, an important secondary principle.

2. On the other hand, the "mothers" of the children or tribes have a primary influence on the arrangement.

* I¹ L¹ are to be found in Numbers xxxii.

† The order given above is that of the sections devoted to the several tribes. In xvi. 4 (Hebrew text, not LXX.) the order is R^{1ab}; xvii. is Josephus's order in reproducing the matter of Joshua xiii. xv. ff.

‡ In vv. 8-40 the same order is repeated, except that in the third division R¹, and in the fourth L⁶ come to the beginning.

The children of the handmaids are either grouped together in almost any order, which is the general rule, or, as in iv. and the Greek variant of xib., follow the children of the respective mistresses. The children of Leah are grouped together and the children of Rachel. Within the Leah and Rachel groups the order of birth is very, but within the handmaid group much less, if at all, influential.

3. The most important illustration of the superiority of the influence of the "mothers" over the order of birth is seen in the strong tendency in the Old Testament to remove Rachel's children from the end of the list. In the Old Testament they *never* occupy this position, to which they belong by order of birth, except in the story of the births and in Genesis xlix.; curiously enough in the later lists of the New Testament, Philo, Jubilees, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, they revert to this position (iii., vib., viii.; cf. also xix.).

4. Within the two chief maternal groups (Leah and Rachel), the order of birth regularly prevails. It has been broken probably by mere textual accident in one or two cases, by the influence of contrary principles which are still manifest in others, and for reasons which cannot with any certainty be conjectured in one or two others.

Deviations from the Order of Birth within the Leah Group.

The order L¹²⁽³⁾⁴⁵⁶ is broken in only three of the fifteen lists arranged under A.

(a) Zebulon exceptionally precedes Issachar in *via.* and vii. Philo, in a list (*vib.*) otherwise agreeing with *via.*, restores the usual order Issachar, Zebulon.¹ Deuteronomy xxxiii., containing list vii., shows literary dependence on

¹ Apart from the lists the order Zebulon, Issachar is found in the Song of Deborah, Judges v. 14 f.

Genesis xlix. containing *via.*¹ List vii. may therefore be regarded as influenced by *via.*; and at the same time as proof that the order in *via.* is, if not original, at least early—earlier, that is to say, than Deuteronomy xxxiii. (about 800 B.C.). It is still of course possible that the order Zebulon, Issachar has arisen from an accidental transposition of the verses at a still earlier date. If not, in view of the generally marked agreement of *via.* with other lists in which the order of birth is clearly influential, it appears probable that the arrangement of the tribes in Genesis xlix. points to an alternative theory of the relative ages of the tribes according to which Zebulon was older than Issachar and all the sons of Leah older than the sons of any of the other mothers. We cannot trace back the theory of Genesis xxix. 31 ff. with certainty beyond the latter part of the seventh century B.C.; for, since the story of the births is derived partly from E, partly from J, it is not necessary that the order in the composite narrative should correspond to that in both or even in either of those sources; it may have been adopted by the editor from only one of them or established by himself. Henceforward, however, the order adopted in JE seems to have exercised undisputed influence; for though the recurrence of L⁶⁵ in two lists grouped under B (xv. *xvia.*) is not quite easy to explain, it is hardly due to the reason just suggested for this order in Genesis xlix. and Deuteronomy xxxiii.

(b) In viii. Judah (L⁴) stands first, though the remaining sons of Leah follow one another in regular order. Here the pre-eminence of Judah (as likely to be emphasized by a Christian as by a late Jewish writer) accounts for the variation. Cf. xii., xix.; also perhaps xv.–xviii., and see below, § 10.

(c) List vii. is very anomalous. On the order L⁶⁵, see above under *a.* But beyond this Simeon is omitted and

¹ See e.g. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, notes on *vv.* 13–16, 22.

Levi placed after Judah. The general explanation of the omission of Simeon, viz. that at the time of the poem that tribe had been absorbed in Judah, might pass. But what of the position of Judah before Levi? It cannot be due, as in the case of viii. (see above under *b*), to the pre-eminence attached to Judah; for Reuben still stands first, and, on the usual interpretation, the poem is of *Israelitish* not of Judæan origin. A somewhat obvious but scarcely satisfactory explanation would be that Judah takes the place of the tribe it has absorbed. I prefer to conclude that either the present order is due to early and *extensive* disarrangement of the text,¹ or that Deuteronomy xxxiii. presents the one thoroughly anomalous and inexplicable list of the tribes found in the Old Testament.

5. *Deviations from the Order of Birth in the Rachel Group.*

Of the fifteen lists in A, seven give the order R^{12} , four others the equivalent R^{1ab2} or R^{1ba2} ; in two (*ii b. vi b.*) from the necessities of the case R^2 only is mentioned. Thus only two exceptions to the order R^{12} occur. Besides these the alternation of the order $R^{1ab} R^{1ba}$ must be considered. Under B, *xii. xiii.* being unaffected by any incompatible principle, retain the order R^{12} . When the tribes are enumerated according to actual geographical order from south to north the order of course becomes R^{21} (so *xv. xvii b.*; cf. *xvii.*), Benjamin lying south of Joseph (= Ephraim and Manasseh). To turn to the exceptions under A:

(a) List *vii.* offers the only simple instance of the order

¹ If at all, the text must be corrected more thoroughly than in Bacon's translation (*Triple Tradition of Exodus*, pp. 314, 269-273), which is based on the suggestions of earlier scholars and adversely criticized in Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 397 f. For though in his translation the order L^{123405} (as in *Gen. xlix.*, list *via.*) reappears, Rachel's children still remain, as in the present Hebrew text, sandwiched between Leah's eldest and youngest, and Benjamin still altogether anomalously precedes Joseph (cf. § 5a).

R²¹. This exceptional order is one of several striking anomalies occurring in the present text of Deuteronomy xxxiii. and discussed above (§ 4c).

(b) In x. we have a curious and, in these lists,¹ unique arrangement R^{1b21a}. It is highly probable that this arrangement is purely accidental and that in the original text of Numbers xiii. the order was regular—R^{1ab2}. See below (§ 7a).

(c) The orders Manasseh, Ephraim (R^{1ab}) and Ephraim, Manasseh (R^{1ba}) appear to have been pure alternatives, though there is a very decided preference for the latter.² Either order may be explained by the order of birth. For while Manasseh was actually, Ephraim was fictitiously, the firstborn son of Joseph (Gen. xli. 51, xlviii. 17 ff. J E). As a matter of fact in the fifteen A lists R^{1ba} appears four times certainly (*vb.* vii. ix. xia.) and a fifth time if the present text of x. is accepted; R^{1ab} once (*xib.*) certainly and twice if the emendation of x. suggested below (§ 7a) be adopted. Some³ indeed think that P was not influenced by J E's story of Jacob's preference for Ephraim, and always used the order Manasseh, Ephraim. In view, however, of the large number of cases⁴ in which, in our present text of P, the order Ephraim, Manasseh appears, this seems highly improbable. And in any case it is unsound to argue that "the priestly

¹ The order occurs, however, in Ps. lxxx. 2, where the tribes in question are mentioned alone.

² Thus in J E we have Manasseh, Ephraim in Gen. xli. 51, xlviii. 1; but Eph., Man. in Gen. xlviii. 13 f. 20, l. 23; Josh. xvii. 17. In P Man., Eph. in Gen. xlvi. 20; Num. xxvi. 28-35, xxxiv. 23 f.; Josh. xiv. 4, xvi. 4; but Eph., Man. in Gen. xlviii. 5; Num. i. 10, 32-35, ii. 18-20, vii. 48-54, x. 22 f. (xiii. 11); Josh. xvi. 5-xvii. 6, xvii. 10, xxi. 5 (and hence xxi. 20-25). Elsewhere Man., Eph. in Judges i. 27-29; 1 Chron. xxxiv. 6-9; Ps. lx. 7 (=eviii. 8); but Eph., Man. in Deut. xxxiii. 17; Judges xii. 4; 1 Chron. vi. 67-70, ix. 3; 2 Chron. xv. 9, xxx. 1, 10, 18.

³ E.g. Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*² p. 132; Dillmann on Josh. xvii. 1; Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch*, ii. 463, n. 2. Mr. Hogg in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 1314, with n. 2 expresses himself more cautiously.

⁴ As cited in the footnote last but one.

writer never recognizes the pre-eminence of Ephraim," since he gives Ephraim the place of honour among the children of Rachel in the camp and marching order (Num. ii. 18, x. 22). In considering lists under B it should be remembered that a *geographical* order (from south to north) gives R^{1ba}.

6. *The Order of Birth in the Handmaid Groups.*

These two small groups are not even kept distinct from one another, nor are they quite always grouped together (§ 2). The variations of 1¹² r¹² are answerable for by far the larger number of the variations in the entire lists. In other words, the arrangement of these four tribes with reference to one another is the least fixed element in the whole. The only approach to rule appears to be that the younger brother is not to precede the elder brother by the same mother. This rule, if rule it were, is broken only thrice (under A)—in ix. and x. (both P) and vb. (Chr.). Another exception would be produced if Dan were restored for Manasseh in Revelation vii. 6 (list viii. ; cf. § 7d).

7. *Variations from the Law that the Children of Leah are grouped together and the Children of Rachel together.*

In the simple order of births (i.) Leah's children fall into two groups divided from one another by the children of the handmaids. In the remaining fourteen lists, the Leah group is five times broken; the Rachel group only once, or, if we take account of the peculiar case of viii., twice.

(a) In x. there are three anomalies: the Leah group is broken up, the Rachel group is broken up, and the order of birth within the Rachel group is disregarded (§ 5b). All three anomalies can be removed at one and the same time by a single simple transposition in the text of Numbers xiii., viz. by placing vv. 10 f. before v. 8. I should therefore,

even were there no independent indication, such as actually exists,¹ that the text of the passage has suffered in transcription, have very little doubt that the actual original order of the verses in Numbers xiii. was 10, 11, 8, 9, and that the original list was identical with *xi^b*, except that *l*¹ still stood at the end.

(*b*) On vii., see above, § 4*c*.

(*c*) In *xia.* and *b.* Leah's two eldest are separated from her three youngest sons by the eldest son of her handmaid. In itself this is most extraordinary; but it is, I believe, to be explained by the influence of *xii.*, and by that *alone*. The order in list *xii.*, as I explain below (§ 10), can be fully accounted for.

(*d*) In connexion with *viii.*, commentators on Revelation chap. vii. have spent most of their energy in speculating on the cause for the absence of Dan. But there are other features in the list demanding attention and, if possible, explanation. The peculiarities are as follows: (1) Judah heads the list; (2) the Leah group is broken up by the insertion in their midst of three children of handmaids and Manasseh; (3) Manasseh, cut off from the rest of the Rachel group, occupies the place of Dan and occurs *not in place of, but as well as Joseph*. The reason of (1) is patent—the pre-eminence of Judah, cf. § 4*b*; (2) could be removed by placing verses 5 and 6 after 8*a*, which would at the same time unite Manasseh (*R*^{1*a*}) with Joseph and Benjamin (*R*^{1*2*}). As to (3), Manasseh is either an original and intentional or a secondary (intentional or accidental) substitute for Dan. In the latter case, adopting the transposition just suggested, the original list closely resembled Philo's (*vi^b*). In spite of the practical

¹ See e.g. Dillmann or Paterson (in the Polychrome Bible) on the passage. Mr. Hogg also discusses the text in a fresh and suggestive manner in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 2581, n. 1. Merely to place *v.* 11 before *v.* 8, leaving 10 where it stands (as, for instance, Dr. Paterson does) is but half to perceive the problem. It removes two of the anomalies noted above, but leaves the third.

unanimity of the evidence for the reading Manasseh,¹ and of the fact that the absence of Dan can be tolerably accounted for by the belief that Antichrist was to come of that tribe, a systematic study of the lists of the tribes can hardly fail to awaken the suspicion—it can be nothing more—that Manasseh is an error, and that Dan was not really absent from the original list. Certain it must remain that had the writer wished to omit Dan, he might yet have completed the number twelve, and still bowed to prevailing custom if, also omitting Joseph, he had included Ephraim as well as Manasseh in his list and prefixed these two immediately to Benjamin.

8. Within the Old Testament there is a decided tendency to throw the handmaid tribes all together to the end of the lists. In the New Testament and extra-biblical literature the youngest tribes—Rachel's children—occupy this position. But for two cases (*va. b.*), exceptions to the tendency in the Old Testament (A lists) can be explained: in i. the pure order of births prevails, possibly also in *via.* (cf. § 4*a*); in iv. another obvious and intelligible principle has been at work (§ 2); or *xia.* see below, § 10. Even in some of the geographical lists (B) the tendency is perhaps to be detected in the fact that Dan, though described as a midland tribe, is named with northern (handmaid) tribes in *xvia. b. c.* Perhaps we are hardly justified in assuming that the tendency was so strong as never to be resisted except for clear reasons such as exist in the cases mentioned, and *va. b.* may form instances of unreasoned departure from the rule.

9. The lists grouped under B, as already remarked above, are affected by principles directly or indirectly indicated in the contexts whence they are drawn. The geographical position of the tribes affects the order in several—most

¹ The Memphitic version reads Dan. But the early existence of the reading Manasseh is attested not only by the earliest MSS., but also by the express reference of Origen to the absence of Dan; see Tischendorf's note, *ad loc.*

notably in xvii., but also in xvi. and xviii. Further, xv. seems quite clearly governed by the same principle, for this list enumerates the western tribes only, the eastern tribes having been previously dismissed (in Num. xxxii.); and the western tribes in this order—first, the two southern tribes, then the four midland, and then the four northern. The geographical principle—the adoption of which is intelligible in the context—is clear in spite of Manasseh preceding Ephraim (cf. § 5c) and Zebulon, Issachar (§ 4a).

10. List xii. represents the order in which the tribes encamped and marched in the wilderness. The principles governing the lists under A (see §§ 1–3) are still effective, but their effect is modified partly by the necessities of the case and partly by the influence of another principle. The necessities of the case, i.e. the symmetrical arrangement of the camp, required the division of the twelve tribes into four groups of three. The twelve tribes in this case consist of five Leah tribes (Levi being excluded), three Rachel tribes, and four handmaid tribes. The three Rachel tribes constitute one of the groups, the three youngest sons of Leah another group; three of the handmaid tribes another, while the fourth is constituted of Leah's two eldest sons and the eldest son of her handmaid (Gad); i.e. the main principle effective elsewhere (§ 2) exercises here also the utmost influence that the necessities of the case allow; the tribes having the same mother are as far as possible grouped together, and within each group the order of birth prevails.

The new principle affecting this order is the desire to place the more honourable tribe in the more honourable position. The place of honour is on the east of the tabernacle—a position occupied in the inner cordon by the more honourable section of the Levites, viz. the priests (Num. iii. 38). This is occupied by Judah and two of his brother tribes; the least honourable position—the northern—falls

to the three handmaid tribes; the second in honour to Reuben, Leah's firstborn; and the third to the Rachel tribes. The relative value of the positions can be gathered from the order of the march and the positions round the tabernacle of the four divisions of Levi (Num. chap. iii.).

The tribes occupying the most honourable position are naturally mentioned first, and hence the desire to give pre-eminence to Judah (cf. § 4*b*) leads to Leah's three youngest sons in this list preceding the two eldest. The placing of the handmaid tribes on the north is probably fully intended and thought out. But it is a nice question whether the writer intended to prefer Reuben and the two tribes associated with him to Ephraim and the other two sons of Rachel, or whether, having secured the best position for Judah, he was content to be governed by the old principle of keeping the Leah tribes all together before the Rachel tribes.

This list is repeated in giving the order of the march (Num. x. 14-29), and with less obvious reason in the account of the offerings of the tribal princes (Num. vii.).

The influence of this list is seen elsewhere. For to this influence I feel compelled to attribute the position of Gad in Numbers i. 24, xxvi. 15 (list xi.). In such lists as *xia.b.* regarded by themselves, the position of Gad is altogether anomalous and quite inexplicable, whereas in *xii.* (Num. ii.) it most naturally originates, as I have just shown, from the very necessities of the case. We must explain the otherwise inexplicable by the explicable: the list in Numbers i. 20-43 is substantially the list of i. 5-15 modified in one particular, by *imitation* of Numbers ii. For this reason I must regard the argument in the Oxford Hexateuch (note on Num. i. 1) that i. 20-47 and ii. are *independent* expansions of the main Priestly work as groundless. i. 20-47 cannot be explained by i. 5-15 only; and if the author of i. 5-15 wished to establish a camp order, the order in chap. ii. is that

at which he would most naturally arrive. In other words, there is no reason, in the varying order of the tribes, for doubting that Numbers i. 5-15 and ii. proceed from the same hand; but i. 20-47 is dependent on ii. and therefore probably by another hand.

The very anomalous position of Gad in i. 24, xxvi. 15 was perceived by the Greek translators, and the reason for it not being understood, they restored a more regular text by placing Gad after Benjamin. For no one probably, if we did not possess the evidence of the Samaritan, which here agrees with the Hebrew text, would be prepared to argue that the Greek order is the original.

11. It is less easy to feel confident about the principles governing Ezekiel's distribution of the tribes (xiv.). On the whole, I am inclined to differ from Dr. Davidson (note on Ezek. xlviii.) and to think that the placing of the handmaid tribes at the extremities of the country, and therefore furthest from the holy centre is intentional. The influences of the old principle of grouping the Leah tribes together may be seen in the connexion of the three tribes Simeon, Issachar, and Zebulun. The feature of the list hardest to understand is the position of Benjamin.

12. The principle governing the division of the tribes to curse and to bless (xiii.; Deut. xxvii.) I do not understand, nor the reason for placing the children of Leah's handmaids between the eldest and the youngest of her own sons. On the other hand, the order in the first division is entirely in accordance with general principles.

In conclusion, I will briefly summarize the results scattered over the preceding comments.

1. The text of Numbers xiii. is to be amended by prefixing *vv.* 10 f. to 8 f.

2. The arrangement of Deuteronomy xxxiii. is very suspicious; if not original, the present text is the result of very extensive disarrangement.

3. The text of Revelation vii. 5-8, presenting as it does a list containing *three* striking anomalies, is open to some suspicion. It is not improbable that 5 and 6 originally stood after 8a : and it is possible that Manasseh is a primitive error, or substitute for Dan.

4. The New Testament, Pseudepigraphical and Philonian lists agree in placing the children of Joseph at the end, and thus differ from the normal Old Testament lists.

5. The orders Manasseh, Ephraim and Ephraim, Manasseh appear to have been used indifferently by all writers—by the Priestly as well as by the Jehrovistic writers of the Old Testament, but with a general preference for the latter.

6. Numbers i. 20-43 and xxvi. presuppose Numbers ii., and on the ground of the order in which the tribes are mentioned may be regarded as proceeding from a different hand ; but there is on this ground no reason for doubting that Numbers i. 5-15 and Numbers ii. are from the same hand. Similarly the unnatural use of the order found in chap. ii. in chap. vii. supports the view generally adopted that chap. vii. is secondary.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

*THE MESSIAH OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY
AND APOCALYPTIC AND THE CHRIST OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

“I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.”—*MATT. v. 17.*

As the University Statutes prescribe as the subject of this Sermon¹ a consideration of the Jewish interpretation of prophecy regarding the Messiah, and its fulfilment in the New Testament in the person of our Lord, it is incumbent on the preacher to define, at the outset, the method he intends to pursue.

First, then, he has to decide whether he is to treat of Jewish interpretation prior to the Christian era, or of Jewish interpretation subsequent to it. If he elects to adopt the latter alternative, he must confine his attention to the consideration of the Old Testament passages messianically applied in Rabbinic writings, such as the Targums, the ancient Midraschim and the two Talmuds. Moreover, as these passages were all but exhaustively collected in recent years by Dr. Edersheim, the preacher has the materials on his subject ready to hand, and by their help could discharge his duty in the present instance with little pains to himself, but with still less profit to his hearers. For as the passages in question are collected from writings which range from the first century of the Christian era to the seventh or later, it is clear that they do not represent the exegesis of any one age, and no truly coherent conception of the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom could be constructed from them. But even if such a construction were possible, it would be profitless to attempt it. The materials are valueless owing to the theory of inspiration and the

¹ Preached before the University of Oxford, Jan. 26, 1902.

peculiar rules of interpretation prevalent in later Judaism. The theory of mechanical inspiration dominated the Rabbinic mind in an almost unintelligible degree. This theory impressed an infallible character on each and all the parts of the Old Testament, even on its individual words and letters, and made its statements, however discrepant, all equally authoritative, and all equally true. But this theory of inspiration is all that is admirable in comparison with their rules of interpretation. It would not be much of an exaggeration to say that by means of these rules a skilful Talmudist could deduce from any Biblical passage whatever almost any conceit he pleased, and the justice of this statement could be sustained in no little degree from the later Jewish interpretation of Messianic prophecy.

I have therefore decided to ignore Rabbinic interpretation on this question, and to devote our thoughts to pre-Christian Judaism, and especially to the contributions made to our subject in the last two centuries before Christ, when inspiration had not as yet forsaken Palestine, and when through the mutual interaction of a vigorous religious life and thought, developments were made and permanent results achieved in this province.

I propose therefore to notice, first, the salient features and developments of the Messianic hope in Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic, and next the actual views of the Messiah, which the Jews entertained at the beginning of the Christian era.

By so doing we shall gain on the one hand a representation embracing the permanent elements of the Messianic hope in Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic, and on the other hand we shall be able to compare the actual fulfilment of this hope in our Lord and the nature of the fulfilment that was looked for by contemporary Judaism.

Before entering on this subject it is hardly necessary to

premise that our investigations are based on the inductive or critical theory of inspiration, and not on the mechanical—that ancient legacy of Judaism. The critical theory examines the several books of the Bible as it would any other document, and studies each by itself and in its historical environment with a view to ascertaining its character, message and date. By no other method can we arrive at valid results. It is true, indeed, that theologians as a rule disown the theory of mechanical inspiration, and yet how frequently are they guilty of the evil of textmongering, which is its logical offspring, of the rending of passages from their contexts, and the wresting from them of meanings which they could not possibly bear.

To return, the books of the Bible, when rearranged by criticism in their original order of composition, appear no longer as detached units, standing often in unintelligible isolation from each other, but as articulated members in a coherent and organic movement of spiritual evolution, in which God's purposes take concrete form in an ever increasing degree.

It is from this standpoint that we address ourselves to our subject. The dates assigned to and possibly the names connected with certain of the Old Testament developments are provisional, but their provisional character does not necessarily affect the cogency of the conclusions.

Now, if we would understand Jewish Messianic prophecy in relation to its fulfilment in the New Testament, we must study first the Messianic Kingdom or the Kingdom of God as foreshadowed in that prophecy, and next the characteristics of the expected Messiah. The subject is immense: we must therefore confine ourselves to the salient characteristics of each conception.

First then as to the expected Kingdom. In pre-prophetic times this expectation, so far as we can discover, was fixed

on the future national blessedness, that was to be introduced by the day of Yahweh. According to the popular conception which was current down to the eighth century and later, this golden age was to be merely a period of material and unbroken prosperity, which the nation was to enjoy when Yahweh overthrew Israel's national enemies. In this pre-prophetic period Monotheism was non-existent in Israel. Israel had its own Deity Yahweh, just as the neighbouring nations had their own deities, and Israel questioned the existence of the latter just as little as that of the former. Originally the sovereignty of Yahweh was conceived as conterminous with His own land and His own people, and His interests as absolutely identical with those of Israel. Though Yahweh might become temporally estranged, He could never forsake His people, and to them were confined all His redemptive acts and gracious purposes. This very ancient view of Yahweh was still the popular one in Israel in the eighth century, as we learn from the Prophet Amos. But this low nationalistic conception of God was overthrown by the monotheistic teaching of the great eighth century prophets. Yahweh, they taught, was the God of all the earth and there was no God beside Him. As such all nations were His, and they no less than Israel were the subjects of His judgments and His redemptive purposes. Yet the old nationalistic claims, that Yahweh considered Israel only, survived side by side with the prophetic monotheism, which logically rendered them nugatory and anachronistic, and of these claims even some of the prophets made themselves the mouthpiece.

Thus we come to distinguish two lines of prophetic succession in Israel. The first is that which frankly accepts monotheism with the universalism that naturally flows from it, that is, the inclusion of the Gentiles within the sphere of Divine judgment and Divine blessing. The second is that which accepts monotheism yet illogically

excludes either wholly or in part the Gentiles from God's care and love, and limits His gracious purposes to Israel alone.

Of the former attitude, Jeremiah may be taken as the typical exponent : of the latter, Ezekiel ; and thus these two great prophets of the exile may be regarded respectively as the spiritual forerunners of Christianity and Judaism.

But abandoning for the present the consideration of this radical difference in the Hebrew prophets, let us turn to those expectations in which they were agreed. The chief of these, we find, was the establishment of God's actual reign on earth. All or nearly all the pre-exilic prophets teach the advent sooner or later of this Kingdom. It was, they universally agreed, to be introduced by a national judgment—collective judgment for collective guilt—limited in its scope according to earlier prophecy, but world-wide according to the prophets of the seventh century and onwards. Over this Kingdom either God Himself was to reign or the Messiah. This Kingdom itself was to last for ever and its scene was to be the present earth according to pre-exilic prophecy.

With the two great prophets of the Exile the Messianic expectation enters on a fresh stage of development. Before the Exile the nation was the religious unit, and the individual as such had no religious worth and could not approach God except through priest or prophet. But with the deportation of the nation to Babylon and the overthrow of the temple and its settled order of priests and sacrifices, the individual came of necessity into direct and immediate relation with God, and henceforth constituted the religious unit. Man must stand face to face with God : God's law must be written on man's heart. The new teaching thus proclaimed a Kingdom of God *within man*. This kingdom within man was not indeed to be a substitute for the Messianic Kingdom, but a preparation. The spiritual

transformation of Israel, individual by individual, became henceforth an indispensable condition for entrance into the coming Kingdom of God. On this condition of entrance into the kingdom all post-Exilic prophets are at one, but, as we have already seen, they were utterly at variance as to the destined comprehensiveness of the Kingdom.

Jeremiah held that it was to embrace all the Gentiles, who should enter it by conversion: Ezekiel and his successors that even those Gentiles who survived the judgement were to be excluded from it for ever. Thus Jeremiah and Ezekiel founded or rather re-founded two very diverse schools of development. Jeremiah taught universalism, that is, that God's gracious purposes embraced all mankind, and that Zion was to be the spiritual mother of the nations: Ezekiel taught particularism, that is, that the Jews only were the objects of God's love. Thus in this otherwise noble prophet of the Exile, the heathenism of primitive Israel survives so far as to represent God's attitude to the Gentiles as that of an omnipotent and merciless deity.

This view of Ezekiel tends at first sight to shock the reader; but he soon comes to condone it, when he reflects that Ezekiel's heathenism in this respect is as nothing compared with the inexpugnable heathenism of one great branch of the Christian Church, which would exclude from the Kingdom of God on earth not heathen communities as did Ezekiel, but Churches of Christ no less Christian than itself; and whereas Ezekiel's ostracism of the non-Israelite was limited to this life only, the Latin Church would condemn to eternal destruction the members of other Churches of Christ, which are no less fruitful than itself in good works and are indefinitely richer in knowledge and wisdom.

But to return. Let us emphasize the two chief notes of the kingdom enunciated in the prophetic school of Jeremiah and his successors: First, the Kingdom was to be *within man*: religion was to be individualized: God's law to be

written on man's heart (Jer. xxxi. 31-35): man's soul was to be the dwellingplace of the Most High: "Thus saith the high and holy One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy: I dwell in the high and holy place with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit" (Isa. lvii. 15).

Secondly, the Kingdom was to be *worldwide*, embracing all the nations of the earth.

It is now our task to trace the development of the third note of the Kingdom. Hitherto prophecy had looked forward to the present earth as the scene of the Messianic Kingdom, but about the middle of the fifth century a new view appears on the horizon in Isaiah lxx.-lxxvi., for which the past indeed had made some preparation. Not the earth in its present condition, this later prophet declares, but a transformed heaven and earth were to be the scene of the Kingdom. If the traditional text is correct, this transformation was not to take place instantaneously and catastrophically, but gradually, advancing *pari passu* with the spiritual transformation of man. In the course of this spiritual and physical transformation the wicked were apparently to be gradually eliminated from the community. The righteous were to attain the full limit of their years—no doubt 1,000—and the sinner was to be cut off prematurely at the age of 100. This peculiar view reappears but twice more in Judaism in the Book of Jubilees, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which belong to the second century B.C.; but though it did not hold its ground it prepared the way for the next and final form of this eschatological hope, which furnishes the third chief note of the Kingdom. This final form arose about the close of the second century B.C., when in the growing dualism of the times it was borne in alike on saint and sage that this present world could never be the scene of the eternal Messianic Kingdom, and that such a Kingdom demanded not merely a new heaven and a new earth akin in character to

the old, but a new and spiritual heaven and earth, into which flesh and blood could not find an entrance. Here at length we have arrived at the third note of the Kingdom. The eternal Messianic Kingdom *can attain its consummation only in the world to come*, into which the righteous should enter through the gate of resurrection.

To recapitulate: we have now the three chief notes of the coming Kingdom of God. First, this Kingdom was to be a Kingdom within man—and so far to be a Kingdom realized on earth. Secondly, it was to be worldwide and to ignore every limitation of language and race. Thirdly, it was to find its true consummation in the world to come.

Let us now turn to the New Testament and inquire if the Kingdom introduced by our Lord possesses the three notes of Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic. The matter can be dispatched in a few words; for these three notes summarize in the shortest possible way the actual characteristics of the Kingdom established by Christ. Thus in answer to the Pharisees asking when the Kingdom of God should come, our Lord declares: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or There! for lo! the Kingdom of God is within you" (Luke xvii. 20, 21). Again, Christ's Kingdom is universal. "The Kingdom of God," declares our Lord speaking to the Jews, "shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. xxi. 43); and "many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the Kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness" (Matt. viii. 11, 12). Elsewhere in the Parable of the Sower He states that "the field," that is, the scene of the Kingdom's activity "is the world," (Matt. xiii. 38). This second note of the Kingdom follows naturally from the first. If character is the sole qualification for admission into the Kingdom, then wherever that char-

acter is found there the Kingdom of God is already actually present. Finally, it was to be consummated in the risen life. "The Son of Man shall send His angels, and they shall gather out of His Kingdom all things that offend and them that do iniquity . . . Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xxii. 41). This is the Kingdom of God come "with power" as St. Mark (ix. 1) describes it.

We thus see that the Kingdom established by Christ corresponds in its deepest aspects to that foreshadowed in the prophetic and apocalyptic writers. It embodies the permanent elements in the past development and fuses them into one organic whole.

Not so however with Judaism. Still clinging to their claims as the only true Church of God, the Jews could not accept the universalism of the greater prophets or this universalism as embodied in the teaching of Christ. God was the God of the Jews only, they held, and of the Gentiles only so far as they were admitted to Judaism. There was no hope either here or hereafter for the world outside the Jewish pale. Thus the Jews, by refusing to part with the unspiritual particularism of the past, unfitted themselves for the reception of the higher revelation of the present, and whilst seeking to exclude the Gentiles from the Kingdom of God succeeded only in excluding themselves.

This must be the natural nemesis of all such exclusiveness or particularism in Judaism or Christianity.

We have now dealt with the chief characteristics of the expected Kingdom. We have next to deal with those of the expected Messiah. Here our attention must not be fixed on points of detail, nor must we seek out the manifold instances of minute correspondence between this hope in the Old Testament and its realization in the New. It would be an *ignoratio elenchi* to press the fulfilment of special predictions as proofs of the Divine guidance of

events, where we regard the whole movement as divine. Here again our views of the expected Messiah must be drawn from the broad view of prophecy as a whole.

But greater difficulties beset the study of this subject than that of the Kingdom. Biblical critics are divided as to the date when certain of the chief factors of this expectation arose. Thus some would bring the prediction of the ideal King down to Exile times. But on the present occasion we may safely waive the consideration of such questions, and address ourselves forthwith to the main question before us, that is, the relation of the Messiah to the Kingdom of God. The student of the New Testament naturally looks on these two ideas as strict correlatives. To him the Messianic Kingdom seems inconceivable apart from the Messiah. But even a cursory examination of Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic disabuses him of this illusion. The Jewish prophet could not help looking forward to the advent of the Kingdom of God, but he found no difficulty in conceiving that Kingdom without a Messiah. Thus there is no mention of the Messiah in Amos, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Joel, Daniel: none even in the very full eschatological prophecies of Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii., or in the brilliant descriptions of the future in Isaiah liv. 11-17, lx.-lxii, lxv.-lxvi., which spring from various post-exilic writers. Nor is the situation different when we pass from the Old Testament to the subsequent Jewish literature. The figure of the Messiah is absent altogether from the Books of the Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, the Book of Baruch, certain sections of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, the Slavonic Enoch, the Book of Wisdom, the Assumption of Moses. Hence it follows that, in Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic the Messiah was no organic factor of the Kingdom. Sometimes he was conceived as present, but, just as frequently, as absent. When he was absent, the Kingdom was always represented as under the immediate sovereignty of God. Thus Jewish

prophecy and apocalyptic represent the Kingdom either as under the direct rule of God, or else of the Messiah as God's representative. Judaism carefully differentiated these two conceptions, and never represented the Messiah's jurisdiction as trenching on the divine, save in a single production of the first century before Christ. The supreme prerogatives of forgiveness, of judgement, of lordship over death, were always reserved in Judaism to God alone. We shall return to this point when we come to deal with the fulfilment of these expectations in the New Testament.

Having now recognized that the Messiah was not an organic factor of the Kingdom, we must shortly consider His chief characteristics in Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic. We may consider these under the usual distinctions of the ideal King, the ideal Prophet, and the ideal Priest.

The prophecies which centre in these three conceptions are no longer submitted, as they were in the past, to the perverted ingenuity of commentators and preachers, who seemed to believe that prophecy consisted of a series of riddles and conundrums, the interpretation of which was to be achieved by the cleverest guesser. Such a view no longer prevails. We do not now suppose that the prophets had definitely before them even the chief events of Christ's life, as Dr. Sanday points out in his Bampton Lectures (p. 404) or any distinct conception of that great Personality. What they saw in prophetic vision was the ideal figure of King, or possibly of Prophet or of Priest, figures suggested by the events of their own days, and projected into the future and that a future ever close at hand. Where the Messiah is expected it is all but universally as the ideal King. The personal ideal Prophet is nowhere distinctly sketched, but is rather to be inferred from the great picture of the prophetic nation portrayed by the second Isaiah. These two

hopes were never combined in Old Testament prophecy. Indeed prior to the advent of Christianity, Jewish exegetes seem never to have apprehended the Messianic significance of the suffering Servant of Yahweh. The idea of a crucified Messiah was an impossible conception to the Judaism of that period.

But the indistinctness which attaches to the expectation of the Messiah as prophet does not attach to that of the Messiah as the ideal Priest in the Old Testament. This expectation, which did not arise earlier than the second century B.C., is clearly attested in the 110th Psalm. The older exegetes indeed held that this Psalm spoke of the ideal Priest of David's line, and they assigned this Psalm to the authorship of David. This date and interpretation, as Dr. Driver shows (*Literature of Old Testament*,¹ p. 385) can no longer be sustained, and the Psalm is now referred by many of the ablest scholars to Maccabean times. While some are of opinion that Jonathan the brother of Judas, and others that Hyrcanus the son of Simon, was the subject of this Psalm, Dr. Cheyne, in his Bampton Lectures, has advocated with superabundance of argument, that it was addressed to Simon the Maccabee, after that he had been constituted "ruler and high priest for ever," by a decree of the nation, in the year 142 B.C. (Macc. xiv. 27 sqq.). A remarkable confirmation of this view has lately been brought to light by Bickell, a distinguished Roman Catholic scholar, who has recognized that the first four verses of this poem form an acrostic on the name Simeon. That Simeon or Simon, according to its Greek pronunciation, was regarded as introducing the Messianic Kingdom appears also from a passage in 1 Maccabees xiv. Finally, we may remark that the only Jewish high priests, who ever bore the title "priests

¹ Only once more in the Old Testament is this expectation referred to, i.e. in Jer. xxx. 21, which, according to Duhamel, belongs to the Maccabean period.

of the Most High God," were the Maccabean—a title which they assumed as reviving the order of Melchizedek when they displaced the Zadokite priesthood of Aaron.

We have therefore in this Psalm a combination of the two offices of priest and king in the person of Simon. These titles were most probably used by its writer in the hope that the Messianic Kingdom would be established in Simon's days. If now we pass from Jewish prophecy to Jewish apocalyptic we find analogous expectations.

The chief authorities for Jewish Messianic expectations in the second century B.C. outside the Canon are the older sections of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the main body of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and 1 and 2 Maccabees. In studying these works the reader is at once struck by the all but entire absence of the figure of the Davidic Messiah or the Messiah descended from David and Judah. Where this hope is expressed (Eth. En. xc. ; Jub. ; Test. Jud. 24) it is practically without significance, and its belated appearances seem due mainly to literary reminiscence. And yet this century is far from wanting in descriptions of the Messianic King ; but His descent is no longer traced to Judah but to Levi. This expectation is clearly set forth in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. How can such a novel expectation, so much at variance with all the past have arisen? There can be hardly a doubt that it was owing to the descent of the great Maccabean family from Levi. Around the various members of this family every thing that is noble in the Jewish history of the second century revolves. Is it a matter for wonder, then, that the zealous Jews, who were looking for the speedy advent of the Kingdom of God, thought that this Kingdom was to be introduced by the Maccabees, or even that the Messiah himself was to spring from this family? At all events an apocalyptic visionary, who wrote when Judas the first great Maccabee

was still living, held that Judas would go on warring successfully against Syria and the Gentile nations, till the Messianic Kingdom was ushered in by God. But Judas fell in 161. The fulness of the times had not yet come. The place of Judas was forthwith taken by his brother Jonathan, who assumed the high priesthood in 153, and in him, possibly, the Messianic hopes of many in the nation centred for a time; but Jonathan fell by his sword in 142, and the hope passed on to Simon, the subject of the 110th Psalm. Simon was the first Maccabee whose high priesthood was recognized by the entire nation, and this they did in words which significantly described him as "ruler and high priest for ever." A hymn describing the Messianic blessedness of his reign is preserved in the Sadducean work 1 Maccabees xiv. 8 sqq.

Then did they till their ground in peace,
And the earth gave her increase,
And the trees of the field their fruit.

The ancient men sat in the streets,
They all communed together of good things,
And the young men clad themselves gloriously but not with garments of war. (So Syriac).

For every man sat under his own vine and figtree,
And there was none to make them afraid."

A still nobler Messianic hymn of the second century is found in the Testament of Levi 18.

Then the Lord will raise up a new priest,
And to him all the words of the Lord will be revealed
And he will execute a righteous judgment on the earth in the fulness of days.

And the glory of the Lord will be uttered over him
And the spirit of understanding and sanctification will rest upon him,
And he will give the majesty of the Lord to his sons for evermore.

And there shall none succeed him for all generations for ever
 And in his priesthood all sin shall come to an end
 And the lawless shall cease from evil.

Simon was succeeded by John Hyrcanus in 135, and this great prince seemed at last to realize the expectations of the past; for according to a contemporary writer Hyrcanus embraced in his own person the triple office of prophet, priest and civil ruler (*Test. Levi* 8), and a statement to the same effect is found twice in Josephus. It is said, moreover, in the former second century authority that Hyrcanus "would die on behalf of Israel in wars seen and unseen" (*Test. Reuben*). But alas for the vanity of human wishes! This most highly gifted member of the Maccabean family was also the last that could in any sense be regarded as noble and religious. From henceforth the Maccabeans became Sadducean in the most evil sense of that term.

From the second century B.C. we pass to the first, and witness a revolution in the expectations of the people corresponding to that in the character of the Maccabees. As the Maccabees in the second century were leaders in all that was best in religion and in morals, so the Maccabees of the next century were foremost in godlessness and immorality. The Messianic hopes of the nation accordingly relinquished the thought of a Messiah of priestly descent and fell back on that of the kingly Messiah, sprung from David, and this expectation soon held the field without a rival. But the warlike character of the Maccabean priest-kings left its impress, and not for good, on the revived hope of the Davidic Messiah. Thus in the Psalms of the Pharisees, which belong to this period, the Messiah is conceived as embracing in His person all the patriotic aspirations of the nation: He is, it is true, the righteous ruler of Israel, but He is no less assuredly the avenger of their wrongs on all the heathen nations. The Pharisaic

party was henceforth committed to political interests and movements, and henceforth, in the popular doctrine, the Old Testament Messiah, the Prince of Peace, became a Man of War. Such a doctrine, it is true, was offensive to some of the noblest Pharisees, such as the author of the Assumption of Moses, who, writing in the early decades of the Christian era, lifted up his voice in protest against the leavening of religion with earthly political ideals; but he protested in vain, and the secularization of the Pharisaic movement culminated in the fall of Jerusalem.

We now come to the New Testament, where we must try to determine the relation that exists between the prophecies of the Messiah in the Old Testament and their fulfilment in the New. We need not linger long over them. We have already seen how Christ's Kingdom realized all that was permanent and best in Old Testament prophecy. It is needless to urge that, as the ruler of such a spiritual Kingdom, He gave the fullest consummation to the Old Testament ideal of the Messianic King, who reigned in righteousness over a regenerated people. And we can understand how as the ruler of such a Kingdom He of necessity held aloof from and opposed unto the death the low and earthly expectations of the nature which we have briefly traced above. Next as regards the prophetic office, it is sufficient to point out that till the advent of Christ no thought of Judaism seems to have connected with the Messiah the greatest picture of the prophet in the Old Testament, that of the suffering Servant of Yahweh. These two conceptions of the ideal King and the ideal Prophet or Servant of Yahweh appear in the Old Testament to be outwardly antithetic and incapable of coalescence in a single personality. But when we turn to the New we find that these two ideals of the past have by a spiritual synthesis been reconciled and fulfilled in a deeper unity, in the New Testament Son of Man. As to the priestly office, we have

seen that the connexion of this function with the Messianic hope was of late origin. Notwithstanding, it was taken up and fulfilled by our Lord in its deepest aspects. His coming death was to be a ransom (Mark x. 45) for the sins of many and His priesthood to be realized in the freewill sacrifice of Himself.¹

We have now sketched roughly the characteristics of the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom in the Old Testament, and touched still more briefly on their fulfilment in the Christ of the New. But even if we had done this in an absolute completeness, it would still be obvious that these Old Testament ideals fail to exhaust the fulness of Christ's claims and personality. Possibly a purely human personality could have given a fairly adequate fulfilment of the above threefold office of king, prophet and priest. The Jews at any rate had no difficulty in recognizing such a fulfilment in John Hyrcanus the Maccabee, though the prophetic gift in his case is synonymous merely with the predictive, and hence falls absolutely short of the true prophetic ideal.

All the Old Testament ideals, then, though realized in one personality, cannot justify the tremendous claims made by the Son of Man in the New. For whereas the Messianic Kingdom in Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic is just as frequently conceived without the Messiah as with Him, in the New Testament the Messiah forms its divine Head and Centre, and membership of the Kingdom is constituted first and chiefly by a living relationship to Him.

Thus our Lord allows no rival claim, however strong, to interfere between Himself and the soul of His disciple. "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me" (Matt. x. 37); "If any man cometh unto Me, and hateth not his father and mother and wife and children, he cannot

¹ The priestly office of the Messiah might be deduced from that of the suffering Servant of Yahweh, but this was not the original conception of the writer.

be My disciple " (Luke xiv. 26). Again this imperious claim to devotion extends to the life of the disciple in its deepest issues: "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. xi. 28). Only through Him can man have access to the Father: "None knoweth the Father save he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27 ; Luke x. 22).

As other claims which are without any parallel in the Old Testament prophecy of the Messiah we should mention first His claim to judge the world: and next to forgive sin; and finally to be the Lord of life and death. In the Old Testament these prerogatives belong to God alone as the essential Head of the Kingdom and appear in those prophetic descriptions of the Kingdom which ignore the figure of the Messiah, and represent God as manifesting Himself amongst men. Here then we have the Christ of the Gospels claiming not only to fulfil the Old Testament prophecies of the various ideals of the Messiah, but also to discharge the functions of God Himself in relation to the Kingdom.

If to the synoptic conception of Christ to which we have confined ourselves hitherto we add the Johannine and Pauline, the parallel between the relation of Christ to the Kingdom in the New Testament and the relation of God to the promised Kingdom in the Old becomes still more complete.

It is needless to press this subject further. We shall only add that though in the gracious Figure depicted in the New Testament we have a marvellous conjunction of characteristics drawn from the most varied and unrelated sources in Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic, yet the result is no artificial compound, no laboured syncretism of conflicting traits, but truly and indeed their perfect and harmonious consummation in a personality transcending them all. So far indeed is the Christ of the Gospels from

being the studied and self-conscious realization of the Messianic hopes of the past, that it was not till the Christ had lived on earth that the true inwardness and meaning of those ancient ideals became manifest, and found at once their interpretation and fulfilment in the various natural expressions of the unique personality of the Son of Man.

R. H. CHARLES.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

III.

THE GROWTH IN WISDOM AND GRACE.

1. IN the development of personality heredity is probably not the most potent factor; environment has at least as great, if not greater influence. What heredity gives is the possibility of powers of mind, habits of will, and dispositions of heart, which becomes a reality only through the environment fostering or hindering. As the individuality develops, it becomes more definite and fixed, and consequently the environment becomes less and less the decisive factor. In personal maturity character should not be shaped by, but should hold sway over, circumstances. In the years of childhood and youth, however, when the individuality is being only gradually realized, environment is of the greatest importance. A good inheritance may be marred by a bad environment, and a good environment may do much to prevent the injurious consequences of a bad inheritance. In the previous Study the attempt was made to show how the Divine grace evoking the human faith of the mother of Jesus secured for Him a religious inheritance, which linked Him to the believers and saints of the Old Covenant. It now has to be shown that by the same means there was prepared for Him an environment, which fostered and did not hinder the realization of His holy individuality. His mother's mood in the conception was trust in and surrender to God; the prenatal influence of the mother on the child was a channel of grace, confirming the tendency to faith; the same attitude of devotion and obedience to God determined the surroundings of the growing child in His mother's love, and care and training. For we cannot but believe that the illumination of the vision, in which God gave her the trust and the task of being the mother of His holy

child, did not at once fade into "the light of common day," but lingered with her to guard her from error and to guide her into wisdom in dealing with her son. How easily may a good disposition be hindered or marred by a mother's foolish fondness or hasty temper, and how greatly may good tendencies be fostered and strengthened by the wise encouragement and skilful guidance of a mother's word or look! Was motherhood ever more highly favoured, and therefore more heavily burdened, than in Mary? For so high and holy a calling there was surely given to her the sufficient grace, the Divine strength made perfect in her human weakness.

2. In the education of Jesus we must not forget the function of Joseph. Some theologians have found offence in the description by the Evangelist of both Joseph and Mary as the parents of Jesus; some critics have discovered in that word an implicit denial of the virgin-birth; some exegetes have imagined that Jesus in His answer to His mother was correcting her error in speaking of her husband as His father. But the language need offer no difficulty if we recognize, as we should, that the physical relation, if the primary, is yet the subordinate element in fatherhood; that a man is father not simply because he begets, but still more because he watches over, and cares for, trains and teaches the child whom he has begotten; that the use of the term Father for God lays the stress on the subsequent spiritual and moral influence on the child, and not on the initial physical connexion. Joseph is rightly described as one of Jesus' parents, and referred to as His father, for in the home he provided and protected, he filled a parent's place and played a father's part. For this position and function he too was Divinely prepared. To him also God committed a trust and task; on him as well God made a demand for confidence and submission. His perplexity regarding his betrothed was removed by a Divine communi-

cation, which he received trustfully and obediently. The effect of this communication would not be confined to securing for Mary a husband's care and kindness, but would determine the attitude of Joseph to the child when born. In the education of Jesus Joseph could not be forgetful of the privilege and the obligation laid upon him, and would strive to be faithful in the fulfilment of the call to a Divine service which had thus manifestly come to him. In basing our conclusion on the assumption that a real communication of the mind and will of God was made to both parents of Jesus, we need not be at all disturbed by the difference in the mode of revelation, a day-vision for Mary, a night-dream for Joseph. For even if the difference is wholly due to the literary peculiarity of the evangelical sources, the original fact is not affected by the imaginative embodiment. As it seems to the writer even more probably the case that the mode of communication does belong to the original fact, and can thus be best explained, he cannot admit any valid objection to this assumption for this reason. Does not the psychological peculiarity of the subject of a Divine revelation affect the mode of the communication? God can in each case choose the most effective method of approach to the human soul. As Mary and Joseph were unlike, God did not reveal Himself to both in the same way. Does not this difference even suggest that the spiritual influence of the two parents would be complementary, and so more adequate than if there were less individual distinctiveness?

3. The Divine revelation, which came to Joseph and Mary presupposed a preparedness of mind and heart. To the selfish and worldly, the wicked and godless neither vision nor dream would prove an effective revelation, calling forth confidence and commanding obedience. We may conjecture that the parents of Jesus were among those who were "waiting for the consolation of Israel." This

conjecture is confirmed by the characteristics of the song of praise sung by the mother of Jesus, and by the language of the other persons among whom we move in the Story of the Infancy. The terms "poor," "meek," "humble," "needy," first used in some of the Psalms to describe the condition, oppressed and persecuted, of God's faithful people, had come to be applied to lowly and true believers, who in quietness of soul waited upon God, trusted His promises, submitted to His providence, and sought the fulfilment of His purpose of grace, not by political agitation, but by the spiritual exercises of prayer and fasting. These were the living links with the prophets and psalmists of old in an age which had almost entirely lost their spirit. That Jesus grew up in such a spiritual atmosphere, purified and vivified by the special revelation which accompanied His birth, is shown by His own utterances. He pronounced blessed "the poor in spirit," "the meek," "the mourning," "the hungering and thirsting after righteousness." He called to Him "the labouring and the heavy laden." He called Himself "meek and lowly in heart." By His early training He belonged to the class He welcomed, blessed, and whose characteristics He claimed as the most attractive ornament of His own spirit.

4. A question as regards the early influences in the personal development of Jesus, which has not received the attention which it deserves, is this, Was any disclosure made to Jesus regarding the mode of His birth, the dignity of His person, the glory of His vocation? Although we cannot attain any certainty about the answer, yet we may reach a high degree of probability by close study of the narrative. We may be sure that there were given to Mary and Joseph the wisdom and tact not to make any intimation which would disturb the quiet growth of Jesus in wisdom and grace, loosen the bonds of affection and submission which bound Him to them, or trouble His mind

with questions which were beyond the understanding of His years. But when He reached the age when, according to Jewish customs, a boy became a son of the Law, was in some degree released from entire dependence on his parents and assumed some measure of personal responsibility, it is not improbable that some communication was made to Jesus. Was it not likely that, prior to His visit to Jerusalem, when He was twelve years of age, some intimation was made to Him as regards His position and vocation? This communication did not probably contain any account of the mode of His birth, as a subject still unsuitable to be dealt with at His age. Mary's words, "Thy father and I," would be less natural and appropriate if He had just been told how marvellous had been His entrance into human life. But this intimation may have contained the explanation of His name given in dream to Joseph, and His title Son of God as told by the angel-voice to His mother. If Jesus went up to Jerusalem with not only the thoughts and feelings which might be stirred in the mind and heart of any Jewish boy who had had a good and godly upbringing, but the consciousness of a more intimate relation to God than any of His fellow-pilgrims, and a higher duty and greater task than any of His boy-companions, due to this communication, then His action and utterance as recorded become to us more intelligible; they are psychologically mediated by the testimony of His parents to the revelation made at His birth.

5. If we now look more closely at His own words, "How is it that ye sought Me? Wist ye not that I must be in My Father's house?" we may learn with some probability the characteristics of His consciousness. What first of all becomes evident is the thorough confidence of the boy in His parents. He is surprised that they did not understand His action, that they could cherish any doubts about His

designs, that they were in any perplexity as regards His whereabouts. Surely this shows how well fitted for the child Jesus had the environment of the home in Nazareth hitherto been. We are prone in our thoughts of His youth to let the shadow of His after years fall backward over His early days. We think of Him as a lonely child, moving in "worlds unrealized" by those to whom the guidance and guardianship of His life was committed. But in such thoughts we probably both misunderstand the character of His personal development, and do wrong to both Mary and Joseph. His words on this occasion at least suggest that He had not hitherto been conscious of any isolation of spirit, of any separation of His interests and aspirations from the desires and purposes of His parents, of any perplexities of mind which they had not been able to understand and relieve for Him. Still more significant does this appeal for understanding become, if His consciousness of God's Fatherhood did not come to Him as an original intuition, unmediated by His home training and teaching, but if the inward certainty was evoked by the outward communication. His action seemed to Him the necessary and appropriate result of the intimation His parents had made to Him; why should they be so surprised by it? They might be expected to understand the consciousness which their words had evoked, and to foresee the action to which it had by inherent necessity prompted Him. It seems more probable then that Jesus did not make a discovery for Himself and then expect His mother to understand it, but as the truth had come to Him through her or Joseph's words He with good reason expected that she would draw from it the same conclusion for the guidance of His conduct as He Himself had done.

6. Secondly, the utterance of Jesus shows that He had come up to Jerusalem and the Temple with the innocent and ingenuous expectancy of youth. On the way, doubtless,

He had sung gladly and heartily some of the Psalms of Ascent, with which the pilgrims cheered their journey. To Him Jerusalem as God's chosen city would be very dear; to Him the Temple as God's abode would seem the most blessed spot on earth; to Him even the priests and scribes and all who had any share in the Temple worship, or waited on its ordinances, would seem highly favoured. The disillusionment that had to come in His manhood had not yet begun. Jerusalem was not yet for Him the murderess of the Prophets. The Temple was not yet "a house of merchandise," still less "a den of thieves." In the Holy City He sought His Father's House. The teachers, who although they did not conduct any formal instruction in the Temple area, yet might be often found with an eager throng around them discoursing on the meaning of the Scriptures, still seemed to Him worthy of attention, and He sought by respectful questions their aid in solving the problem of His conduct which His fresh consciousness had raised. He had not yet discovered how vain and barren were their subtleties, and how perverse and even pernicious their applications of the law. His denunciation of the scribes still lay in the hidden future. He was in the Temple, not as a critic, still less as a cynic, but as a worshipper and an inquirer. For Him piety and patriotism could still seek in Jerusalem and the Temple with its worship and witness inspiration. Although the dispersion of the illusion, and the discovery of the reality still lay in the future, was there, we may ask, any disappointment in the present? It is not at all improbable that the teachers failed to satisfy His mind with their answers to His questions, and that their failure as well as the failure of His parents to understand His motive and action, did throw Him back more upon Himself, did drive Him to lonely musings on His own duty and destiny, did lead Him to seek, as He had not done before in the same degree, the guidance of the Holy Scriptures as regards His

Father's mind and will. On this occasion was at least begun that process of painful discovery of human imperfection which he had to pass through to qualify Himself for His work. Before He began His work He had to realize the conditions under which it had to be done, and the methods of doing it. That He might be able to save, He had to discover how great was the need of salvation. That sad lesson was not improbably begun at this first visit to the Temple.

7. Thirdly, we may find in this utterance a prophecy of the life that was to be. The moral imperative had spoken in His soul, had been heard and heeded, and was henceforth to rule His life. Necessity was laid upon Him to be in His Father's house, a necessity so absorbing and compelling that all else was forgotten, the convenience of His parents, their anxiety on account of Him, nay, even for the time the authority which they claimed, and He heartily at other times rendered. We have already here the same moral consciousness which afterwards found expression in such sayings as these. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to accomplish His work." "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished." "Not My will, but Thine be done." In the youth already conscience was supreme, and its supremacy was not recognized with a grudge, but heartily. His duty was His delight. His conscience, though imperative in mood, was not imperious in tone. There are conscientious men who refuse enlightenment, and so fail in moral development, but he sought enlightenment and gained development. His questions in the Temple, we may be sure, were not about the foolish subtleties and vain trivialities in which the scribes delighted. Can there be any doubt that His only concern was to find out His Father's will in His house? That His conscience was not imperious

is further suggested by the statement of the Evangelist, that on His return to Nazareth He was subject to His parents. While conscious of the absolute claim of the Divine will, and while doubtless using all the means in His reach to find out what that will for Himself might be, He was willing to accept the guidance and even control of the moral standards and religious convictions of His home. Throughout His youth there continued a union of originality and dependence, which affords one of the best evidences for the position which has been insisted on in this and the previous Study, that the total divine operation in the Incarnation embraces not only the human individuality of Jesus, but also the inheritance by which through His mother He was united to the religious life of previous generations, and the environment in which by subjection to earthly parents He was able to grow in the knowledge and fulfilment of His heavenly Father's will.

8. Fourthly there is in these words of Jesus, what was most characteristic in His consciousness, His conception of God as His Father. This, as has already been indicated, need not have included any knowledge of the mode of His birth. Neither is it likely that there was as yet an intuition of pre-existence; when and how that intuition emerged in consciousness must be the subject of a future inquiry; meanwhile it may be said that the gradual development of the consciousness of Jesus seems at this stage to exclude it. There was a fit place in His consciousness for the sense of pre-existence only when He had reached His maturity, for that was one of the last consequences of His unique relation to God which would present itself to His mind. We cannot suppose that the metaphysical implicates of His consciousness, which have so bewildered and baffled Christian theology, were in His thoughts, as to His growing mind they could have caused only perplexity. We seem warranted in saying that it was a distinctively religious

consciousness of God's Fatherhood which Jesus at this stage had reached. He thought of, trusted in, loved, and served God as Father. He was sure of God's love, care, bounty, guidance, guardianship, authority and approval. At first not fully conscious of the absolute uniqueness of that relation, as He came to know His fellow men better, He doubtless gradually realized that His consciousness did isolate Him from others, and that among men He was alone with the Father; yet His confidence in His parents' understanding, and His expectation of instruction from the teachers in the Temple seem to involve that He did not yet fully and clearly know how exceptional His relation to God was. Still more gradual must we conceive the process to have been if, as has been previously assumed, His consciousness was evoked by some communication from His parents. But it may perhaps be objected that we have no right to assume any such communication, and to assign to it such significance, for we are bound to consider this consciousness as absolutely original. But this objection involves a false antithesis. The consciousness could be both original and mediated by a communication from others. Just as in regard to conscience we can recognize that it is an original endowment from God, and yet its development is mediated by the evolution of social standards of morality, so we may maintain that had Jesus not been "the Word made flesh," no human testimony could have aroused in Him that consciousness of God's Fatherhood; and yet as His whole individual development was conditioned, and necessarily if there was to be a real Incarnation, by heredity and environment, that consciousness must first be awakened by outward testimony.

9. This consideration suggests a principle which must be faithfully applied in the interpretation of the person of Jesus. His personal development was not isolated, independent, unrelated, an evolution of inherent forces under

immanent laws, without any stimulus or direction from the race to which He belonged, the society in which He did His work. There had been a Divine preparation for His coming, and the entire mediation of His personal development by His heredity and His environment was not less than His unique individuality a Divine gift. The communication about His Divine Sonship, although by human instrumentality, was ultimately due to a Divine revelation. The education which He received and which enabled Him to make that communication His own, was guided and ruled by the impression made and the influence wielded on His parents by a Divine revelation. The inheritance which came to Him in a mother's faith in, and surrender to, God was no gift which the race bestowed on Him, but the response to, and result of a Divine revelation. God Himself by His Spirit purified and sanctified the earthly tabernacle for His holy Child, the Son of His love. This same principle must be applied in tracing the further development of Jesus from youth to manhood, with this difference only, that in His childhood and boyhood that revelation had come to Him through His mother and home, and that in youth and manhood He consciously and voluntarily sought the enlightenment and quickening of Divine revelation in the Holy Scriptures. Looking forward we cannot conjecture what that development will be, but looking backward from the Baptism, the consciousness which it reveals may enable us in the next Study of this series to disclose how Jesus nourished the life divine in Himself by the study of the Word of His Father in the Holy Scriptures.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE MINOR PROPHETS.

VI. HABAKKUK.

THE name Habakkuk is explained by St. Jerome to mean "a wrestler," and by Luther "one who presses to the heart"; but it probably means "pressed earnestly to the heart." We know nothing of his history; but since his book ends with the words "To the chief musician on *my* stringed instruments," and as that magnificent poem was evidently meant to be chanted in the Temple, it has been supposed that he was a Levite. The fact that he is twice spoken of as "the prophet" shows that he held an assured position, as that title is only formally given to Haggai and Zechariah. There are many legends about him, one of which is preserved in the Apocrypha (*Bel and the Dragon*, 33-39).

It is there related that he was one day preparing pottage for his reapers, when an angel told him to convey the meal to Daniel in the lions' den at Babylon. He replied that he had never seen Babylon, and did not know where the lions' den was. The angel thereupon took him by the hair of the head and placed him in the lions' den, where he bade Daniel eat of the food provided for him, and, immediately afterwards, he was conveyed by the Angel back to his own land. The story is an interesting indication of the fact that he lived in the Chaldean epoch, and indeed he is the only prophet of that period. He probably wrote in the reign of Jehoiachim, and towards the commencement of the Babylonian captivity, B.C. 586. Although his book contains few actual predictions of the far future, and no Messianic prophecy unless iii. 13 be one, he is nevertheless a very great prophet, and as a moral seer and deep theologian has few equals among the Minor Prophets. He had to deal with a tremendous problem—the sudden dawn of the Chaldean power—which led him into earnest speculation as to God's

moral government of the world. He was led, as we shall see, to find the solution of his difficulties in the fact, which no one before him had so clearly expressed, that "wrongdoing is self-destruction even in prosperity, while there is joy and peace in righteousness even amid misfortune and misery." Unlike his predecessors he has no denunciations against the crimes or idolatry of his people, unless some critics are right in the uncertain conclusion that the four first verses refer to Judah. If however this be the case, the wrongdoing complained of seems to have been mainly due to external tyranny. The problem of holiness in suffering was presented to him under a new aspect. Job and some of the Psalmists had been deeply perplexed by it, but only as regards the lives of individuals. They solved it mainly by the consideration that the condition was exceptional, and that though the wicked might for a time flourish like a green bay tree, yet he was soon cut down.

In Job we find the additional suggestion that even the holiest men are not entirely guiltless before God. The earlier sacred writers did not touch on the later solution of the problem by pointing to the life beyond the grave.

But Habakkuk's difficulty was far more serious, for he saw before him a righteous and suffering *nation* oppressed by a godless and wicked people; and it was amazing to him that God should tolerate so apparent an anomaly. The difficulty was all the greater because there did not seem to be any prospect whatever of any immediate alleviation. Under these circumstances Habakkuk "speaks *to God for Israel* rather than as do the other prophets *to Israel from God.*" The answer which he receives from God to these problems is :

I. That God is the Lord and that judgment will fall at last on the wicked : and

II. That earthly prosperity has nothing to do with the deepest realities of life.

This truth is expressed in God's answer to the prophet's appeal, which is the most memorable verse in his prophecy.

"Behold his soul (the soul of the Chaldean) is puffed up, it is not upright in him. But the righteous shall live by his faithfulness."

The importance of this utterance is shown by the fact that it is three times quoted in the New Testament (Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11; Heb. x. 38), and that, in the form "The just shall live by faith," it is the main substance of St. Paul's theology, namely, "justification by faith." Thus Habakkuk enunciated a truth which is one of the most spiritual links between the Old and New Dispensations, and, like all the greatest of the prophets, he was a teacher of spiritual righteousness as definitely transcending ceremonial observances. In the midst of an oppressed and suffering nation, crushed by cruel and insolent tyranny, he is still the prophet of faith.

His "oracle" falls into three main divisions.

I. The agonizing cry, followed by God's terrible announcement of the rise of the Chaldeans, and the troubled inquiry of the prophet.

II. God's answer. The prophet will ascend his watch tower to hear what God will answer. The answer came mainly in the great verse which we have quoted, and which amounts to the declaration that righteousness does not only contain the *promise* of life, but that it *is* life. The remainder of the chapter consists of five strophes each consisting of three verses, in which the nations rise and taunt the Chaldeans with their rapacity, their selfishness, their haughty ambition, their cruel drunkenness and their vain idolatry.

III. The third chapter is one of the most magnificent in the Bible. It is called "A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet upon Shigionoth" which might be translated "in dithyrambics," or "to the music of ecstasy." It is mainly

occupied with an exultant hymn of praise which dwells upon God's mighty deliverances of His people in times past ; and, in consequence, despite the present distress and affliction the prophet triumphantly concludes :

In Jehovah will I rejoice,
I will be glad in the God of my salvation.
Jehovah, the Lord, is my strength :
He maketh my feet like hinds' feet,
And maketh me walk upon the heights.

Thus the prophet's anguish and distress end in words of unquenchable hope.

VII. OBADIAH.

The name of Obadiah means "servant of Jehovah." It was a common name, but the prophet (of whom nothing is known) cannot be identified with the other Obadiah mentioned in the Scriptures. His book is the smallest in the Old Testament and may be summed up in the words "*The doom of Edom.*" It is evident that he wrote after the destruction of the northern kingdom, and shortly after the final invasion of Nebuchadnezzar. This seems clear from verse 20: "The captivity of this host of the children of Israel which the Canaanites have carried captive even unto Zarephath, and the captivity of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad shall possess the cities of the south." The expression "this host" seems to show that Obadiah may have been one of the inhabitants of Judah who fled into Phœnicia before the Babylonish invaders. Sepharad may be a name for Sardis ; and if so, Obadiah probably wrote about B.C. 586, shortly after the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem the Edomites seemed to have behaved with abominable insolence and cruelty. They intercepted the fugitives who tried to escape down the Jordan valley, and indulged in heartless and

drunken demonstrations even on the hill of the Temple. Their conduct on this occasion showed so wicked a form of hatred and malignity that it excited the most passionate indignation of the Jewish Psalmists and Prophets, who frequently called upon God to avenge it. (Lam. iv. 21, 22; Ezek. xxxv. 1-15; Isa. lxiii. 1-6; Ps. cxxxvii. 7; Esdr. iv. 45-56.) Even "by the waters of Babylon" the weeping captives of Judah remembered bitterly how, while the Babylonians were destroying Jerusalem and the Temple, the envious Edomites exultantly shouted "Down with it! Down with it! even to the ground."

The prophecy falls into two sections:

I. The first deals with the guilt and punishment of Edom, though she thinks herself to be so secure amid the rocky fastnesses of Petra.

II. The promise of restoration to Israel after Edom has perished at the hands of the heathen, and of the Jews.

The prophecy of Edom's ruin was amply fulfilled. In B.C. 312 we find the Nabatheans in possession of Edom; in B.C. 166 Judas Maccabæus drove them from Southern Palestine; in B.C. 135 John Hyrcanus reduced them to entire subjection to the Jews; and in B.C. 66 Simon of Gerasa laid Idumea waste with fire and sword.

VIII. HAGGAI.

Haggai was one of the earliest of the post-exilic Prophets, all of whom—though they had many important truths to enunciate—fall incomparably below the impassioned fervour and splendid poetry of their greater predecessors. This was due to the depressed and humble position to which the Jewish nation had sunk. The Ten Tribes had finally disappeared, and Judah was no longer an independent people under its own king, but was reduced mainly to scattered communities of exiles, of whom those who had returned to their own land formed one of the pettiest satrapies of the

Persian empire. Israel was in fact "no longer a kingdom, but a colony, and a church," under Zerubbabel the governor, and Jeshua the high priest. They laid the foundations of the Temple amid mingled sounds of joy and weeping; but when they had rejected the overtures of the Samaritans, two obscure magnates, Rehum and Shimshai, stirred up the jealousy of the Persians against them, and succeeded in hindering the progress of the house of God. Haggai and Zechariah aroused the Jews from this lethargy, and when Tatnai and Setharbosnai appealed to Darius on the subject, the original decree of Cyrus was found and Darius approved of the endeavours of the Jews. The whole main message of Haggai may be compressed into the words "Build the Temple." Nothing is known of him personally. His name means "the Festival," probably because he was born on some Jewish feast. His prophecies were all delivered in the sixth, seventh and ninth months of the year B.C. 520, as those of Zechariah were mainly spoken in the eighth and eleventh months of the same year.

Haggai's prophecy, which is prosaic and full of often repeated formulae, falls into four divisions. He has been called "the most matter-of-fact of all the prophets," and is full of repetitions. His first discourse (i. 1-11) turns on the one exhortation "Arise and build." It was addressed to Zerubbabel and Jeshua and reproaches the people with more attention to their own ceiled houses than to the Temple, of which the prophet puts into God's mouth the words, "I will take pleasure in it, and will be glorified." In the Hebrew word for "I will be glorified," the final *h* (ה), is omitted, and as ה stands for "5" the Jews said that five things were wanting in the new Temple—namely, I. The Ark and Mercy-seat; II. The Shechinah, or Cloud of Glory; III. The fire that descended from heaven; IV. The Urim and Thummim; and V. The spirit of prophecy. In this message Haggai declares that the prevalent drought and

poverty were a punishment for the neglect to build the Temple.

2. The second discourse (ii. 1-9) is mainly full of *comfort and promise*, and contains the remarkable prophecy that the "latter glory of this house shall be greater than the glory of the former," since the "desire of all nations shall come" into it. The prophecy is usually interpreted of Christ's visit to the Temple, but in the Hebrew the abstract word "*the desire*" means "*the desirable things of all nations*"; and the promise was fulfilled by the splendid gifts bestowed on the Temple by Darius, Artaxerxes, Herod, and other princes.

3. The third discourse, two months later, is a promise that plenty shall reward the fulfilment of duty, the promised blessing to begin "from this day." The meaning of the two Halachoth, or ceremonial rules, about which he asks the priests, is that iniquity or uncleanness is more diffusive than holiness.

4. The fourth discourse is a special promise to Zerubbabel that God will make him as a signet on His right hand. This was fulfilled in the fact that "the sure mercies of David" were fully granted in the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was a direct descendant of Zerubbabel.

Prosaic as Haggai's prophecy may seem to be, it yet teaches the three great moral truths, (I.) That faithfulness is directly connected with national prosperity; (II.) That discouragement is no excuse for neglect; and (III.) that when a good work has to be done, the time to do it is *now*.

IX. ZECHARIAH.

Zechariah was a younger contemporary of Haggai, and urged, though under very different forms, the same message. We know no more of him than that he was "the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo," and therefore belonged to a

priestly house. He was probably a young man when he wrote, and had recently returned from exile.

What we call "*the book of Zechariah*" contains the prophecies of three different prophets, of whom the two placed last wrote long before the prophet Zechariah. The first of these anonymous prophets wrote chapters ix. to xi., and the second wrote chapters xii. to xiv. The first eight chapters only are by the contemporary of Haggai.

The first six chapters of the genuine Zechariah consist of an address and seven visions. He begins with an exhortation to repentance (i. 1-6), and then follow the visions :

I. (i. 7-17.) *The Angel Riders*, implying that God will ultimately punish all heathen adversaries.

II. *The four horns and the four smiths*, which also implies the approaching judgment of the heathen.

III. (ii. 1-13.) *The Restoration of Jerusalem*.

IV. *The Restoration of the Priesthood and the Prophecy of the Branch*, in which Jeshua is disrobed of his "filthy garments" and clothed in festal apparel.

V. *The Golden Candelabrum*. In this vision is prophesied the future glory of the Temple, and the share in that glory which belongs to Zerubbabel and Jeshua, the anointed prince and the anointed priest.

VI. The sixth vision is a double one ; first, *of a flying roll* (v. 1-4)—or perhaps the true reading should be *the flying sickle*, implying that all thieves and false swearers should be cut off. The second part (v. 5-11) is of *a flying ephah*, implying dishonest gain in which at last is placed a woman, the symbol of wickedness, over whom the ephah is closed by a plate of lead, and she is carried away to Babylon. This is the fulfilment of the promise, "I will remove the iniquity of the land in one day."

VII. The seventh vision of *the Four Chariots* (vi. 1-8) indicates God's judgments upon heathen nations.

At the close of these visions we have another, of *the*

crowning of the High Priest (vi. 9-15). The last two chapters (vii., viii.) turn on *a question about fasting*. Many of the Jews at this time kept four fasts, which commemorated four disastrous days at the beginning of the captivity. The people of Bethel send two messengers to the prophet to ask whether these fasts should still be kept. The answer of Zechariah, as of nearly all the prophets, implies the eternal nullity of ceremonialism as compared with moral duties. The prophet gives them no direct answer about these fasts, but bids them to be true and kind and faithful, and then their fasts should become joy and gladness and cheerful feasts; until ten men of all nations should, in envy and admiration, take hold of the skirt of a Jew and say, "We will go with you for we have heard that God is with you." Thus appropriately ends the authentic treatise of Zechariah, the grandson of Iddo.

X. AN ANONYMOUS PROPHET ("Zechariah" ix.-xi.).

These chapters are undoubtedly the work of a different prophet from the Zechariah who wrote the first eight chapters. They belong to an epoch previous to the fall of the northern kingdom. Their style is different; their linguistic peculiarities, their recurrent phrases, their historical standpoint, their whole circle of thought is different. There is no trace of angelology; there are no visions; they allude to political and national circumstances which have no relation to those which existed in the days of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. There is no allusion to Babylon, but the enemies contemplated are Syrians, Phœnicians, Philistines, Assyria and Egypt. The Temple of Jerusalem is still standing (xi. 13); the Northern Kingdom is still powerful (ix. 10-13, x. 6, 7 and xi. 14). The chapters therefore must certainly have been written, not by Zechariah, but by some younger contemporary of Hosea. The days alluded to are those of Shallum, Menahem, and the anarchy which suc-

ceeded the death of Jeroboam II. How these chapters came to be attached to the prophecy of Zechariah is unknown; but some suppose that they may have been written by the Zechariah mentioned in Isaiah viii. 2. They are much more powerful than the preceding chapters. They fall as usual into three main divisions:

1. The triumph of Zion over her enemies, such as Damascus, Tyre, Askelon, Gaza, Ashdod and Ekron (ix. 1-8). The advent is then prophesied of the Holy King of Sion (ix. 9-11), who is to come lowly and riding upon an ass, a prophecy which is quoted by St. Matthew of the coming of Christ (Matt. xxi. 5). There then follows a splendid strophe promising deliverance and glory to Israel.

2. The second division dwells on the exaltation of Israel and Judah, though it is mingled with memories of judgment.

3. The third division dwells on apostasy, and judgment which is to be inflicted by some terrible invasion from the north. The prophet is bidden to assume the duties of a shepherd over the people, and he makes two staves, one of which he calls "graciousness," to imply peace with the surrounding countries; and the other he calls 'union,' because he wishes to unite Judah and Israel. Three other shepherds, or kings, have preceded him and been cut off, but since the people are disobedient and ungrateful, he breaks his staff "graciousness," and demands some reward for his labours. They scornfully offer him thirty pieces of silver, the price of a slave. The typical character of this narrative is brought out by St. Matthew (xxvii. 10), who applies it to the betrayal of our Lord by Judas. The prophet then breaks his other staff, "union," and contemptuously casts the thirty pieces of silver either "to the potter," or (as in the Syriac) to the Temple treasury. In this the unknown prophet again becomes a type of the Good Shepherd whom Judas sold (Matt. xxvii. 9; Mark xii. 41).

The prophecy is a very powerful one, but some of the historical allusions are uncertain.

XI. ANOTHER ANONYMOUS PROPHET

(“Zechariah” xii.–xiv.).

These chapters were written under the pressure of some impending calamity, in which there is reason to fear that Judah had taken part in the siege of Jerusalem by its enemies (xiv. 14, R.V.).

Here again we have three divisions :

1. *The great deliverance and the better age* (xii. 1 to xiii. 9), which tells of God’s judgments on the heathen (xii. 1–9), of the repentance of Jerusalem (xii. 9–14), and of the purification of a repentant remnant from guilt and falsity. In this division several passages are applied by the Evangelists to Christ. One is, “They shall look on him (or ‘me’) whom they pierced,” of which the original reference is uncertain, though it may apply to the traditional murder of Isaiah by Manasseh, or of Urijah by Jehoiakim.

2. The second part of the prophecy (xiv.) deals first with judgment on national transgressions, and then with the final glory of the Messianic kingdom.

XII. JOEL.

All modern critics, with scarcely an exception, have come to the conclusion that Joel was a prophet of the post-exilic period, since he is entirely silent on the wickedness of Judah and Israel, and makes no allusion to the use of High Places and to other idolatrous aberrations denounced by the earlier Prophets. Nothing whatever is known of Joel except that he was the son of Pethuel, who is equally unknown. He borrows largely from the earlier Prophets. He makes no mention of kings or princes, and seems to allude to the Babylonish captivity in iii. 1, where he

speaks of Israel as having been "scattered among the nations." Many of his allusions to worship, as well as his complete silence about the northern tribes, his familiarity with previous writers, his allusions to Levitic worship and the narrowness of his political horizon all seem to show that he wrote during, or after, the days of Ezra.

His prophecy falls mainly into two short divisions :

I. The day of the Lord as indicated by a fearful plague of locusts, which is described at length.

He then alludes to a penitent assembly of the nation which had been followed by abundant rain and renewed prosperity (ii. 18, 19).

II. Jehovah promises deliverance (ii. 19-27), and we have then a description of the outpouring of the Spirit, the judgment of the heathen, and the blessings bestowed on Judah. The prophecy is not free from difficult allusions into which we cannot enter, but it dwells on the elements of hope and fear, and inculcates the lessons which lie at the basis of all moral and religious teaching, namely, the certain reward of the righteous, and the certain punishment of the wicked. His prophecy of the outpouring of God's spirit upon all flesh is alluded to both by St. Peter (Acts ii. 16-21) and by St. Paul (Rom. x. 13).

XIII. JONAH.

The book of Jonah differs entirely from all the other Minor Prophets. The Jonah whose fortunes are described is the son of Amittai, who lived in the reign of Jeroboam II. in the eighth century before Christ. But in this book he is always spoken of in the third person, and critics are now almost unanimous in the view that the book was written after the Exile. Among other proofs of this the language contains a number of Aramaic forms, and Nineveh is spoken of in the past tense as a city which no longer existed.

There is scarcely a single living scholar who regards the

story as having been intended to be taken literally. There is not the faintest trace, either in sacred or profane literature, of the events narrated in this book. It is now universally regarded as a late but interesting specimen of the Jewish Midrash or Haggada, that is, a story not founded on actual events, but a moral and spiritual allegory—thus belonging to the same phase of literature as the books of Job, Daniel, and Esther. The only argument of the least validity urged against this view is the allusion ascribed to our Lord in Matthew xii. 39, 40, where we find the words, “As Jonah was three days and three nights in the fish’s belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” There is reason to doubt whether this verse is not a later addition to the original; since “the sign of the prophet Jonah” (Matt. xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29) refers not to the sea monster, but to the repentance of the Ninevites at Jonah’s preaching. Even, however, if this view be rejected, “it does not necessarily follow,” says the late Dean Plumptre, “that this use of the history as a prophetic symbol of the Resurrection requires us to accept it in the very letter of its details. It was enough for the purposes of the illustration that it was familiar and generally accepted.”

The fact, however, that the book is a moral allegory and not a narrative of actual events does not in the least detract from the value of the many profound lessons which it teaches. There is a contrast throughout between the littleness of man and the almighty mercy of God; between the dark sinister selfishness, intolerance, and personal unworthiness of the prophet who tries to escape from the commands of God, and cares more for the loss of comfort involved in the withering of his gourd than he does for the release from peril of the vast population of Nineveh—and the large mercy of the Almighty, who gently rebukes his fierce and selfish religionism.

Thus the book of Jonah is full of great lessons of toleration, of pity, of the impossibility of flying from God, of the merciful deliverances of God, of the just retributions of God, of the infinite love of God, of man's little hatred shamed into fatuity, dwarfed into insignificance by God's abounding tenderness. But the main lesson of the book is the rebuke which it involves of the narrow and hateful particularism of those Jews who thought that God cared only for them, while He was utterly indifferent to the destruction of all the nations of heathendom. The main lesson of the book is therefore that which is found in the book of Wisdom: "O God, the whole world is as a drop of morning dew, but Thou hast mercy upon all . . . for Thou lovest all things that are, and abhorrest nothing that Thou hast made. . . . But Thou sparest all . . . for they are Thine, O Lord, Thou lover of souls."

XIV. MALACHI.

Malachi was certainly the last of the Prophets. He wrote fully sixty years or more after Haggai and Zechariah. We know nothing of him, and are not even certain of his name, for the word Malachi means "My Messenger, or My Angel," and the first verse is translated in the Septuagint: "The oracle of the Word of the Lord to Israel, by the hand of His angel!" and in 2 Esdras i. 39, we find the words "Malachi, who is called also an angel of the Lord." In Malachi iii. 1 the name occurs in the words, "Behold, I send you *My Messenger*." He has been called "the Seal" because his book closes the canon of the Old Testament. It is almost certain that he wrote during the twelve years' absence of Nehemiah at the court of Artaxerxes, after his first visit to Jerusalem. During this period many evils rose to a head, the worst of which was that sad and fatal degeneracy of the priesthood which Malachi so strenuously denounces.

After the brief introduction on the love of God for Judah (i. 2-5) the book falls into three sections :

I. Denunciation of the sins of the priests (i. 6-ii. 9).

II. Denunciation of the sins of the people (ii. 10-iii. 15).

III. Prophecy of the Day of the Lord, and its forerunner.

1. *Sins of the Priests.* These sins consist chiefly in the ingratitude of the Priests for the love of God. This was shown by their offerings of polluted bread, and of blind, sick, and lame victims for sacrifice upon God's altar, such as even their earthly governor would refuse with indignation. They treated God's worship as a weariness and a thing to be despised, and unless they repented Malachi threatens them that God would send His curse upon them. He represents their crime as the more heinous because at this very time the heathen feared and honoured God's name and offered to Him incense and a pure offering—the acceptable sacrifices of prayer and love. What was needed by the priests was not only ceremonial exactitude, but, far more than this, moral faithfulness.

2. *The Sins of the People* (ii. 10 ; iii. 15.) The chief sin which the prophet denounces is the marriages with the heathen women ; but he adds, in an obscure passage, that, in consequence of the misdoings of the people, women came weeping and wailing to the altar of Jehovah, and covered it with their tears. He also severely denounces the frequency of divorce—a thing which, he says, God hates. (ii. 13-16.)

He next dwells on their insolent defiance, which God would certainly judge ; for he would be a "swift" witness against the sorcerers, adulterers, perjurers, oppressors, and insolent. (ii. 17-iii. 6). He proceeds to deal with further warnings, and tells them that their locust-eaten harvests and blighted vineyards are a punishment for their sins ; but that if they would return to their duty and repent of

their iniquities, God would open for them the windows of heaven, and all nations should call them happy. (iii. 7-12.)

He further rebukes them for their querulous distrust because God did not reward their outward humiliation and small Levitic scrupulosities (iii. 13-15), but he thankfully acknowledges that there is a pious remnant among them who should hereafter be as jewels in God's treasure house. (iii. 16-18.)

3. *The Day of the Lord.* He concludes with admonition and blessing, speaking of the Day of the Lord in which the wicked should be consumed, but the holy should shine under the healing wings of the Sun of Righteousness. Before the great and dreadful Day of the Lord He would send them Elijah the Prophet. This promise, as our Lord explained, was fulfilled in the mission of John the forerunner of the promised Messiah.

It is regarded as ominous that the last word of the last prophet of the Old Testament is "curse." The word (cherem) should however be rendered rather "ban" than "curse," and this ban has certainly fallen upon Palestine for ages. The Jews, however, to avert the evil omen, always read after the last verse of Malachi the verse which immediately precedes it.

They adopt a similar method to mitigate the stern conclusions of the books of Isaiah, Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes.

F. W. FARRAR.

FIDES VICTRIX.

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is begotten of God; And whosoever loveth Him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of Him.

In this we perceive that we love the children of God,

When we love God and do His commandments;

For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments;

And His commandments are not grievous!

For whatsoever is begotten of God, overcometh the world:

And this is the victory that hath overcome the world,—even our faith:

Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

1 JOHN v. 1-5.

READING his Gospel and Epistles, we feel that it is such an one as John the aged to whom we are listening; we are all his "little children." He writes as a veteran leader in Christ's wars, standing now on the verge of the apostolic age. The sixty years of St. John's ministry have witnessed all that God has wrought by St. Peter and St. Paul for Jew and Gentile; they have been illuminated by the judgement fires of Jerusalem's overthrow, and the martyr fires of Nero's persecution. The Christian faith has encountered, under one shape or other, most of the world-powers hostile to it. By this time the Church is firmly planted in the cities of the Mediterranean shores; and Christ's fishers have spread their nets and are plying their craft along all the currents of life and thought that flow through the Roman Empire. Looking back on his own battles and his Christian course so nearly finished, remembering the triumph of the Captain of salvation which has been repeated by His followers in life and death upon so many fields, and looking forward with the eye of prophecy to the advent of the new heaven and earth, the old Apostle is able to say, in no premature or presumptuous assurance, "This is the victory which hath overcome the world, even our faith!"

It was a dismal world that St. John surveyed—the world

which had Domitian for its Emperor, Juvenal for its poet, and Tacitus for its historian—where men in all directions lay crushed beneath the moral evils and tyrannies of the age. He alone and his Christian comrades upon that wide arena stand erect and free; in the Christian camp alone are found confidence and moral courage and resourcefulness: “Who is he that overcometh the world,” the Apostle cries, “save he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?” *Victory* is the word in which, at this threatening hour, the last of the Apostles sums up his experience (*ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα*) and the issue of the first grand campaign of Christ’s kingdom, in the course of which its whole history was in principle rehearsed. He sees “the darkness passing away, and the true light already shining.” So Jesus had been bold to say, with Gethsemane and Calvary awaiting Him, *θαρσέετε· ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον.*

We ourselves have seen the end of the nineteenth century, and still the fight goes on,—a weary warfare. As one crisis after another passes, the war of the ages opens into larger proportions; it sweeps over a wider area and draws more and more completely into its compass the forces of humanity,—this vast elemental conflict between the sin of man and the grace of God in Christ. The end is not yet. The powers of evil recover from defeat; one and another of the heads of “the wild beast” is “smitten unto death,” and “his death-stroke is healed, and the whole earth wonders after” him. The advance of Christ’s kingdom calls into the field at every stage new opposers; treasons and schisms, and collusions and compromises with the enemy, have caused innumerable repulses and indefinite delays in the subjugation of the world to the rule of Christ, which seemed imminent to the fervent hope of His early followers. Still their faith remains—our faith—after this long testing, the invincible rock and rallying centre of the spiritual forces, the fountain of hope and refreshment for mankind.

Everything else has changed ; empires, civilizations, social systems, religions and philosophies, have gone down into the gates of Hades ; but the Church of Jesus Christ survives and spreads, the imperishable institution of our race. Still the gospel shines out over the wreck-strewn shores, the one sure light-house for the labouring ship of human destiny. The Christian faith, as St. John proclaimed and held it, is the most vital, the most active and progressive and ameliorative factor of modern history. "Neither is there salvation in any other" ; up to this date, "no other name has been given under heaven amongst men, whereby we must be saved." Nothing since has touched human nature to the like saving effect ; nothing else at the present time takes hold of it so freshly and so powerfully for good as the doctrine which St. John calls "our faith."

The struggle in which John the Apostle was engaged as a foremost combatant, while it has swelled into world-wide dimensions, has assumed features outwardly far different from those of his times. But the identity of principle is conspicuous. And the conflict of faith in the twentieth century, in some main conditions, repeats the experience of the first century more closely than has been the case at any intervening epoch. Now as then the contest centres in the primary facts of the Gospel record and the nature and authority of Jesus Christ as thereby authenticated, other issues being brushed aside. Once more we "have the same conflict which" we "saw to be in" St. Paul and St. John. Present-day discussions are going to the root of things in Christianity ; and Christians may rejoice in the fact, since a conflict so radical should be the more decisive. The apostolic testimony to Jesus Christ the Son of God, and the living work of His Spirit amongst men : these two demonstrations, just as at the beginning, supply the ground on which faith and unbelief are waging battle. Here lie the burning questions of the hour ; other debates,

momentous as they have been and still may be—concerning the authority of Church or Bible, the validity of Orders and Sacraments, or the doctrines of Election and Free Will—fall into abeyance in comparison of these. *Who was Jesus Christ? Does He now live and work in the world, since His death at Calvary; and if so, how?* This is what men are wanting to know; and who can tell us better, with more intimate knowledge and transparent sincerity, than His servant John?

Let us endeavour to get behind the Apostle's words in this passage, asking from them two things: First, what was the specific object of the world-conquering faith, as St. John held it and witnessed its early triumphs? and in the second place, what were its characteristic marks and the methods of its working?

I. The answer to our first inquiry lies close at hand. "Every one who believes *that Jesus is the Christ*, is begotten of God; . . . and whatever is begotten of God overcomes the world. Again, "Who is it that overcomes the world, but he that believes *that Jesus is the Son of God?*" A little further down (*vv.* 9, 10) we read: "This is the witness of God, viz. that He has borne witness *about His Son*. . . . He that does not believe God, has made Him a liar, in that he has not believed in the witness that God has borne *about His Son*." Further back, in chapter iv. 14, 15: "We have beheld and do bear witness, that *the Father has sent the Son* as Saviour of the world. Whoso confesses *that Jesus is the Son of God*, God dwells in him and he in God." The assertion of the Divine Sonship of Jesus was the Apostle John's battle-cry—no stereotyped, smooth-rubbed article of a long accepted creed, but the utterance of a passionate personal conviction, the condensed record of a life-experience of the most profound and vivid nature, shared by the writer with numerous companions, and as fruitful in its beneficial effect on others as it had been commanding and realistic to the consciousness of the first recipients. That

“ Jesus is the Son of God,” that “ the blood of Jesus, God’s Son, cleanses from all sin,”—these facts were the life of life to the fellowship which the Apostle John had gathered round him; in these two truths lay the very nerve of the faith which the testimony of the apostolic Church has propagated and sustained in the world until now.

The Apostle, in making these emphatic and repeated statements about the person of his Master, is *denying* as well as affirming. By the time that he wrote this letter, it is likely that most intelligent and candid men who had acquainted themselves with the facts, were persuaded that Jesus Christ was in some sense a Saviour and Divine. But then differences began. To people of philosophical training and ways of thinking, the Godhead appeared so utterly remote from material nature that to accept Jesus of Nazareth as being, in any proper sense, “ the Son of God ” was for them difficult in the extreme. To think of a Divine Person having been actually born of a woman and subject to the mean and offensive conditions of physical existence—it was monstrous, disgusting! The idea revolted their sensibilities; it was an outrage upon reason, to be classed with the Pagan myths of the birth of Athena or Dionysos. For the visible facts of the history of Jesus Christ His apostles were competent witnesses, and should be listened to respectfully; but the interpretation was a different matter, and required a philosophy quite beyond these fishermen of Galilee. Faith must be wedded to reason, the revelation of Christ adapted to the mind of the age. With this purpose of rationalizing Christianity on a Hellenistic theosophic basis, and of reconciling the incompatible attributes of Deity and manhood in the Redeemer, the Docetists—the “ men of seeming ”—broached their theory, probably before the close of the first century. This hypothesis explained His human and earthly career as being purely phenomenal, an illusion of the senses, an edifying spectacle and parable, a piece of Divine play-

acting, behind which there lay a spiritual reality of an order wholly different from the ostensible and carnal; to this deeper content of the Gospel, hidden from a vulgar "faith," only those in the secret, the men of advanced "knowledge" (cp. 2 John 9), held the clue. The writer traverses the Docetic doctrine specifically in chapter iv. 2 ff., "In this perceive ye the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesses *Jesus Christ come in flesh*, is of God; and every spirit which confesses not Jesus, is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist" (cp. 2 John 7; John i. 14, etc.; also 1 Cor. xii. 3).

To a humanistic and positive age like the present, the offence of the Person of Jesus Christ lies on quite the other side. Our aversion is the transcendental. We are sure that Jesus Christ is man; but how can He be at the same time the very God? The problem of our Docetism is to explain His seeming Deity. It has become the fashion to say that Jesus Christ "*has the value of God for us*"—a subtle phrase capable of more meanings than one, but which serves on the lips of not a few to eliminate from the God-man all true Godhead. Let us once suspect that Jesus Christ is God simply in human estimate, and we have ceased to esteem Him so. If the face-value of our Lord's Name has no solid ascertainable capital behind it, the Christian currency is indefinitely depreciated; all the contents of our faith are depleted; the entire stock becomes a more or less nominal asset.

Other Gnostic theorists of St. John's later days would have it that Jesus Christ consisted of two persons: there was "Jesus," Mary's son, a man like ourselves, only more pure and godlike; and there was besides "the Christ" or "Son of God," who descended on Jesus as the Holy Spirit at His baptism, wrought in His miracles and teaching, and finally left Jesus to die on the cross alone at the moment when He cried, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" The

notion of a double personality in the Lord Jesus Christ, worked out with numberless variations in detail, was a general tenet of early Christian Gnosticism. The Apostle gives to all these evasions a point-blank contradiction: "Jesus *is* the Christ.—Jesus *is* the Son of God.—God loved us, and sent His Son as a propitiation for our sins.—The blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanseth us from every sin." As much as to say, "Jesus Christ is not two persons but *One*—the God-man, the sinless Sin-bearer! We have a real incarnation, a real atonement; and not a system of phantasms and dissolving views, of make-believes and value-judgments."

By delivering this witness—"the testimony of God," the Apostle calls it, "concerning His Son"—St. John has preserved Christianity from dissolution in the mist of Gnostic speculation. He has kept for us the faith which saves men universally and subdues the world,—"to wit," as St. Paul put it, "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." Our human nature is a paltry thing enough in many of its aspects; but when one sees how it requires, and how all over the world it responds to, the revelation of God in Christ, it becomes a grand and terrible thing indeed. Nothing less, it seems, than God Himself, made man, will suffice to fill and satisfy, and thoroughly to save, the soul of a man. No cheaper blood than that of "Jesus, God's Son," has served to wash out the turpitude of man's offence and to cleanse his conscience from dead works for service to the living God. These assertions of the New Testament anticipated the experience of nineteen Christian centuries. To say that the old controversies about the nature of Christ, or the modern discussions in which they are revived, are metaphysical subtleties, of no importance for practical life, is to say a thing about as mistaken and superficial as could be put into words. By so much as any one has subtracted from the human reality of the character and life of Jesus Christ on the one hand, or from His Divine glory and authority upon

the other, by so much he has diminished the effectiveness of the gospel, its power to awe and win the general spirit of mankind and to save the people from their sins.

If Jesus Christ be in point of fact what His Apostles said, if the infinite God has in Him come down to our nature and lodged Himself there for its salvation, then the grace of God and the nearness of God to men are brought home to us with overwhelming force. Let me fairly believe and grasp for myself the fact that "God so loved the world," that the man who lived the life of Jesus and died for human sin upon the cross, is one with the Almighty Father and His only-begotten Son, the effect on my nature is instantaneous and immense: all life and the world are changed to me from that hour. This faith becomes, in those who truly have it, a spring of new and pure life such as rises from no other soil, a fountain of hope and ardour and moral energy which nothing can overpower, for its source is the bosom of the Father. To have such inward life is surely, in St. John's sense, to be "begotten of God," to become the child of God through faith in His Son's name.

II. The second question, as to the distinctive marks of the conquering faith and the proper methods of its working, is not answered here so categorically as the first; but its answer is implicitly contained in these verses and occupies great part of the Epistle. The answer turns on the two main points of *feeling* and *doing*, of temper and conduct. The conquering faith if really such—if it is to meet human nature and needs, and to take effectual hold of the individual man and of society—must teach us first how to love, and then how to behave. Now faith in the Son of God incarnate does these two things, like no other principle. It inculcates *love and discipline*; it kindles a holy fire in the heart, it puts a strong yoke about the neck. The Christian faith, where it is truly and rightly held, teaches men *to work by love* and *to walk by rule*.

1. For the former of these two marks chapter iv. 19 speaks: "We love, because He first loved us." Love is the primary fruit and palmary evidence of the Spirit of Christ (Gal. v. 22). "Herein," says our Apostle, "have we come to know love, in that He (Jesus the Son of God) for us laid down His life" (iii. 16): it was as if the world had never known love before. Alike in quality and quantity, love has wonderfully grown amongst mankind since the Christian era, reinforced, like some feeble stream dwindling in the sands, by a new and vast reservoir gathered high in the mountains of God. In its noblest, tenderest, and most fruitful manifestations, the love that prevails in the world must be traced, directly or indirectly, to the coming of the Son of God.

That God Himself should have the love of our whole being, was "the first and great commandment" of Jesus; His Gospel secures the keeping of this law. Let any man once believe that God was in Christ, let him behold, as Saul of Tarsus did on the way to Damascus, the glory of God in His face, an immense love is awakened in his heart toward the Great Being who has thus stooped to his salvation. He begins from this time to serve God as a trustful child obeys the father, as a son amongst the many brethren of whom Christ is the Firstborn. That faith in Jesus as the Son of God generates this unique devotion to the Father who sent Him, the Apostle assumes as a matter of course and of everyday experience amongst his "little children."

But the further consequence, touching the second law of Jesus, St. John does insist upon and return to again and again (ii. 6-11, iii. 10-24, iv. 7-21). For it was here that the chief difficulty was found in the working of the new faith, as our Lord predicted,—e.g. in Matthew xxiv. 10-12. Just upon this point the victory within the Christian heart, and within the Church, was then stubbornly disputed; and for the same reason the conquering faith has

suffered so many rebuffs and long delays in its march through the world. The love to God to which the Gospel gives birth, was to break out in all directions in love to men, thus bearing its manifold remedial fruit ; from this spring were destined to flow forth the streams of mercy and beneficence that should renovate human society and turn the earth into a garden of the Lord.

Now the Incarnation is the basis of the human affections awakened by Christianity. Love to God and to man are, in St. John's view, identical passions, the same love toward kindred natures—kindred, however distant, since they are one in the person of the Son of God, and since men are made sons of God through Him. “ Whosoever loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of Him.” It is the nature of God Himself that one loves in His children ; and if you do not love that nature *here*, you do not love it *there*. The pious man who is not brotherly is a monster, a gross self-contradiction. St. John is very short with people of this class : “ If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar ! ” Either he is a hypocrite, wilfully deceiving others ; or else he still more completely deceives himself. “ He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen ” : there is something of God in every good man, and if you do not see and love that something, then the eyes of love are wanting ; you dislike the visible sample, then it is idle to say that you approve the invisible bulk. It is not in reality the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that the selfish and suspicious Christian professor loves, but a theological figment of his own brain. According to the doctrine of this Epistle, one cannot love God truly without embracing in the same love men who are His image.

On the same principle of the solidarity of God with men in Jesus Christ, one cannot love men rightly without loving God who is their original. If love to men proves the truth

of our love to God, love to God proves the worth of our love to men. Love to God is impossible without love to man; love to man is possible indeed, but imperfect and and unsure without love to God. While the human affection reveals the existence and employs the energy of the Divine, the Divine affection guards the purity and sustains the constancy of the human. There are those indeed who love their fellowmen without any manifest regard to God—amiable, generous, philanthropic men who are not religious. But if the Apostle John was right, there is a grave anomaly, there is some great mistake or misunderstanding, in such instances as these. Some men have more religion than they will admit, or are fairly aware of, as others certainly have very much less. “Herein,” St. John writes, “we know that we love the children of God, *when we love God and do His commandments.*”

We must, to be sure, take the word “love” in its Christian sense. We have nothing to do here with the love that is animal passion; nor with the love that is corporate selfishness—the devotion of a man to his family, his friends, his clan, which is consistent with cruelty and injustice towards those outside of the narrow circle and has no humanity. There is again much sincere and humane affection which looks to the physical wellbeing of its subjects without a thought for the true ends and inner wealth of human life. The higher love includes this lower, which touches bodily need and natural welfare (*τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου*, chap. iii. 17; cp. Jas. ii. 15–17); but the lower is often found without the higher—a philanthropy that sees in the man only the more sensitive and necessitous animal, and knows nothing of his hunger for the bread which came down from heaven. That love alone is worthy of a human being which embraces his whole nature, reaching through the flesh the depths of his spirit as the compassions of Jesus did; the charity which supplies the body’s needs, must be instinct with the sense of that which

lies behind them in the sufferer's soul, or it degrades instead of blessing. When we love in our offspring not our own so much as God's children, we love them wisely and well. When it is not their wealth nor their wit, nor the charms of person and manner, for which we prize our friends and cleave to them, but *character*—purity, courage, truth of heart, reverence, goodness, the God-given and God-born in man or woman—that our affection seizes and that we treasure as one that findeth great spoil, then we love in deed and in truth, and we know what this great word means. All deep human love strikes down somewhere into the Divine, though it may strike darkly and with a dim feeling after Him who is not far from any one of us. "Every good gift and perfect boon cometh down" from the Father; this is the best of all His gifts, and, coming from Him, it leads to Him. If that leading be resisted, both God is missed and love is lost. It is a daring saying of our Apostle, but we may trust it if we esteem love worthily: "Love is of God; and every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God . . . He that abideth in love abideth in God, and God in him" (iv. 7, 16).

Now, in truth, we have found "the victory which hath overcome the world." Love is ever conqueror. There is no refuge for the heart, no fortress in temptation but this. There is nothing which so lifts a man above the sordid and base, which so arms him for the battle of life, as a pure and noble passion of the heart. Where kindled and fed from above, it burns through life a steady fire, consuming lust and vanity and all the evil self in us, changing earth's dross into heaven's pure gold. Of all such love working through the world's mighty frame, the love of God the Father, who created and redeemed mankind in His eternal Son, is the heart and central pulse; and the Christian faith supplies the main channel by which it is conveyed to mankind.

2. To the first characteristic of "our faith," in its operative

force, we must add a second—the *discipline* of the Lord Christ, into which His love translates itself: “For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments.”

In Jesus the Son of God mankind has found its Master. We have in Him a King to obey, a law to fulfil, a pattern to follow, a work to do, a Church, which is His body, to serve in patient affection and self-effacement. Discipleship spells discipline; Antinomianism is the most shocking and deadly of heresies. Free Churches in which the adjective of their proud title overshadows the substantive, where combativeness and self-assertion have free play and men will not “submit themselves one to another in fear of Christ,” are doomed to sterility and disintegration. Without rules and bounds, love spends itself in emotional effusion and exhales in vapid sentiment. Let the stream be banked and channeled, along the natural lines of its course, and it turns a thousand busy wheels, and spreads health and fruitfulness and beauty over the plain which, unbridled and unguided, it converts into a stagnant marsh. There is nothing which sustains and deepens true feeling like wise restraint, and the harness of well-ordered labour. What becomes of the love of man and woman without the Seventh Commandment? of the endearments of home without toil for daily bread, without household laws and the constraints of mutual duty? Where those once touched with the love of God and the fire of the new life are not taught, or refuse to learn, the right ways of the Lord, where they will not endure “for the Lord’s sake ordinances of men” and the “hardness” that makes Christians good soldiers, their religious zeal proves evanescent or turns to a wild and hurtful fanaticism. Wholesome, honest love means always *commandment-keeping*.

“The world” on which the commandments of Love’s law directly bear, is the sphere of each man’s personal lot, the little, homely, circumstantial world of his daily calling.

There "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vain-glory of life—all that is in the world" (ii. 16)—wait in continual siege. In that small arena, watched closely by the eyes of God, and perhaps of two or three besides, the unceasing conflict is pursued with appetite and pride and passion, with mean circumstances and petty provocations and saddening disappointments, with languor and indecision, with restlessness and discontent. On this secret battlefield, character is, stroke by stroke, beaten into shape, through the hourly choice and acting out of good or ill amid the countless forgotten details of home relationship and business avocation. There the crown of life is lost or won. Of this near and more intimate *κόσμος* St. John was thinking, rather than of the great world of history and of empires, when he assured his readers of victory; for it was in their personal habits, in the family system and social environment of the times, that the field of their hardest conflicts lay.

Any achievements gained, whether by the individual Christian or the Church collectively, in the greater world outside depend upon success here in the first place, on the trained fidelity of Christ's servants in their private walk of life. Practised in that gymnasium—in the household, in the school, in the punctual and honourable discharge of daily business—Christian men will know how to behave themselves in the Church of God, how to "walk in rank" (*στοιχῶμεν*) as men "led by the Spirit" and "living by the Spirit" (Gal. v. 18, 25), keeping step and time with their fellows; that love of order, that instinct for unity of feeling and action will possess them, which our Lord prayed for in His disciples when he asked "that they all may be one, as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee" (John xvii. 21).

But where professedly religious men are undisciplined and self-indulgent in their private habits, loose and careless in talk amongst men of the world, unscrupulous in business, irregu-

lar in worship both at home and Church, ready to turn their shoulder from the heavier burdens of Christ's service, no one can wonder that discords break up Christian communion, or that "our Gospel is hid" and "our faith" in many quarters is rebuffed and flouted by the world, when it is so cruelly wounded in the house of its friends. If defects of love are a chief occasion of stumbling and cause of delay in the Church's advance to conquest, defects of discipline hold a like bad eminence. In these things, we may be sure, our hindrances lie far more than in any intellectual difficulties or sceptical prepossessions of the time. It is our Lord's first and last complaint, "Why call ye Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?"

To the Apostle John's experience, love and discipline were one. Love, in practice, is keeping the commandments—"the old commandment" perfected in "the new" (chap. ii. 6-8); obedience, in spirit, is simply love. "But the law of Christ," some one says, "is severe and strict; it requires a righteousness exceeding that of Scribes and Pharisees." Certainly it does.—"I must be always giving and forgiving, always bearing and forbearing." Of course you must; who could think of following Jesus Christ in any other way?—This reluctance means simply a cold heart towards Christ. Do our soldiers think it a monstrous thing that they must bear rigid discipline and bitter hardship, that they must shed their blood for King and country? The cruel thing would be to prevent them doing it. Or does the mother count it hard to suffer and to stint herself for the babe at her breast? if mothers once began to reason thus, the race would perish. "*His* commandments are not grievous," says the heart which knows the love that God hath toward us, "because they are His—because I love Him and His lightest word is law to me."

After all, the God-man is the Master of men; His "spirit of power and love and discipline" is bound to prevail with

those who bear His name. However long a task it may prove, as men count time, the Lord Jesus will yet have His yoke fitted to the world's neck ; and the Father's will shall be done on earth as in heaven. He must reign.

GEO. G. FINDLAY.

THE ADORATION OF JESUS.

THE apocalypse of John appears to have been written in the heart of a wild storm which smote upon certain circles of the early Church towards the close of the first century. The book came to some Christians belonging to the diocese or circuit of the prophet John in Asia Minor, who were almost being carried off their feet by an imperial policy of persecution directed against the very centre of their faith, an attempt to substitute Cæsar for God as the supreme object of human worship. The Apocalypse was meant, and has proved of service ever since in the experience of the Church, for the tempted and the wavering. Stripped of accidental details, its message is direct and plain. It is a scripture addressed to all who find inducements in their circumstances to prove disloyal to Jesus or to admit misgivings, uncertainty, and languor into their consciousness of God, especially by failing to realize how completely their relation to Him is bound up with the work of Jesus. To keep such people straight and confident amid the cross-currents of opinion and social usage or the more private vexations of life, this scripture is composed ; it aims at putting an edge upon man's sense of need and at displaying the wealth and wonder of God's provision.

That is one reason why it opens with a vision of Jesus. For what people need above all in so trying a position is to have their hearts and imaginations flooded with a warm sense of God's character and purpose. Faithfulness depends on faith, and faith is rallied by the grasp not of itself but of

its object. The first aids to wounded or fainting faith are found, outside the ground of introspection, in the exulting consciousness that there is a God behind and over all, that this God is our God, and that He is completely and uniquely intelligible in Jesus. Those who require to have their trust kept alive do not want acute analysis of their own fears and hopes. Their experience and ideas promise little or no permanent satisfaction. The way to lift them out of depression into the manliness and confidence of faith is to win them from the absorbing contemplation of themselves to reflect on the greatness of their God; and what more persuasive and ample revelation of God's providence can be found than that offered historically and personally in Jesus, as men realize his spirit and recollect his life? The truth breaks in waves of joy upon the soul, and we can feel the prophet's heart vibrating under its intuition in his opening doxology, one instance of that "*carmen Christo quasi deo dicere*" with which Pliny found the Asiatic Christians sustaining themselves in a tenacious loyalty—which seemed to him little better than sheer obstinacy and perversity. The vibration passes into these words:

To him who loves us and loosed us from our sins by his own blood—yea and he made us kings and priests unto his God and Father—to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

To him . . . be the glory! John knows perfectly well that he can induce his friends to forget their own anxieties and weaknesses only by prompting them to look up with glowing recollection to the character of Jesus; not unless they rank him higher than all else, can they feel the rock under their feet, and live consistent and elate. For undeniably apprehensions, which mean instability, begin to fade as the conscience lays stress on the eternal background of human faith in the person and achievements of Christ, and before the prophet John has anything to say about his friends' trial, he has

much to say about their Lord. He does this in order to break up any possible complacency and make them radically sensible of their true needs. It is a healthy discipline. Dr. Chalmers confesses in his journal that he spent a whole year in youth pondering little except the sublime conception of God's energy and power, which stood out before his mind with such vividness that scarcely an hour passed when he did not breathe "a sort of mental elysium. And the one idea which ministered to my soul all its rapture was the magnificence of the Godhead, and the universal subordination of all things to the one great purpose for which He evolved and was supporting creation." This capacity of taking a wide and religious survey of the world rescues faith from many of the dangers attendant upon local vexations and absorption in the details of ordinary life; and, were it for nothing else, it would be salutary on that account. In some degree the attitude is absolutely essential to a healthy faith. Adoration means inspiration; it rallies and supports the soul. To be rescued from the weakness which attends mistiness and pettiness of outlook, as well as from stolidity, piety must be fed not so much with great thoughts of God as with thoughts of God's greatness, especially of the scope and depth implied in Jesus and his salvation. Sane and spontaneous devotion of this kind has always a value of its own in religion. For as Jesus is the proof and assurance that God is uppermost in the world, and that the last word will be His, obviously the true and wise order of life is to keep him uppermost in our estimates and opinions, since any dulness upon this point reacts disastrously upon the springs of conduct. No surer index of religion is to be discovered than the relative value men assign instinctively to the various objects of their moral confidence. And as the supreme test is not what we admit into the circle of admiration, but what we set up on the throne; not what is thought good but what is thought best—so the moment of moments

in religion is when a man passes from the confession "Jesus is admirable" to the cry "Jesus is indispensable." Amid uneasiness and strain, whatever be the difficulties that claim a man's sympathy or tax his endurance, they are best met and understood as he learns to approach them along this line of a profound conviction of God's providence and presence in Jesus. *To him . . . be the glory!* Such is the standpoint accessible and essential to the Christian soul at any rate; and the least modification or relaxation of the supreme value possessed by Jesus for the drifting soul of man spells moral weakness in the end. No combination of threatening circumstances is really so formidable to faith as the temper which has come to disparage its need of Jesus for the knowledge or service of God. The primary requirement is to know not the number of the Beast but the central place of the Lord.

But men need more than the conviction of an over-arching and eternal providence of God in Jesus to secure them against panic or lethargy of conscience. It is everything to them to feel sure of the real character that lies behind this massive power, and Christianity meets the need by ascribing sovereignty to a God of love. Men are in the hands not merely of One who is more than equal to all visible authorities but of *him who loves us*. The R.V. of this verse rightly changes the A.V. *Who loved us* is true, but it is not all the truth. *Who loves us* is a phrase covering the timeless grace of God in Jesus, which underlies the Christian experience, and is expressed, not exhausted, in Jesus' death. The dominion of Jesus rests upon his power of love. He is Lord of human life simply because—in the deepest sense—he bears an eternal love to it. *He that hath the bride is the bridegroom*. He has won the heart of men, not by overwhelming displays of magnificence and authority, but by a revelation of his own heart in its warmth and purity, showing mankind that in their life with him they

can reckon upon ungrudging patience and succour, perfect understanding of their needs, and eternal pity for their sorrows. However they fare, he associates himself with them and makes their interests his own. The constant sense of this, which grows upon a man with his experience, is the emotion of the religious life. It is also the one safe attitude in view of a situation where persecution is imminent. Repeatedly throughout the Apocalypse of John the movement of thought swings back to this centre of gravity in the Christian faith, the profound and overmastering sense of indebtedness to Jesus for his interpretation and protection of man's life in this confusing world. In Jesus the prophet John finds, and would have others for their health and peace find also, the current of an undeserved love pouring upon man from first to last, counting no sacrifice too costly and deeming no object too mean or poor. This is thrown into the foreground of the book for obvious reasons, which are intensely practical. As the second and third chapters show, the world in the church is more serious to John than even the church in the world. The consciousness of all that is put at man's disposal by that Love, the revelation of the value attached by God to the individual soul and of His incredible care and pains to secure its welfare, these—together with the sense of piercing gratitude—must at all costs be revived, for they are among the strongest forces astir in human experience that make for loyalty and nerve the conscience against compromise and dismay. Where they are keen, the fire of patience and of courage will not easily die down, since the controlling sense of Christ's love to men inevitably nerves them, as any great passion or pure trust must do, to be somewhat worthy of itself. Hence the appositeness of this allusion, almost the only one made by John in this apocalypse, to the love of Jesus as a motive for man's adoration of his person. The practical inference is that disappointing and disappointed

alike can draw immediate comfort to themselves, and with comfort courage, as they turn from their past record or the hostility of their surroundings to the luminous gospel that in Jesus God loves them and loves them of His own accord. The situation, John feels, is far too serious to be met by any commonplace belief or cold acceptance of the truth, or by easy-going good nature on the part of Christian men. Such ways of thought and feeling coast the quicksands dangerously near.

But even love needs to be shown, if it is to be fully trusted and obeyed. It is powerful as it is visible and active ; and the adoration of Jesus which steadies men is born of their personal experience and of sane reflection upon the integral parts of that experience. The content of faithfulness includes thought as well as emotion. Men are kept loyal to Jesus, John explains in this doxology, as they lie under a hearty and intelligent, if simple, sense of what he has done for them and what he makes of them. Both are to be realized.

He has done for them a work of redemption, the supreme evidence of his love being that he has dealt with sin. He *loves us and loosed us from our sins by his own blood*. So John describes the redeeming act, speaking of the share of Jesus in more active terms than usual, yet making no attempt to explain or justify a statement which was a commonplace to most Christians in his day.¹ The object of the passage is purely practical and devotional. Simple and pregnant, it reflects a combination of accuracy and moral impressiveness which has not always marked later and elaborate attempts to philosophize upon the same subject. Men are recalled to their consciousness of freedom and reconciliation with God, in contrast to the fettered

¹ Some frank and reverent reflections on this redeeming effect of Jesus' death are offered by Dr. Paul Rohrbach in his recent volume of travels, *Im Lande Jahrehs und Jesu* (1901) ; Gulgatha, pp. 418-427.

hampered intercourse which was their all until Jesus became to them God's deep assurance of forgiveness and strength. They are invited to remember the great change, and to remember that they do not owe it to anything less than the sheer grace and goodwill of Jesus. Nothing can well be more explicit or obvious to the conscience. And this emphasis upon the fact, not upon the "why" or the "how" of forgiveness, is primarily meant for all who are prone, while they dwell upon temptation, to undervalue the love of God as something too ethereal to meet and master the coarse, uniform pressure of evil upon the soul. The death of Jesus shows God's love both active and victorious, capable of entering into the worst details of life and triumphing over its supreme enemies. Jesus, in a word, came to be a Saviour and he did his work. For that sympathy and effectiveness men adore him; and adoring him they are delivered from the power of many base dominions. For after that great deliverance and all that it implies upon the part of Christ, who can reasonably doubt his will to claim and succour human life, much less his sincerity and ability? Persuade men to get a sight and sense of Jesus their Redeemer, and you have begun to render them less capable of yielding to any of those temptations which depend for their effectiveness upon their power of getting a secondary place assigned to Jesus in the scale of moral value. The simplicity with which John produces this impression is a proof, if proof be needed still, that the adoration of Christ is quite independent of that "swollen habit" of speech upon the subject which Channing once resented as unintelligent and unmoral. Here ecstasy leads to moral activity, and praise does not slope away into barren verbiage or dithyrambic ornament.

This love of Jesus prompts to further loyalty and gratitude, however, because it evidently makes something of men's character in the present. *To him who loves us and loosed*

us from our sins, and—for still more has to be done—he made us kings and priests unto his God and Father, a Jewish method of picturing the growth and greatness of man towards God. Moral dignity and inner devoutness, royalty and reverence, nobility of bearing and intercourse with God, these are two permanent effects of grace in life, against which the trials of life, as these Asiatic Christians no doubt were finding, are at serious feud. Trouble and hardship are apt to break down the erect and serene spirit of faith, and at the same time to suggest that God is distant and somewhat aloof. Hence the double note struck here. There is a somewhat analogous experience in the 51st Psalm, where the writer first prays for pardon and then asks, in almost the same breath, for an erect undaunted spirit: *Create in me a clean heart, O God—and renew a right (or, stedfast) spirit within me; uphold me with a free (princely) spirit.* To be a king and a priest, in some such sense, is the prophet John's ideal of the Christian career; in the present passage, quoting these Old Testament names, he leaves βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς (see v. 10) as a literal and harsh rendering of the Hebrew phrase, probably to bring out the idea of reigning by itself. Even we, harried and despised and insignificant, in a corner of this huge pagan empire, possess a royal standing of our own. We are not units, but a community with a history and a hope. Our connexion with Jesus opens up a commanding position, and we too have our "Imperial" day.¹ With military instinct, like a general rallying his troops on the eve of an engagement, John strikes this ringing note of authority as an element of

¹ This seems to be the sense in which *the Lord's day* is used in Apoc. i. 10. The first day of each month appears to have been called in Asia Minor the *Imperial day* (Σεβαστή, cf. Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, E. Tr., pp. 218, 219). In a book where Jesus is repeatedly the antithesis to the pagan emperor who attempted to usurp his divine position, there is evident appropriateness in a Christian calling the first day of the week by a title which implicitly suggested the imperial prestige and worship of the Christian Lord.

faith, to remind his readers that their relation to Jesus makes them masters of the world and destines them to be slaves of no passion, policy, or change. Faith, to succeed, must cease to be merely apologetic; it must be felt as a regal experience. To be saved by Jesus evidently is to be regarded as far more than a mere rescue. Is it not initiation into the higher life of a royal community, with privileges and rights to which men must live up? *Noblesse oblige*. Jesus is to be adored because he makes his people free men, gifting them with an independent career of their own for which they must answer to God alone. He puts men in a divine relation to God, which carries with it superiority to all lower standards and influences; and such a firm though modest consciousness of destiny binds a man by a most healthy tie of responsibility to right and conscience. Faith in Jesus, which leads to the faith of Jesus, should render a man bravely independent of all opinions save the highest, and incapable of bowing to any undivine or anti-divine authority. Amid a welter of competing jurisdictions, faith vibrates to the moral authority of Jesus as supreme because it is redemptive in a positive and ennobling sense.

So with the inner side of faith. *And he made us priests to his God and Father*. The right and desire of access is what John means; the sense of forgiveness brings men such a confidence in God's goodness that they turn to Him freely with all other needs, feeling He is no stranger to them. The Apocalypse shows no trace of the querulous study of providence and history which pervades the Jewish writings of the age. Hardship and hostility in the world were more than met, for the Christian temper, by wider access to the Father; and naturally Jesus was a pledge to men that God would never be cold or aloof. Their direct communion with the God and Father of Jesus rendered pessimism unreasonable and quieted excitement, as it destroyed the taste for compromise or surrender. This

right of prayer and intercourse with God is not absolutely confined to those who are conscious of the Christian revelation ; but what John declares is that in their experience of Jesus as a Redeemer men acquire so unwonted and satisfying a conviction of God's openness and welcome that they are thrilled to adoration. We who *through him do believe in God*, as an earlier writer had put it, possess a unique motive to enthusiasm in faith, which is at once the commonplace and the distinctive note of Christianity.

The two thoughts naturally correspond, for men pass unscathed and erect through the passions of existence just as they are in touch with the inner secrets of their God. They are *kings* because they are *priests*, to use John's technical phrase.¹ He is least likely to bend the knee to Rimmon who is inwardly subdued in adoration before the mercy of God to him in Jesus ; and the seductions of the world make most impression upon the conscience which is not allowing itself to be touched and taught by the eternal purpose and utter graciousness of Christ. Complacency, on all grounds, is at once a mark of mental inertness and of moral inefficiency. It is faith withering on its stalk, soon to be rudely cut up and flung out on the ground. Hence the doxology to Jesus at the opening of the Apocalypse is quite in place. Kindling at the thought of God, the writer passes into rapture over the divine value of Jesus to his people ; as the aim of the whole book is to quicken loyalty on all sides and sustain patience among the churches without exciting revolutionary hopes, it is but natural that emphasis should fall primarily upon the character of him who is at once the source and object of these virtues. A passionate enthusiasm for Jesus seemed to John the one antiseptic for that poisoned age. For adoration is meant to be the driving

¹ This seems upon the whole better than (with Weiss) to regard *ιερείς* as somehow qualifying the collective *βασιλείαν*: God wishing His people to serve Him, not as mere subjects but as priests.

power of the Christian life in its troubled course. Such thoughts of Jesus as John here exhibits, springing from the rapture and enthusiasm of faith, are set down for a purpose; and that purpose relates to the difficulties of practical religion, which in certain of their acuter forms cannot be overcome apart from a heightened temperature of devotion. As creatures and children of God, men require repeatedly to be made alive to their true position in the world, partly to lower the conceit of false independence, partly to revive constancy by the realization of what infinite resources lie behind them in the love and death of Jesus. Forgetfulness that we are creatures, as Faber shrewdly said, is the ruling spirit of this age; and this accounts for much of the wavering and uncertainty that play havoc with the religious health of those who imagine, or at least act as if they imagined, that they have only themselves to fall back upon in the great struggles of existence. The disease assumes two forms: it is either a smooth complacency or a feverish anxiety. Both are dangerous, and the one remedy is a return to man's proper position as created and redeemed by God through Jesus Christ. *To him, not to ourselves or anything created, be the glory.* To be sure of God, as a man may reverently and reasonably be through his faith in Jesus, becomes at once the spring of action and the source of heroism and of sacrifice; for by such a direction of heart one is enabled to see things in their true proportions, with God in Jesus over all. Practical errors are, more often than is suspected, the result of mistaken estimates. Religion, as the apocalypse of John repeatedly suggests, is not admitting Jesus into life; it is putting him over life. It is not serving him so much as serving him first and foremost. It is reserving for him the superlatives of wonder and gratitude. It is to live with a permanent undercurrent of indebtedness to him, breaking out as here into occasional freshets of praise. No man is able to run his course with

much patience or success if he is not *looking to Jesus*, the author and finisher of the faith, although the expression of that trust varies according to the individual temperament. It is the direction and devotion of the heart, above all, that sustains and urges forward life in the open ; so much, we may say, is a common element in all varieties of religious experience, and the dialect of dispassionate observation is on all counts unfit for the loyalists of God. Hence before mysterious explanations of the Roman power and its limitations, John sweeps his readers up into a timeless source of moral heroism, thus meeting by anticipation more than one of their current perils. The adoration of Jesus rather than the exploration of history is the means of securing peace and vigour in the Christian life. Up with your heart and mind to Christ, he cries! *To him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever.* The worst danger ahead is not persecution, but the languid unabashed spirit that fails to leap up in a Christian soul at the sight of Jesus and his grace.

It is the old lesson reiterated by Amiel in last century, that nothing resembles pride so much as discouragement. No inconsiderable number of ordinary apprehensions are often due to the collapse of some exaggerated opinion, which a man has been cherishing, of his own merits and abilities. Unconsciously people now and then lay overmuch emphasis upon their personal skill and strength as factors in maintaining the struggle. They secretly resent being deeply obliged to Christ. At any rate, to all intents and purposes, they act as if everything would fail were their hand taken from the task. Or, in the very desperation of conflict, they nervously take their eyes off the eternal Will, of which they form a part, and concentrate their attention too exclusively upon what they consider to be the best methods for keeping up their religious life or maintaining some cause in which they feel personally interested. It is an ill-balanced

attitude. In practice, if not in theory, Jesus becomes secondary and at times irrelevant. And when the inevitable reaction comes with its searching philosophy and disconcerting revelation of inadequacy, the sense of disappointment and despair is correspondingly severe, for any relaxation of man's hold upon the divine necessity of grace really courts embarrassment and allows weakness to creep insensibly into life. Those who overcome owe their success to *the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony*; and the order of ideas is significant. Such is the urgency of the conflict that the only chance for them is Christ and his redeeming sacrifice. That is primary. A decided stand must be taken for truth and conscience; but perseverance and confession are as nothing without the previous fact and act of Christ's redemption appropriated by the soul. The Apocalypse is full of this vital and timely message. It urges that, morally speaking, life is only safe when it has thrown its weight upon Jesus, and that man's efforts after consistency succeed only in the atmosphere of conscious obligation to the death and sacrifice of Jesus. All centres round God *and the Lamb*. This consciousness draws all else along with it, investing a man with confidence and stripping him of paltriness with its attendant slackness of effort. Adoration thus gathers up a man's energies. In dwelling with gladness upon what he owes to the redeeming and renovating love of Jesus, he is insensibly opening the doors to courage and to ardour; for a distinct motive to purity is gained by every one who takes the trouble to realize that he is pardoned and how he has been pardoned.

We feel we are nothing—for all is Thou and in Thee;
 We feel we are something—*that* also has come from Thee;
 We know we are nothing—but Thou wilt help us to be.
 Hallowed be Thy name—Hallelujah!

Such praise implies a disinterested sense of God and un-

common reverence. But it has the further merit of being a tonic; it purges a man from the weaknesses of sanguine over-confidence, faintheartedness, and presumptuous sloth, while it brings home to his mind in a vivid manner the resources at his disposal in God's character and purpose, as well as the obligations of his privilege. He who admits cheerfully this bond of dependence is able to take to himself the comfort of Christ's responsibility for the faithful, and to put aside with increasing decisiveness unnecessary fears. He does not serve Jesus on his own initiative. Loyalty to him is not an adventure or an exploit; it is the response to a mighty grace. Consequently he finds it is one great source of moral strength to realize that the Christian life is ultimately a calling which rests upon an eternal spiritual movement of God Himself in Jesus. *With his own blood he loosed us*, who also says *I am the First and the Last*. These two factors, the infinite sweep of redemption and its personal cost, converge upon the thoughtful conscience with an access of emotion, and the former is not to be obliterated behind the latter. Was it not Coleridge who admitted that one defect in his favourite philosopher Spinoza, was that he began with "it is" instead of with "I am"? Christian endurance demands the latter conviction. It is through Jesus that all this affection and energy of God plays upon his character, bearing it through confusion and lifting it above every chance of moral failure. *To him, therefore, be the glory and the dominion for ever*. In this personal relation to Jesus, or rather in the consciousness of it steadily maintained from day to day, lies all that makes a man Christian and keeps him Christian. *Brethren*, writes an unknown homilist of the second century, *we ought not to think meanly of Him who is our salvation; for when we think meanly of Him, our hopes of Him are also mean*. This is precisely the temper that pervades the Apocalypse with its apotheosis of Jesus, rendering it

strangely profitable despite the uncouth forms of expression that recur throughout its pages, and remind us that primitive Christianity is not equivalent entirely to permanent Christianity. The Apocalypse has a timeless element. It is not an argument that Jesus is morally superior to that arch-agent of Satan, the Roman emperor, nor is it an ingenious attempt to explain how the worship of Jesus is compatible with monotheism. Such dry light and cold blood are ineffective. What the book does is to appeal, in the spirit of Jesus himself, to people who know his unspeakable value to their own lives, and who are sincerely conscious that apart from him they would never have been quite sure of God's mercy or of His redeeming grace.¹ Standing on this common ground, John tells his readers plainly that any descent is perilous; in the service of Jesus "cold hearts are counted castaway," and steady adherence to his faith amid hostility and languor is impossible without a spirit of exulting confidence in His redeeming love. In short, the true temper for any religious struggle is that which passionately magnifies the claim of Jesus to man's reverence and trust. The witness and weight of experience vividly illustrate the thesis that it is but a step from inadequate conceptions of Jesus to conduct which is unworthy of his name, a step too frequently taken in the calms as in the crises of religion. Wisely then the place and the language of this doxology suggest what the whole tenor of the book corroborates, that faith—faith in Jesus—is the ultimate secret of faithfulness, and that to slacken the flow of gratitude and wonder towards Jesus, or to treat God's mercy shown in him as in any sense a commonplace or a right, is to dry up the roots of virtue in the soul. Communion with him spells consistency, and it is

¹ "Jesus himself felt he was a Mediator . . . In him the sense of mediation attained its highest level of stability, inwardness and reality" (Wernle: *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, p. 25).

from inward trust more than from anything else that a man's life for Christ gains the outward triumph of maintaining itself worn but unstooping to the end.

JAMES MOFFATT.

ON A RECENT EMENDATION IN THE TEXT OF
ST. PETER.

IN the EXPOSITOR for last year I ventured the suggestion that the obscurity in one of the most perplexing statements in the New Testament, that passage which affirms of Christ a mission (either evangelic or the opposite) to the fallen angels, was due to a very simple cause, viz., the omission of the name of Enoch after a group of similar letters. And it was suggested that the first step towards clearing the Petrine argument was the restoration of the name and the subsequent study of the passage in the light of certain descriptions which are found in the book of Enoch. Since writing the article in question, it has come to my knowledge that I had just anticipated, in the emendation referred to, a much better scholar than myself, and also that both of us had been anticipated, some years since, by a celebrated Dutch theologian. This is in the highest degree interesting. For though, at the first sight, the successful emendation of an obscure passage is like the famous pool of Bethesda, where the first man that troubles the pool monopolizes the virtues, and all who follow him obtain nothing for their patience and their pains, it must be remembered that the medicinal act is not always so clear, in the critical world, as to convince mankind of the miracle. And we must not be surprised if the angel that is set over Conjectural Emendations (to imitate a phrase from Hermas) should find it to his credit to trouble the water two or three times for the same disease.

One wonders what would have happened at the famous pool if two persons had jumped in at precisely the same psychological instant! Would they both have been healed? Or if a difficult passage should be doctored simultaneously and independently by a couple of experts with the very same result, ought we to believe them?

It may, perhaps, be accepted as a canon that when there is more than one hand occupied in producing an adroit emendation of a passage, the value of the emendation is greatly increased. And for this reason we were glad to find from Dr. M. R. James that the very same reading had occurred to himself which we had published last year.

But then the emendation really hails from Holland. It was made by Cramer in 1891, and will be found in his *Nieuwe bijdragen op het gebied van godgeleerdheid en wijsbegeerte*. That makes three justices' hands to it, as Autolyceus would say. The emending hands may at least be held to correct one another for personal equation. We were not, all of us, suffering from Enoch on the brain.

Cramer's emendation, for such we may now call it, was attacked by Baljon in a series of papers on Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament, which he wrote in *Theol. Studien* for 1890. And certainly in the form in which Cramer presented the matter it was far from convincing. Cramer was anxious to get rid of the passage altogether as an interpolation which had arisen in the following manner: An early scribe, commenting upon 1 Peter iii. 24, where the angels and authorities and powers are said to have become subject to the ascended Christ, writes upon his margin the remark, which was due to a comparative study of 2 Peter and Enoch, that "Enoch went and preached to the spirits in prison," and this comment

'Ενώχ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν
becomes corrupted into

ἐν ᾧ καὶ κτέ

and absorbed into the text, where it was misunderstood of a visit of Christ to the angels and of a preaching of doom.

It will be seen that this is not nearly simple enough as a history of textual corruption, and it ignores the Petrinism of *ἐν ᾧ* for the opening of a sentence. Moreover, Cramer did not know, as we now do, that Enoch had been actively used in the first chapter, or he would not have been so hasty to eject the passage, nor so subtle as to imagine a commentator upon 1 Peter who had been misled by a study of 2 Peter and Jude into a remote reference to the book of Enoch. No doubt this method is incorrect, but the emendation itself may be correct where the reconstruction is faulty.

Baljon appears to me to hold a brief against emendations of the text of the New Testament, but it must be allowed that in this case Cramer had not presented the matter attractively, so that there was some excuse for a negative verdict on the part of Baljon.

I came across the reference to Cramer (to whose work I have not yet had direct access) in Dr. Carl Clemen's essay entitled *Niedergefahren zu den Toten*, which was published at Giessen in 1900. And a few days after I had noticed the passage, Dr. Clemen himself asked my attention to it, as well as my opinion of the adverse verdict which he had passed upon Cramer.

If I may venture to comment adversely upon an extremely interesting and valuable contribution to the subject of the Descent into Hades, I should say that Dr. Clemen was too anxious to make modern theology to be perfectly unprejudiced in his treatment of ancient theology. He wishes to ground the modern doctrine of the Larger Hope, as it is commonly called, upon the larger interpretation of the Descent of Christ into Hell. Now the "Larger Hope" can safely be left to take care of itself; it depends not upon the creed but upon the Larger Mercy of God; and we must

not take the reference in 1 Peter out of its historical setting and certain connexion with the book of Enoch, in order to elaborate a doctrine of hope beyond the grave. The fallen angels are a bad historical precedent for either hopes or fears. To begin with, in the Enochian sense they never existed; and further, they existed to the mind of the eschatologist who discoursed on them, in Tartarus and not in Hades (as I was recently reminded by Mr. St. Clair). Thus the article in the creed is not in evidence.

So we will ask Dr. Clemen to leave the passage in 1 Peter which speaks of the "spirits in prison" outside of his future treatment of a very important matter of Christian speculation. And with this suggestion (I hope he will forgive its freedom) we may for the present leave the matter.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

DIALOGUES ON THE CHRISTIAN PROPHETS.

IV.

Armageddon—Double ending of the Apocalypse—The Ezekielic ending and its date—the New Jerusalem.

Riddell. I fear I may tax your patience and attention to-day, Mason, but *à propos* of our discussion of Babylon being Rome, I have been trying to make out something of “the true inwardness”—as Matthew Arnold would say—of the last two chapters of the Apocalypse, which are a counterpart to the Elegy, or elegiac diatribe, on Rome.

Mason. You mean, I think, that the picture of the New Jerusalem is a counterpart to the picture of Rome in chapter xviii.

R. Yes, you remember there is a terrible battle in chapter xix., which I suppose we may call the Battle of Armageddon, though the name has not been mentioned since xvi. 16. Did you ever hear the striking suggestion of Hausrath that “Armageddon,” while it means of course “City Megiddo” in Hebrew, sounds also very like Ha-Roma-haggedolah, “Rome the Great,” in Hebrew? Westcott and Hort in fact prefix the Ha—Harmageddon.

M. That is remarkable. Can you tell me what the LXX. puts for Megiddo?

R. It spells it *Μαγεδῶ* or *Μαγεδών* or *Μαγεδδών* or *Μαγεδδῶ*. The LXX. has all sorts of ways of spelling the same name.

M. Nothing however corresponding to the last syllable of Gedolah?

R. No; we have to start with the name of Megiddo—as we call it—that famous field of more than one battle. Why

the seer should call it *Ar*-mageddon, instead of simple Mageddon, is rather a puzzle, unless he means the *city* of Rome; for *Ar* means "city," and there is no *city* worth mentioning of *Megiddo*. But if you ask why it should be written Har-mageddon, with the H, the answer is much the same, namely, that Har means (high) "mountain" as distinct from a "hill," and *Mount Megiddo* is a misnomer for the plain near Esdraelon: there is no Har at Megiddo. If then the H is correctly read, there was probably meant to be some suggestion of *the city* of Rome in the syllable prefixed. However that may be, this bloody battle is one of the most awful things in the Revelation. The idea of the fowls of the air being invited by the angel to the feast of carrion flesh of kings and chiliarchs (who *must* of course be Romans, for no other chiliarchs existed) and strong men, is very dreadful. It is a token of the uttermost loathing felt by the author for his country's foes.

M. Yes, it is inconceivable that he can have meant the apostate Jews of his own country, who after all were mostly patriotic. But I am eager to know what you have made out.

R. I submit to your notice, with some misgiving as to the details alone, a rearrangement of chapters xxi. and xxii. concerning the New Jerusalem. Whatever else you may think about it, I feel sure you will agree with me that enough is here said to show who are *not* included in it, and that it will never do to identify the picture of *Babylon* which we have discussed (EXPOSITOR, March 1902) with the picture of those who are *not of the new Jerusalem*. The two pictures can only be set over against each other as of two diametrically opposed cities, not as two forms or aspects or divisions of the same city or people. In other words, Babylon is not Jerusalem, nor Jerusalem Babylon. First of all, then, I will ask you to read the two accounts, which I call A and B, and which are here made out of what I

always had supposed was one account, though it was bewildering enough, indeed I think more so than any other portion of the book. Here they are :—

A

xxi. 9. And there came one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls, who were laden with the seven last plagues; and he spake with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the *bride*, the Lamb's wife.

xxi. 10. And he carried me away in the spirit to a mountain great and high, and he shewed me *the city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God*, having the glory of God.

[xxi. 11. Her luminary was like, etc., to xxi. 22. And I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God, the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof.

For these verses xxi. 11–22, which may be called the Ezekiel passage, see below.]

xxi. 23. And the city hath *no need of the sun*, neither of the moon, to shine upon it, for the glory of *God did (doth) lighten it*, and the *lamp* thereof is the Lamb.

xxi. 24. And the nations shall walk by the light thereof; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it.

xxi. 25. And the gates thereof shall in no wise be shut by day: for *there shall be no night there*:

xxi. 26. And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it.

B

xxi. 2. And I saw *the city the holy Jerusalem new descending out of heaven from God*, prepared as a *bride* adorned for her husband.

xxii. 3. And the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall do him service:

xxii. 4. and they shall see his face: and his name shall be on their foreheads:

xxii. 5. and *night shall not be* any more; and they *need no* light of *lamp*, and (there is) light of *sun*; for the Lord *God shall lighten* them, and they shall reign for ever and ever.

xxi. 3. And I heard a great voice out of the throne saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them.

xxi. 4. And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, nor shall sorrow nor crying nor pain be any more.

xxii. 1. And he shewed me a river of *water of life*, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb

xxii. 2. in the midst of the street thereof. And on this side of the river and on that was a tree of life, bearing twelve crops of fruit, yielding its fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

xxii. 6. And he said to me, *These words are faithful and true.* And the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets sent his angel to shew his servants what must shortly *come to pass.*

xxii. 12. *Behold, I come quickly,* and my reward is with me to render to each as his work is.

31. *I am the A and the Ω,* the first and the last, *the beginning and the end.*

xx. 8, 9. [Homage offered to the angel.]

14. *Blessed* are they that wash their robes, that their power may be upon the tree of life, and by its gates they shall enter into the city.

15. Without are the dogs and the *sorcerers* and the *adulterers* and the *murderers* and the *idolaters*

xxii. 3a. And all that is accursed shall be no more.

xxi. 4. The first things have passed away.

xxi. 5. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.

xxi. 5. And he saith, Write, for *these words are faithful and true.*

xxi. 6. And he said to me, They have *come to pass.*

xxii. 7. and, *Behold, I come quickly.* *Blessed* is he that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book.

xxii. 10. And he saith to me, Seal not the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is short.

xxii. 11. He that is unrighteous let him be unrighteous still, and he that is filthy let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous let him do righteousness still, and he that is holy let him be holy still.

xxi. 6. *I am the A and the Ω,* *the beginning and the end.* I will give to him that thirsteth of the fountain of the *water of life* freely.

xxi. 7. He that overcometh shall inherit these things, and I will be his God and he shall be my son.

xxi. 8. But to the cowardly and unfaithful and *abominable* and *murderers* and *adulterers* and *sor-*

and every one that doeth and maketh a lie.

xxi. 27. And there shall not enter into it anything common and he that maketh *abomination* and *falsehood*: except they who are written in the Lamb's book of life.

cerers and idolaters and to all the false, their part is in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.

The first point that must occur to the reader is the repetition of several phrases in these two chapters, a repetition which is wholly unlike any that we find in the rest of the book.

M. Yes, if I remember right, in Revelation i.-iii. there are some cases of repetition, but that repetition was made upon a definite plan, and here there is no such plan. Will you just tell me which the repeated phrases are?

R. The repeated phrases are: "The city the holy Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God," as "a bride," having "no need of sun," for "God lightens it"; "water of life," and "no night." "These words are faithful and true." "Behold, I come quickly." "I am the α and the ω , the beginning and the end." "The abominable and murderers and adulterers and sorcerers and idolaters and all liars" are excluded from the city. Besides these ten expressions there are others which appear to be in correspondence; the sentences beginning "Blessed," the expressions "what must shortly come to pass" and "it hath come to pass," and those which refer to the temple and the tabernacle respectively. These repetitions would be intelligible enough if we had two separate visions first described separately and then combined into one account, but they are not intelligible in the form and in the order which our Apocalypse presents.

M. I wish you would tell me what the difficulties are in the present arrangement of our chapters xxi. and xxii.

R. They are very clear. First of all, (1) chapter xxi.

begins with the statement, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth had gone away, and the sea is no more. And I saw the city the holy Jerusalem new, etc." Then it proceeds: "And I heard a loud voice out of the throne." Where is the throne? It will be said that "the great white throne" has been already mentioned in the previous chapter (xx. 11) with "Him that sat upon it." But that will not do. The difficulty is that in xxii. it is added that "the earth and the heaven fled from before His face." If after the appearance of the new heaven and new earth the throne is to be understood as being again set in the new Jerusalem, then it is more reasonable that this should be stated plainly, as it is in the fourth line of B.

M. You mean it is more reasonable so, than for us to be left to draw the inference that the one vision melts into the other and is continued by it. There is undoubtedly a great difficulty in saying that "the sea gave up the dead which were in it" (xx. 13), and immediately afterwards that "the sea is no more" (xxi. 1). It is a question of how close the chronological sequence is meant to be, for although the phenomena are those of eternity, they are represented here, as throughout the book, under the terms of sense, "I saw," "I heard."

R. Exactly so. Now, I would ask you to tell me which you think is the more likely sequence of the two following: (a) The great white throne; the disappearance of heaven and earth; the dead standing before it; the books opened; the judgment; the sea and death and Hades having rendered up their dead; death and Hades being then cast into the lake of fire; the same sentence on those who are not found written in the book; a new heaven and earth without sea; and the new Jerusalem descending, etc.: or

(b) Two visions: One of judgment before the throne, in which the sea still figures after the heaven and earth have

fled, until it melts into the lake of fire which swallows up death and Hades: the other, separate from it, in which there is a new heaven and earth and no sea?

M. I do not think there can be any doubt that the supposition of two visions is more reasonable.

R. But if so, the throne of God should be described as present in the new Jerusalem. No more is required than the mere mention that it is there. The great white throne and He that sat thereon had previously been such that from His face the heaven and the earth fled, and *there was no room found for them*. Surely some word is required to inform us that the throne is now in the city, which is therefore large enough to contain it, in such a way that "the tabernacle of God is with men." But there is no such word given us.

M. Well, I admit that we may feel that something is required.

R. Then again (2), we have had nothing to connect "men" (xxi. 3) with those whose names are "written in the book of Life" (xx. 15).

M. But I should be inclined to argue that since all other men but these have been cast into the lake of fire (xx. 15), there is no need to characterize "men" any further.

R. And my reply would be that against that lies the grave and insuperable objection that the author does carefully state what becomes of the rest of men when in xxi. 8 he says, "But for the cowards and unfaithful and abominable and murderers and fornicators and sorcerers and idolaters and all the false, their part is in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." This is quite intelligible if only we do not suppose it to be a repetition of what was said nine verses before *in the same* vision, but it is not reasonable to think that the author would say in xx. 14, 15, "This is the second death, the lake of fire; and if any was not found written in the book of life, he

was cast into the lake of fire," and would then proceed, eight verses later to include *in the same* vision the words just quoted from xxi. 8.

M. I see your point. You are opposed to the idea of repetition in a literary work, except for just cause. But is the Revelation a literary work?

R. We will deal with that question later. I proceed to another reason. (3) The course of the paragraph has now run on to the end of xxi. 8, "the second death," without interruption, unless we admit the insertion of the words, "And all that is accursed shall be no more" (xxii. 3a) after the words, "pain shall be no more" (xxi. 4). Upon this possible insertion something will be said later. But when we come to xxi. 9 we have an almost insuperable difficulty, unless we assume it to be the opening of a distinct vision. For otherwise it is an insipid repetition of what has been said only seven verses before. And yet it is described as if it were something entirely new, introduced by the agency of another angel. "And there came one of the seven angels that had the seven bowls of them that were full of the seven last plagues, and spake with me, saying, Come hither; I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. And he brought me away in the spirit to a mountain great and high, and shewed me the city, the holy Jerusalem, descending," etc. By what straining of language can we possibly suppose that the former statement, "And I saw the city . . ." (xxi. 2) is a mere brief anticipation of this fuller picture?

M. I think with you that it would be a straining towards an insipid *réchauffé*. So far as I observe, the seer's usual method is here followed, by which he opens every fresh successive stage of vision by the words, "And there came . . . and he spake, saying . . . and he brought . . . and he shewed me." The freshness of the original vision is not reproduced by any description which purports to describe

something freshly seen when it has been seen before. And so you ask, Why should we make the seer his own mar-plot when we can adopt the simple solution that two parallel visions, seen at different times, and differently treated by the seer as parallel, have been suddenly merged into one by a copyist or editor, possibly through some accident to the original manuscript?

R. That is what I ask. I hope I am not exorbitant, though I am sorry to tax your patience. Now, will you (4) follow this vision, which commences at xxi. 9? You will find that it contains a gorgeous and elaborate description of the new Jerusalem very closely based upon Ezekiel, a point to which we will return presently. Meanwhile we pass on to xxii. 6, "And he said to me, These words are faithful and true," and we must here ask, Which words are meant? There have been no words quoted as the angel's ever since xxi. 9. From that point onward the description is the seer's own. Nor can "these words" mean "the following," because the next sentences both begin with "And": "And the Lord God," "And, behold, I come quickly" (xxii. 6, 7). We are entitled to hold that, as in other cases where the expression "These words are faithful and true" occurs (xxi. 5; xix. 9), so here also it must refer to words in the immediate context. As there are none in the present arrangement to which they can refer, we must find some other arrangement, and such is found in column A, where they refer to xxii. 12: "Behold I come quickly . . ." The very fact that this is almost the same as "*and* Behold I come quickly . . ." may well have seemed to the copyist who is responsible for the present arrangement to serve as his justification for making the change.

M. You will tax my patience, Riddell, if you say too much about a copyist. I confess he is a *bête-noire*.

R. (5) Proceeding with xxii. 6, we find that the angel was sent to show God's servants (who are in any case the

Christian Prophets (xxii. 9 ; xix. 10), including especially the writer himself) things which *must shortly come to pass* ; and you recollect that in xxi. 6 we had, “ And he said to me, They (the words) have come to pass ” : the words referred to being the words, “ Behold, I make all things new,” which immediately precede.

M. Is there anything contradictory or otherwise objectionable in saying that some things have come to pass, and then that other things must come to pass ?

R. Certainly ; a contradiction it is, upon the supposition that the present arrangement is authentic. First we read that all things have been made new ; then, a chapter later, in the same description, *ex hypothesi*, that certain things—which can only be the same things, the details of the new Jerusalem, since no others are mentioned before the book itself comes to an end—must come to pass. Had the order been reversed in our present arrangement, so that the “ must shortly come to pass ” preceded “ they have come to pass,” we might have understood the two statements as the opening and the close of the description ; but as the order stands, this solution is out of the question, and we are compelled to conclude that we have two parallel accounts, which, however, so far from being identical, exhibit a difference in the time of their composition, A being earlier than B, along with other contrasts of some importance which we shall presently see.

M. Hold hard : you overwhelm me, Riddell, with your conclusion that A is earlier than B. I am not prepared to have all these crushing results hurled at me so fast.

R. Sorry, Mason, but I am sometimes carried too far for the moment. My point is that there are two accounts, and you will admit that two accounts cannot possibly be quite simultaneous, and that therefore one is prior to the other. Never mind, then, just now, which is the earlier.

M. Good. But you seem to have more to say in proof of your point that there are two.

R. (6) It is not easy to see how xxi. 8 can be followed in the same vision by xxi. 27; for if all the specified kinds of evil persons have their part in the lake of fire, into which they were actually cast in xx. 15, it is quite unreasonable to add shortly afterwards that two of these specified kinds "shall not enter into the city."

M. I agree that it is superfluous.

R. I will be content for the present with your bare agreement, and I am now coming to my "seventh and lastly."

This last point (7) to notice is the parenthetic passage xxii. 8, 9, followed by another (xxii. 10, 11) which may perhaps belong to it. The homage offered by the seer to "the angel who sheweth him these things," that is, the angel of the seven plagues (xxi. 9), might belong to almost any stage in the vision, and be recorded at any part of the description. It is in accordance with the usual practice of the Prophets. We have already had it in almost the same language in xix. 10. We shall see homage offered by Cornelius to the Prophet Peter at Caesarea in Acts x. 25, 26, in very similar terms, and we shall see a reference to it in 1 Corinthians xiv. 25. There is no great difficulty connected with the occurrence of this passage where it does occur, except indeed that it cuts off the verses xxii. 12-15 from the preceding part of the narrative.

M. Yes, but allow me to offer a probable explanation of their present order, one which commends itself to most readers, namely, that the several momentous expressions, "Behold I come quickly . . ." "I am the A and the Ω . . ." "Blessed are they . . ." are placed here as echoes, "lingering on and loth to die," of the preceding description. Will this not satisfy you?

R. I do not think that such an explanation is quite satis-

factory, because, to mention only two reasons, (1) they are not simply echoes, but each one, while it begins like a previous statement (xxii. 7, xxi. 6), ends in a different way of its own; and (2) there is no introduction to them. In xxii. 10 the subject meant in "*he saith to me, Seal not . . .*" may or may not be the angel as the passage stands. But if it be the angel, the subject of the solemn expressions which immediately follow, "*Behold I come . . .*," "*I am the A and the Ω,*" is certainly not the angel, but the Lord Jesus, as in verse 16. Consequently the best that can be said in favour of the present arrangement is that here in xxii. 12-15 there are many disjointed statements.

M. Disjointed, yes: no one can deny that.

R. But may we not boldly say that they are *dislocated*, and by a slight readjustment arrange them all as the columns A and B exhibit them above?

M. Lead on then, and help me to examine this arrangement, which is yours.

R. We have seen already that A is earlier than B. It is also very much fuller. The angel takes the seer to a high mountain to show him the bride, while in B no angel is mentioned throughout. In A the lines of Ezekiel's description of the restored Jerusalem are followed so closely by the seer that I have ventured to draw up a list of the original passages of Ezekiel (LXX.) for your convenience in comparison.

M. I begin to wish very much that the whole LXX. were available in an English version.

R. Certainly you would be astonished very often if you had one. Here is my list of the passages, from Ezekiel alone, which the author of Revelation has used in his A account:

Ezek. xl. 1. "He led me . . . and set me upon a very high mountain." (Rev. xxi. 10.)

Ezek. xvi. 8, 11. "I entered into a covenant with thee

(Jerusalem), saith the Lord, and thou becamest Mine . . . And I adorned thee with adornment." (Rev. xxi. 9.)

Ezek. xliii. 2. "And behold the glory of the God of Israel was coming (into the city) . . . and the earth shone forth as light from the glory around." (Rev. xxi. 11.)

Ezek. xxviii. 16. "The cherub led thee out of the midst of stones of fire." (This illustrates the comparison of "her luminary" to "jasper stone." Rev. xxi. 11.)

Ezek. i. 22. "The appearance of crystal." (Rev. xxi. 11.)

Ezek. xlviii. 31. "The gates of the city by the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; to the north three gates . . . and the eastern side . . . three gates . . . and the southern side . . . three gates . . . and the seaside . . . three gates." (Rev. xxi. 13.)

Ezek. xl. 3. "And in his hand was a builder's line and a reed measure." (Rev. xxi. 15.)

Ezek. xliii. 16. "And Ariel (Jerusalem) is of twelve cubits by twelve cubits, foursquare upon its four parts." (Rev. xxi. 16.)

Ezek. xlviii. 8. foll. "Length twenty-five thousands, and breadth twenty-five thousands." (The reading in Rev. xxi. 16, "furlongs," is very doubtful, and it may very likely not be original at all.)

Ezek. xliii. 13 appears to give the standard of the cubit. (Rev. xxi. 17.)

Ezek. xxviii. 13. "Thou (Prince of Tyre) hast been clothed with every precious stone, sardius and topaz and emerald (and jacinth) . . . and sapphire and jasper . . . and amethyst and chrysolite and beryl." (Rev. xxi. 19, 20.)

Ezek. xvi. 24. "Thou (Jerusalem) madest thyself an eminent place in every street." (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. xliii. 5. "Behold, the house was full of the glory of the Lord." (xxi. 23.)

Ezek. xliii. 7. "Thou hast seen, son of man, the place of

My throne . . . , where My name shall tabernacle." (Rev. xxii. 1.)

Ezek. xlvii. 7. "And behold, upon the margin of the river very many trees on this side and on that." (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. xlvii. 8. "And the waters shall heal." (Rev. xxii. 1.)

Ezek. xlvii. 9. "And whithersoever the river shall come (things) shall live." (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. xlvii. 12. "Neither shall its fruit fail : it shall bring forth new fruit according to its months (Heb.), and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and its increase for health." (The whole passage is much perplexed in LXX. and appears to have been much discussed. There is probably much more in the various readings than has been hitherto shown.) (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. ix. 4. "Go through Jerusalem, and put a sign upon the foreheads of the men who groan." (Rev. xxii. 4.)

Ezek. xlv. 17. "And it shall be that when they enter the gates of the inner court, they shall put on linen garments." (Rev. xxii. 14.)

Ezek. xliii. 7. "The house of Israel shall no more profane My holy name by their fornication and their murders." (Rev. xxii. 15.)

M. That is a good long list.

R. Remember that the above citations are not the only passages on which the A description is based by the seer. But they suffice to show how largely his mind was affected by Ezekiel in the portraiture of this particular vision.

M. Do I understand you to say that in his B account he avoids the use of Ezekiel ?

R. No, he quotes (Rev. xxi. 3) a passage from Ezekiel xxxvii. 27 rather closely: "And my tabernacling shall be amongst them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And the nations shall know that I am the Lord who sanctify them": although Zechariah ii. 10 is another text which may here be laid equally under contribution.

Further comparison of the features of A and of B shows that while A contains no temple, "for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple thereof," B declares that "the tabernacle of God is with men."

M. Do you mean then that the tabernacle is to be understood as part of the holy city ?

R. No. We have been told that the "throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it," but we are not told of any other visible contents. "The fountain of the water of life" may be supposed to be in or near it ; but it does not seem to require to be specially localized, and as far as this detail of B is concerned it may as well be part of the Paradise of God as of the City of God.

M. In fact I might urge that the picture of B is a city without foundations, without walls, without gates, without temple, without food to eat, perhaps without a fountain to drink.

R. Yes. Whereas A says that people shall enter the city by the gates, and that nothing common or evil shall enter into it, B is very different, for no entrance or exclusion is mentioned at all ; the evil are said to have their part already in the lake of fire. Yet B has a royal throne, citizens, light, joy, refreshment, promise of inheritance, freedom from sin. B is an entire contrast to the old Jerusalem. The presence of God and the union of His servants with Him—for they shall serve, shall see Him, shall bear His name, shall reign for ever—seems to be the grand feature of B.

M. I see that you make B to be a very great contrast to A. A is glorious and complex. B is simple, almost *jejune*.

R. My last observation leads to another in reference to Revelation i.-iii. These three chapters, as I have endeavoured to show elsewhere, were written at Patmos, after the bulk of iv.-xxii. was written at Ephesus. But B contains the promise : "He that overcometh shall inherit

these things, and I will be his God and he shall be My son." Along with this must be set the recurring promise, "To him that overcometh will I give . . ." in ii. 7, 11, 17, 26, iii. 5, 12, 21. There is a striking resemblance of form.

M. You refer to a part of the ending of each of the Epistles to the Seven Churches?

R. Yes. Moreover it is very remarkable that of these seven passages in Revelation ii., iii., no less than five refer directly to the two endings of the book arranged in A and B.

ii. 7. To eat of the tree of life which is in the paradise of God (A).

ii. 11. To be not hurt of the second death (B).

iii. 5. To be clothed in white garments, and I will not blot his name out of the book of life (A).

iii. 12. To be a pillar in the temple of My God, and he shall not come forth out of it again, and I will write upon him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, the new Jerusalem, which descendeth out of heaven from My God, and My new name (A) (B).

iii. 21. To sit with Me in My throne (A) (B).

The other two refer to passages very late in the book, which, equally with A and B, appear to me to have been written before ii. and iii.

ii. 17. To partake of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he who receiveth it. This is based upon xix. 12.

ii. 26. To have power over the nations, and he shall shepherd them with a rod of iron, as the potter's vessels are broken in pieces. This is based on the same passage as the preceding, xix. 15.

M. The last text is rather terrible in its import. It hardly breathes a Christian spirit at all. It is the remnant of Jewish patriotism. But what do you infer?

R. The inference appears to be justified, that xix., xx., xxi., xxii. were written *before* ii. and iii., and therefore *before the greater part of* i.; and it seems probable that the form of the promise in xxi. 7 has suggested the recurrent form of it in ii. and iii. The question arises whether we can find in ii. and iii. any clue to the date of this composition. We are dealing just here in probabilities only, perhaps shadowy probabilities, but it is always worth while to see which way the probabilities point, and I am much mistaken if we have not such a clue in ii. 5, "Repent and do the first works: otherwise I come to thee and I will *remove thy candlestick out of its place*, unless thou repent." After the destruction of Jerusalem it would be known that the Golden Candlestick had been removed to Rome. The Prophet warns "the Ephesian Angel of the Church" that a similar fate awaits it unless it repents.

M. Whom do you understand by the Angel of the Church?

R. I look first at the Synagogue, and I find that the position of the angel in the synagogue was partly that of a churchwarden and partly that of a vice-chaplain. I infer then that the angel's office was analogous to that of the synagogue angel. For the Jewish complexion of the Epistles to the seven Churches is visible in almost every verse. You may well say that some of their contents are hardly Christian.

M. Your clue to the date of this part of Revelation is interesting. Have I heard it before?

R. I do not know. Probably not. One other clue is almost certainly to be found in iii. 12, "The name of the city of My God, the new Jerusalem, that descendeth out of heaven from God, and My new name." Is it possible, let me ask you, that a new Jerusalem could be contemplated as coming into existence or into sight as long as Jerusalem stood intact? This is a question which any reader can put to himself.

M. St. Paul knew of two Jerusalems, did he not? both existing at the same time.

R. Of course he did, but the difficulty is rather about the *descent*. When St. Paul says "the Jerusalem which is above is free," he is indeed using the language of a Prophet, into which a long disquisition might well be made; but he does not speak of that Jerusalem descending direct from God *out of* heaven, it remains *in* heaven. The time for its descent would be when the earthly Jerusalem was about to disappear or had disappeared.

M. Perhaps so. I have not considered the question.

R. Yet it is not easy to think that any one, Jew or heathen or Christian, ever could bring himself to think that Jerusalem would disappear. That it should be not only encompassed with armies but captured, that the Temple should be destroyed, that vast multitudes should perish—these were disasters that could be dreaded and anticipated; but that the Saviour's words, "They shall not leave one stone standing upon another in thee," should be fulfilled in their literal thoroughness is almost more than any man could believe until the fulfilment took place, or just before it. The upholders of the late Domitianic date (95 A.D.) for the composition of the Apocalypse have no difficulty here, and they make a strong point of the probability that no visible Jerusalem was standing when xxi., xxii. were written. And yet they can make but a poor case for the Domitianic date out of the warning in ii. 5, that the candlestick of Ephesus would be removed out of its place. For what a frigid reference that would be to an event which was some twenty-five years ago! Those words must have been written *soon* after 70 A.D., when the golden candlestick of Jerusalem was removed out of its place to Rome. And can you not imagine the seer writing A in 69–70, when Jerusalem was a doomed place though still standing?

M. Yes. I can imagine how he fell back in imagination

on the bold outlines of Ezekiel's prophecy for comfort and relief in those weeks of agonizing suspense.

R. There must have been a state of fearful suspense for months before September 2, or whatever later date was required for the news of the fall of the city to travel to Asia.

M. I have looked out the place in Ezekiel, and now I should like to ask you whether it may not be plausibly urged against such a view that the prophecy of Ezekiel, on which so much of xxi., xxii. is based, belongs to a definite date, "the fourteenth year after the city was *taken*" (Ezek. xl., LXX.); and that therefore the seer was likely to have written his prophecy *after* 70 A.D., if not even the fourteenth year after that date.

R. Extremely fanciful. That the seer had before his eyes the plain statement of Ezekiel's own date, is simple fact; but he had had this date before him all his life. There was nothing occurring in 84 A.D. to evoke such a reconstruction of Ezekiel's prophecy. It is fanciful to suppose that the seer, or some pupil of his, would wait till 84 merely to produce a correspondence of the two prophecies in a particular point which is nowhere mentioned, and which would lead to nothing. Nor did he need to wait even till 71. For we have to bear in mind that the capture of Jerusalem was a gradual process. And here there is, as it happens, one stage which is worth attention. On May 6, A.D. 70, Titus became master of the outer quarter of the city called Bezetha, and in Greek *Καινόπολις*, "Newtown." Those who insist that the prophecy A must have been written *after* the capture of Jerusalem may fairly observe that this name is almost identically reproduced in the Apocalypse, "I saw the *city* the holy Jerusalem, *new* descending . . ."

M. It is a curious coincidence.

R. A coincidence, and probably nothing more, as regards the name. But as regards the capture of part of the city—

and it was a large part, the northern quarter extending from the Jaffa gate and Herod's palace on the west to the valley of Jehoshaphat and the Temple platform on the east—it is probable that the news of this partial capture would reach Asia in some exaggerated form, so that it would be reported that *the city was taken* some four months before this was true.

M. On the whole then you think there seems to be nothing adverse to the conclusion that A was written about the middle of the year 70, and that B was written rather later, when the full extent of the utter destruction was made known. Would this conclusion throw light upon the contrast between xxii. 6, "what must shortly come to pass," and xxi. 6, "they have come to pass"?

R. Yes, some. In writing A, the seer contemplates the dissolution of the city, disappearing in the storms and tumults of the seven plagues; yet he finds mental and spiritual relief by being led by one of the angels of those same plagues to the view of a brighter, holier future, in which the "Jerusalem which is above" is realized, as the wife of the Lamb. But in writing B he has pondered upon the limitations of A only to attain a simpler conception of the heavenly city. In the saying of Him that sat upon the throne, "Behold, I make all things new," there is involved a new conception of Jerusalem, as wholly distinct from the old, wholly distinct from the restoration of it by the mouth of Ezekiel or by his own previous vision. And the words "*have come to pass,*" "*the first things have passed away,*" imply that they are never to return, not even as the foundation of a new ideal city. The ancient watchwords still hold good, and are to him the keys of his present existence: "Behold, I come quickly." "I am the α and the ω ." "He that overcometh shall inherit these things." But now, instead of the washing of robes that they may enter by the gates into the city, the blessing is attached to the

plainer and more comprehensive duty of "keeping the words of the prophecy of this book." But what a remarkable feature is this! Never before, except in i. 11, "What thou seest write in a book and send to the seven churches," have we had the idea of a book expressed at all. Each separate prophecy has been as separate as those of Isaiah and the ancient prophecies; it has embodied a separate ecstasy, a separate vision. No idea of binding them together into a volume has been expressed. But in xxii. 9 we read, "I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren the prophets and of them that keep the words of this book"; in xxii. 10, "Seal not the words of the prophecy of this book." When we come to xxii. 18 we have reached a further point in history, at which the book is destined expressly to be read in church, and contemplated as being read, and read without addition to it or diminution from it: "I testify to every one that heareth (as they are read aloud) the words of the prophecy of this book."

M. It appears to me that you take the words seriously. And so we ought to do. I thank you for it. But, tell me, is there not still a difficulty in xxii. 9? You said that "the angel which sheweth me these things" belongs to A and not to B; and you maintain that A was written previously to B, and that the first mention of the prophecies being gathered into a book occurs only in B. But xxii. 9, which is in A, also refers to a book. How do you account for that?

R. I acknowledge the difficulty. But I think it is possible that the idea of collection into a book may have been present to the seer as early as the conclusion of the great vision of the descended holy Jerusalem. Nothing is gained by supposing that it was seen early in the seer's career, or by supposing that the order of the book is anything else than the order in which the visions were seen. Let us assume then that this vision is the crown and climax of his

Apocalypse. As the Prophets of old had collected their prophecies, or had them collected for them, so should this Christian Prophet do. This supposition appears to do no violence to the conclusions obtained above. Or another is possible, namely, that the seer himself inserted the words "and of them who keep the words of this book" after "thy brethren the prophets," when he was himself combining the two accounts into one. "Keep" has the double meaning of "guard" in the sense of a guardian in office, and of "observe" in the sense of a layman; the latter being much the commoner, and very frequent in the New Testament. But it would be possible to translate, "of the prophets, even of them who guard the words of this book." "The book" cannot, I think, be any other than our Apocalypse. It would not be safe to say that it was the book of Ezekiel, from which so much of the vision of the new Jerusalem was drawn. The supposition that we have here a later insertion of the seer as editor is still easier than the other. But perhaps the easiest of all would be——

M. If you are going to resort to a copyist again, Riddell, I shall despise you!

R. Well, Mason, now that you have used the word, let me only say that after he had read that a blessing was pronounced on "him who kept the words of the prophecy of this book," it would seem to be no exaggeration of claim that such an one should be called "blessed" along with the Prophets whose fellow-servant the angel declared himself to be. You will agree that the seer's autograph was copied by some copyist.

M. I am becoming impatient, and the hour is late. Just tell me how you explain the reference in xxii. 11 to wickedness still and righteousness still.

R. It is one that appears to suit a time when persistency in set habits had not been yet awakened and overthrown by a catastrophic crisis such as had then occurred. "A little

further on" the course of the present world must travel first, before the awakening, but only a little; the issue, though deferred, is still certain, and "the consequences" of human actions "will be what they will be." Sorry to have tired you, Mason.

M. Not at all, Riddell. Now good night; and thank you for being such a "painstaking controversialist."

R. As the Greek professor said of the other Greek professor, whom he had just demolished!

M. A thousand pardons! What am I saying? I must be asleep. I meant to say that you have really worked hard at your thesis, and you make me think.

R. Thanks, old man. That is a higher compliment than to say I persuade you. Good night!

E. C. SELWYN.

HENRY DRUMMOND.¹

IN venturing to address you upon Henry Drummond, I propose mainly to consider his life as a type of modern Christianity, and to offer some reflections upon it. The world has lived too long upon its past; the Christian is still overmuch tempted to point to the sample saints of long gone days as if these latter years were barren in example of men who lived continually near to God. Why should we thus incessantly turn to the early imitators of the Lord Christ as if they, more than the noblest men and women of today, could teach and inspire us to walk worthily? It is a pagan notion that finds the Golden Age in the misty past; for the Christian it lies in the future. It is being brought nearer by the lives and labours of just such men as Henry Drummond, and it is they as nearest us whom we should study, whose work we must take up. For there is no reason apart

¹ An address delivered to the first-year students of the United Free Church College, Glasgow.

from ourselves why the Golden Age should not begin tomorrow.

The life of Henry Drummond covered the second half of last century. He was born at Stirling in 1851, and died at Tunbridge Wells in 1897. Of the 500 pages that compose Prof. Smith's account of Drummond's life, two are devoted to the matter of his parentage, and this is no unusual proportion to give to the discussion of a question that is obviously conditioned by the facilities with which the necessary information can be obtained, and by the public and private sentiment that would in certain cases, although wrongly, consider even that slender number two too many. As the influence of ancestry becomes more exactly known, and men understand better the various factors that determine the nature of offspring, we may expect to find an increasing amount of attention directed to the problem of definitely ascertaining what any particular man owed in the first place to his immediate parentage, and afterwards to the environment in which he passed the more plastic years of his life. It is only thus that we can rightly appreciate what, so to say, a man owes to himself; without this three-fold investigation any comparative study of the lives of individuals is not only unfair, but worthless. For no two men start with the same inheritance—no two men have exactly the same chance—and two lives that were apparently of equal usefulness may easily have been intrinsically disparate, the one representing a noble development from a poor beginning, the other a poor development from a noble beginning. Further, every such investigation, if properly conducted, is one more addition to the data upon which will be decided that most fundamental of questions as to whether nature is stronger than nurture, or vice versa, where the term *nurture* may stand for the environmental conditions to which reference has already been made. A very

slight acquaintance with modern literature, especially of the lighter type, is sufficient to furnish one with evidence of the widespread pessimistic belief that nature is stronger than nurture. A man, it is urged and depicted again and again, is in perpetual bondage to his immediate ancestral past; he cannot counteract the inherited bias towards specific evil. Christianity maintains the reverse position, and confidently proclaims that all such past connexions may be treated as negligible quantities, and life's handicap be counteracted by the power of the grace of God. Science, in her present tendency to rebut the suggestion of the transmission of acquired characters, may be held to be coming round to the same position. It is not my purpose to pursue these inquiries in relation to Henry Drummond at the present time; suffice it to say that his certainly was a great inheritance, a genial environment, but trading with his talents he increased and scattered, and increased again.

We may pass over his schooldays and undergraduate life with a single reference. To appreciate its significance you must recollect what you have heard or possibly known for yourselves of the singular charm that invested his every appearance upon religious and other platforms—the charm of voice, of thought, of perfect ease and naturalness. During his second session at Edinburgh University, when little more than sixteen years of age, he joined the Philomathic Society, and one evening shortly after his admission rose to address the house for the first time. “Mr. Chairman and gentlemen,” he began, “I think, Mr. Chairman . . . I think . . . I think, Mr. Chairman . . . I think . . . I hope you will excuse me, I am very young.” “There was a deadly silence,” writes my informant, who was present on the occasion in question, “during Drummond’s efforts to speak, but he sat down amid a burst of derisive laughter. Students, though as a rule the most generous of critics, are never keenly sympathetic with those who plead youth as an

excuse for a maiden speech catastrophe." Yet from this we may see what he owed to himself in the matter of public speech.

It was after three years of New College routine that Drummond decided to make a break in his theological studies, and devote a year to mission work and the study of Natural Science, geology in particular. But this uniquely planned winter was still young when he was swept into what ultimately proved to be the greatest experience of his life, and for wellnigh twenty months he either accompanied or followed Messrs. Moody and Sankey throughout the length and breadth of the British Isles. It is peculiarly interesting to trace his intellectual and spiritual development from this period onwards, for the stages are clearly marked. At this time, so far as regards theology, he was practically a Traditionalist. As a matter of fact, theology *per se* never seriously interested him, and he must have been in a (for him) strangely aberrant mood one day in February 1871, when he wrote, "I think I shall have a shy at the B.D. by and by." In the Revival meetings, however, he sounded every note in the scale of Christian truth. The effect of his speaking must have been tremendous. Opposite the words, "Others mocking said, These men are full of new wine," in the description of the day of Pentecost, he has these jottings in the interleaved pocket Testament that he used all through the campaign :

"Many people object to religion because 'there is a great deal of excitement about it': not at all. It was not because they were religious that they were excited; it was because they were not. Religion is a calming thing. Its greatest watchwords are Peace and Rest. Be still, trustful, not afraid,—that is what it ever whispers into the agitated, sinful, perplexed mind. Irreligion is an exciting thing. That causes excitement,—a terrible situation, appalling issues hanging on slight threads of conduct, upon

today's doings, feelings, resolutions. The most exciting situation in the universe is an unsaved soul. Picture it on the brink of eternity. Tomorrow you may stand there for the last time,—then Eternity. That future hangs upon the present; do not refuse today's decision upon the chance of tomorrow's reformation; what situation could be more exciting."

Or listen to this beautiful illustration of Consecration: "In a sense it is a continual process. And yet we do not need to be always consecrating ourselves. If we think we have not done it right, we do not need to do it again. We only need to add more consecrated elements to our life which has been already consecrated. There are unconsecrated parts of our life. We have only to add them as we find them. *Thus*: a child has a picture-book, tattered, many pages lost, lying all over the house. A friend calls, and sees the pictures. Being a print hunter, he wishes to possess them, offers a new book to the child instead of the old one. Next day it is given. Days after, the child stumbles on a leaf of the old book—lays it aside. Next day finds another—lays it aside. They belong to the friend. When he comes again, the child gives him the pages. *But he does not give the book again.* That is already consecrated. So we are always stumbling on stray pieces of our life which have never been given up to *Him*. Consecrate these as ye find them: but ye are Christ's."

That is the first stage; it practically covered his life from boyhood till the close of his college days. Then we may gather hints of a coming change in the following extracts from letters by one of his most intimate college friends. The date of the first is November 20, 1876: "Drummond preached in the Barclay yesterday to the thunder-striking of friends and enemies; they wanted him for assistant, but he demurs. He held forth on (rather 'off') the Ten Virgins—Christianity and Christ—question whether anybody is really

converted, etc.; but the stately figure in the gown and the melodious burr of his r's seem to have been what struck most." Drummond did eventually become assistant to Dr. Hood Wilson, and the same friend writes in April of the following year: "Drummond has been confusing the old people and rejoicing the young in the Barclay all winter, giving the Higher Evangelism to the world."

Pass over a few years, and we reach another well defined period in his life. Certain seed that had been sown in the soil of his mind during his college course, more especially perhaps in connexion with his study of the Old Testament, began to sprout after a period of seeming inactivity. The Church was racked with the case of Prof. Robertson Smith, and Drummond was not slow to perceive the peculiar vantage of the newer standpoints in relation to such subjects as the interpretation of the Creation story in Genesis in view of the accepted facts of science. And so we have *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, and then, more particularly, the well known articles on "The Contribution of Science to Christianity," and "Mr. Gladstone and Genesis," in the *EXPOSITOR* and *Nineteenth Century* respectively. To those who know these writings a great change in Drummond's intellectual position is at once apparent; formerly he was a Traditionalist, now he is a Protestant. How about the other side, the purely spiritual? At the beginning Drummond is as hard at work as any pastor in his mission at Possilpark. Later he speaks to hundreds of students on Sunday evenings in Edinburgh, and drawing-rooms of London society during the season. His addresses are certainly more restricted in range than those of the earlier period even as his audiences are more select; but their intensity is not a whit diminished, their object is the same, nor is their success different.

Again pass over a few years, and we find a third distinctly marked stage into which he has glided almost

imperceptibly from the previous one. His chief work, *The Ascent of Man*, belongs here, the most superficial reading of which discloses the fact that the story there narrated leads up to the conclusion of the final chapter in which it is sought to show that Evolution and Christianity are one in their object of making more perfect living beings, and one in that through which they work, even Love. Drummond has passed from Protestant to Humanitarian. You see this in every one of his Christmas Addresses; it is obvious in their very titles. In the first period he had laid strong emphasis on the individual; the "Kingdom of God" meant little to him in those days. But now it is charged with meaning as he changed the accent of his teaching by reason of his growth in knowledge and experience, and laid it more on the social aspects of Christianity. Yet this does not mean that his interest in the individual had lessened. He certainly restricted his platform work almost entirely to the University man; but this species is cosmopolitan, and Drummond sought him in every clime. His message was as in the previous period, his object still the same, his enthusiasm in no way abated.

Allow me to show you this Humanitarian at work in Australia as he appeared to an eyewitness in the summer of 1890. The letter from which I quote was written by a young Australian mining engineer to his friend the Rev. Graham H. Balfour, of Melbourne. I have reproduced exactly his conversational but very expressive English. "Of course," he says, "as you know, I can have seen but little of him during his brief and busy visit to our country, but there was no mistaking him; even the average eye could not mistake the spiritual meteor. Like yourself and hundreds of others, I heard all he had to say to the students, and met him on four different occasions, once by arrangement, and twice, I might almost say, by accident. You who were on his committee know quite well the

various addresses he gave, and upon these I need scarcely touch. It seems to me the best thing I can do is to put down simply what I can remember of our meetings. It was after I heard him deliver his address on "The Kingdom of God" in the Athenaeum Hall or the Coffee Palace Hall (which was it?)—an address which was a revelation to me as it was to hundreds of others—and after he had concluded it that I heard him say that he had come from the other side of the world for *us*, that he was prepared and anxious to meet any one of us who wished to speak with him *any time, anywhere*. How well do I remember the sudden flash of something beautiful when he said this! 'Here,' thought I, 'is a man who has crossed the world for us, for any one of us, who asks us individually to meet him and talk with him if we feel the need, at a time which we might decide for ourselves, at a place which we might fix for ourselves. And he at this very time pressed with the burden of address after address, and nursing his dying friend John Ewing.' Verily something beautiful had come our way, and to me at least he seemed a new species of humanity. To have seen him, I have felt ever since, was to have had a vision of his Master Christ.

"Well, I met him. You introduced me to him, you'll remember, after his address, and I told him I had received a card of introduction (not that any were needed) to him from a friend who was studying in Edinburgh and had often heard him; and when I mentioned his name, he called him to mind at once. I simply mention this to illustrate his marvellous memory for faces and names, for you know quite well the thousands of students he came into contact with in Edinburgh.

"Well, he fixed the time and the place of our meeting. Shall I ever forget it? A moonlight night, the Toorak manse, where his friend and yours, Balfour, lay dying. I protested against dragging him away, but he insisted, and

we walked for three hours around these secluded and half-country roads beyond and about Toorak. I knew exactly what I wanted to ask him and lost no time. I do not intend to drag myself into this more than is necessary to reveal, though but in shadow of a shade, the man himself, so I will only give the first question chiefly for his answer. 'Is it possible, Professor, bearing in mind your address on the Kingdom of God, for one to become a member and yet doubt or disbelieve the divinity of Christ?' At once his quiet, eager, intense, sweet voice replied, 'Did the first disciples believe in it when they were first called?' How Scotch to answer by asking another question!

"'No! How could they?' and at once the vision flashed on me. 'Quite right, it grew on them by degrees.'

"Well, from that moment on for two hours he had me talking, and you know such a thing at that time was strange for me to do. He made me talk, drew me out—I couldn't help it—and now I can see how in his own words he had buttonholed my soul. But suddenly I came to my old self, and protested that I had never done such a thing before, and had not come to hear myself talk but him. And then he did speak on many things on our way back to the manse, where he gave me his little book on *The Greatest Thing in the World*, and wrote his name in it. It was that evening he told me that he was bringing out a new book in the near future, which was to be more mature than his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. Well do I remember how he avoided in his wisdom all theological issues, and steered away from them as from a shoal.

"After he had diagnosed me—for that is what he did that night—he recommended me to read the works of John Fiske. I did, and found his spiritual diagnosis correct. I must tell you how I arrived at the first address, for it is an illustration of the grip he got on all sorts and conditions of minds. I was dining in the home of an orthodox Jewish

family, when the eldest son said he was going to hear Drummond, and his brother and myself said we would like to join him. I remember asking him what attracted him in Drummond, since I thought it strange the Christian evangelist should draw the child of Israel thus. 'It is very simple,' he said: 'my brother was ill at Ormond College, last Friday, and felt anything but good tempered,—was lying up in his bedroom alone when a knock came at the door. 'Oh, come in!' he said in a longsuffering sort of a way, when in stepped a perfect stranger, so neatly dressed and with such a soft kind voice. 'Could you tell me where Balfour's room is? I have lost my way; but are you unwell?' And there and then he sat down, for a long time kept him company, and cheered him up considerably (you know what the influenza is?). So impressed was my young brother with him that I am going to hear him with a great deal of curiosity and pleasure.' Well, we went that night, and every other night, and used to withdraw to a coffee-house together and turn the address over and over, and over again. It was the freshness of the early world to all of us. I recollect, too, the orthodox Jewish parent himself coming one night to see and hear for himself if by any chance his family were hearing what they should not hear. But all was well. I am wandering on and on through the gallery of memory, quite forgetting that you have yours and all have theirs of this glorious saint. I will refer to one other meeting. He had gone to Adelaide, I knew. I was at a great football match, in the middle of the crowd, quite thirty thousand, and could see little of the game. At about half time I turned round, and found Professor Drummond standing behind me. It was the very thing he wanted—some one who could explain the points of our game. I asked him in that case to come to another football ground where he could see the game better. He was quite eager, and became quite wrapt up in the game. There, too, he

began to speak about his work, and indicating the athletes he saw all round him said, 'These are the men I want to get hold of. Do introduce me to some of your wild beasts!'

"There was no mistaking what he meant. 'The men I have around me are all right—they won't do any harm—but I would like to get hold of the wild beasts.' Sure enough we had not passed along very far before I saw several of the species he wished to grapple with, and introduced him, and he was very pleased. How open his soul was to all his surroundings, how ready for suggestion from everything, and how quick at detecting anything fresh! I remember on this occasion saying, 'There, Professor, is one of the men you want, a wild one, but a regular nugget (a common word out here, as you know).' 'Nugget,' he said—'a beautiful word; I never heard it so applied before,' and so on and so on. To follow him any further upon these brief occasions is impossible—he came at me from all points. I feel he was all that a man ought to be, and give up in despair trying to follow the elusive influence that always won my love and wonder.

"As you know, little practical social work has resulted from his visit to our shores. Such work needed his fostering care a little longer; but his personal influence, particularly in private interviews, when his soul touched another soul—as it did in hundreds of cases—into a clearer and a higher life, is an abiding source of spiritual wealth in our native land."

And the engineer concludes with these strange lines:

His heart was just four pieces joined,
A man, a woman, and a child,
And a kind of a sort of a Holy Ghost.

Perhaps you will bear with this short sequel from the pen of Principal Andrew Harper, who knew nothing of the previous account. "When I was going to England,

in 1891 or 1892, there were several Jews on board the ship, but, as is usual, they were not very popular with the other passengers. There was one, however, who, though not more popular than the others, was very much quieter and seemed to have literary tastes of a more elevated kind. I got to know him slightly, but had no particular interest in him till we reached Brindisi. There he went ashore before I did, and returned to the ship with several volumes of Tauchnitz's English series in his hand. Meeting me, he showed me the Tauchnitz edition of Drummond's booklets, which he had just bought. I was a little surprised, and later, when we were again at sea, I asked him how he came to be interested in Drummond. He said that his younger brother was a student at Ormond, and when Drummond was in Melbourne fell ill in the college. One day Drummond was at Ormond looking for another man when by mistake he went into this young man's room. Seeing a man he did not know evidently ill, Drummond did not, as most of us would have done, apologize and stumble out as he had stumbled in; he went up and kindly asked after his health and spoke a few cheery words, and every time he was in the college again he always called in to see how the sick man was. This so touched the hearts of his brother and himself that they both attended all his meetings, and after he had left diligently read his books. Hence the joy of this elder one at finding so good and cheap an edition of the booklets. 'But,' I said to him, 'you do not accept the assumptions which underlie all his teaching, do you?' 'No,' he replied, 'but I find it appeals to me, and I try to follow it in my own way.' 'This is an instance,' concludes the Principal, "of how Drummond gathered influence everywhere he went by the depth and breadth of his human sympathy."

I have gone into these details because Drummond offers

such a clear example of the evolution hinted at above. Every man begins as a Traditionalist, i.e. practically is first a Roman Catholic in the broadest sense of that term, and some remain such all their lives. Others move on and become Protestants, i.e. unable to accept in their entirety the views of the past, they give their strength to extending that new light which they have received; in this stage likewise some spend their lives, and some do die protesting. Others again move on, and seeing that the life is not only more than food and raiment but even than acquiescence or protestation, resolve that Christ-like they will spend themselves and be spent in the interests of humanity. It is not suggested that these three stages are exclusive of one another; rather are they taken as types of the predominant tendencies of men. Nor is it necessary to suppose that these transitions are always upwards, for evolution is not synonymous with progress, and there is much so-called humanitarianism with which the most of us can have but little or no sympathy. I would rather ask you this, What after all does it matter whether a man is Traditionalist, Protestant, or Humanitarian so long as he has the true life and follows "the true light"?

But these extracts will have done something more for you in touching upon features of Drummond's character. This man, with something of the cavalier about him, with his fine distinction of physical appearance, literary phrasing, and manner of thought, all that about him which made him appear to many as an ideal of sweet reasonableness, together with his extreme loveliness,—how is it possible to put down on paper that in him which drew men, held them, transformed them? Of one of his friends Drummond wrote, "Some natures are so transparent that they cannot hide even a finger joint." Himself, on the contrary, no man ever fathomed, and there was continually about him that overpowering sense of solitariness which Ravignan

knew when he said, "Solitude is the mother country of the strong; silence is their speech."

Drummond's exalted view of life naturally gives us a certain interest in his attitude towards public criticism. Very few of his critics knew the man, and he certainly gave them scant encouragement to continue their attacks. He never assailed an adversary; he never defended himself. It was not worth life's little while to bicker. Criticism never had any effect upon him; he took no colour from his environment. There was about him something of the intangibility of Christ,—“All they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath, and rose up, and thrust Him out of the city, and led Him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast Him down headlong, *but He passing through the midst of them went His way,*” only to reappear elsewhere. And so Drummond would make his statement and then retire; later he followed it up with another.

A reminiscence by an American friend helps to elucidate this point. “In June 1893, when he came to this country to visit the Chicago Exposition, I spent ten days with him at Lake Nepigon, Canada. I can recall one remark he made about his speeches and writings which explains many of the criticisms passed upon them by those willing to misunderstand him. He had brought with him the proof sheets of a book soon to appear, written by one of our leading American clergymen. On Sunday morning we read together the introductory chapter. In this chapter the writer carefully protected himself against any possible misunderstanding regarding what he said and what he did not say. In discussing the introduction, Drummond remarked to me that he thought one lost force and impressiveness by such defensive apologetics. He said he tried to state what he thought as clearly and forcibly as possible, but did not bother himself by declaring what he

did not think. He realized that he might strengthen the criticism of his enemies, but he thought he made himself more acceptable to those who would come to him for help—that he wrote for them and not for his critics, and that he was confident that he was not misunderstood by his friendly readers.”

One of the very few criticisms of his work—within my recollection the only one—that he discussed with his friends was a characteristic tirade by Mrs. Lynn Linton in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review* for September 1894. Concerning it he said very simply and very truly that “it wasn’t fair.” In her *Life*, published last year, two letters are reproduced from Herbert Spencer disclosing the secret history of that article. In the first of them he complains: “I am in the mood of mind of the weather-beaten old tar whose nephew proposes to teach him how to box the compass, and who is prompted to tweak his nose. The nephew in this case is Professor Drummond, who, in his recently published work, *The Ascent of Man*, with the airs of a discoverer and with a tone of supreme authority, sets out to instruct me and other evolutionists respecting the factor of social evolution which we have ignored—altruism.” After detailing his fancied grievance, Herbert Spencer continues, “To return to the tweaking of the nose above indicated, I do not, of course, like to undertake it myself, but I should be very glad if somebody would undertake it for me, and, on looking round for a proxy, I thought of you. With your vigorous style and picturesque way of presenting things you would do it in an interesting and effective way, at the same time that you would be able to illustrate and enforce the doctrine yourself. Doubtless in an article entitled, say, *Altruism*, you would have many ideas of your own to enunciate at the same time that you took occasion to rectify this misrepresentation. An interesting essay in

the *Nineteenth Century* might be the result, and, not improbably, you might find occasion for dealing from the same point of view with Mr. Kidd's book on *Social Evolution*, now very much talked about." There is surely something, to say the least, pathetic in this picture of our premier philosopher concerned to flout an imaginary adversary, and condescending to employ the "vitriolic vocabulary" of a woman who, as one well known critic has remarked, was no more qualified for the task in question than her parlour-maid. "Habet! I exclaim, in the language of the arena," opens the second Spencerian letter, in acknowledgement of the essay. Exactly; the whole in the manner and language of an arena into which it would have been impossible for Henry Drummond to descend.

Every one knows Buffon's epigram, "The style is the man himself," but few can point to a more perfect example of its felicity than is to be found in Henry Drummond. From an early period he had practised writing, and although at the age of nineteen sundry articles which he had offered to a monthly magazine were returned, it would appear that he had more success with the local press. Thus, in a letter written to his brother in August 1871, there occurs this passage: "You would be thoroughly disgusted at getting a paper with a miserable penny-a-liner about the *Raploch*. ——— imagines everything in print to be little short of immortal." He was extremely careful, almost fastidious, about his phrasing and expression. The original introduction to *The Ascent of Man*, after being set up in type, was rewritten and reduced in length, as the result of friendly criticism. An entire edition of one of the booklets was destroyed because he discovered a "knot" in a paragraph at the last moment. He was especially particular in the selection of adjectives, and enforced this provision upon those in whose literary efforts he took an

interest. You recall his saying, "A *Nineteenth Century* article should be written at least three times—once in simplicity, once in profundity, and once to make the profundity appear simplicity." Even more sternly he wrote to another friend, "For your humility read Frederic Harrison's article in the October number of the *Nineteenth Century* (the year was 1895) on Ruskin as a Master of English Prose. After reading it you will wonder, as I did, however any of us have the face to print a line." Accordingly we have from him page upon page of polished, limpid English; there is not a heavy sentence in one of his books. His pages are beautiful to read because they express the secret thoughts of a beautiful mind. Love was the light of his life; not only his style but his message were like himself. All through his life-warp was woven a broad band of altruism that gave the dominant tone to the pattern; in others it is a mere thread. Hence many have thought that *The Greatest Thing in the World* was his most characteristic message. But as Graham A. Balfour has observed in an Australian appreciation of the man, "*men* were always more interesting to him than *things*." "Gentlemen," said Drummond, on his first meeting with the Edinburgh University students after his return from Australia, "Gentlemen, since addressing you here, I have circumnavigated the globe, and the greatest thing I saw in my travels was a Christian man." It is now a commonplace to remark upon his boundless sympathy, and the singular way he had of making people feel that they could tell him anything. He naturally believed tremendously in the power of the influence of one soul upon another. "Many people exaggerate talent, no one influence," he wrote in his pocket Testament. And this, elevated into the region of the Divine, may possibly be said to be the centre of his theology. A man becomes like his gods; Christ's definition of treasure is, "That which draws the heart after it."

Take Christ into your life, make Him your treasure, and unconsciously you become like Him. Such was the burden of his message, and it was sealed to his hearers, because they recognized in him a true example.

I have read, and men still talk of "Drummondism," and by that phrase, according to their temperament and turn of mind, they appear to designate some point of view, some theory, some attitude of soul that they consider to be his secret. But surely the only Drummondism was Drummond, for even as he invited men not to a system but to a Person, and sought to give them not a phrase but a life, so was he greater than all his teaching. And it is for him that I would recommend you to seek in his writings, and, having found, to imitate. For as James Martineau has it, "The noblest workers of the world leave behind them nothing so great as the image of themselves."

J. Y. SIMPSON.

RUTH: A HEBREW IDYL.

THE STORY: ITS SETTING AND SPIRIT.

CHAPTER I. 1.

THE short book, which thus begins, has a very close relation to the Book of Judges. Not only is its period contemporary with the rule of judges in Israel, but its object is to make us acquainted with the private and domestic life of the land while men of iron and blood were directing its public policy. So sweet a companion never attended so stormy a record as here in this tale attends that Book. The transition from one to the other is like that from war to peace. The temper and feeling change in a moment, and we pass into a new atmosphere. After the rage and fury of storm the air becomes soft and calm; the bristling of spears is changed to the rustling of the ripe barley; and

if there is sadness in the book, it is the sadness of a story which refreshes and pleases even when it fills our eyes with tears. Only one other such transition do we know in all literature, and that is when the great historian of the French Revolution, in its ethical aspects and meanings, passes from the din and wild death of the falling Bastille and says, with equal pathos and beauty, "Oh! evening sun of July, how at this hour thy beams fall slant on reapers amid peaceful woody fields; on old women spinning in cottages; on ships far out in the silent main!"

We cannot, therefore, while we read, keep too intimate both the connexion and the contrast between this tale of lowliness and poverty, and what has just been told of tribal heavings and unrest when the judges ruled; for it seems almost certain that these gentler chapters at one time were attached to, and as an appendix formed part of, the preceding Book. Some say that the moon, which now attends our world in its nightly wanderings, was once a part of the earth; and that it became detached when things were taking shape for man and withdrew to the place of ministry apart, whence now its silvery light is shed over all. In something of the same way the Book of Ruth may be said to be related to the Book of Judges. This kindly Word of God, as if now settled in its own place in heaven and dividing its light from a distance, spreads a radiance over every page of that sterner record. For this one pleasing instance of fine instinct and motive in the life of a peasant home suggests the truth that, during all the sudden fray which judge after judge raised, the constant sanctities of the cottage and the family altar were the saving of the nation. The influence of this representative case spreads sweetly over the whole period, as if God would thereby assure us to all time that the quiet power of woman, and the patience of home-keeping lives, and the care of the cradle and the hearth, mean as much in His eyes as the work of the

statesman and the warrior. There are both struggle and victory here, but they are those of virtue—the virtue of all gentle and gracious womanhood.

It would be almost to insult the unadorned and homely beauty of the whole of this narrative, if we spoke of the structure and style of the book. Had it all been taken down from the recitative of one who did not know that his tale was being noticed, or had it been written out as it came unconsciously from the lips of a prattling child, the story could not have been more artless and simple. There is no style—no intermediate element between the thought and its resolution into language; the simple facts are presented through the most transparent medium of words and are left to speak for themselves. There is here that naturalness and ease which are the truth of all expression, and which the most ambitious art only seeks to realize. As a fragment of early literary work the Book of Ruth stands alone; it is certainly a curious and unexpected “find” in the annals of Israel. Take it as we may, it remains unreproved and unexplained—a gem of literature so rare as to be priceless. The very genius of simple narration is in this Hebrew tale; and around it a gentle *glamourie* floats, in which

All puts on a gentle hue,
Hanging in the shadowy air
Like a picture rich and rare;
It is a climate where, they say,
The night is more beloved than day.

It has an office in the Bible not unlike that which God has given the flowers in the world of nature; it softens, it sweetens, it soothes. And, as God has greatly cared for His flowers, He has greatly cared for this book. Its Maker has made it very beautiful.

In a later Testament than the one from which we here read, the Bible is fearless in its record of the descent of

Jesus Christ from Adam in humanity's ordinary course. It seems almost to go out of its way to tell all the truth of that succession, as if it would emphasize some dark links in the chain that was stretched along the earth-level attaching from generation to generation the Son of God to the sons of men. Here we are shown that mysterious connexion at one of its sweetest and holiest joinings ; and the link which we see being historically forged is of cleanest gold. "Boaz begat Obed of Ruth ; and Obed begat Jesse ; and Jesse begat David" ; and Jesus the Saviour was David's son. Of Ruth, then, according to the flesh (we must never forget) Christ came. Yet it would be a disregard of the truth of humanity and of God's divinest work in human nature if we were to trace His power and purpose in history, and if we found His meaning and order in the arranging and adjusting of the Bible part to part into a perfect whole, but either were unwilling or failed to see His presence and some elements of His own power in the individual hearts and separate lives of those who are named in His Book and who acted parts in the scenes there depicted. The light which falls on the face of her whose life pervades this book with a spiritual spell, is light from heaven—the light which is the life of men ; and the love which filled her Moabite heart so full was love which came fresh from the heart of God Himself. One who loved as Ruth did, whether she was a daughter of Moab or of Israel, was not far from the kingdom of God ; and every such life as hers, whether lived long ago or being lived to-day, is preparing on earth a way for Christ.

This little book, so fairly set yet so firmly fixed in an important historical place in Holy Scripture, would seem, therefore, to have even a higher mission than to illustrate and complete Hebrew history. Here we have the Eternal appreciation of every-day virtue and service in the midst of little ordinary things, and the Divine recognition of these

as powers in making the world what God wants it to be. There is given in the pleasing form of a fireside tale God's own testimony to the Divine essence in all truest human love and His vindication of love's continual self-sacrifice; and, in its setting in God's own Book, this fragment of Hebrew folklore is meant to teach that, in the timidest breast of timid woman, there may reside an energy which affects human life and the destinies of ages more even than clattering arms and clashing armies. "Ruth" is thus a book for correction and instruction. For we are all inclined to make much more of any loud winter storm than of the lingering summer tide, and of a raging lightning cloud than of the gentle daily light. Why else have we made so little of Ruth and so much of Samson with his club and of Deborah with her fiery tocsin? Yet a mightier force than that of armies came as softly as the dayspring over the hills of Moab that morning when Ruth timed her steps to Naomi's there; and she, bringing into Judah only a woman's heart filled with a wonderful love, was able to do more for the land of her exile than its soldiers spending themselves in battle all along its frontiers.

To teach gentle lessons the wise use gentle methods; and it is to remind us of what we daily forget that, after the wreck of things in *Judges*, the fair and modest form of Ruth is here shown us "gliding in serene and slow," like the white doe of the immortal poem amidst the ruins of the abbey, and, "as one incapable of her own distress," diffusing lustre and peace around her life which love and duty have redeemed of its own sorrow. Every man had been doing that which was right in his own eyes; havoc had been made of the nation's life and all was turbulent and rude. But no miracle was wrought, nor any sign given from heaven, when God began to heal and renew. No deed of heroism was done in high places nor was there valour in war; no sword is drawn nor bow bent in all the

pages of this book, and its only rites are those of two holy hearts in faithfulness and purity and blameless love. God's Word to make all things new was spoken, and God's steps in history towards the Christ were being taken, when Ruth, unaware and half-bewildered, came in amidst the confusion to appease and reconcile and subdue. The power put forth is that of a woman, not rarely endowed by nature nor highly idealized by those who tell her story, but

A Creature not too bright or good
For human nature's daily food.

Only the common and essential characteristics of womanhood are represented in Ruth—a lowly mind, a large and loving heart, and active brightness; and, for this reason, a universal reference and appeal attach to all that is told us of her. The plainest and the most refined, the richest and the poorest, all and alike feel that they may say of her, “The same is my sister and mother”; for Ruth's need was what every woman knows and her comfort what every woman desires. Any woman can (so to speak) substitute herself for Ruth, and can imagine herself thinking, feeling, acting just as she did. Strong lessons in resignation to God's will and gratitude for His goodness may be learned here as throughout all Scripture, but the distinctive and finer teaching of the book is given when almost unconsciously our heart is drawn with our eyes to the woman herself, who in these imperishable verses, as in an avenue where both sunshine and shadow fall, flits and lingers continually.

Those who are to read this story aright must cultivate a certain spiritual mood; they must in a measure breathe and absorb the spirit of the book itself. Antiquity surrounds and secludes it like the wilderness around an oasis; and there has thus been preserved to it its own old-world innocence and simplicity. This should restrain our

present-day spirit as we enter a place so enclosed and guarded, and should not only forbid our rudely disturbing or even too rudely gazing, but should subdue our soul to reverence and affection. We must be in sympathy with all that is pure and of good report, if we are here to love; and love we must if we are to understand. In this book the Bible brings its readers to all time into a place of rest. God here blesses His people with peace. There is no commotion here, only a gentle and gracious movement. The narrative no longer sounds in a rocky bed; it glides among the smooth stones. The ear is no longer stunned; it is lulled. We are beside the still waters, and all around us is a sweet native wildness—a natural unmolested garden, where fine instinct and virtue have their own way of growing. A melodious spot it is too, where the song of God has its seasons! The book is sacred to the lowly and the poor; its *genius loci* is a woman of simplest life and of russet homebred sweetness—the Hebrew saint of meekness and of poverty, with whom if we walk this garden we shall meet with God.

ARMSTRONG BLACK.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

IV.

THE VOCATION ACCEPTED.

1. FROM Jesus' utterance in the Temple, when He was twelve years old, a light falls forward; and from His words at His baptism, when He was thirty, a light falls backward; and thus the intervening eighteen years, in which He grew from youth to manhood, although no record of His sayings and doings has been preserved for us, need not be shrouded in utter darkness. He returned to the home and the workshop in Nazareth with the moral imperative heard, and the

filial consciousness aroused within His soul, and with, we seem to be warranted in adding, a growing sense that His filial consciousness was not shared, and the moral imperative was not heard by all. During the period of preparation for His vocation which followed, these factors in His personal experience were more fully developed. With the growth of His reason His filial consciousness would become more definite and certain; and, with the growth of His conscience, the moral imperative would become more absolute and urgent. As His knowledge of the world and of men widened and deepened, there must have been to His sinless and perfect spirit an ever fuller disclosure of the wickedness and godlessness abounding around Him, of the need and unrest, misery and hopelessness of human life. He was learning that the world was needing a Saviour, and that He was the Saviour for whom it was waiting.

2. The world's need He could learn from the book of human life which lay open to His discerning and sympathetic gaze, and the parables very clearly and fully show how close an observer He was of all man's works and ways. His own call to meet the world's need He learned from several sources. Probably His parents, after His visit to Jerusalem, as He grew to manhood, disclosed to Him more fully the revelation of His character and destiny made at His birth. If, as is often with some reason assumed, Joseph died before His ministry began it is not unlikely that the time of mourning in the home was an occasion when His mother took out of the treasury of her memory the marvellous and sacred secrets which had been there stored. Meditation and reflection did doubtless deepen and strengthen His sense of God's Fatherhood and of His call to a work for God; but as He was fully and truly man, the inward did not develop without the outward; meditation and reflection were nourished by the study of the

Holy Scriptures. A promise of a Saviour was there fully and clearly given. What we call Messianic prophecy had, as we now more fully recognize, an immediate function for the enlightenment and encouragement of the contemporaries of each prophet. It acquired very great value for the Apostolic age and the Christian Church as an apologetic argument, as a proof that Jesus was the Christ, in whom God's promises were Yea and Amen. It rendered the most wondrous service as the means by which Jesus was enlightened about His high and holy calling for His Father.

3. While we may thus conjecture for general reasons that the holy Scriptures exercised the function of instruction and stimulus in Jesus' personal development, we must closely examine His use of the Old Testament in His public ministry to discover what He learned from prophecy about Himself and His work. In examining Jesus' quotations from, and references to, the Old Testament two considerations must ever be kept in view. Firstly, His use of the Old Testament in His public ministry was didactic and even sometimes polemical, and therefore as a whole does not afford us any certain guidance as to what portions had specially nourished His inner life in His preparation for His work. The references to the law in the Sermon on the Mount have no direct bearing on His view of His vocation. His use of the 110th Psalm in His controversy with the scribes is no proof that the Davidic kingship had any attractions for Him. His quotations and references do show His thorough familiarity with the whole of the Old Testament, so that He could freely and readily draw instruments of instruction and weapons of warfare from it whenever He needed ; but do not prove that for His consciousness of His vocation all parts were equally significant. Secondly, the Gospels have not preserved for us much which we should desire to know. We may be sure that after the

confession by the disciples of the Messiahship of Jesus, and His first announcement of His approaching Passion, He taught them much about His resolves and expectations; and probably in that teaching, were it now before us, we could discover more certainly and adequately by what portions of Scripture Jesus Himself was most deeply and strongly influenced. But the disciples, as the record shows beyond doubt or question, were at this time losing sympathy with their Master. Cherishing their own foolish and vain dream about the coming of His kingdom, and their own place and power in it, they were not interested in, and did not remember what He was teaching them about, His Cross; and, therefore, the reports of His sayings on this great theme are so fragmentary and inadequate. Hence neither the frequency nor the number of Jesus' quotations from any part of the Old Testament can decide the question, which was most influential. One single quotation, owing to its occasion or purpose, may be such more decisive for this question than many others.

4. It is at least interesting to note that the author of the First Gospel is reminded by the character of the ministry of Jesus of words written about the Servant of Jehovah. (Matt. viii. 17 is a quotation from Isaiah liii. 4, and Matt. xii. 18-21 from Isaiah xlii. 1-4.) Each of the Synoptists finds in the same prophecy a definite anticipation of some circumstance of the Passion (Matt. xxi. 5 quotes Isaiah lxii. 11, Mark xv. 28 Isaiah liii. 12, and Luke xxii, 37 the same verse as Mark). The fourth Evangelist (John xii. 38) finds the unbelief with which Jesus was met foretold in Isaiah liii. 1. Jesus in His first discourse in Nazareth, according to Luke iv. 18, 19, claimed that he had fulfilled the prophecy in Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, and lviii. 6. His answer to the question of John the Baptist has reference to the same prophetic ideal (Matt. xi. 5, 6). These two passages are of crucial significance, and their testimony is worth more than

many quotations used in teaching and in argument in revealing to us the views He held regarding His work. The use which He makes of the title *Son of Man* does in no way weaken the conviction that the ideal which He set before Him for realization was not the Davidic kingship, but the Servant of Jehovah. That the title was suggested by the vision of Daniel of "one like unto a son of man" (vii. 13), and that Jesus claimed for Himself the dominion there described (Matt. xxvi. 64) cannot be denied; but surely we may allow that Jesus had sufficient originality to put His own meaning into the title, which He chose for Himself. Some of the sayings in which the name is used show Him in His lowliness and gentleness, far more like the Servant of Isaiah than the ruler of Daniel. The writer cannot be persuaded that there is much to be gained for our understanding of the mind of Jesus from the Apocalyptic literature, especially the *Book of Enoch*. It is not certain that He had in His early manhood in Nazareth access to this literature. Even if He had, it is not likely that such writing would exercise over His mind the same influence as the far more spiritual teaching of the prophet of the Exile. That the title used by Him has such prominence in this work, is no proof that His conception was not His own, but was borrowed from it.

5. This inquiry as to the origin of Jesus' ideal would be quite useless if, as is sometimes assumed, He began His ministry with some vague anticipations that He had a work for God to do, but found out only during its course what that work was. This seems to the writer an absolutely incredible assumption. Jesus did not make experiments, and only by their failure or success find out what the path of duty for Himself was. He did not begin with the expectation of being the victorious and successful Son of David, and only when disappointed and defeated form the intention to be the suffering and the saving Servant of Jehovah.

Doubtless He learned the definite conditions under which His work was to be done by an experience of them, the immediate duty by the appropriate occasion, the particular directions of His course by God's guidance of His every step in answer to His prayers. He had not a full-timed programme which He carried through; but He knew what His vocation was before He began to fulfil it. The thirty years' preparation, in which he learned what His work was, was adequate for His three years' ministry, in which he fulfilled His calling. As has already been indicated, we have reason to believe that the vocation He was conscious of, and accepted, was that of a Saviour from sin by the sacrifice of Himself.

6. Are these conjectures confirmed and transformed into certainties by what we may learn about the Inner Life of Jesus from the records of the Baptism? If we learn what was the significance of John's baptism generally, we may be helped to discover what it meant for Jesus. John preached the approach of the kingdom of God as a judgment on the sinful, called to repentance and amendment of life, and promised a time of spiritual revival. By the rite of baptism was symbolized repentance for sin and resolve of amendment. Even as a preparation for the new covenant which God was about to form with His people, it must have meant at least this, that the people were ready to admit their great need, and to welcome the good gift of this new covenant, in which forgiveness of sin and spiritual renewal were the greatest blessings promised. Taken broadly, baptism was the self-dedication to the new order of which John was a herald. For Jesus baptism could not mean repentance for personal sin and resolve of personal amendment; for He had no sense of guilt, and felt no need of reformation. If it had no significance or value for Himself it could not confirm John's ministry, but would have been an empty compliment unworthy alike

of him by whom and to whom it was offered. If Jesus had no need of baptism for Himself, He could not submit to it simply as an example to others, for action must be dutiful if it is to be exemplary. We do not teach others their duty, and encourage them to do it by doing what is not our duty also. There was a feature in common between the baptism of Jesus and of the people generally. In both cases it was a response to a Divine summons. Jesus too dedicated Himself to the new order. But the difference between Himself and others was this, they dedicated themselves as recipients and subjects, He as fully endowed and fully empowered agent and sovereign. His private preparation in the home was by this act closed and His public ministry in the world was opened. At His baptism He abandoned His family good and duty, and devoted Himself wholly to the fulfilment of God's will in His calling. But the baptism seems to enable us to define that vocation more closely and to discover in it a direct reference to repentance and amendment. If He was resolved to realize the ideal of the Servant of Jehovah, then He conceived His vocation as vicarious. He was called to save by suffering for the people. The new covenant required His sacrifice as a condition of its institution, and in dedicating Himself to the new covenant He dedicated Himself to the Sacrifice. In His baptism he gave Himself to a vicarious repentance and amendment.

7. We must, however, look more closely at this conception of vicarious sacrifice, because it is beset with misunderstandings. It is by no legal fiction that the iniquities of us all were laid on Him, that He was reckoned among transgressors, and that God made Him to be sin for us. It was by an organic union, a vital self-identification, tender devoted sympathy with the race, that He made its sin, guilt, shame and curse vicariously His own. The possibility of His substitution has sometimes been based on the

universal relations of the Word of God to the race. Without questioning the reality of these relations, or their significance and value for a theory of the atonement, which seeks to take into account all that may be helpful for a solution of the problem, the writer must express his conviction that for religious experience the psychology of Jesus is far more interesting and influential than the metaphysics of the Word, that what will appeal more potently to Christian faith is the adequate recognition of the vicarious element in Jesus' own consciousness. He was so truly man, and so deeply loved mankind, that nothing human was alien to Him, that He did not stand apart in lofty superiority, in harsh contempt, or stern judgement from the sin and misery of the race; but he felt the burden and the blight, the sorrow and the shame, the darkness and desolation of man's sin as His very own, just as the parent feels his child's wrongdoing, and the patriot his country's dishonour; but He felt more keenly than any man, with mind darkened and heart dulled by sin, can feel. It was not condescension but compassion which brought Him to John's baptism, in which He accepted, not as a grievous burden or unwelcome task, but as His freely and readily chosen calling from love to God and man, a responsibility for, and an obligation in regard to, the world's sin.

8. This vicarious consciousness of Jesus seems to throw some light on one of the deepest problems regarding the relations of the infinite God and finite man which human thought has ever attempted to deal with. The question has been raised, Is not God's infinitude limited by His finite creatures? Does not the freedom of man's will especially introduce, as it were, a foreign element into the Divine existence and consciousness? But if the Infinite can, so to speak, appropriate as His own the whole life of His creatures, can live in them, can transform their mental, moral, and spiritual experience, so as to make it even a

subordinate moment in His own perfection and blessedness, then the finite does not limit the Infinite, but becomes His organ and function. If this be so, then the more universal any consciousness is, the wider the range of feeling, the deeper the reach of thought, the greater the result of effort which it can vicariously experience, the more abounding the life of others which it can re-live in its own convictions, affections, and purposes, the nearer is it to the infinite consciousness of God. It was a consequence of Jesus' divinity as the Son of God, that He possessed a true and full humanity as Son of Man, that He re-lived in Himself the life of the race, and thus bore its burden, waged its warfare, endured its trial, and passed through its shadow and even let its curse fall on Him. While in human life generally there is this vicarious element, it can be realized perfectly only in One, in whom manhood has its home in the bosom of God. For the full explanation of the psychology of Jesus, His vicarious consciousness, we need the metaphysics of the Word of God, His universal relations; yet it is the psychology, through which alone we can with interest and intelligence approach the metaphysics.

9. The answer Jesus gave to John's question at the baptism does not contradict but confirms the conclusion regarding His vicarious consciousness, which we have reached. What was the righteousness which Jesus felt bound to fulfil? It was not the righteousness of the Pharisees, the strict and literal observance of rites and precepts from fear of punishment or hope of reward. It was not even the righteousness which John required of the people—repentance and reform. He was, it is true, in closer agreement with John than the Pharisees, for the Pharisaic conception involved the view of God as lawgiver, ruler, and judge, but John's involved a recognition of God's presence and action in human history to save and bless men who in humility and confidence committed themselves to Him. Jesus' conception

of righteousness was most probably that of Isaiah liii. 11. The righteous Servant shall justify many because He shall bear their iniquities. It is in His vicarious consciousness and the sacrifice which this would ultimately involve that Jesus fulfilled all righteousness. There is a higher righteousness than being justified by one's own works, a higher even than depending on God's forgiveness; and that belongs to Him who undertakes by His own loving sacrifice for sinners to secure God's forgiveness on their behalf.

10. That Jesus at His Baptism had the ideal of the Servant of Jehovah before His mind, and even in His answer refers explicitly to the prophetic language, finds a further confirmation in a saying of John the Baptist's, recorded in the Fourth Gospel, which many scholars have found it quite impossible to accept as a genuine utterance of John's at the time. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." This is so unlike the testimony to the work of the Messiah given by the Baptist, according to the Synoptists, that even those who accept the saying as genuine are forced to conclude that we have here a solitary prophetic intuition unrelated to, and inexplicable by, his habitual modes of thought. But the incompleteness of the narrative allows us to assume that there was some conversation between Jesus and John; that Jesus communicated to John what His own ideal of His work was, that accordingly John's words refer to what is recorded in Isaiah liii. about the Servant as "a Lamb led to the slaughter"; that Jesus for a time at least raised John's mind to the height of His own insight; that when the influence of Jesus was withdrawn John relapsed to His own familiar modes of thought; and that the answer of Jesus by the two disciples on a later occasion was a kindly reminder of the conversation in which He had persuaded him of the truth and rightness of the ideal which He was faithfully realizing.

11. If this was the task which Jesus at His baptism accepted then He dedicated Himself to humiliation. But because He had humbled Himself God at once highly exalted Him. Whether the vision and the voice had a purpose for John and the people as well we need not now inquire; all that now concerns us is what it meant for Jesus. It confirmed His filial consciousness; it sealed with the Divine approval His dedication to His work, the summons to which had come to Him in John's preaching, and the character of which He had symbolically indicated in His acceptance of John's baptism. There was besides an endowment with supernatural power by the descent of the Spirit. We have no evidence that Jesus wrought any miracles before His public ministry began, nay, we have no reason to suppose that He was even conscious of any miraculous power. The Spirit had been His from the beginning as the Spirit of truth and grace; by the Spirit's operations His conduct had been guided, and His character formed. The Spirit as a revelation of His filial relation to God did not first come to Him at His baptism. But the manifestation of the Spirit at His baptism was, as at Pentecost, a communication of supernatural power. He received resources for His work on which he had not reckoned when anticipating and dedicating Himself to it; hence He was in a sense unprepared for the use of those powers unless in so far as His absolute submission to God and His entire devotion were the best preparation for any moral emergency. It was necessary that a decision should be definitely formed regarding the exercise of His supernatural power in His public ministry. This decision Jesus made in His temptation, the subject of the next Study, by rejecting all such use of His power as to His moral discernment and spiritual insight seemed inconsistent with the vocation which in His baptism He had accepted.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

BITTER OR HONEY-SWEET ?

THE student of ecclesiastical history, as he ploughs his way wearily through the interminable controversies of the Reformation period in the German-speaking lands, catches a sudden glimpse, at a certain epoch, of *one* controversy which can hardly fail to awake in him at least a lively sense of surprise and curiosity—unless his course of reading has banished all hope and all human interest from his mind. It is as though one went on foot through a dreary country of featureless barren hills, scarred and torn with the dry ugly channels of winter torrents ; and all at once one turned a corner, and saw afar off a vista of lofty mountains and of wide flats, half-lighted up by a brilliant sun, half obscured by thunder clouds. Here, at last, is something worth looking at, something which challenges and stimulates and rewards an eager curiosity, something as interesting as unexpected.

The controversy of religion to which I allude was that very remarkable—and surely very fundamental—one, in which the watchwords were those quoted above, and in which the combatants were the followers of Luther and Zwingli on one side and the (so-called) Anabaptists on the other. There were many things indeed on which they differed widely ; many points in respect of which the views of the better sort of Anabaptists were surprisingly “modern” as contrasted with those of their opponents ; but what really and truly divided them utterly and hopelessly was that diametrically opposite conception of the Christian life and calling in respect to this world which is briefly expressed in the question “bitter, or honey-sweet ?” Below and behind all other controversy about freewill, predestination, total corruption, justification by faith alone, eternal punishment, universal Fatherhood of God, internal

and innate witness of the Spirit, authority of the written Word, and so forth (as to all which it may be modestly but unhesitatingly claimed that the whole trend of modern religious opinion is towards the Anabaptist position) lay those two contrasted and irreconcilable ideals of what Christian life was meant to be, what its aim and object and motive. Quite apart from the extravagances of some, and the criminal follies of a few (upon which the ecclesiastical historians have unfortunately suffered themselves to dwell with exclusive attention), it was in fact this conception of Christian life and duty which made the Anabaptists so abhorrent to the ruling powers, both Catholic and Protestant, that they got no hearing and found no mercy. More than that, it was this same conception of Christian life and duty which made them so obnoxious to the great and successful leaders of the Reformation that these were (to say the least of it) grievously impatient and unfair towards them in word and deed. When any one tries to say a good word for "Anabaptists," people always think of Münster, and the horrible crimes which were perpetrated there. But it was many long years before John of Leyden came to the front, many long years before any excesses were even charged on these poor folk; it was at a time when even their enemies testified to the wonderful patience with which they endured affliction, that Zwingli advocated and Luther applauded the harshest measures against them. In this matter we need not judge them. They may have been quite justified. Truly the times were very difficult; and men who were in sore perplexity, and honestly believed that the attitude of the Anabaptists jeopardized the whole future of the Reformation, may be forgiven if they were not charitable, or even just: But it is at least right to point out that it was *not* the excesses of the Anabaptists (which did not then exist), but the peculiar convictions of the Anabaptists as to Christian life and duty, which aroused so

much wrath against them in the breast of Christian professors. Moreover, these convictions—however peculiar they may have seemed then, or seem now—cannot be set lightly aside or treated as wild extravagances by those who take the New Testament as their guide to faith and piety.

The Anabaptists were accused of preaching a “bitter Christ.” They accepted (in a certain sense) the phrase, and retorted by asserting that their opponents preached a “honey-sweet Christ.” The words sound strangely, and even offensively, in our ears; yet, if we examine them dispassionately, they serve to express a contrast which was no particular or partial one, but did in fact extend to the whole length and breadth of the religion which was inculcated on the one side or the other. None doubted then (nor does any one doubt now) that our Lord came, in part, to set a certain stamp upon the life of His followers here upon earth. What was that stamp—the seal of the living God—to be? What was to be the general character and colour of the Christian life, whereby they should be known as Christ’s disciples? Was a good Christian’s life to be pre-eminently a joyful one? joyful, because on the spiritual side Christ has done all, and suffered all, for us; joyful, because on the material side our heavenly Father giveth us all things richly to enjoy: joyful, therefore, without misgiving and without restraint—save such as prudence and decorum demand: joyful, even unto joviality, if the high spirits, if the necessary means, are given? Or was the Christian’s life intended and foretold to be an arduous and a sorrowful pilgrimage through a desert land, wherein the true disciple can never feel himself at home, never pretend that he has anything more than a very partial and fugitive interest, always having before his eyes the prospect of infinitely better things to come?

The moment we ask ourselves this question we perceive that it *may* be answered, that it *is* answered, in both ways.

As a matter of fact the former is commonly inculcated in the Christian teaching of to-day, while the latter is assumed or expressed in the hymns which we have inherited. There is nothing ridiculous in this discrepancy—though to ridicule it is so very easy—because it merely reflects a discrepancy deeper down, a discrepancy within the Christian revelation itself. Take, for instance, the view which commended itself to Luther and to the great Gospel teachers of that day: how much there is in the New Testament, and (let us add) in human nature at its best, to bear it out! Putting aside particular texts like S. Matthew vi. 33, or 1 Timothy iv. 8, the whole revelation of the Father delivered by our Lord Himself in the Gospels leads irresistibly to this conclusion. If it is Our Father who hath appointed us to glory and a kingdom hereafter, it is that same heavenly Father who hath sent us into this world now, and made this world so fair and so happy a place as (on the whole) it is, and given us a nature so that we must needs love life and want to see good days. If He is the Father for the aged man who turns his dim eyes wistfully towards the uncreated light, so He is for the little child that shouts and plays in absolute unconsciousness of any life but this; so He is for the young man and maiden who are (almost literally) all in all to one another. None who believes in “the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”—the Father whom He taught us to love and trust and worship—could possibly want to silence the merriment of that child, or to stifle the happiness of those young people. But we are all of us children to a great extent, and if we are old in years the most of us (and the best of us) are always young in heart. Even in the days of persecution, therefore, we may be sure that most Christians were happy most of the time, for the simple reason that they too were human beings, and were intended by their Father in heaven to be happy, and were all the better able to be happy because they recognized His lovingkindness

and were not anxious about the morrow. When people think about the primitive Christians, in the days of the Apostles and afterwards, they seem so often to forget that they were our fellow-creatures, having the same instincts, the same limitations, the same necessities. The fountain of laughter, of merriment, of joy in things felt and seen, is inexhaustible in human nature. Nothing dries it up in good men's hearts, whatever their trials. Let the cloud lift ever so little, and they will begin to sing and play; they will "eat drink and be merry" whenever they have the chance. Who shall find fault, since the All-wise has made us like that—for the most part? How much better frankly to set the seal of God's approval, and of a clear conscience, upon a life as joyful, as full of vivid interest, as light-hearted, as the circumstances will allow! That was, and is—as everybody knows—the answer given by common sense and piety (which do ever go astray except they go hand in hand) taking their stand at once upon the broad facts of human life and the broad teachings of Holy Scripture. It is so obvious that God has made the world exceeding fair, and human life full of pleasures, great and varied; so obvious that He has, for His own purposes, made the pursuit of pleasure the dominant factor in our being, although it may, of course, be displaced partially and temporarily; so obvious that, if all men behaved as God would have them, the sum of human joy and gladness would be indefinitely increased; so obvious, again, that Christ came to redeem and ennoble human nature—not to alter it into something radically different. This answer, therefore,—this "honey-sweet" theory of the gospel, as the Anabaptists called it—commended itself (as it does still) not only to the unthinking multitude, but to a great part of the best and most thoughtful men. It commended itself in especial to the German Reformers, Luther and Zwingli: it fell in with the admirable "sanity" of their attitude towards

religion and common life, with that wonderful knowledge of and sympathy with human nature in its broad and everyday aspects, which made them so powerful—within limits, so irresistible. If a man heartily accepted the gospel of salvation, of reconciliation through the blood of Christ, of Christian liberty and abrogation of all demands and all restraints save those which were for his own good, how could he fail to be joyful? and if it pleased God (as it generally did) to give him the means of enjoying himself here and now, why should he not? The mere fact that God had implanted in his nature these desires of enjoyment, and granted these means of gratifying them, was warrant enough. Why should not a man spend his leisure hours in pleasant company, drinking good wine, and playing on an instrument of music? Why should any fellow Christian look sourly upon him for doing so, or suspect him without cause of excess or riot? “That man is a fool who does not love women, wine, and music.” It was a very courageous saying—but there was plenty of Scripture for it! All three were at the marriage feast of Cana in Galilee—and our Lord was there too. The asceticism in respect of these three which so early crept into the Christian Church (as early as the Second Epistle to Timothy, as early as the Acts of Paul and Thecla) is not Christian in character or origin, but “Manichæan.” If such a saying, therefore, offends the ears of many pious people nowadays, it is only because they draw a dangerous distinction between what one thinks in real life and what one is supposed to think in religion. Let us clear our minds of cant. It is possible, after a fashion, to get rid of the wine from the marriage feast of Cana, at which Jesus was, and His disciples. It is possible to do this indirectly by persuading oneself that it was unfermented—that it was only grape-juice. But not even this hardihood of explanation will get rid of that other and more dangerous element—the women. It is not the bride,

of course, but "the virgins that be her fellows," both wise and foolish, as always. They were good and innocent, it will be urged, as became the friends of the friends of Christ! So was the wine—however strongly alcoholic. It is the sad fate (let us say) of wine and of women, human nature being what it is, to cause the most dangerous excitements, perturbations and confusions in the minds and the affairs of men. All history, ancient and modern, heathen and Christian, is full of it. Three-fourths of our Christian literature (as *read*) turns on nothing else. You cannot drive away the women from the feast of Cana; why trouble about the wine? The intoxication which the former will produce among the unwary and excitable is far and away more dangerous to their religious peace and religious progress than any which the latter can set up. Nevertheless Jesus *was* there, and brought His disciples with Him; and as the wine loosed the tongues of the guests, He listened with kindly tolerance to the rising tide of merriment and laughter. They did not talk theology at that feast or discuss spiritual experiences, any more than at that other feast in Levi's house, when he entertained for the last time his old friends and acquaintance. The kind of talk which goes on at marriage feasts (barring the baser elements, of which we need not speak) is much the same all the world over. It is not spiritual in tone; it is not intellectual in character. If our Lord listened to it with kindly tolerance—as we are sure from His subsequent action that He did—it was not because it appealed to *Him*, but because He knew that "the love of women, wine, and music" is innate in every man, and must be reckoned with even by the Saviour of the World. Therefore (be it said with reverence) He set Himself not to cast out this love of the creature, but to educate, to refine, to restrain, to sanctify it. Thus argued the great leaders of the German Reformation, and we cannot say they were wrong: to do so would

be to set ourselves in contradiction to much that is most characteristic of the Gospels.

But the gospel which so many divines preached, and so many princes as well as peoples accepted with enthusiasm—broad and tolerant as it was, and level to the apprehension and the sympathy of the average man—did not commend itself at all to a great multitude who were afterwards known to the world as Anabaptists. It failed to convince them, or even to attract them. In order to understand, let us see first what manner of men they were. They were almost all of them working people, people of the lower class, who had been trained in the school of adversity to think instinctively of life as always hard and often bitter. That particular age was one of unexampled hardship for the poor. Again, they had behind them the lively memories of persecution. All through the middle ages, and especially in the last century, there had been men and women in plenty who found no satisfaction in the dominant religion, who cherished with ardour a secret faith whose foundation was the Book, whose strength was personal communion with God. Some were inside the Catholic Church, some outside. They were Fraticelli, Beguines, Friends of God, Mystics, and many other things. It made little difference. If their faith was known, the Church put forth her hand and crushed the life out of them, one way or another. When the breath of religious liberty passed over central Europe, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, all that were left of them, all that had learnt of them in secret, came forth from their holes and corners; they stood up on their feet, like an exceeding great army, because the hour was come that they should bear witness to their faith—to the amazement and confusion of the princes of this world. Again—and this was the chief thing—these men had read the New Testament for themselves, and to them it spoke a very different lan-

guage. They found little or nothing there about the joyousness of life, but very much about its sadness, its danger, its delusion. They read no precepts there about eating and drinking and being merry—except in the mouths of heathenish men and reprobates. They found the immediate followers of Christ spoken of and spoken to as a little flock, as sheep in the midst of wolves, as pilgrims passing through innumerable dangers and deceits to their true home beyond. No one can deny that they were right. Whatever there is to be set on the *other* side, there is beyond question a great deal on *this* side. The general tone of the New Testament writings is unmistakable, and this tone grows graver, sadder, as it draws towards the end. In 2 Timothy iii. 12, “*all that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution*”; in Rev. vii. (and *passim*) there are none in glory save those who come out of the great tribulation. It is only custom, and the blinding power of a vague human tradition, which enables us so largely to ignore the fact. The Anabaptists (we say) ought to have considered that the tone of the New Testament writings is in this respect determined by the circumstances of the first age, by the poverty and reproach and persecution which were the constant accompaniments of discipleship. To that there are two answers. As for the Anabaptists, their circumstances were not different. In all the wide-lying Austrian lands, in the thickly-peopled South-German lands, they died, not by hundreds, but by thousands. Even in the Swiss cantons they were slain. Men and women perished alike: the only difference was that the husband was burnt, the wife was drowned. They may be pardoned if they failed to appreciate the one feature which distinguished their case from that of the first Christians. These had been trampled upon and slain by heathen or Jewish rulers; they themselves by rulers nominally Christian. When Luther himself was firmly convinced that the Pope

was Antichrist, the Anabaptists may be forgiven if they saw the mark of the Beast on all the governments of that sanguinary and ferocious age.

The other answer is for us, as well as for them. Ought we to take the strong language of the New Testament with so light a heart as we generally do? If internal evidence goes for anything, neither our Lord nor His Apostles had the least suspicion that the epoch of suffering, of oppression, of necessary antagonism between the disciples and "the world," would ever cease, until the end came. Granted that the suffering and the oppression were to cease (since ceased they have for the great majority of Christians) ought we so lightly to conclude that the antagonism was to cease too? Is the picture drawn in such clear outline in the New Testament of a Christian community, grave, sedate, upright, kindly disposed towards all, tenderly affectioned one towards another, ready to share everything with the brethren, submissive to all outward rule (save when it meddled with the things of God), earnestly expectant of the new heavens and the new earth—is this picture obsolete? Is it wholly superseded by the modern vision (which in parts hardly draws at all upon the New Testament) of the man full of laughter and good spirits, of the successful merchant, of the strenuous citizen, of the ardent politician, of one who throws himself with whole-hearted enthusiasm into a dozen pursuits and interests which (as far as we know) have no influence upon the life of the soul, and (as far as we can guess) will have no recognition whatever in the life beyond? It is worth thinking about, because our religion must be false if it is not conformed to the New Testament, and because (all cultus of isolated texts apart) there can hardly be any serious doubt what the general tone and colour of the New Testament is in this respect. The crimes of the Anabaptists—which made them so hateful in the eyes of the rulers—were all to be found in the

persuasion that they ought to live as the first Christians were told to live. They lived separate, sharing all things voluntarily with one another. They obeyed the laws (save on religion) but they would not help to put the laws in exercise—for the laws were cruel and unrighteous. They told the truth, but would not take oaths—for our Saviour had forbidden that. They offered no resistance to violence and wrong, but they would not bear arms,—for how could brother stand up to slay his brother, simply because they were subjects of neighbouring and rival tyrants? Certainly there are few Christian Socialists to-day who would not heartily approve the principles on which they acted. Certainly no Christian folk ever had a better right to take to themselves the words, “For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we were accounted as sheep for the slaughter.” By the deliberate violence of their enemies they were slain, all the sort of them: by the hardly less cruel unfairness of their rivals their memory has been obscured or blasted even unto this day. Yet even so we have to ask ourselves to-day “Which was after all the true version of the Gospel, the bitter, or the honey-sweet?” Was so much of the New Testament, so much of its exhortation and precept, so much (above all) of its tone and colour, merely temporary and accidental? Is there no call *to-day* to come out and be separate? Is there no room *to-day* for communities, as well as for individuals, living and working on really Christian principles? Is that *diffused* influence of Christianity, which is at once so powerful and so weak, the only form which has the Divine sanction? If men and women are in earnest, and if they stand aghast at the evils of the time, should they not enter into closer partnership of life and means, forsaking the desires of the mind as well as of the flesh, in order to live more nearly as they pray? The Word of God has a wonderful vitality of its own. Buried in obscurity, which is often only the obscurity of

familiarity, it comes out of its grave in due season. There were large elements of the New Testament which, ignored for centuries, sprang to light and life again at the Reformation, and have so continued. There are other elements, perhaps, which awoke then likewise, only to be discredited and cast out. But if they are there, they also must live and work, and that mightily, for no word of God—no phase of New Testament teaching—can return unto Him void: it shall accomplish that which He pleases, it shall prosper in the thing whereto He sent it.

R. WINTERBOTHAM.

THE INTERPRETATION OF HABAKKUK
CHAPTERS I. AND II.

CHAPTER I.

THERE has been considerable discussion in recent years regarding the interpretation of Habakkuk chapter i., and there are striking differences in the contending views which are presented. In connexion with those discussions certain proposals for the rearrangement of the text have received increasing prominence. The writer believes that the text of chapter i. may be restored to an older sequence in a very much simpler manner than has been proposed hitherto. This conclusion, and the interpretation of the chapter which goes along with it, rest on principles which have not received much attention, at least in this connexion. A fresh consideration of the whole subject is therefore offered in the hope that it may be of some value.¹

The chapter is generally divided into three sections—verses 2-4, 5-11, 12-17. There is controversy regarding (1) the subject matter or historical background of each, (2)

¹ A good account of the problems of the chapter and of the interpretations given to it will be found in G. A. Smith's *Twelve Prophets* (1898). See also *EXPOSITOR*, 1895.

the relation of the sections to one another. The problems of the chapter practically all emerge in a discussion of the first section.

In verses 2-4 Habakkuk complains of oppression, that is clear and undisputed. But is the oppression of a class by their Jewish fellow-countrymen, or of the nation by a foreign people? Both views are held and each has an array of distinguished supporters. It seems to the present writer that the verses taken by themselves almost unequivocally favour the view that the wrongs are social wrongs, and that the injustice is inflicted by the strong on the weak within the Jewish community itself.¹ The view that the oppressors are a foreign people, and that it is the Jewish State that suffers the oppression, is really an inference drawn from the other sections of the chapter. The extent to which it is inconsistent with the actual wording and natural interpretation of verses 2-4 is confessed in a very practical manner by Nowack, one of its latest supporters.² He thinks it necessary to excise a number of words and phrases that will not adapt themselves to the interpretation which he believes the remoter context demands. Budde's isolated attempt to infer the existence of foreign oppression from the actual wording of the verses³ will hardly be judged successful. It may be said that an inference *ab extra*, i.e. from a remote context, is made to override the natural sense of the passage itself.

The whole argument entered on a new stage when Giesebrecht (1890)⁴ and Budde (1893)⁵ independently pointed out the close connexion in language and tone between verse 12 f. and verses 2-4. They argued that the relationship is so intimate that we are justified in treating the last section of the chapter, verses 12-17, as the original continuation of 2-4.

¹ So Davidson (*Cambridge Bible*, 1896 and 1899), and Driver (*Introduction and D.B.*). ² *Kleine Propheten*, 1897. ³ *Expositor*, 1895, p. 379.

⁴ *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 196 ff. ⁵ *Theol. Stud. und Kritiken*, 1893, 383 ff.

This being granted, they read back the plain statements of verse 15 ff. into the less definite language of 2-4. They conclude that the oppression complained of in the earlier verses is at the hands of the foreign enemy described in the end of the chapter. This is the strongest argument that has been advanced in favour of such an interpretation of 2-4. Its supporters differ in their identifications of the oppressor and in their treatment of verses 5-11, but a preponderance of later writers have accepted the conclusion that a national oppression is complained of in the beginning of the chapter (Wellhausen, Nowack, Cornill, G. A. Smith).¹

Obviously the proposal to attach verses 12-17 to verses 2-4 is the vital part of the argument. It is somewhat remarkable that the weakness of the construction has not been more felt, especially since Rothstein has already suggested (1895)² that the argument for union is of partial application only. No more than verses 12 and 13 may rightly be regarded as a continuation of 2-4. The difference is all important. It is unnecessary to elaborate again the argument for attaching verses 12 and 13 to verses 2-4, but it is needful to give at some length the reasons which seem to forbid a similar treatment of the following verses. They may be stated as follows :

1. Verses 12 and 13 alone have that close relationship to 2-4 which is a justification for their being regarded as originally a continuation of them. When the following verses are made an integral part of this first section, we must recast our interpretation of it and indeed tamper with the text of 2-4 to secure harmony. We are not entitled to construct a consecutive passage from parts which differ so much when taken separately.

¹ The first two in the footsteps of Giesebrecht, the last two accepting Budde's arrangement.

² *Theol. Stud. und Kritiken*, 1895, p. 51 ff.

2. By the removal of verses 12 and 13 from their present position, 14-17 come to follow 5-11, and are seen at once to form a most convincing sequence. Rothstein has so far maintained this connexion, stopping however at verse 15. He corrects the first word of verse 14 תַּעֲשֶׂה, into יַעֲשֶׂה. The same correction, it is to be noted, is adopted by Nowack, although he does not join verse 14 to verse 11; it has support, therefore, apart from any hypothesis regarding the order of the verses. The present text is plainly accounted for by the second person in verse 13, with which תַּעֲשֶׂה was wrongly made to harmonize. After this correction the two sections, verses 5-11 and verses 14-17 unite with absolute smoothness. The description of the conqueror in 14-17 is altogether in the spirit and phraseology of 5-11. Supposing the original context of verses 12-13 could not be determined, it would still be sound criticism to remove them from their present position, in order to restore the connexion between verse 11 and verse 14. It is the height of improbability that 5-11 and 14-17 should describe different conquerors, as Budde and those who follow him maintain. In the latter section there is neither accusation nor complaint to form a link with verses 2-4.¹ The feeling expressed in verses 14-17 is exactly the same as in verses 9-11.

3. After verses 12-13 have been transferred to form a part of the first section of the chapter, a slight but significant connexion is established with the section following, 5-11. The first section, as restored, ends with a reference to certain בְּגֵרִים. Verse 5, which follows, commences with a summons to the בְּגֵרִים to take note of the advance of the Chaldean army.²

¹ In verse 17 read יַלְכֵן as LXX. Vulg. Syr. The interrogative הַ of M.T. is a dittography. Giesebrecht's reading הַיְעֹלָם is merely a conjecture and imports an expression of complaint into the section.

² This assumes the LXX. text, which is generally preferred to M.T.

4. The rearrangement of the text as now proposed assumes an error which is much more easily explained than the changes which Budde and Wellhausen presuppose. Two verses have fallen out on to the margin, and have then been replaced at the wrong point in the text. The correction is hardly more than a simple transposition.

According to the view here maintained, the whole chapter falls into four sections: verses 2-4, 5-11, 12-13, 14-17. By the transposition of 12 and 13 an older arrangement is restored, in which there are only two sections: 2-4 + 12-13 and 5-11 + 14-17. After this restoration the question of the historical background of the chapter is much simplified. The first of the two sections is a complaint of oppression in which the sufferers are named the righteous, and the oppressors are the wicked who deal treacherously, and have been ordained for judgement, yet so act that judgement is perverted. The oppressed suffer violence and iniquity and spoiling. This is a description of social conditions within the Jewish community. It agrees with the picture of society which Jeremiah, at the end of the seventh century B.C., lays before us. The second section is a delineation of the Chaldeans and their conquests. They are named in verse 6. It has been asserted that 14-17 describe a more advanced stage in the conquest than 5-11 do. It is probably because 14-17 are always read in the light of 12-13 that this has been maintained. At most there is a certain literary progress in the description. Budde lays quite undue stress on the wording of verse 6 in his argument; verses 10-11 are as much at variance with the strict interpretation of that verse as are 14 ff.

We have now to inquire what the connexion is, logically or historically, between these two sections. An important principle of interpretation is involved. When the relation of successive paragraphs or sections in a

prophetic writing is discussed, a right understanding of the literary character of such a document is of considerable moment. Every one is aware that the larger prophetic books are collections of the prophet's utterances, or of his written oracles. From a literary point of view they are an assemblage of fugitive pieces and not sustained compositions. It is therefore understood, to an increasing extent, that we are not entitled to assume connexion between successive paragraphs, or even at times between successive verses, unless the transition is smooth and evident. Mere juxtaposition is no serious presumption of chronological unity. We are not entitled to make transitions by conjecturing missing links. Continuous connected composition, even on a moderate scale, is the exception. Sometimes the chapters are a congeries of fragments. At all times they leave the impression of an imperfectly arranged assortment of the materials which a life of prophetic utterance and composition left behind it. Are the books of the "lesser" prophets in a different position? Some of them are so short that we are specially apt to assume that they are literary works or compositions. But we are not justified in doing so without proof. They also, for the most part, are collections, though of small extent; "remains" left by the prophet, or selections made in his lifetime. Successive paragraphs may not, as a matter of course, be assumed to be of the same date or to issue from the same situation. There must be proof in each case.

In the discussions on the connexion of sections in Habakkuk chapter i. this literary situation and this principle of treatment have been practically ignored. Indeed the bare assumption that there is a connexion between the successive paragraphs has been a ruling influence in the interpretation. This presumption must be laid aside, and the relation of the sections considered

without the bias which it imports. If the results already established are now presupposed, the question is, what relation is there between the section that describes a state of internal injustice and class tyranny, and that which describes the advent of the Chaldean conquerors?

Those who assume that there are two such sections, of whatever extent, generally proceed to the conclusion that the coming of the Chaldeans is a punishment on the people for the condition of injustice and oppression that prevails. But the tenor of the description of the Chaldeans is decidedly unfavourable to this conclusion. How explain the remarkable fact that there is not a single reference in the whole section, including 14-17, to Judah's suffering from the imperial power? When 12-13 are separated from the description of the conqueror, the fact cannot be contested. Surely if the announcement of the Chaldeans were specifically an announcement of punishment on Judah, it would have been expressed more definitely. The Chaldeans are presented to us as (divinely ordained?) conquerors of the world without any mention of their particular relation to Judah. The view that they are executors of judgement on Judah becomes plausible only by the introduction into the argument of the implicit assumption that the successive paragraphs must have a connexion. It is an assumption we are not entitled to make. It is, indeed, sufficiently natural to infer that the prophet would not exclude Judah from the list of conquered nations, and that he would explain its inclusion by reference to the oppression of which the ruling classes were guilty. If so he occupied the same position as Jeremiah. But chapter i. contains no expression of this view. There is no logical connexion between the two sections of the chapter. They are quite independent. If the prophet had a message to his people similar to that of Jeremiah (chaps. iv.-vi.), it is not preserved in the collection of his prophecies.

Still less, it may be added, can verse 5ff. be regarded as an answer to the complaint of the preceding section. National disaster is no direct remedy for social evils, and its indirect results cannot be counted on. Since the catastrophe would overwhelm the righteous, not less than the wicked, their situation would be worse, so far, instead of better. A prediction of foreign conquest is no answer to a complaint of injustice.¹ In another aspect, however, the complaint is a charge that God remains inactive while wrong is done (*v.* 13). The guilty may be regarded as compromising the whole nation, so that Jehovah's punishment of the people would remove the reproach that He did not interfere. A prediction of national disaster would vindicate Jehovah's moral government and so be an answer to the charge. And yet if this were the purport of verse 5ff. surely the circumstance of Judah's punishment could not be left implicit only. The whole point of the passage is left unstated, according to this interpretation of it, which must therefore be rejected.

It remains to allude to the slight connexion between the sections, which is established by the coincidence that the one ends with a denunciation of the בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל, and the other continues by an address to the same בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל. This formal bond of unity cannot neutralize the complete want of connexion between the contents of the sections. If verse 5 is original the coincidence merely throws light on the principles of arrangement, followed by the collector or compiler of Habakkuk's prophecies. It may reasonably be conjectured that the sections were placed side by side because of the formal connexion so established. There seem to be parallels to this in other prophetic writings. On the other hand, Rothstein suggests that verse 5 has been interpolated in order to connect the successive parts. The proof of this is really strengthened when verses 12-13 are

¹ So Budde emphatically in *EXPOSITOR*, p. 381 f.

made to precede verse 5. The source of the word בְּגֵרִים, is brought to light in verse 13. The conclusion remains, accordingly, that there is not proof that the two sections of chapter i. are two parts of one utterance or composition. They contribute separately to our knowledge of the teaching of the prophet.

CHAPTER II.

This chapter falls into at least five paragraphs or sections, marked off from one another, more or less, by differences of character or subject matter. Omitting verses 13 and 14 as interpolated, the paragraphs may provisionally be given as consisting of verses 2-4, 5-8, 9-12, 15-17, 18-20. The question of chief interest regarding them is, whether they supply a continuation to one or both of the divisions of chapter i. Those who find a connected sequence in chapter i. equally succeed with chapter ii. There is indeed in parts a close similarity between the chapters. But the features which are in common may imply the same historical situation and the same writer, and yet not the same composition or utterance. Very clear and specific proof is needed to justify the last conclusion.

Verses 1-4 do not form in themselves a satisfactory unit or paragraph. They are separated, however, from the verses which follow by the corrupt text at the beginning of verse 5, and their character is so distinct from verse 5 ff. as to require separate treatment. But they leave a very fragmentary impression. Possibly the unintelligible words at the beginning of verse 5 originally belonged to this section, and made its meaning clearer. The verses are generally held to contain Jehovah's answer to the prophet's complaint referred to at the beginning (*v.* 1). As they stand they lead up, at least, to an answer. Verse 4 is too obscure, and its text too doubtful, to make it quite certain that the answer was actually expressed in that verse. However the

question of the connexion of the paragraph with the preceding chapter is not affected by this uncertainty. It is quite obvious that the verses have a close affinity with the division of chapter i., which consists of verses 2-4 and 12-13. The complaint here alluded to might be that actually made in chapter i. 2, and i. 13 finds a suitable continuation in ii. 1. The difficulty is to account for the separation, if this was the original sequence. Deliberate rearrangement is a very unlikely cause, and if we make accident responsible, the hypothesis of reconstruction becomes unduly complicated. In the face of this difficulty sound method seems to forbid us to take the hypothesis of a literary connexion between i. 13, and ii. 1, as the pre-supposition of our interpretation of the prophet. Another conjecture may be suggested, mainly to show the possibility of alternatives. Might not chapter ii. 1 be an editorial or scribal addition, intended to establish a connexion with what precedes? If the section originally began with verse 2, the wording might appear to imply that something was missing, such as is supplied by the insertion. When verse 1 is removed the following verses appear in quite a different light. They speak of a vision, fulfilment of which will surely come, although it delay (*vv.* 2-3[4]). They form a suitable introduction to almost any vision, and may belong to that contained in verses 5-8.

Verses 5-8. This paragraph as it stands is mutilated at the commencement, though whether the corrupt words at the beginning of verse 5 represent the original commencement or not, remains uncertain (compare above). The section describes the coming fall of some great conquering people. In the mouth of Habakkuk either the Assyrians or the Chaldeans are no doubt to be understood.¹ None of the nations subdued by the Chaldeans would equally satisfy the

¹ The approximate date of this prophet is assumed to be determined by chapter i.

description. The terms employed might describe either the Assyrians or the Chaldeans,¹ and so the choice between them is made to depend, for the most part, on the interpretation of chapter i. When that is supposed to predict the downfall of the Chaldean empire, the Chaldeans are here understood, but if of the Assyrians they are here preferred. It certainly simplifies Habakkuk's message to suppose that the same downfall is described in both chapters. But there is no difficulty in the assumption that Habakkuk predicted the overthrow of the Assyrian empire, and also that of its Chaldean successor. Besides chapter i. does not speak of the fate of any one nation. It contains a description of the conquering Chaldeans (*v.* 5 ff.), and supplies no presumption at all regarding the subject of ii. 5 ff. It may be doubted if there is any consideration decisively in favour of either view. The fact that the destruction of the tyrant empire is to be accomplished by the remnant of the peoples (*v.* 8) does not seem to throw light on the name of the empire.

It may be added that if we refer this section to the overthrow of the Chaldeans, it is of later date than i. 5 ff., since there they are depicted as conquerors. The passages, so regarded, are not inconsistent, for they are successive messages addressed to somewhat different periods and circumstances. On the other hand, if the section in chapter ii. predicts the downfall of the Assyrians, it is earlier than the description of Chaldean conquests in chapter i., for that probably represents a stage in Chaldean history after the destruction of Nineveh.

After verse 8 comes a series of woes. Verses 13 and 14 may be considered interpolations. If so it is highly probable that verses 11 and 12 should be transposed. The result is a paragraph consisting of verses 9, 10, 12, 11.

¹ Budde argues for the Assyrians (most fully in *Ency. Bib.*, ii. col. 1923).

It may be considered separately without prejudging the question of its connexion with what follows. The section is directed against one who exalts himself at the expense of others. But for the distinct reference to "peoples," in verse 10, the expressions used would leave no doubt that some individual or class in the community is referred to. Jeremiah xxii. 13f. is a close parallel. But there is certainly textual error in the clause in which the peoples are mentioned. Possibly it is not even an original part of the verse. The balance of probability, therefore, certainly is that the paragraph denounces social evils.

The next paragraph also, verses 15-17, is a woe that may be taken to be directed against the wrongdoing of individuals or a class, and not against a conquering people. If the passage is read without the preconception that the whole book is concerned with international relations, that will certainly be the interpretation adopted. The last clause of verse 17 is capable of the other interpretation, but if it is united to the preceding verses it has its meaning made clear by them. As, however, it occurs in verse 8 also, it may not be original here. The supposition of a refrain, occurring twice only, in a chapter composed like the present, appears to have nothing to commend it.

The two paragraphs last considered are sufficiently alike to be classed together, and they imply a historical background similar to that of chapter i. 2ff. But there is no justification for the conclusion that this part of chapter ii. is a continuation of the corresponding part of chapter i. They may be assigned to approximately the same date, and the similarity of chapter i. may be pronounced a confirmation of the identity of their authorship. Further inference is gratuitous.

Verses 18-20 constitute the last section of the chapter. They are directed against idolatry. The problems of re-arrangement and authorship which the verses present have

no bearing on the preceding discussions, and may therefore be left untouched in this inquiry.

It now appears that there are two main divisions in verses 1-17 of this chapter. One predicts the overthrow of the Assyrians or of the Chaldeans (*vv.* 5-8, with 2-4 possibly as a preface); the other denounces social wrong-doing (*vv.* 9-12, 15-17). Neither of them is clearly a unit from a literary point of view.

These divisions or groups of verses in chapter ii. are unmistakably parallel to the sections of chapter i. But there are points of contrast also, and we are not entitled to assume literary connexion between the chapters. The imperial triumph described in chapter i. cannot well be the reverse of the defeat predicted in chapter ii. Further, stress should not be laid on the fact that the evils described in the two chapters are not identically the same, nor treated in the same proportion. The passages are too short for this to be significant. But the difference of the prophet's attitude in the two cases may be noted. In chapter i. Habakkuk complains that God holds His peace when the wicked swallow the righteous (*v.* 13). In chapter ii. he prophesies woe to the unrighteous, and that the cup of the Lord's wrath is at hand for them to drink. The difference is no certain indication of difference of date, but when there is no transition it is hardly consistent with literary unity.

W. B. STEVENSON.

*A PURITAN AND A BROAD CHURCHMAN IN
THE SECOND CENTURY.*

THOSE who have paid any attention to the Christian literature of the post-apostolic age must have been struck with the immense contrast between it and the earlier Christian writings. Take the epistles of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, the Shepherd of Hermas—what interest they have is mainly historical, showing what was the state of thought and feeling and life in the early Church. Clement impresses us by his simple goodness, Ignatius by his passionate enthusiasm; but, short as they are, we have probably found it something of a task to read with attention their epistles to the end, while Hermas and the apocryphal writers are full of puerilities and absurdities. The truth of St. Paul's statement is continually forced upon us, that not many wise or learned are to be found among the immediate successors of the Apostles. Intellect is suspected as dangerous, and not without reason: for, as yet, there is no fixed rule of faith, and the new wine is bursting the old bottles. Those who had been trained in Greek wisdom, a Marcion, a Valentinus, a Basilides, are seizing one or another portion of the revealed word, and working it up into one-sided or fantastic systems. The infant Church is threatened alike with persecution from without and heresy from within. This extremity of peril calls out new powers of defence. The calumnies and cruelties of the heathen are met by reasoned apologies addressed to the Emperors: the aberrations of the heretics by more thorough examination of the teaching of the Bible, by more careful statement and more exact definition of Christian doctrine. Thus the

powers of thought and expression were gradually developed in what was beginning to be known as the "Catholic" Church. In order to meet the misrepresentations or misunderstandings of heathen or half Christian writers, the defenders of the faith had to familiarize themselves with modes of thought alien to the earlier Christianity.

Among these defenders we may distinguish two different types: one that of men like Tatian and Tertullian, who followed in the steps of the sons of Zebedee, and were ready to call down fire from heaven on their opponents; the other that of men like Justin and Clement of Alexandria, who were actuated by the spirit which prompted St. Peter, when he said that "God was no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him," and by St. Paul, when he declared to the Athenians the unknown God, whom already they ignorantly worshipped. I propose in this paper to draw out very briefly the contrast between the two types in their leading representatives, Tertullian and Clement. Both were born about 150 A.D., both brought up as heathen; Clement was probably converted about 180, Tertullian some fifteen years later; Clement died about 212, Tertullian perhaps in 230; both were possessed of great natural ability as well as of great learning. As a writer and an orator Tertullian stands foremost. He is a master in that great rhetorical school of Rome, of which Seneca may be called the founder, and of which Lucan, Tacitus and Juvenal are the most conspicuous examples. Their great excellence lies in their condensed force. Strictly speaking, no one man deserves the credit of creating this weighty and impressive style. It is not Seneca; it is Rome—the Roman spirit and the Roman power—which speaks out in such full-charged sentences as Virgil's

Tu regere imperio populos Romam memento,
Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos,

not less than in Juvenal's "Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas," and Tacitus' "Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant." Not unworthy to be placed by the side of these "jewels which, on the stretched forefinger of all time, sparkle for ever," are the well known sentences of Tertullian: "Semen est sanguis Christianorum" (*Apol.* 50), "O testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae" (*De Test. An. c.* 2), "Christus veritas est, non consuetudo" (*De Virg. Veland.* 1). But the delight in framing these brilliant aphorisms (*sententiae* the Romans called them) had its own disadvantages. Accuracy had sometimes to be sacrificed to effect. A telling phrase would be spoilt by qualifications: no neutral tints were admissible. So we have the defiant scream, "Sepultus resurrexit: credo quia impossibile" (*De Carm. Christi.* 5), where Roman sobriety is lost in African fervour.

Clement's style is the very contrary of all this. He has the Greek many-sidedness and openness of mind: showing what splendid possibilities are involved in Juvenal's contemptuous description of "the starveling *Graeculus*. Humani nihil—or rather, according to Bishop Westcott's magnificent expansion of the phrase—nihil in rerum natura a se alienum putat." Only in one point does his Greek resemble Tertullian's Latin—both are very hard; but the Greek is lacking in the vehemence and the animation of the Latin. As Munro points out in his edition of Lucretius, the later Greek is far more cumbrous and awkward than the contemporary Latin. The sentences are long, the constructions loose, participles are often substituted for verbs, and the meanings of the words are forced and strained to give an appearance of novelty. Notwithstanding there is hardly any patristic writer, the study of whom is more to be commended to those who have leisure, than Clement. There is no one who is more filled with the spirit of love towards God and man, no one who cherishes higher hopes for man-

kind, or who has a more absolute trust in God's providential guiding, not only of the world at large, but of each individual soul. Of modern writers, the one who reminds me most of him, from this point of view, though of course far inferior in ability, is Erskine of Linlathen. Even the slovenly sentences at times take form and breathe and glow under the stress of some generous enthusiasm; just as Browning's rough jolting verses are fused into splendid harmony when he is fired by some great thought.

I proceed now to point out the relations between Tertullian and Clement, and shall then consider how far and in what respects they may be regarded as representing respectively the Puritan and the Broad Church tone of mind.

Clement, the head of the Catechetical School or Christian University of Alexandria, was no doubt a much more conspicuous person than Tertullian of Carthage, the quondam lawyer. There is no evidence, as far as I know, that the former was acquainted with the writings of the latter, nor indeed that he could read Latin. On the other hand, Tertullian wrote several treatises in Greek, and Nöldechen, in an article in the *Jahrb. f. protest. Theologie*, vol. xii. 279, has collected many references in his treatises to the tenets and writings of Clement. In the treatise *De cultu Feminarum* many remarks (such as those on the use of purple, on dyeing the hair and on false hair) are taken from the *Paedagogus* of Clement. The attendance at the games is condemned on the same ground by both: thus Tertullian (*Spect.* c. 3) follows Clement (*Paed.* iii. § 76) in referring to it, Ps. i. 1, where our version has "sitting in the seat of the scornful," but Tertullian has "*in cathedra pestium non sedit*," in accordance with the LXX. *καθέδραν λοιμῶν*, given by Clement. The use of garlands for the head is condemned alike by both as opposed to common sense, since neither smell nor sight is gratified when the flowers are put out of the way of both organs. Again, garlands are used for idols and for the dead:

the Christian should have nothing to do with the ornaments of devils or of death. The only crown for him in this life is his Master's crown of thorns (*Pae'l.* ii. § 70 foll.; *De Cor.* 5, 10, 14).

But, though Tertullian in his earlier writings often follows Clement, we find a growing opposition in more important points, e.g., as to the interpretation of the words "Seek and ye shall find." Clement applies this to the Christian's advance in knowledge; as in *Str.* i. § 51, "The Word does not wish him who has believed to be idle." So *Str.* v. pp. 650, 654; *Str.* viii. p. 914 *init.*, "The righteous man will seek the discovery which flows from love." Tertullian on the other hand limits it to the unconverted. When Christianity has once been chosen, there is no room for further search, which only leads to heresy (*De Praescr.* 8 foll.). Another important difference is as to the way in which persecution should be met. In *Str.* iv. § 76 foll. Clement quotes our Lord's words, "When they persecute you in this city flee to another," and says that he who disobeys this command is rash and foolhardy. Above all, if he uses provocation, he becomes partly guilty of the sin of the persecutor. By telling us to give up our coat to him who has seized the cloak, Christ means us to propitiate the wrath of our persecutors and not stir them up to blaspheme the Holy Name. Tertullian (in his very interesting treatise *De fuga in Persecutione*, 6) seems to allude to this when he says "that some persons have tried to excuse their cowardice by pleading the Lord's command 'to flee to another city,' but this (he says) was intended only for exceptional persons and exceptional times and circumstances. If the Apostles had been cut off, it must, humanly speaking, have precluded the spread of Christianity. Later on, we find St. Paul going to meet persecution at Jerusalem, and the disciples agreeing to it as the will of the Lord. And the same lesson is confirmed by many other texts: 'Blessed are they which are

persecuted for righteousness sake,' 'Fear not them that kill the body,' etc. This applies especially to those who are in prominent positions. It is the bad shepherd who flies and leaves his sheep to the wolf." Here Tertullian seems to refer directly to Clement as a *fugitivus*¹ in the words "sic enim voluit quidam, sed et ipse fugitivus, argumentari"; for we know (from *Eus. H.E.* vi. 3 and 11) that, on the outbreak of the persecution under Severus in 202, Clement acted on the principles he had avowed, and left Egypt for Syria, where his services to the Church are highly spoken of by the Bishop, Alexander.

Another point of disagreement is asceticism. Clement defends the moderate use of God's gifts, and praises the marriage state as giving wider experience and a larger field for the exercise of virtue, and also as carrying out the will of the Creator and following the example of some of the Apostles. On all these points his views are controverted by Tertullian. While Clement deprecates second marriage unless under special circumstances,² Tertullian condemns it altogether in the most unmeasured terms as hardly better than adultery, and "would certainly have enforced a total abstinence from marriage, if the human species could have been continued without it, as he would have prohibited eating and drinking, if the life of man could have been sustained without food."³

Turning now to the broad differences between Tertullian and Clement, in characterizing the tone of mind and thought of the former as puritan, I do not mean that he held, for instance, the same precise views as Calvin or John Knox, but that he had the same rigidity, the same determination, the same undoubting confidence in himself, the same stern condemnation of all who held different views of Christian truth. He had eminently the qualities of a good hater.

¹ See *Str.* vii. 874, 869; iii. 550, 551.

² *Str.* iii. 547 foll.

³ *Kaye's Tert.* p. 198.

For moderate Christians he had no mercy. The follower of Christ must give up all for Him. He must literally renounce the world and all that is in the world, its pleasures, its comforts, its honours, its ideas, its wisdom, even its virtues. All these belonged to the Evil One. Towards the end of his life he became so dissatisfied with the lukewarm spirit of the Catholics, whom he stigmatized as "psychical," that he joined the enthusiastic sect of the Montanists, whom he distinguishes as "spiritual," and accepted the visions and prophecies of the haeresiarch and his followers as being an actual revelation from the Paraclete, so that he even quotes their utterances as authoritative, both in practice, as in regard to the lawfulness of second marriages, and in doctrine, as in regard to the corporeity of the soul.¹

Tertullian's attitude towards Greek learning and science is seen in the *De Praescriptionibus*, c. 7, "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem? the Academy with the Church?" (*Ib.* 14), "Let curiosity yield to faith. There is no truth outside the Church, no error in the Church. What is novel is false. Doctrines and practices are not to be introduced at the fancy of individuals." It is strange that one who put Church authority so high, should afterwards desert the Catholic Church and claim the right of private judgement to join a body condemned by the Bishop of Rome, declaring that the dictum of three spiritual men was of more weight than that of all the psychical bishops.

One point on which Tertullian laid great stress was discipline, as to which he seems to have quite lost sight of the principles laid down in the parable of the tares and wheat, and to have done his best to quench smoking flax. In his writings we first find a list of seven mortal sins, as distinguished from venial. He held that one who had committed mortal sin by denying the faith in time of persecution, could not again be restored to the Church, but must be left to the

¹ *De Anima*, 9; *De Monog.* 1, 14.

judgement of God. He condemns in the strongest terms the laxity of the Bishop of Rome, who granted absolution to those who had been guilty of fornication, and afterwards repented. It is vain to argue that the Lord does not desire the death of a sinner, for that is spoken of one who has not been baptized. The puritan objection, answered by Hooker, to practices which are not ordained in Scripture, is set forth in two sentences of Tertullian, "Prohibetur quod non ultro permissum est" (*De corona*, 2); "Negat Scriptura quod non notat" (*Monogamia*, c. 4). The contrast between their own methods and those of the Catholics is expressed in the words, "What you call perversity, I call reason; what you call cruelty, I call kindness" (*Scorpiace*, 5).

I will close this part of my subject with the famous sketch of future judgement which winds up the treatise on the Spectacles of the amphitheatre. "If you love spectacles, look forward to the greatest of all spectacles, the final judgement of the universe. How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many proud monarchs and fancied gods, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many magistrates who persecuted the name of the Lord melting in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians; so many sage philosophers blushing in red-hot flames with their deluded scholars; so many famous poets trembling before the tribunal, not of Minos, but of Christ; so many tragedians now singing of their own sufferings." "This spectacle, this triumph, far transcending those of any earthly amphitheatre, is already assured to us by faith, without the leave of consul or praetor or high-priest."

I think what has been said represents fairly the general tone and drift of Tertullian's writings, though passages may no doubt be found which are hardly consistent with it, as especially in the beautiful treatise on the Testimony of the Soul. While Tertullian thus narrows within the strictest

limits the operation and influence of the Divine Spirit, and sees nothing here but a world lying in wickedness by the side of a lukewarm Church and a little flock of the spiritual; while he looks forward to a future, lurid with the flames of Divine vengeance, to be for ever exacted from the unrepentant mass of humanity, Clement on the other hand beholds God, everywhere and at all times, as the all-loving Father and Teacher of mankind, training them, often by severe discipline carried on, both in this world and the next, for eventual perfection. Faith, hope, and love are alike conspicuous in Clement, but the two latter graces have small place in the gloomy soul of Tertullian.

JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

(*To be concluded.*)

BARNABAS AND HIS GENUINE EPISTLE.

THE last few years have seen excellent work on the Epistle to the Hebrews, the great anonymous hortatory letter of the New Testament. But we have hardly reached anything like agreement on the subject. It remains wrapped in much mystery, like the Apocalypse of John. And largely for a similar reason, our failure to imagine a completely convincing historical situation to which the argument may be seen to be truly relevant. But the materials for such a fresh interpretation have been steadily accumulating, though the first effect of a perception of some hitherto neglected aspects of the situation implied has been to send certain scholars off on a wrong scent and lead to reactionary theories. Such is the theory that the Epistle was not addressed to Jewish Christians, but to certain believers in danger of apostasy from religion altogether; also the view, springing largely from the same minimizing of the working of old Judaic influences upon

those addressed, that its destination is to be sought as far from Palestine as Rome itself.

The Roman destination of Hebrews has recently been set forth by Rev. G. Milligan in an able paper,¹ in which he nevertheless combats what Westcott rightly calls the "ingenious paradox" that its readers were Gentiles. In this position, both positive and negative, he has since received support from Professor A. S. Peake,² support the more valuable because of his fine insight into the genius of his author's theology and the fairness of his statement of the case as a whole. Yet I am more persuaded than ever that their historical setting of the Epistle is incorrect, and detracts seriously from its true use as a primary source for knowledge of the Apostolic age. Indeed, Mr. Peake's frank recognition of the difficulties in fitting the Epistle's references to persecution into the known conditions of the Roman Church, and his consequent vacillation as between a date just before A.D. 64 and one under Domitian, tend strongly to make his reader suspect that he is here off the line altogether. Nor can one think he does well in summing up, on the question of authorship, in favour of Harnack's suggestion that Priscilla and Aquila were its joint authors. But in any case its plausibility is bound up with the Roman destination, itself most doubtful.

Some have come to regard the problems just alluded to as insoluble, and to acquiesce in negative results. But under such conditions the exegesis of the Epistle cannot but suffer, for want of a clear historical setting. Yet the data supplied by the Epistle itself are not really few, or even as vague as is sometimes supposed. They cohere with a great deal of external evidence of one kind and another. Accordingly there seems room for a fresh discussion of the questions of Authorship, Destination, Date, Occasion,

¹ The EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1901.

² *Hebrews* in The Century Bible (1902).

by the aid of the greater variety of "historic points of view" which study of this Epistle and of the Apostolic age in general has of late brought to light.

It may tend to clearness, to state our conclusions beforehand. They are these. The author of our Epistle was Barnabas, to whom it is assigned by the earliest confident witness of antiquity. Its destination was a group of churches on the Palestinian seaboard, of which Caesarea may be taken as type; its date about A.D. 61-62; its occasion the culmination of a number of influences which had been, for longer or shorter periods, depressing the Christian zeal and loyalty of certain Jewish believers in those regions. In arguing to these points we shall take them as far as possible in the order just outlined.

A. BARNABAS THE HELLENIST APOSTLE.

1. The Barnabas of the New Testament was a far greater man than the Barnabas of modern tradition. It is essential, then, that we break down the current prejudice which would bar his authorship of an Epistle like Hebrews on the ground that a cause must be adequate to the effect¹ assigned to it. In the New Testament he appears in the Acts and three of Paul's Epistles: and no single passage can be cited to prove that he was other than a great man, large in mind as well as in heart. That he was finally overshadowed by the commanding genius of "the Apostle" (as the Church came in the second century to style St. Paul), simply gives a comparative measure of the man, and one which in no way warrants a belittling estimate. For, after all, it was he who "discovered" his greater colleague,²

¹ Origen remarks that "the thoughts of the Epistle are admirable and not second to the acknowledged apostolical writings" (ap. Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* vi. 25).

² He and Saul were probably old acquaintances. Some suggest they had met in Tarsus (whither a Cypriot Jew might have been drawn for study); but it is more likely that it was in the Holy City that the young Levite and the young

and helped him to gain that footing with the older Apostles which his own powers confirmed and increased; and further it was probably as the colleague of Barnabas, not *vice versa*, that Paul continued to be thought of in old-fashioned Christian circles.

This means a good deal, and it is fully borne out by other things. The man who was sent down from the Apostolic circle in Jerusalem to judge of the new departure created by the striking beginnings of Antiochene Christianity, was far more than a good-hearted person. He must have enjoyed a reputation for ability and inspired insight second only to the leading apostles; and next, a point of great interest in the present connexion, he must have been regarded as one peculiarly fitted to deal with problems touching the relations of the old and the new in Judæo-Christianity. That is, apart from Stephen, with whom he had probably much affinity (of which more in the sequel), he was the leading Hellenistic Christian in the primitive Church. And in the opinion of that Church itself he stood on a far higher level of authority¹ than Stephen. It is instructive to contrast the relative dependence of Philip the Evangelist in his work in Samaria. No such sanction at the hands of any of the Twelve was needed to authenticate the Christianity sanctioned by Barnabas. Indeed, does not this episode of itself justify the title "Apostle" in a sense only slightly inferior to that in which it was used of the Twelve? His function in relation to Christianity in Antioch was exactly analogous to that of Peter and John in Samaria; and there is no act more essentially apostolic, known to us, than that of authenticating and confirming the beginnings of the Gospel in a fresh field. This is how

Rabbi became friends—perhaps in connexion with the synagogue frequented by "Cilicians" and other such Hellenists (Acts vi. 9).

¹ It was probably for this reason that he, so eminent for his love of the poor, was not chosen one of the Seven.

Acts seems to regard the matter, in referring to "the Apostles Barnabas and Paul" in South Galatia (xiv. 4, 14).

Paul not only confirms this, but carries us a step farther, in hinting at the fact that Barnabas had seen the risen Lord. He first equates his own apostolic rights with those of "the rest of the apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas," and then brackets Barnabas (reference to whom is not demanded by the context) with himself (1 Cor. ix. 5 f.). But he has just defined "an apostle" as one who had "seen Jesus our Lord." And this, to judge from what seems the ascending series—apostles, brethren of the Lord, Cephas—was the current notion of apostleship even according to Palestinian usage. So much is implied by the high place given to the Lord's brethren,¹ and by the use of "Cephas" rather than Peter. Accordingly it appears most probable that Barnabas, whose kinswoman Mary had a house in Jerusalem, and who seems to have owned property himself in the neighbourhood (Acts iv. 37), had shared the vision of the risen Lord, recorded in Acts i. 6 ff., upon which apostolic status was held to rest.²

But if so, he was also an earlier disciple in some degree, like the young man of Mark xiv. 51 f., who was present at Christ's arrest and in whom most see the evangelist Mark himself. As such, he may have been among the friends of Jesus who beheld the crucifixion from afar (Luke xxiii. 49), and indeed may even have been directly cognizant of his Master's ex-

¹ This estimate, which had no ground in Christ's own teaching, and which was only Palestinian and temporary in its range, prepares us for the other fact, viz., that there does not seem to have been any hard and fast line drawn in the first generation between the Twelve and other apostles as defined by St. Paul.

² The view put forward here and in the next paragraph on internal evidence, is also supported by the tradition of the Ancient Church. Besides the evidence adduced below, p. 419, one may cite Chrysostom, *Hom.* xxix. on Acts; the author of *Prædestinatus*, who calls Barnabas "Christ's disciple" (c. 7); and the *Encomium* by Alexander Monachus (sixth century), who regards him as the chief of the Seventy.

periences during the last visit to Jerusalem.¹ Such a view would help to explain the extraordinary realism of the language used of Christ's temptations, particularly such as we connect with the Garden of Gethsemane, found in Hebrews v. 7 f.²—supposing that we are led to see in Barnabas its author. How possible all this becomes, once we get rid of our conventional notion of the Twelve as alone about the person of the Saviour as disciples, may be realized by asking ourselves a simple question: "Why should not the unnamed disciple who accompanied Cleopas on his memorable walk to Emmaus, have been Barnabas? There is good reason to believe that this man was no ordinary member of the Master's circle, since to him so singular a privilege was vouchsafed. In any case it is hard to believe that, with numerous eyewitnesses of the risen Lord, like Cleopas, Joseph Barsabbas,³ and many another, living and working in the primitive community, so commanding a place was conceded to a Cypriot Hellenist who had never seen the Messiah for himself, and so did not fall even within the wider circle of the apostles (1 Cor. xv. 7). On this, the common view, there is no proportion between the position of Barnabas in the early years of the Jerusalem Church and his assumed antecedents. We must remember that this Church laid stress on a man's

¹ If one may hazard a guess as to the source of Luke's supplementary knowledge touching all connected with the Passion, no one is more likely than Barnabas. Indeed it is most tempting to connect the tradition that Barnabas was one of the Seventy, with the reference to their mission in Luke's Gospel alone (ch. x.); and to infer that he was the Evangelist's authority for the whole special cycle of Christ's words and deeds in which it occurs (ix. 51-xviii. 14).

² "Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."

³ I conjecture that the surname "Barnabas" was given to Joseph the Cypriot to distinguish him from this Joseph, and that the very similarity of the surnames chosen was due in part to this circumstance. No doubt the name was already a current one; but the Apostles seem to have given it a more spiritual sense than its original etymology (Bar-Nebo) warrants.

objective connexion with its Messiah, rather than on subjective insight into the meaning of His teaching, such as was possessed by a Stephen. Nor is there any hint given that Barnabas won his standing by sheer gifts: we simply find him enjoying high consideration whenever he comes before us. This is most easily explained by supposing that he had had the fullest privileges of personal connexion with the Master which could belong to a disciple outside the inner circle of the Twelve. And for this supposition there is the amplest room.

Let any one consider these passages in Luke xxiv. "They reported to the Eleven and to all the rest" (v. 9); "two from among them," viz. from the apostolic circle (v. 13); "they found assembled together the Eleven and those with them"—the company to which the risen Jesus appears and gives the last commission reported in Luke's Gospel, saying "ye (are) witnesses of these things" (see verses 33, 36, 44, 48 f., 50 ff.). Let him put alongside these Acts i. 21 f., which refers to a body of men who had been in Christ's company more or less throughout His ministry; and the inference is inevitable. The disciple-circle was far larger than we are apt to imagine; and the same is already implied by Luke's account of the mission of the Seventy. It is, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that a man who held his knowledge of Christ and the Gospel at second-hand,¹ would rise almost at once into the position of leadership and authority which Barnabas evidently enjoyed.

How commanding Barnabas' place in Palestinian and Syrian Christianity really was, most fail to perceive, because

¹ It is very doubtful also whether Paul, who so insisted upon his own competence as a witness to the risen Christ, would have been satisfied to undertake his great pioneer mission as the colleague of one who could not help to "establish out of the mouth of two witnesses" the truth of what would seem to many of their hearers incredible. In choosing Silas as his next colleague, Paul may have had the same qualification in view; see Acts xv. 22, compared with i. 23.

they view it in the light of Paul's more brilliant career, as seen first through the Gentile Christianity of other regions, and then through the experience of Christian history as a whole. So viewed Barnabas' rôle was far less impressive. But look at it in the other way suggested, from the standpoint of the primitive Palestinian Church; and all is changed. It was Barnabas who rendered possible the earlier stages of Paul's career, with its growing brilliance; and that not only by his generous belief in the ex-persecutor, but by the weight of his own authority. No ordinary man could have availed to remove the cloud of suspicion hanging over the young Saul. Further, there is good reason to believe that it was Barnabas' great reputation alone which prevented criticism of the Gentile mission, as conducted by himself and Paul, from emerging sooner and in a more effective form at Jerusalem. Observe the significant order of the two names in Acts xv. 12, 25, which here as elsewhere proves its value as reflecting current and local conditions. Speaking in his own person, and as representing the feeling for Paul's leadership already established in Antioch, our author has just before referred twice to "Paul and Barnabas" (xv. 2). When, however, their relative authority in Jerusalem comes to be in question, we learn that men "hearkened unto Barnabas and Paul rehearsing what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them" (xv. 12); and again mention is made of "our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 25).

We are so accustomed to speak of "the Apostle of the Gentiles," as to forget that the older apostles and the Palestinian Church thought of "the Apostles to the Gentiles," according to Paul's own witness in Galatians ii. 9; "that we (I and Barnabas) should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the Circumcision." Nor is there any evidence that they ever ceased to think of the two as

at least co-ordinate, if many did not to the end regard Barnabas as superior. And this was probably the perspective in which Judaeo-Christianity saw the matter throughout the Apostolic age, and in certain circles for long after. Nay, most Judaeo-Christians throughout Palestine must have viewed Barnabas as the greater and wiser man, in that he was more sensitive to what was due to Jewish feeling and traditions. This is implied in the difference of opinion as to a matter of expediency which occurred at Antioch. There Barnabas followed Peter's lead in thinking that Jewish feeling, rather than Gentile, should be considered, when the two clashed on the secondary matter (as they esteemed it, though wrongly, as Paul shows) of social equality as between Jewish and Gentile brethren in Christ. This shows the spirit in which Barnabas carried out his ministry, leaning towards recognition of the value of the traditional forms of Israel's religion, wherever the spiritual reality did not seem to be sacrificed. To him personally, as to Paul, the latter had become all in all: but the external forms had a symbolic or suggestive function, not yet formally superseded by any Divine command. And so he held a relatively positive attitude to them, which admitted of a somewhat opportunist policy, as at Antioch. What is not clear, is how far he accepted the lesson which came to him on this occasion through Paul's relentless logic. But the way is quite open for supposing that if he saw adequate reason to sacrifice the outer form, he would not shrink from so doing.

It is natural to think of Barnabas, the Hellenist Levite, as coming to the Gospel by a line of approach analogous to that followed by Paul himself. That is, each found the institutions of Mosaism inadequate to the inner satisfaction of their religious needs. Only, while the young Rabbi, Paul, wrought vainly at the obtaining of merit by "Works of the Law," the Levite Barnabas tried to find cleansing of conscience from the sense of defiling sin through the sacri-

ficial rites of Judaism. But in his case also, innerness of experience forced him to feel the lack of reality in the results attained. Thus to Barnabas the ineffective media for atonement and true communion proved the *paedagogus* to bring him to Christ, by the negative method of shutting him up to Him as condition of access to God. For the Mosaic ritual system had made him acutely conscious of a defiled conscience, but had proved unequal to its purification. It is clear that the attitude of one who so approached the Gospel, might, after his need was met by the reality yearned for, be quite other in relation to the preparatory institutions from that of Paul to the legal system. Such rites had been helpful as far as they went, viz., as symbols and shadows of the spiritual reality: they had not stimulated the latent "sin in the flesh" to seek to establish a self-righteousness. Barnabas had escaped that kind of bondage. Hence his attitude to the old could be kindlier than was Paul's, though he no less had outgrown it by deepening experience of the reality symbolized.

For such an attitude we have ample analogy in the Clementine literature, which, whatever ideas may be peculiar to it, assumes very similar views of sacrifices, "the Holy Place," and even baptisms for purification from sins (e.g. *Recogn.* i. 36-39), as common among Jewish Christians after A.D. 70. That Barnabas should long before that date have reached like results, along the line of the "Alexandrine" symbolic theology widely diffused in Hellenist circles, may surely be granted as probable. And indeed the fact that his name is introduced into this literature in a position second only to Peter's, may well be due to the fact that such was the type of doctrine with which he was associated in Judaeo-Christian tradition. And this holds even if it be not conceded, that the influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews can be traced in the Clementines, which would thus contain proof presumptive that the

Epistle itself came to the authors of this literature as the work of Barnabas.

2. Tradition outside the New Testament, beginning with Clement of Alexandria, who here almost certainly depends on an early Judæo-Christian source, makes Barnabas one of the Seventy, and indeed their leading member. The Clementine legend, in both forms, assumes that Barnabas was a personal disciple of Jesus the Prophet, a disciple second only to Peter as an authoritative exponent of the truth.¹ Further witness to the repute attaching to Barnabas before the older memories of apostles other than the Twelve and Paul died out, is afforded by the Gospel attributed to him. It was probably akin to the "Traditions" (*Paradosis*) of the Saviour's teaching attributed to Matthias, which Clement of Alexandria cites with respect: and both he and Hippolytus imply that Matthias was already appealed to by Basilides and his followers as an authority for teaching not found in our Gospels. Accordingly we may suppose that the "Gospel according to Barnabas," which is placed in later lists² of apocryphal writings next to what is there called the "Gospel according to Matthias," goes back to the first half of the second century at latest. If we may gather anything as to its character from what seems a version of one form which this Gospel assumed, namely the work entitled *Vero Evangelio di Jessu chiamato Christo, novo profeta, mandato da Dio al mundo, secundo la descrizione di Barnaba Apostolo suo*, it would seem to have proceeded from much the same Jewish Christian circle as the original Clementine legend. Further it will be noted that Barnabas is here called one of Christ's apostles, as is also the case in the

¹ *Strom.* ii. 20; *Hypotyposes*, vii. ap. Euseb. *H.E.* ii. 1; Eusebius *H.E.* i. 12, and others cited in Lipsius, *Apokr. Apostelgesch.* II. ii. 270.

² In the List of the Sixty Books it comes before Matthias in a class of "Teachings" (*Didaskalia*), but after Matthias in the *Decretum Gelasii*, which also implies that they were current in more than one recension.

sole Greek fragment¹ which survives as from his mouth : “ Barnabas the apostle said, ‘ In conflicts that are evil, more to be pitied is he who wins ; because he comes off with the balance of sin.’ ”

The general result of our study of Barnabas, the Hellenist Levite, is to show that he was just such a man as might have written the Epistle to Hebrews, if only there were enough positive evidence to connect it historically with his name. That he was reputed to be the author of an important writing, may perhaps be inferred from the fact that by the middle of the second century at any rate he was credited with the composition of the so-called “ Epistle of Barnabas,” which was certainly not his work. That his authorship of the Epistle to Hebrews was the reality of which this false ascription is the *simulacrum*, we hope to make plain in the sequel. But meantime we must anticipate one objection on the threshold, derived from the very apostolic status which we have endeavoured to prove that he enjoyed. It is often assumed that Hebrews ii. 3 could not have been written by a personal disciple and “ apostle ” of Jesus. Thus Mr. Peake writes, “ It is possible, though perhaps not probable, that Barnabas was not a hearer of Jesus ” ; as if a hearer of Jesus could not have written such words. But this is to read the passage too much in the light of the use made of it to disprove Paul’s authorship. It is fatal to that hypothesis, but for reasons peculiar to Paul’s history. Were it not that he had had to vindicate his apostleship in the face of alleged dependence on apostles who had “ known Christ after the flesh,” the objection would hardly have been raised. The passage is simply one of many instances in the Epistle in which the writer identifies himself with his

¹ Probably from his *Didaskalia* : see Grabe, *Spicilegium*, i. 302, Βαρνάβας ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐφη ἕν ἀνέλλαις πονηραῖς ἀθλιώτερος ὁ νικήσας, διότι ἀπέρχεται πλέον ἔχων τῆς ἀμαρτίας. Clement of Alexandria also, besides calling Barnabas “ an apostolic man,” and “ one of the Seventy,” twice calls him “ the apostle.”

readers. This is altogether fitting in one penning a serious warning. If he does not except himself from its scope, he only enhances its force with his readers and conciliates their feelings. Thus having begun with "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation," he is practically bound to finish with "which . . . was certified unto us (*εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαίωθη*) by them that heard"—this being true of his readers as a whole, among whom he rhetorically includes himself.

B. BARNABAS AND THE EPISTLE TO HEBREWS IN EARLY TRADITION.

The more the external evidence is examined and cross-examined, the clearer becomes the superiority of Barnabas' claims. For the earlier traditions connecting Hebrews with the name of Paul, do not amount to theories of direct authorship at all; while those naming Clement of Rome and Luke, are for the most part scholarly guesses meant to supply the missing link between the Epistle and Paul. They rest upon literary phenomena, starting from a comparison of the Epistle with writings with which it has obvious points of contact. There is perhaps one exception. Origen, who was then living at Caesarea, refers¹ to an existing story (*ἱστορία*) to the effect that Clement of Rome himself wrote it. Here the fact that Clement of Alexandria speaks only of Luke as the literary link between Paul and the Epistle, tends to show that the tradition was Caesarean,² and not Alexandrine, and so less likely to be mere learned inference.

However this may be, there is nothing of the sort at all

¹ Quoted by Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* vi. 25: ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθίσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τῶν μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ὑπὸ τῶν δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον.

² We shall see later how such a tradition may be harmonized with Barnabas' real authorship. Another reading of Origen's meaning is possible, viz. that the account reached him in a written form, say in Irenaeus and Hippolytus (see note to p. 424). But Eusebius would hardly have failed to note the fact.

equal in confidence to Tertullian's witness, when he writes: "There is extant also a work of Barnabas entitled *To Hebrews*." He then goes on to refer to "Barnabas' Epistle" as "more generally accepted among the Churches" than the *Shepherd* of Hermas.¹ It is now widely recognized that Tertullian here speaks not as one putting forward a doubtful inference, but as appealing to what would be admitted as common to himself and those with whom he is remonstrating. But the matter will repay further consideration in relation to the area which Tertullian's view may be held to represent.

Zahn has recently argued² that it could not have been widely shared in the African Church, since in that case "it would be inconceivable that the Roman Church, from which the African received its sacred Scriptures, should, so far as we know, have then and for long been content to reject both the Pauline origin and the canonical rank of Hebrews without indicating another author. Again one sees from Tertullian's whole argument, confirmed by the witness of Cyprian's writings, that Hebrews had in Carthage had from of old no sort of relation to the New Testament." Accordingly he concludes that a MS. must have reached Tertullian from one of the Churches in which (according to Zahn) Hebrews ranked as Scripture, entitled "Barnabas' Letter to Hebrews." It can, he thinks, have come only from Asia Minor, the home of that Montanism which had caused Tertullian to pen such a work as his pamphlet *On Modesty*, indignantly protesting against the lax disciplinary policy of the Roman Church in particular.

But plausible as this is, as far as Zahn states it, it needs only to be thought out a little further, to refute itself. For

¹ *De Pudicitia*, 20: "Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, a deo satis auctoritati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6); et utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore mœchorum."

² *Einleitung in das N.T.*, Bd. ii. 116 f.

the essence of the passage is twofold. (1) It descends in so many words from the level of "the apostles" (i.e. the New Testament Scriptures as then conceived), to add the superfluous witness of a comrade of apostles,¹ for the sake of setting it over against the authority of the *Shepherd*, already believed by many to be the work of an apostolic man,² the Hermas saluted in Romans xvi. 14. And for such a purpose a work by Barnabas, an apostolic man, was just the thing. But (2) it was so, only supposing the Roman Church, against the policy of whose bishop Tertullian is protesting, was known to admit the authorship here assumed: else his argument loses all cogency. Hence we find in the passage exactly what Zahn excludes from it, namely proof that there was a strong tradition in Rome connecting Barnabas with our Epistle. Nor is that all. For we get in this very reminder of the incompatibility of the tone of the two works here contrasted (in the matter of restoration from mortal sin) the probable explanation of the Roman attitude to Hebrews, both in what is said and what is left unsaid.

Zahn misstates the plain facts, when he writes as if Tertullian implied that Hebrews ranked in certain churches as Holy Scripture. The whole tenor of the passage in question is to the opposite effect. But in any case, whereas Tertullian's own tendency now was to magnify Hebrews at the expense of the *Shepherd*, the tendency of the Roman Church, owing to its special attitude on discipline, was the reverse. It wanted to make as much of Hermas as it could, while it had an equally good reason for not emphasizing its original tradition touching the actual author of Hebrews.

¹ Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere.

² Tertullian had once shared the general estimate of this work; see his *De Oratione*, 16, where he cites Hermas' book as one from which authoritative precedents *might* be drawn.

The silence of the Roman Church is really eloquent. If it knew the Epistle to be by a man of little weight, it was policy to name him. On the other hand, it is improbable that Hermas would refer in his own work to Clement, if he was then held to be author of Hebrews, the very work which his doctrine of repentance seemed to traverse.

Hence Roman tradition simply dwelt on the negative fact that the Epistle lacked the highest authority,¹ viz. that of Paul "the Apostle"—which would have made any maxim in it fully binding. Such an attitude explains the practice of Irenaeus, who used Hebrews in a few instances,² but not as Scripture, and of Hippolytus, who went further and denied its Pauline authorship.³ Zahn believes he was led to speak explicitly (where his master Irenaeus had been content to take the thing for granted) owing to the appeal to it as Paul's, and so holy Scripture, made by the heretical Theodotians of the closing years of the second century. These followers of Theodotus, the Roman banker, held, that "there was a certain power of the highest order, Melchisedek, and that He was greater than Christ; so that Christ, as they said, was after His image."⁴ It is obvious how easily they could twist Hebrews to their purpose; and this well explains how Hippolytus, whose views on discipline would make him honour Hebrews rather than the *Shepherd*, should yet be at pains to reassert the negative Roman tradition touching its origin.

¹ This is the inner meaning of the fact recorded by Eusebius, that "some have disallowed the Epistle to Hebrews on the ground that its Pauline authorship was controverted by the Roman Church" (*Ecl. Hist.* iii. 3).

² E.g. *Adv. Haer.* ii. 30 (*verbo virtutis suae*, cf. Heb. i. 3), iv. 11, v. 5; see also note on p. 421.

³ So says Stephen Gobar (c. A.D. 600), as cited by Photius, bibl. 232, and Photius himself in bibl. 121. Batiffol (*Revue biblique*, viii. 278 ff.) thinks that an obscure reference to the Roman Clement in Photius' context perhaps means that Hippolytus at least held him the author.

⁴ Hippolytus, *Ref. omni. haer.* vii. 36: δὲναμιν τινὰ τὸν Μελχισεδὲκ εἶναι μάλιστα, καὶ τοῦτον εἶναι μείζονα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα φάσκουσι τὸν Χριστὸν τυχεῖν.

But further, this view of the situation explains the attitude of the Muratorian Canon to both writings, which seems similar to that of Hippolytus. This catalogue of canonical books earnestly deprecates the idea that the *Shepherd* of Hermas could rank with "the Prophets" proper or "the Apostles." Hence it is anxious to show how recent it was in origin, i.e. after the Apostolic age altogether. On the other hand it passes over our Epistle in silence, as if it were notorious in Rome that it had no claim to be considered Pauline; while he mentions to dismiss the claims of an Epistle to the Laodiceans and one to the Alexandrians, to which the name of Paul was falsely attached. Both of these, as it seems, but certainly the latter, he describes as "forged with a view to Marcion's heresy," i.e. to dissociate Old and New Testament religion. This corresponds closely enough to an element in the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," and suggests that it was current in certain limited circles, at least in the West, under Paul's name—which is quite likely in a writing originally anonymous. But the description does not suit Hebrews at all. On the whole, then, this witness too favours a Barnabas tradition in Rome, especially as some explicit reference was to be expected, if it was connected with the revered name of Clement—an attribution therefore to be held peculiar to the eastern Mediterranean, e.g. Caesarea, where Origen was living when he referred to it as an account current with some (though unknown to Clement in Alexandria).

The status of Hebrews in Rome about the end of the second century, was just such as would be natural on the assumption that it was believed to be by Barnabas. It needed no apology; it made no claim to be canonical, either on the ground of authorship by Paul (or other of those regarded in the West as "apostles" in the fullest sense)¹

¹ Had Roman tradition taught that it had been addressed to Rome, it is quite likely that this might have changed matters.

or as a "prophetic" writing, such as the partisans of the *Shepherd* claimed that it was. Hebrews stood just outside the canon, on the ambiguous border-land which was suffered to exist for a long time in Church usage. So Irenaeus is said¹ to have used it in the same way as he used the *Wisdom of Solomon*, which the Muratorian Canon recognizes as a work accepted in some high sense.² Thus the constructive evidence of Rome agrees with the explicit witness of Tertullian for North Africa, a witness in which he has later support in the Stichometry contained in the Codex Claromontanus. This reckons *Barnabae epistola* as having 850 lines, which comparative reckoning³ proves clearly to correspond to the length, not of the "Epistle of Barnabas," but of the Epistle to Hebrews. Again we have the evidence of the *Tractatus de Libris*, which definitely names Barnabas as author of Hebrews,⁴ and therein expresses the opinion of some part of the Latin Church, perhaps in the fourth century. Finally Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, writing about A.D. 380, observes that some say it is by Barnabas the Apostle, or Clement the bishop of Rome, or Luke. Thus he places Barnabas' authorship first, as if best supported by tradition, and himself makes no objection to it (*Haer.* 89).

To sum up the broad effect of our discussion so far. Barnabas was one of the greatest personages of the Apostolic

¹ Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. 26.

² The sense is a little ambiguous. *Wisdom*, Jude's Epistle, and "the pair bearing the name John," in *catholica habentur*—which may represent more than one Greek phrase, e.g. ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ (ἐκκλησίᾳ), or simply ἐν καθολικοῖς, masculine or neuter: cf. Eusebius' expression (iii. 3), οὐδ' ἄλλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα.

³ See e.g. Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, xxviii. f. Zahn is driven to dire straits when he calls this "one-sided emphasis" on the figures involved (which are confirmed by Nicephorus). Its witness is far more objective than his own reasoning, which it upsets. It is borne out also by the position of Hebrews in the Stichometry, viz. after the Catholic Epistles, and before the Revelation, Acts, and the *Shepherd*.

⁴ Compare an article by Batiffol in the *Revue biblique*, vol. viii. 278 ff.

age. The only names we can place before his are those of Peter, James, Paul—John, from the nature of his genius, coming to the front only after A.D. 70. Thus he satisfies one main requirement in the author of Hebrews. For, as Renan¹ says, “the single fact of addressing an epistle to a great Church indicates an important man, one of those personages who figure in the apostolic history, and whose name is celebrated.” May we not add that some knowledge of the great name in question would be needful to float an anonymous epistle into currency outside its original circle of readers? Further, “it may be conceived on this hypothesis how the Epistle has been attributed to Paul. It was, in fact, the lot of Barnabas always to be lost in some sense in the rays of the glory of the great Apostle; and if Barnabas composed some writing, as appears very probable [e.g., from the spurious *Epistle of Barnabas*], it is among the works of Paul that it is natural to seek the pages really from his pen.” In a word, “not one of the special features which the Epistle presents is opposed to such an hypothesis.” To justify this estimate more fully will be the task of a future paper.

VERNON BARTLET.

¹ Preface to *L'Antichrist*. This argument is enhanced when we notice how firmly he speaks to his readers of their shortcomings; see v. 11—vi. 8, x. 25 ff., xiii. 7 ff.

ST. PAUL ON LIFE AND IMMORTALITY.

SOME months ago the *Spectator* permitted, in its correspondence columns, a discussion of the passage (1 Cor. xv. 32) in which St. Paul quotes from Isaiah the words "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." But the writers seemed more interested in commenting on some strong words of Professor Huxley's than in arriving at a real understanding of the meaning of the Apostle, and the correspondence fizzled out in a very disappointing manner. In a letter to Charles Kingsley, Huxley wrote: "As I stood behind the coffin of my little son the other day, the officiating minister read as a part of his duty the words, 'If the dead rise not again, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' I cannot tell you how inexpressibly they shocked me. Paul had neither wife nor child, or he must have known that his alternative involved a blasphemy against all that is best and holiest in human nature. I could have laughed with scorn."

These words are undoubtedly very interesting, as well for the profound faith which they reveal—faith in the reality and importance of human life—as for their criticism of St. Paul. There is also a point of curious interest. Huxley punctuates the passage in the manner which may now be regarded as correct, the manner adopted in the Revised Version, not as in the Authorised Version and the Burial Service. Are we to conclude that the officiating minister was a careful scholar whose knowledge guided his reading, or that Huxley himself made the change instinctively in obedience to his acquaintance with the text or his understanding of St. Paul's whole argument?

But it is much more important to determine St. Paul's meaning than to discover why Huxley quoted the words as he did. Adopting the punctuation of the R.V., let us con-

sider whether the Apostle's argument is in truth open to criticism. Does he mean to affirm that, apart from belief in a future life, we may as well fall to the level of the animals, "renounce our manhood, howl and grovel in bestiality"?

St. Paul knew as well as we do—probably much better—that among the Pagan Greeks and Romans, and among the Sadducean Jews, there were many who, without any definite faith in a future beyond the grave, were yet capable of living noble and truly human lives in accordance with the standard of nobleness and humanity to which they had attained.

It fortifies my soul to know
That, though I perish, Truth is so.

So sings a modern English poet. But the sentiment is not modern. It has inspired great and heroic souls in all ages. And St. Paul elsewhere frankly acknowledges the great attainments of Pagan virtue and the reality of the illumination which the human soul, even in its natural condition, receives from God. In his Epistle to the Romans (chap. ii. 14, R.V.) he declares that "when Gentiles which have no law do by nature the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts." And he upbraids the Jews on account of the frequent superiority of Pagan virtue (*v.* 24) saying "the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you" (i.e. you Jews), adding (*vv.* 26, 27), "if therefore the uncircumcision keep the ordinances of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned for circumcision? and shall not the uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who with the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law?" This was very liberal doctrine for a Jew of those days.

Now surely it is absurd to suppose that the man who

dared to adopt such an attitude in regard to the illumination of the Pagan conscience and to Pagan virtue held that the absence of belief in the Resurrection left man altogether without motive for a good and noble life. The man whose calm judgment is expressed in the carefully balanced argument of the Epistle to the Romans was not likely to be so carried away by his eloquence as to declare, in however rhetorical a manner, that without the great hope man lost his humanity and became as one of the beasts.

What then does St. Paul mean when he says, "If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die"? We must recollect that the whole argument in which this saying occurs is addressed to people who professed belief in Christ, but denied, or doubted, the resurrection of the dead. It does not appear that these people were prepared to deny our Lord's own resurrection. For St. Paul bases part of his argument on their belief in the risen Christ. "If," he says (*vv.* 13, 14), "there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised; and if Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain." The Apostle is therefore contending with professed believers in Christianity who denied the future resurrection. When this is understood the force of his reasoning in verses 30-32 becomes evident. It amounts to this, "Why do we Christian workers live a life of unceasing toil and danger? Why do we stand in jeopardy every hour? I protest that my daily existence is a continual death. At Ephesus my life was no better than that of a fighter with beasts. Now what is the good of all this if we have no more than the ordinary hopes of men?" Thus may be expressed the meaning of the *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, "if after the manner of men I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me?" That is, what is the good of it all if it be merely human, if it be merely for the ordinary ends which men set before themselves? Why should the

Christian live a life of *other*-worldliness if he has no hope beyond *this* world? Why should he sacrifice himself utterly, wearing out heart and brain and bodily frame in a strife for things which do not belong to the course of this world if he has no hopes beyond this world? "If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." That is, if there is no future life before us, let us give up our great conflict and subside into the ordinary life of humanity.

St. Paul has in his mind two very different modes of life: the Christian and the Pagan (or earthly) life. The one is characterized by a vast faith and a perfectly measureless hope. While that faith and that hope exist, every sacrifice is worth the making in order to do the Lord's will and be worthy of our place in His kingdom. The other mode of life is earthly and temporal. Or, as St. Paul puts it in this passage, it is *after the manner of men*, just the ordinary human life as known to the average Greek of the time. In its own way and degree it may be a good, and even noble, life. But, compared with the Christian life, it is mere eating and drinking and dying.

Now what St. Paul declares is that you cannot live the former of these two lives if you have no prospect before you but that presented by the latter. If your hopes are merely of this world, your life cannot belong to the Eternal. The great truth which is here presented is that the Christian life and the Christian hope are inseparable; the one cannot exist without the other. And this is a most important lesson for the present age. In our day, as in the time of St. Paul, there are many who have a profound admiration for Christianity, who are indeed willing to call themselves Christians, but have no belief in the creed of Christianity and no confidence in its great promises of a life beyond the tomb. They admire the ethical teaching of Jesus. They believe in the doctrine of love and brotherhood. They give

unstinted admiration to the splendid devotion of those heroes of the cross who could say as truly as the Apostle, "I die daily." They regard the Christian life as the noblest thing under the sun. But they have no belief in the Divine Christ and the Resurrection. The usual way of settling the great question is expressed by some such formula as this, "Well, after all, Christianity is a life, not a creed."

This is exactly what St. Paul denies with all the tremendous energy of his soul in the passage before us. If the creed goes, the life must go too. The creed and the life are inseparable. Christ and the Resurrection give to men the conviction, the spiritual power and the splendid hope which make the Christian life possible. Apart from this creed man must limit himself to merely earthly hopes, and his life must slide back again to the Pagan level. He may be good and great upon that level, but it will be with a goodness and greatness not Christian, but Pagan.

There are, of course, certain intermediate stages. There are those whom the forces of Christian training and Christian influence keep more or less within the sphere of the Christian life. There are also those who cling to the forms and ceremonies of religion on account of the connexion of these things with the moral and social life of the community. But these are mere passing phases. They could not endure if the Christian creed were to vanish from the earth.

St. Paul's argument in this passage becomes far more impressive when his teaching on the nature of the Resurrection is kept in mind. That teaching not only gets rid of all the difficulties which are generally experienced in connexion with the subject, but also presents the most glorious and inspiring vision possible of the great hope which is set before us.

St. Paul forbids us to regard the Resurrection as the re-animation of our corruptible bodies. He also elevates

our thought above any mere doctrine of the immortality of the soul. For him the future life is not a second life of the sort we have here, nor is it a world of shades, a pale copy of reality. His conception is neither the mediæval one nor the Pagan one. It is rather that this life, with all its conditions and modes of existence and of knowledge, shall be merged and completely transmuted in a new state of being. The eternal shall supervene upon the temporal. Mortality shall be swallowed up of life. We shall not lose connexion with life by the loss of our corruptible bodies, we shall gain a far richer, fuller, more abundant life. We shall not be unclothed, but clothed upon (2 Cor. v. 1-5). "What is mortal," that which belongs to this world of corruption, shall be "swallowed up of life." As a dream melts and is lost in the fuller reality of our waking existence, so shall that which here we deem our waking existence melt away and be lost in a far more intense reality. When compared with the eternal world, this life is but a realm of shades, a region of dim, pale, fleeting ghostly things.

That is a doctrine worth having. It makes life worth living and every conflict for truth and right worth engaging in. For it sets before us the hope of a realization which will redeem from failure every justly aimed effort. Moreover this doctrine is important for our own time, because it is in harmony with much of the best thought of the day. Some of our deepest thinkers have been led to hold that there are *degrees of reality*. Some forms of being are more real than others. And St. Paul's doctrine of the Resurrection amounts to this, that there is a degree of reality beyond anything we know here. Surely there are to be found everywhere proofs of the truth of this teaching. For when we look deeply enough into anything, we find mysteries we cannot penetrate, problems we cannot solve, contradictions we cannot overcome; which means that the

final explanation is not here; the most real thing is beyond us.

The Christian hope is that, in Christ, we shall have our share in the enjoyment of a more real life in the future than we have in the present. With that hope in view even the ordinary man can catch something of the spirit of the great Apostle, the spirit too of the great poet of the nineteenth century whose last utterance breathes the same boundless confidence.

One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph.
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better, sleep to wake.

They are great words, but here are greater. "Behold, I tell you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. But when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

CHARLES F. D'ARCY.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

V.

THE TEMPTATION.

1. THE contrast between the brief allusion to the Temptation in Mark's Gospel, and the longer records in Matthew's and Luke's presents a critical problem, of which no entirely satisfactory solution has been offered. It is not likely that, if Peter had known the fuller account, he would have failed to give it a place in his public teaching, and that Mark, his companion, if he had heard it from his lips, would have omitted it from his record. But it is also unlikely that if the bare reference preserved in Mark had been all that was known in apostolic circles, the author of the common source of Matthew and Luke would have taken the liberty of framing an imaginative narrative to gratify unsatisfied curiosity. Without any attempt to account for the apparent ignorance of Peter, which the actual omission in Mark seems to involve, on the ground of the greater improbability of the invention of the narratives in Matthew and Luke, it will be assumed in this Study that we have a right to treat the story of the temptation as a historical account, and not an imaginative composition.

2. As there were no witnesses of this experience, the record must be ultimately derived from Jesus Himself. On some appropriate occasion, for some important purpose, He must have told His disciples what He had passed through, not from any vain desire to talk about Himself, but with the intention of warning them against a similar danger to which they were themselves exposed, or of justifying to them a course of action to which they were opposed. If we ask ourselves, when would Jesus be most likely to speak about His temptation, we need not hesitate long for an answer. No fitter time can be thought of than just after

the confession of His Messiahship by the disciples and His announcement of His passion to them. His rebuke of Peter surely required explanation and justification. Peter must be made to understand that he was playing the part of the Tempter. How could Jesus more impressively show that Peter's thoughts and plans, in which the other disciples shared, savoured not of God, but of men, than by a confession of His own experience? He Himself had been tempted to take the course which was being preferred by His disciples to the path of Divine appointment, on which He had just expressed His resolve to enter, and had rejected the course which they proposed as a submission to the solicitations of Satan himself. It was some such serious crisis in His relation to His disciples which compelled Him to make this self-disclosure, from which, we may be sure, He painfully shrank.

3. If this communication had this direct practical purpose, it would necessarily assume the most effective didactic form. Jesus was not giving His disciples material for His biography; He was seeking to make intelligible to them His own experience for their defence and safety. We need not look then for literal history, but may rather expect parabolic instruction. So great was the distance, mental, moral and spiritual, between the Master and the disciples that, had He recorded His experiences with prosaic accuracy, and not poetic suggestiveness, they could not have understood Him. The disguised, subtle and plausible suggestions of evil in which His moral discernment and spiritual vision discovered temptations, would not have appeared dangerous or injurious to their blunter sensibilities. He was compelled to bring His temptation down from the height of moral and spiritual ideality in which He lived even to the depth of reality in which they moved. It was quite in accord with His usual method as a teacher that He should seek to reach the reason and grasp the conscience

by embodying truth in a tale. But as Jesus was a poet as well as a thinker, His parabolic method was no artificial expedient, but a natural expression of His mind and spirit. He did not go out of His way to speak figuratively in order to produce the greatest effect; it was His own way so to speak.

4. To take the narrative literally involves us in many serious difficulties. Is it credible that Satan could assume a bodily form at will, that he could transport Jesus from the wilderness to the pinnacle of the Temple, and thence to the top of the high mountain (it is certain Jesus would not transport Himself, or God Him, for Satan's purposes), or that all the kingdoms of the world could be seen in one moment of time from one mountain? If we cannot take the whole narrative literally, we simply confuse ourselves by attempting to combine historical and figurative elements in the story. Again, is it probable that, if these suggestions, baldly stated in the words of the narrative, had been plainly put before Jesus by Satan himself, He would have felt them to be at all serious? The manifest presence of Satan would have made his solicitations innocuous. We may be sure it was in more secret and subtle forms than those which the narrative, taken literally, brings before us that Jesus was tempted. The evil which brought Him into any moral peril must have had at least the appearance of good. We do Him no honour in assuming that He could have been so easily tempted. To preserve His innocence it is not necessary, as is often taken for granted, to assume an external tempter. A man's moral "within" and "without" does not correspond with the outside and the inside of his body. Every man's consciousness has an abundant and varied content, which is not so exclusively his own that he can be held directly responsible for it all. He hears and remembers the thoughts and plans of other men. Only if he assents to them and approves of them can he be praised

or blamed for them. These stores of the mind may become the occasion of temptation, but the mere possession of them does not involve any guilt. Jesus did not live in mental isolation, in a moral vacuum, but He knew the wishes and hopes of others, and these could become the source of temptation to Him without any external tempter.

5. The first question regarding the temptation to which we must attempt an answer is this: What new element was there in the consciousness of Jesus at this time that made Him liable to so prolonged and so serious a strain of temptation? He had come to the Jordan to submit Himself to the baptism of John as His self-dedication to His vocation. How He conceived that vocation the last Study sought to discover. The conclusion reached was that He regarded Himself as the Servant of Jehovah, destined to save the people from their sins by the sacrifice of Himself. But the conclusion of the third Study must be taken along with this. Even as a youth He thought of God as His Father. His filial consciousness toward God accompanied His fraternal consciousness towards men, and we cannot assert which was more original, but may assume that the two aspects of an indivisible consciousness were mutually conditioned. It was not His filial relation to God which He discovered at His baptism, although that was confirmed. At His baptism His fraternal consciousness, which had brought Him to be baptized, was approved. In neither can we find the reason for the Temptation. In it rather He had to maintain His dependence on God, and His sympathy with man in face of a new element which had entered into His experience at the baptism. He became conscious, as it would seem for the first time, of supernatural power. How was the exercise of this endowment to be related to the submission which He rendered to God and the service which He offered to man. The suffering Servant of Jehovah seemed to have no use for miraculous activities. Must He

then surrender this vocation and assume the functions of the Messiah so long expected and so ardently desired? Must He, as His supernatural endowment seemed to indicate, turn from His own aspirations and fulfil the people's expectations? Was He to prove Himself the Son of God by supernatural greatness or by sacrificial lowliness? That, we may conjecture, was the question which had to be answered in the wilderness.

6. The question related to His vocation, and not to His individual relation to God. It has been assumed that Jesus was on this occasion tempted to use His supernatural power for His own self-indulgence, self-protection and self-advancement, to work miracles to meet His own needs, to deliver Himself from dangers, and to further His own greatness, to annul practically the Incarnation by raising Himself above the human conditions which had been accepted. This is quite a credible and intelligible explanation, but there is a very good reason why it should be set aside. Even Christian theologians have done injustice to the consciousness of Jesus by throwing to the forefront the claims which He made for Himself, and by letting fall into the background the duties which He accepted as His vocation. Not His person, but His vocation was His exclusive interest. He perfected His person as He fulfilled His vocation. His person was so identified with, so absorbed in His vocation, that it is altogether unlikely that He would think of Himself apart from His work. It may therefore be doubted whether He was ever so much concerned about His own comfort, safety or fame, apart from the claims of the kingdom of God and His calling therein, as to be liable to any temptation to seek His own ends by wrong means.

7. Even if the temptations related to His vocation, we must still choose between two possible references. Did the three forms of temptation refer to the means to be employed in the establishment of the kingdom, or to the ends to be

sought in the government of the kingdom when established? Was the question to be settled one of immediate policy or of ultimate principle? It may seem as if we could not distinguish two separate issues here. Must not the means correspond to the ends, will not the means determine the ends? That is a moral certainty; but men are constantly hiding it from themselves, for they do evil that good may come, and seek moral and spiritual ends by physical and secular means without perceiving the inconsistency. They delude themselves into the belief that inferior causes may yield superior effects instead of accepting the certain law of an exact equivalence. While it is conceivable that Jesus might have been tempted to pander to popular prejudices and passions to gain a popularity which He might afterwards use in the interests of His kingdom, yet it is not likely that He would for a moment consent to use means inconsistent with the ends He set before Him. We may assume that the temptation related to ends, not means merely.

8. How was He to use His power for the ends of the kingdom? There were abounding misery and need in the land. Should not the kingdom bring comfort and relief? The land of promise was in many parts drear and barren. Should not the earthly seat of the kingdom of God be fertile, fragrant, beautiful? The chosen people was held in bondage by a foreign oppressor. Revolt was steadily and ruthlessly repressed. Yet, although there might be great danger in the effort to cast off the Roman yoke, should not the venture be made in reliance on God, whose will it must be to set His people free? Nay, with a pure worship and a righteous life might not the delivered nation hope even to take the place of the imperial oppressor, and to exercise a world-wide dominion, not cruelly and unjustly, but righteously and mercifully? Might not the kingdom bring fertility and prosperity for the land, deliverance and security

for the people, nay, even the rule of truth and righteousness over all the nations of the earth? Such may have been the suggestions regarding the ends of the kingdom which passed before the mind of Jesus, and which He rejected as temptations of Satan.

9. How did these suggestions come into the mind of Jesus? They were presented to Him in the popular expectations of the Messianic age, with which He must have been quite familiar, as He had not lived in solitude, but in free and frank intercourse with men. It is not necessary now to indicate all the contents of this popular hope. Three features of it show a striking resemblance to the forms of the Temptation. The earth was to be renewed; the foes of the Messiah after a vain attack were all to be overthrown; the kingdom of glory in Palestine was to extend its borders to include the other nations. Jesus must have realized that He must either definitely accept or decisively reject these expectations in His ministry. What could be more probable than that He should deliberately face the issue in order to settle it finally?

10. But it may be objected: Would Jesus assign sufficient importance to these popular expectations to be in any way tempted to realize His vocation by fulfilling them? It must be remembered that these expectations were not the vain and wayward imaginations of the people, but drew their inspiration and justification from prophetic predictions. The prophets had depicted the Messianic age as one of material prosperity, political emancipation and imperial dominion for God's chosen people. The land is to become a garden; the people are to cast off every yoke; the other nations are to seek incorporation in Israel as the condition of Jehovah's favour. Taken literally, these predictions could afford the material for Jesus' Temptation.

11. Against suggestions, derived not only from the popular expectations, but even from the prophetic predictions, Jesus'

own ideal of His work, drawn, as we have already seen, from those portions of the Holy Scriptures with which His filial and fraternal self-consciousness had intuitively recognized its affinity, had to be maintained. Here lay the stress of the Temptation. Here He felt the inward strain. He revered and recognized the authority of the Scriptures as the Word of God. Yet, as in His public teaching afterwards He acknowledged that some of the commandments of the Law had been given for the hardness of men's hearts, so He was now led to the discovery that some of the predictions of the prophets, if literally fulfilled, would have led Him to courses of action, inconsistent with, contradictory to, the inward testimony of His own moral conscience and religious consciousness. It is noteworthy, however, that in the Holy Scriptures He found the spiritual principles, by the acceptance of which He overcame. It was not by base indulgence, or vain ostentation, or vulgar ambition, that He was tempted; but so unique was His vocation that He had to transcend even the anticipations cherished by prophets, and that it would have been infidelity for Him to be and do what prophets had expected the Messiah to be and do. How keen must have been the moral insight which made such a discovery, and how great the moral strength which accepted the burden of loneliness which His greatness imposed!

12. This view of the Temptation surely makes it more credible to us that He was tempted. We cannot think of the common temptations of pride and lust, and hate, as assailing Him; but His temptations were elevated as His Person and His vocation. Just as we are tempted to make the lower choice possible for us, so was He; but while our lower choice is a sin instead of a duty, His lower choice was the fulfilment of expectations, due to a lower stage of the revelation of God, instead of fidelity to His own inward testimony to the final stage of God's self-revelation to man.

This does not lessen the reality of the temptation, for the temptations on the lowest moral level are not the most real, and those on the highest least so. The saint's temptation to self-righteousness is just as real as the drunkard's temptation to self-indulgence. As the saint has none of the drunkard's temptations, but has his own, which would mean nothing to the depraved man, so Jesus, untouched by our temptations, was really tempted by suggestions of evil, which never come within the range of our experience.

13. In conclusion, it may be frankly admitted that Jesus' fall before any temptation appears a moral improbability; and that the question of what would have happened had He on this or any other occasion yielded to sin is just as speculative as the question of what would this world have been without sin, and as little deserving of serious consideration. But we must beware of putting for the moral improbability a metaphysical impossibility. Jesus was free to choose the wrong course as well as the right; otherwise His Temptation would have been a mere pretence, and His Incarnation a mere semblance. Without moral freedom there is no real human personality; if on the one hand there is no temptation, then on the other there is no perfection. There can be no legitimate appeal against this conclusion to His divinity, as we must conceive the divinity consistently with the reality of an Incarnation, and must not imagine that we magnify the divinity by mutilating the humanity. We must begin with history, and not metaphysics, with Jesus' own consciousness, that He was tempted, and not with any inferences which may be drawn from the conception of the Logos, prior to and unconditioned by the Incarnation. We truly laud the grace of the Son of God only as we confess that He who was so rich became so poor that He was tempted in all points, even as we are, yet without sin.

NOTE.

The writer ventures to present here for consideration a possible solution of the critical problem referred to in the first paragraph of this Study, of the admissibility of which he himself is not sufficiently convinced to justify his assuming it throughout his treatment of the subject, which, however, seems attractive enough to warrant its mention. If we may regard the narrative found in Matthew and Luke as ultimately derived from Christ's own teaching at Caesarea Philippi, and may interpret it not literally, but symbolically, we may ask the question whether the narrative is intended to present figuratively only the initial temptation in the Wilderness, or also the subsequent temptations which Jesus during the course of His ministry experienced? It is noteworthy that we do find in the records several incidents, of which the various forms of the Temptation may be regarded as symbolic representations. The multitudes whom He had once fed sought to be fed again, and would doubtless have been well pleased to be relieved of all their temporal anxieties by His supernatural power. Might this not be symbolized by the suggestion to turn stones into bread? Jesus was challenged by the rulers in Jerusalem to show some sign in proof of His authority to cleanse the Temple. He was required by the scribes in Galilee to show a sign from heaven that they might believe. That temptation might be figuratively represented by the demand that He should cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. The multitude sought to force on Him an earthly kingship; His disciples were eager for His rule as the Son of David; He steadily refused to gratify His friends by fulfilling these hopes. Need the offer of world-wide dominion mean anything else, or more? At first sight it does seem more probable that Jesus would not at the beginning of His ministry anticipate the dangers which He would meet, and need to escape; but, being guided step by step, would reject

this or that method of exercising His power and establishing His claims, only when the judgement and decision was forced on Him by His external circumstances. These two considerations might lend some support to the following suggestion, if it should commend itself as a legitimate solution of the critical problem. We may suppose that of the initial temptation there was no detailed narrative, and Mark's Gospel preserves all that was known about it in Apostolic circles. But among the *Logia* there was this narrative of subsequent temptations, delivered by Jesus to His disciples at Caesarea Philippi. The two Evangelists who used the *Logia* as well as Mark's Notes assumed that this narrative must be a fuller account of the Temptation thus briefly referred to in Mark, and accordingly detached it from its context in the *Logia*, and inserted it in the proper chronological sequence instead of Mark's brief reference. As the writer does not profess to be an expert in Synoptic criticism, he will not dare to pronounce any dogmatic judgement on the subject. If the suggestion is inadmissible, the two considerations which seem to lend it support lose their probability. For it is not at all unlikely that Jesus was by an initial temptation forewarned and forearmed, and so saved in the strain and stress of His work from the additional burden of discovering the principles which were to be applied on each occasion of doubt or difficulty. As we have seen, there was nothing to hinder His knowing beforehand what sort of a Messiah was expected, and He would be desired to be. The striking resemblance between His inward temptations in the Wilderness and the outward temptations He met with during His ministry is simply an evidence of His clear and full knowledge, won by the normal exercise of His mental powers, of the conditions under which His work had to be done, and shows how thorough had been the thirty years' Preparation for the three years' Ministry.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

PSALMS OF THE EAST AND WEST.

WE propose here to establish some kind of comparison between "The Psalter" as the hymnal of the Jewish Church and an epitome of devotion in the Christian world with a modern production, entitled *Psalms of the West*, by an anonymous writer who tells us however in the preface of his second edition "that nothing could have been further from the author's desire than any such comparison." At first sight it might seem a bold step to compare the lyrical anthology of the Hebrews, extending over eight or nine hundred years, and now more or less in use for 3,000 years, with a private collection of a single writer of the present day. But the collection before us is in a sense representative, being thoroughly saturated with the spirit of the age, whilst the author is one well qualified by scientific training, wide culture, and considerable attainments to speak as the mouthpiece of a large class of cultivated people whose appreciation of the volume is manifested by its appearance in the fourth impression ten years after its original publication.

Bearing in mind, then, the main contrast between the two collections—the one being a collection of collections by several writers, and the outcome of historical national events extending over a long period in the distant past, whilst the other is the production of one writer under the influence of entirely different surroundings in a single epoch in modern times—we may say at once and in general terms that intense devotion in relation to a personal God is the leading peculiarity of the Hebrew Psalms as the outcome of the Semitic mind; whereas in the Arian mind, and in this modern book of Psalms we note the tendency to abstract speculation contemplating the absolute. In the former there is an evident striving after the love of God, in the latter a most diligent search after the knowledge of

God, theology predominating in the one, philosophy in the other; the latter having an aptitude for Science and Art, the former a genius for Religion; this one gifted with Divine intuition, though narrow at times in its conceptions, that possessing an extensiveness of view which in its vast sweep takes in the whole cosmos, but lacks intensity in a corresponding degree.

Put side by side, these two collections, simply regarded as "human documents," display distinctive features: the Hebrew Psalmists in their boldness of access approach the Deity in a manner quite unlike our modern Psalmist in his wistful uncertainty and distant awe regarding the Divine Presence in the manifestations of His power.

Take, for example, the third and fourth Psalms, generally regarded as morning and evening hymns! They are the national utterances of a friend of God, confident of His Divine protection. Psalm xiii. contains the supplication of a child addressing its father; Psalm lxxxv. is a confidential colloquy between the worshipper and the object of his adoration. In all these we note the "direct immediate contact with God"; whilst the western Psalmist, in tones of hesitating doubt with wondering reserve addresses the inscrutable power which pervades the universe.

Again, there is a tone of mellowed affection in some of the Hebrew lyrics which in days when their composite character was not so well understood caused them to be regarded as the sole production of "the sweet Psalmist of Israel." Light rather than sweetness, the dry light of science, is the predominating characteristic of *Psalms of the West*. At the most we get here "cosmic emotion," as in frigid aloofness the modern man stoops before the altar of "the unknown God."

If there are these contrasts which strike us at every turn, there are also curious coincidences both in thought and expression. These in a great measure arise from the fact

that the later writer is indebted to a great extent to his predecessor, as appears from the evident hebraizing tendency in the style adopted, though perhaps unconsciously. We meet with phrases in *Psalms of the West* which constantly remind us of Psalms of the East, though the meaning attached to them is very different from that of the original whence they are derived. Thus in the very forefront of the collection, which begins with the words "Awake, my heart, and sing praises to the God of our salvation" we come across such expressions as "the strength of our Redeemer," "the health of his righteousness," mingling with other phrases with a peculiar modern ring in them, as in the description of the sun as "a governor to the planets," imparting "vital power" to "his family of worlds," described as a "minister of thy forces," or in the curious thought expressed in equally singular words, "the book of the Infinite hath no letter of the print of time."

In the same way Psalm xix. of the modern book is by no means unlike Psalm xix. in the ancient, though interlarded with modern phrases; whilst one of the most modern Psalms of the West, that on General Gordon, is indited especially in the language of Hebrew psalmody, and reads, indeed, like one of the Maccabæan Psalms. It reminds us of the curious fact that warriors have always been fond of the Hebrew Psalms, the Venite—Psalm xiv.—being the battle song of the Knights Templars.

At other times we meet in *Psalms of the West* with expressions of the most pronounced modernity, as in Psalm v., which is really a condensed agnostic version of Jehovah's speech at the close of the book of Job. In not a few of these Psalms the author assumes the attitude of critic, and censor of "metallic creeds," i.e. the popular religion or theology of the day, and in which he sometimes approaches the confines of militant heterodoxy.

Nor is our modern Psalmist behind in giving expression

to pragmatic doctrinaire statements as to the results of modern thought (see *Psalms of the West* xxxvi., xxxviii., xxxix., xlii., xliii., xlv., xlvi., lxiii.—lxv., lxvi., first ed.), which sometimes savour of scientific dogmatism, and at other times may be regarded as pœans of modern progress (Ps. lxxxiii.). These are in complete variance with the simple views of nature peculiar to the Hebrews living in pre-scientific days. In their Psalms we have the communings of the soul with God expressed with mystic indefiniteness, but also with fervid ardour; they are “aus der Seele des Volkes gedichtet,” they come from the very heart of the people. In *Psalms of the West* the popular element is altogether absent. Here we have the cultured utterances of a superior mind, writing for the “fit and few” who are in sympathy with the writer. The most striking coincidences between Psalms East and West are to be found when they formulate principles of conduct, i.e. in their ethical tendencies; here they are almost identical. Both make for righteousness. This may be seen if we compare Psalm i. as a prologue to the book of Psalms with Psalm xv. of *Psalms of the West*, in which the modern trials of the soul, its “sad warrings,” and “silent trouble” are spoken of, and the writer exhorts himself to go forth “in the plain robe of truth.”

If thou knowest right, do it; if thou desirest right, seek it strenuously; if thou searchest truth, work faithfully in light and reason.

Have we got here a modern paraphrase of many well-known utterances in Psalms of the East?

Perhaps nowhere do we possess a better illustration of both the resemblances and the differences than in what are called the Nature Psalms. Here it is that the cleavage between ancient and modern, scientific and pre-scientific, Western and Eastern modes of thought become most pronounced, and what we notice in the Hebrew

Psalms of this description is a complete absence of our modern love of nature. The writers, or redactors of the Psalms are, indeed, under the influence of their natural environment; they take in readily the impression produced on their mind by the configuration of the soil, the fauna and flora of the Holy Land; they feel intensely the beauty and terror of natural phenomena. In these typical nature Psalms—take the 8th, 15th, and 29th, for example—the variety of scenery, snow-clad mountains, and valleys standing thick with corn, sunny plains, and dreary deserts, contrasts of heat and cold, the rigour and softness of the climate, fructifying streams, and destructive cataracts—all these give stimulus to the imagination. They also suggest bold metaphors and tropes for conveying spiritual truths, such as deliverance from “the horrible pit” (Ps. xl.), the shadow of a great rock as the symbol of Divine protection, the “well of life” (Ps. xxxvi.), the river which maketh glad the City of God, not to mention other physical features suggesting mental images at every turn. Many of these Psalms have for their distinguishing feature a constant reference to the God of nature, and it is a marked tendency in Hebrew poetry to view nature in its close association with man and his Maker. “When I consider,” etc., “what is man?” etc. The modern nature poet is apt to represent the soul of man as absorbed with, or responding sympathetically to, the pulsations of the spirit of nature. So the first half of Psalm xix., considered as a fragment of a longer nature Psalm, may be fitly compared with Psalm xix. in *Psalms of the West*, written, we are given to understand, on a glorious morning in Cromer. Listen to the modern writer :

In the silence of many voices, we hear them not; but their tremor is from all creation.

In the felt darkness we see no light, but the heavens are filled with the glory of unnumbered suns.

Yet darkness glitters with the beauty of motion; the black sky is alive with everlasting radiance:

The music of light in multitudinous cords, the many voiced choir of praise in their circles of unseen melody.

Sweetly do the heavens sing in their ever-changing lyrics; the elements, with their colours, unite in the whiteness of purity.

Compare this with the Hebrew Psalm, and no doubt the scientific presentment helps to make the conception grander in its cosmic aspects.

But the impression of beauty and sublimity is not heightened much, although the older poet, in his childlike simplicity, knows nothing of the solar system, the revelations of the spectroscope, and in other respects is far behind the scientific Psalmist of the West.

Again, take Psalm xxix., where in *v.* 3, "the God of majesty" (Wellhausen's translation) is the storm God "sitting above the water flood." Here the terribly beautiful imagery is so impressive that Goethe has produced it in the song of the three angels at the close of the second Faust. It has been called one of the grandest memorials of Hebrew lyrical poetry. But here, too, as in Psalm xlvii., He who appears as supreme over the forces of nature also employs and controls them in crushing the powers of evil arrayed against man. In all these Semitic and the Arian poetic aspects of nature differ, but the Hebrew loses little by comparison. The plastic genius of Hellenistic art succeeds in symbolizing "the unseen powers beyond the veil of visible things." The modern poet notices the vital power of law interpenetrating all physical phenomena. They are apt to worship the beautiful and the true respectively. The ancient Hebrew poet knows nothing of such abstractions; he sees in all the operations of nature a personal God full of goodness and truth, and he worships Him only.

In Psalm civ., in which are described the wealth and economy of nature, the writer's mind is lost in æsthetic

rapture, but what inspires his muse is the all-pervading thought of God over and above nature. In silently watching the natural process the feeling produced is intense religious reverence for the Author of nature in all His wonderful operations. The Western Psalmist feels something like this, too, as in Psalm xxxix., which begins :

In the silence of night I beheld the firmament, and a great awe transfixed the current of life.

But, then, he goes on to ruminate after the manner of modern thinkers :

Is this earth a rough model of God's experiment, an untempered vessel to be cast aside from the City which His hand will fashion? Are all the worlds better than ours, or are all more woefully cankered? etc., etc.

Thoughts like these may have passed through the mind of such Hebrew writers as the author of the book of Job, and a few of the later Psalmists in sympathy with its contents. But grand as these speculations on nature are, and natural enough in our age of scientific criticism, they take away the freshness, the ardent, devotional feeling, the firmness of faith in an all-ruling Providence, which give the first place to the book of Psalms among manuals of devotion all over the world.

Our modern Psalmist is impressed, over-awed by the endless extent of the ocean of being, by the enigmas of existence; it is with a feeling of misgiving that he appeals to the Eternal Silence which gives no reply to his questions. Still, living as he does under Christian influence, having within him the "anima naturaliter Christiana," he rights himself: "the universe apparent is not all," "man the atom in the worldstream" sees "confusion and stress and a mighty battlefield of blind forces."

"*But* the lord of the body is the soul, and the Lord of the Cosmos is God."

This introduces the mystical element in the Psalms, and

we proceed to note coincidences and contrasts between the spiritual songs of Zion and of *Psalms of the West* in this respect.

To begin with Psalm xvii., which opens with a piercing cry of much tried innocence and closes with a "faint foreshadowing of the beatific vision," "I shall behold Thy face in righteousness," i.e., it would seem, communion with God. So again, Psalms xlii. and xliii. contain the utterances of the languishing soul thirsting after the living God, as Psalms lxi., lxii., lxiii., too, contain the spiritual musings of Hebrew mysticism. They are indicative of the Semitic intensity of feeling already referred to as forming so strong a contrast to the reticent manner, the measured tone, the somewhat frigid, self-contained attitude of the Western Psalmist. He too feels the *Seelensehnsucht*, the longing of the soul to enjoy communion with the Divine Soul of all; but he is restrained by an intellectual shrinking from expressing too much. This partly arises from a profound consciousness of the gulf which separates the finite from the infinite. The fervid heat which kindles the Jewish breast cannot be quenched or repressed, it must be uttered in words. For this reason the Hebrew Psalms form the necessary complement in the English liturgy and Scotch hymnology; they supply what the colder, or phlegmatic temperament of the north-western people could never have independently evolved out of their own inner consciousness.

There is a mystic tone of sacred poetry which belongs to a later stage of religious development, when the pale cast of philosophic doubt has clouded the mind, as in the following passage taken from *Psalms of the West*, which reminds us of Byron's "Melancholy Star" in the *Hebrew Melodies*.

Lo! the star has rested and is still! the meteor of hope which guided us through many lands in doubt and weary waiting hath become a fixed star, shining with the calm beauty of truth, etc., etc.

On the other hand there are passages in which the author speaks of a stirring mystery in common things, "the sublime simplicity of infinite potency, the unbounded eloquence of silence," which remind us of the mysticism of Maeterlink, passages which would convey no meaning whatever to the ancient Psalmists, nor to modern Christians under the sole influence of Hebraistic modes of religious thought and feeling.

To sum up, the real contrast between the ancient and modern Psalms here under review is that between implicit faith and an inclination to fatalistic doubt. The characteristic trait of the Hebrew Psalms is fiduciary trust and hopeful resignation. The characteristic of the modern Psalmist is unflinching fidelity to truth, as ascertained by observation and experiment, and with it a manly submission to the laws of nature with resigned cheerfulness in the performance of duty. The latter is really a recrudescence of the sceptical mysticism of the Stoics as distinguished from the mystic ardour of the heroes of faith. If "Psalms of Trust" are not altogether absent from the modern collection, it is because the writer here is under the influence of a religious sentiment derived from his Christian training and surroundings, as may be seen from the language he adopts. How strong this influence is may be inferred from the fact that even Heine, the most modern of moderns, the most thoroughly hellenized Hebrew of the Hebrews, in one of his last poems re-echoes consciously or unconsciously the sentiments of Psalm xxiii., the so-called "shepherd-song of God's flock."

The third point to which we would now draw attention is the philosophy of the Psalms considered as poetry of reflection. As a constituent portion of the wisdom literature of the Hebrews, the Psalms touch upon and express views on human life in its relation to the universe and God, as well as on man's destiny here and hereafter.

Life in the Psalms is always represented as a state of conflict between the friends and foes of Jehovah, a continued struggle between the powers of good and evil, in which God takes the side of the true in heart, and the children of Abraham are the defenders of the faith and where God's foes are those of His people. "God is on my side," is the device of the righteous; "the wicked shall be taken in their own craftiness" (Ps. x.).

The national Deity is appealed to by the Psalmists, speaking in the name of the people of God: "Fight Thou against them that fight against me." Of the quietism of the East there is little in the "Praises of Israel." Throughout they more or less reflect the perturbed state of the national life, the heaving and sinking of the heart kept between hope and despair, between fear and rallying faith.

In *Psalms of the West* the atmosphere is more serene. There are stirrings within and storms without here too; but in the turmoil and agitation an attempt is made invariably to speak peace to the soul, to regain perforce intellectual equipoise, to face fearlessly the storm in maintaining tranquility of mind, "amid the confusion and stress and a mighty battlefield of blind forces," in short, the aim here is a perfect calm which is a mixture of Christian resignation and manly reliance.

"Let us steadfastly search for saving belief and right action as becometh the capacity of manhood."

Of sin in the sense of the Hebrew Psalms there is little said in *Psalms of the West*, though in both there are the same allusions to the holy war in which the "warrior of heaven" is engaged to exterminate the evil that is in this present world. In the Psalms of the East sin is constantly represented as the war plot of nature, disturbing the harmony of the universe, as, for example, at the close of Psalm civ., where the praise of the whole creation ends with the prayer, "may sinners be consumed out of the earth." In *Psalms*

of the West we have the modern conception of sin as imperfection to be gradually removed by the evolutionary process on which depends the ethical progress of the race.

As to the final question of man's ultimate fate, death and hereafter, perhaps the most gloomy as well as the most characteristic view of the ancient book of Psalms is that of death as a shepherd, "They lie in hell like sheep" (Ps. xlix. 5), which, as Prof. Cheyne points out, corresponds to a similar trope in an old Arabic poem, where we read, "To-day they are driven forward by death like a troop of camels," and which, again, suggests a gloomy passage in Pascal's Thoughts comparing mortals to a number of condemned prisoners led forth one by one out of the dungeon to be executed in the sight of the rest. This, however, only alludes to physical death, whereas the Hebrew Psalmists regard death as a finality, and compare man to the "beasts that perish." *Psalms of the West* look "beyond the gates of death," and speak of "a new pilgrimage to the region of the mansion of heaven." Here and elsewhere we have the modern scientific deduction from natural phenomena as to the existence of an "invisible universe," the hope of future existence extended beyond the grave, an idea derived from the moral fitness of things like the arguments contained in that interesting monograph on *Death and Hereafter* by Sir E. Arnold. Here, too, we meet with the modern notion of posthumous existence in the influence we continue to exercise on others who survive us mingled with a vague hope of personal continuance in another state of existence. "A moment of time is a movement of life, for time has no being apart from change. All that thou doest is recorded everlastingly, and every thought hath operation in distant futurity."

In the present conflict between faith and science, then, which of the two manuals, *Psalms of the West*, which tells us that "Faith in reason, and confidence in our strength,

which was given for a high purpose, will avail more than many prayers, and the work of true science will gain what supplication had asked in vain since the world began," or the Psalter, which says, "Trust in the Lord; He is their succour and defence"—which of them, we ask, is most suitable for present needs?

To this we reply that we are not called upon to choose between the two epitomes of devotion; the use of the one need not exclude that of the other. The older volume has its peculiar traditional advantages, and the more recent compilation, intended as it is to supply a need for a scientific age, may be used conjointly with it as specially adapted for modern readers, bearing fully in mind the superior claims of the book of Psalms for the purposes of edification.

"Commune with thine own heart and be still," are words in the ancient book of Psalms by no means out of harmony with the following in the modern book of Psalms:

"Commune ever with the fountain of light; let all thy thoughts and actions be laid in his sight. . . .

"The harmony of humanity is the echo of the voice of God."

Further, there is certain correspondence between science and conscience—Wissen und Gewissen—producing a conformity between truth and justice, law and loving pity which requires for the sake of completeness such a confluence of Semitic and Arian, ancient and modern forms of devotional thought.

In the last place let us ask which of the two reflects most correctly the working of the modern mind, or serves most effectually to correct its aberrations—Jewish optimism in the Psalms, or modern pessimism in *Psalms of the West*.

It has been said, "The Psalter is the book of spiritual happiness," that modern pessimism would have been unintelligible to the ancient Psalmists. But there are many psalms, such as Psalms xii. and xiv., which are full of doleful sadness.

There is the serious element in the composition of the Semitic mind where tragedy predominates. Pessimism and optimism may both be read between the lines, as, indeed, they both represent tendencies of humanity under different conditions, irrespective of race and creed.

In the same way *Psalms of the West*, compared with other modern poems or prose compositions contained in the recently published breviaries and hymnbooks of pessimism, might almost be called optimistic, though here and there occurs a passage which has a strong flavour of pessimism. In fact no work of this character would effectually appeal to the human heart unless it contained something of both.

In short, each of these collections of Psalms contain expressions which appeal to the universal heart, in sorrow and in joy; in both there is a complete absence of unhealthy sentiment, such as we are apt to meet in some of the mediæval hymns, or the sickly effusions of modern pessimistic mysticism.

In intensity of feeling, vigour of expression, in unshaken trust in the promises of God *Psalms of the East* surpass *Psalms of the West*. In grasp of scientific truth, in breadth of view, in mental balance, *Psalms of the West* may claim the palm. Both are excellent in their own way, expressing as they do the old and new time-spirit respectively. But inasmuch as the changes of time and place have not been able to diminish the freshness and force of the old, whilst its modern rival, if such it be, cannot claim to have added anything to its spiritual contents, in throwing upon it the full light of modern science and modern thought, the majority of modern readers, comparing the old with the new and acknowledging in full their comparative merits, will be inclined to say—and in this the author of *Psalms of the West* would readily agree with the verdict—"the old is better."

IS SECOND PETER A GENUINE EPISTLE TO
THE CHURCHES OF SAMARIA?

INTEREST has been quickened of late in the Second Epistle of Peter, so perplexing just at the moment when one arrives at some conclusion regarding it, by the appearance of several works of the first importance. There is Zahn's learned and exhaustive defence of the Epistle in his *Einleitung in das neue Testament*, giving weight to some of Spitta's rather erratic theories. Dr. Chase also has laid students under obligations by his able articles on Petrine literature in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, in which he abandons the apostolic authorship of the Second Epistle. And now we welcome a worthy edition of the Epistles of Peter and Jude by that eminent authority on the first centuries, Professor Charles Bigg, who is a strenuous advocate of the genuineness of the Second Epistle. In view of the mature judgment of two such patristic scholars as Dr. Zahn and Dr. Bigg, there is insufficient warrant for Mr. Moffatt to say in his *Historical New Testament* that "the composition of this writing during the course of the second century, and probably in its first half, cannot be regarded any longer as one of the open questions in New Testament criticism."

These recent researches have prepared the way for a theory as to the destination of the Epistle, which, it seems to me, solves the outstanding problems. The evidence, in my judgment, is strongly against the opinion of Spitta and Zahn that the recipients were Jewish Christians; nor can one agree with Dr. Bigg that, as "First Peter will satisfy the conditions of 2 Peter iii. 1 fairly well," the same circle of readers is probably addressed in both Epistles. But if 2 Peter was written by the Apostle through an "interpreter" from Antioch, shortly before he went to Rome, to the Churches of Samaria, most of the difficulties in the way

of accepting it as genuine will disappear. In support of this hypothesis it will be necessary to examine the literary affinities of the letter, its Petrine element, the nature of its teaching and its attestation.

I. THE LITERARY AFFINITIES OF 2 PETER.

1. *The Old Testament.*

There are very few direct quotations from the Old Testament in this Epistle. The most obvious is in iii. 8, one half of which is evidently taken from Psalm xc. 4, where the LXX. agrees with the Hebrew. The author is true to the meaning of the Psalm. No loitering falsifies the promises of God; the prophecy as to the Day of the Lord proclaimed in the far past to the fathers, and afterwards repeated in the Gospel of Christ, though not yet fulfilled, will assuredly prove true. God is maturing purposes of mercy; our distant ages are but as yesterday in His sight, and a thousand of our coming years are only His tomorrow.

Some of the language of iii. 13 is probably suggested by Isaiah lxy. 17, lxvi. 22. Also the original of the first saying of ii. 22 is almost certainly to be found in Proverbs xxvi. 11, because the second half of the verse, "so is a fool that repeateth his folly," exactly suits the argument of our passage. Possibly it was current in Greek, for it is called "a proverb"; but if so, it was independent of the LXX., which reads τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔμετον; and the Hebrew is by far the most probable source for the saying as it stands here, especially in an author who seems to be indebted to Proverbs in other parts of this Epistle.

The indirect influence of the Old Testament on St. Peter is very much greater and more striking because its conceptions often are the warp of the argument. Prophecy, unintelligible to the original prophet, finds its meaning

and the fulfilment of its forecasts only in the Christian facts ; the experiences of the old Israel are the most cogent illustrations of the life of the new (i. 19, 20 ; ii. 1 ff.).

The citation of Noah and the Flood (ii. 5 ; iii. 5, 7), Lot, Sodom and Gomorrah (ii. 6-8) as warnings is probably due to the words of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 37, 38 ; Luke xvii. 26-29). But there is a subtle proof that our author had drunk deep of the spirit of the Old Testament stories. In the Gospel narratives Christ speaks of the days of Noah and of Lot only as days of judgment. This would have suited Peter's threat of doom on the false teachers ; but in harmony with the account in Genesis, which sets forth the gracious discipline of God with the world, he adds, "but preserved Noah and seven others," "delivered righteous Lot," believing that God cannot forget the righteous remnant of the Christian Church, but that "the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation."

The example of Balaam, though possibly a commonplace, is enlarged by our author from Numbers xxii. to suit his own purposes (ii. 15, 16).

Reminiscences from Proverbs will account for most of the imagery of ii. 17. The figure of a flowing fountain, full of meaning in Palestine, is often found in the Old Testament (cf. especially Proverbs x. 11, xiii. 14, xiv. 27 xvi. 22 ; Jer. ii. 13) to denote that the fear of the Lord is the truest wisdom. This may have given rise to "these are wells without water," so vain are these libertines with their empty words as compared with the Apostles who preached the power and parousia of the Saviour. The second metaphor describing the avarice of the false teachers, "mists driven by a storm," may be derived from Proverbs xxi. 6, xxv. 14. In contrast to the true prophet of the Old Testament (i. 21) these men come upon the Church with their lies and greed, like racing scud in a squall, dimming the light of truth. Also the third clause, "for whom the

blackness of darkness is reserved," sounds like a combination of Proverbs xxi. 16, with the thought of the fate of the angels (ii. 4); cf. also the last words of Proverbs xxi. 6. The true prophet points to a bright day whose dawn will be ushered in by the morning star (i. 19), but thick darkness awaits the false teacher. It should be observed that the Hebrew and not the LXX. is the most probable source for these comparisons. Another favourite expression of Proverbs, ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (viii. 20, xii. 28, xvi. 17, 31, xvii. 23), occurs in 2 Peter ii. 21 (cf. ii. 2, 15). Possibly echoes of Proverbs xxi. 24, 26, in which the insolently wicked who scoffs not at belief but at law is defined (Toy), may be found in 2 Peter ii. 10, 13.

The third chapter especially must have been written by a Hebrew who was saturated with the thought and spirit of the Old Testament. His cosmogony and the account of the Flood are evidently based on Genesis i. 6-9, vii. 11. Every stage of the process of creation begins with "God said" (cf. 2 Peter iii. 5, 7, "by the word of God"). In later Jewish theology the instrument in creation is the Memra, or in Philo the Logos. Paul, John, and the author of Hebrews extend the idea by assigning the agency to the Son. The author of 2 Peter abides by the original conception of Genesis, and may intend to give in passing an answer to those who hold that matter is eternal. As in Genesis, the firmament separates the upper waters from the earth, which rose out of the lower waters (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος, iii. 5, chiasmically arranged, as so often in 2 Peter), and at the Flood the waters from above pouring down, and those from below rushing up (δι' ὧν) overwhelmed the earth (cf. also Ps. cxlviii. 4).

Another strand in the pattern of the thought of 2 Peter is the Old Testament prophecy of the Day of the Lord, defined and coloured, as we shall see, by the sayings of Jesus. This promise goes so far back that it is now treated by

many as a delusion (iii. 4), though the Flood should be a warning that judgment will come in the future as it did in the past. "In the Old Testament prophets the Day of the Lord is to be a day of judgment and thereby also of salvation. Around this Day as a day of judgment all the terrible pictures of gloom and the dissolution of nature gather" (A. B. Davidson). With 2 Peter iii. 7, 10, compare Psalm xcvii. 1-5; cii. 25, 26; Isaiah xiii. 9-13; xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxvi. 15, 16; Malachi iv. 1. Also, "the eternal kingdom" (2 Peter i. 11) is not improbably drawn from Daniel vii. 14, 27, which gives a description of the final victorious rule of one like unto a Son of Man.

One cannot avoid the impression that the author of 2 Peter was better acquainted with the Hebrew Bible than with the LXX.; for not only does he deal freely with his passages, and depart from the LXX. where we can with some degree of certainty check him, but there is no trace of Alexandrianism in his thought. Imagery and ideas are Hebraic.

2. *The New Testament.*

The Gospels. The two most manifest points of contact with our Gospels are found in the account of the Transfiguration and in the eschatology. 2 Peter i. 16-18 presents substantially the same situation as that given in the synoptic narrative of the Transfiguration, with the splendour of the Divine presence and the accompanying voice in attestation of sonship. The reading of B, *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα*, adopted by W. H., Weiss, and Nestle, is not identical with any in our Gospel records. Peter is nearest to Matthew, who reads *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*. Nor are the words taken from the utterance recorded in the Gospels at the Baptism. If our Gospels were before the writer of this Epistle, it is also difficult to account for the omission of the words "hear Him," which would have suited his

purpose so well. The Transfiguration showed that Jesus is what the Apostles claimed Him to be, the Revealer of the Father, possessed of such divine power that His commands must be obeyed, and that His parousia is certain. If the writer had to meet the objections of false teachers, who claimed that the Resurrection was a spiritual fact already come in their own life, his only possible appeal was to the Transfiguration, when they had got a glimpse of the essential honour and glory with which He was to be crowned at the Resurrection (cf. Heb. ii. 9). From the Transfiguration Jesus returned to earth to resume His work. Further, the event was witnessed by the three Apostles alone. Many saw the risen Christ. Only those of the innermost circle can speak with the fullest authority concerning the nature of their Lord.

The eschatology of 2 Peter also reproduces the main outlines of the teaching of Christ as given in the Synoptics. At the approach of the Son of Man in glory the world will dissolve before His majestic holiness (cf. *δι' ἣν παρουσίαν*, 2 Pet. iii. 12 with Mark xiii. 26 and parallels). The heavens will pass away (2 Peter iii. 10, 12; Mark xiii. 31 and parallels). With the collapse of the firmament, the stars fixed therein, will fall melting (*στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται*, 2 Pet, iii. 10, 12; Mark xiii. 24, 25 and parallels; cf. Isa. xxxiv. 4). Terror and dissolution will overtake the earth and all therein (2 Pet. iii. 10, 11; Luke xxi. 26, 33 and parallels). "The promise of the Lord Jesus" (iii. 13), though expressed in the language of Isaiah lxv. 17, lxvi. 22, and an apocalyptic idea (cf. Enoch xci. 16; Apoc. xxi. 1), probably underlies such statements as Matthew xix. 28, xxv. 31. A blending of prophetic phraseology of the Old Testament with an apostolic term may be seen in the unique phrase "the parousia of the Day of God" (iii. 12).

There are some additional features. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief" (iii. 10), an apostolic commonplace

(1 Thess. v. 2 ; Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15), is based on a saying of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 43 ; Luke xii. 39). Our author shares the conviction of the apostolic era, also to be traced back to Christ, that the times before the return of the Messiah will be degenerate. Signs of the end are found in 2 Peter in the false teachers (Mark xiii. 22, 30 ; Matt. vii. 13-15, 22, 23, xxiv. 11, 24) ; and evidently under the influence of the teaching of Jesus he employs the examples of Noah, and Lot and Sodom to fledge the arrow of his threatenings (2 Pet. ii. 5-7, iii. 5-7). A rich interpretation is given to 2 Peter iii. 3, 4, 10-12 by the parables of Matthew xxiv. 45-51 ; Luke xii. 35-46 ; and the consummation of the eternal kingdom at the appearing of the Son of Man (2 Peter i. 10, 11, iii. 13, 14) finds its best illustration in Matthew xxii. 1-14 ; xxv. 31-34, 46.

Many scholars hold that a leading purpose in the composition of the Gospels, especially Mark, was to counteract doubts as to Christ's return on the part of those who were growing disheartened through their delayed hope. We find the same restiveness and discontent in 2 Peter. It reflects the questionings to which the Gospels supplied an answer : its eschatology is of the Synoptical type.

Of indirect references to gospel history there are some which, though not so evident as the foregoing, are more or less obvious. The most natural interpretation of 2 Peter i. 3 is that the writer has in his mind the personal call of Jesus to himself and other disciples to follow Him, and the discovery that He is the Revealer of the Father full of grace and truth (John i. 14, 42). In the Old Testament *δόξα* and *ἀρετή*, almost synonymous conceptions, were applied to Jehovah, and Peter transfers them to Jesus as the one through whom full knowledge of God was brought to him (Isa. xlii. 8, 12). For this reason " God " and " Jesus Christ " are combined under one article (2 Pet. i. 2).

The remarkable saying of Jesus in Matthew xi. 27, Luke x.

22, affords a striking parallel to 2 Peter i. 3, 8. Along with this go ideas found in the parable of the sower (Matt. xiii. 11-13, 23; Luke viii. 10, 15). Those who possess the honest and good heart, the Christian *καλοκαγαθοί*, will be fruit-bearing. To them are given the mysteries of the kingdom. These mysteries are dispensed only through the Son, who, having all power, reveals a knowledge of the Father to those who are morally receptive. Not only does the word *ἐπίγνωσις* (*ἐπιγινώσκω*) occur both in Matthew and 2 Peter, but the thought of Peter agrees with that of the Gospel. Nothing but a character fruitful in virtue is receptive of true knowledge of Jesus Christ, the Revealer of God. Such knowledge in its turn confers power for life and godliness. It is worthy of notice that the distinctive addition in Luke x. 23, 24 finds its closest parallel in 1 Peter i. 10.

As we shall see when we consider the false teaching of this Epistle, there is such affinity in the thought and expression of 2 Peter ii. 19-21 with Matthew xii. 28, 29, 43-45, Luke xi. 21, 22, 24-26, that we may safely regard this passage as the Gospel source to which the words *τὰ ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων*, and possibly *ὑποστρέψαι* are traceable. Whether Luke xiii. 7, 8, is a sufficient source for 2 Peter i. 8, iii. 9, 15 is uncertain. There is greater probability that the favourite designation of the Christian life as "the way" (ii. 2, 15, 21) is an Old Testament expression finding its completion in Christ "the Way," and that "the holy commandment" (ii. 21) is His command to follow Him in that way. In this connexion 2 Peter i. 10, 11 may be compared with Matthew vii. 14.

A review of these passages shows that the author of this Epistle is familiar with gospel incidents and imbued with its teaching; but he follows no one Gospel in preference to the others. Sometimes he is in greater accord with Matthew, again with Luke, and there is one reminiscence of an event recorded in John (2 Peter i. 14, John

xxi. 18, 19). It is almost certain that our written Gospels were not before him, so independent is he of them, and so delicately allusive to what in them is put with a different turn. Corroborative evidence of this is found especially in 2 Peter i. 19, in which written prophecy is said to be the source of illumination for Christians until the Day of the Parousia dawn. After Matthew had been issued such an utterance as this would have been almost inconceivable. Also the most reasonable explanation of i. 15, 16 is that the author hopes to leave a trustworthy written record of that life, into the secret mysteries of which he with but few others had been initiated. Another confirmation is afforded by the words of ii. 21, which suggest that so far the sayings of Christ had been transmitted by tradition (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 15).

The Pauline Epistles. Traces of Pauline thought are very scanty. In i. 1, "the righteousness of God" is not the peculiar Pauline conception, but is the quality of one who is a just God and a Saviour for all, and no respecter of persons (cf. Acts x. 34). The word *ἐπίγνωσις*, though common in the later Epistles, has been sufficiently accounted for by Synoptic usage. Moreover, the Christology of these Epistles, especially its cosmic significance, has no parallel in 2 Peter iii. 5, 7. Nor does the word *καλεῖν* occur in the favourite Pauline meaning; and the doctrine of the indwelling Spirit of the risen Christ in the believer is nowhere to be discovered, however much the essential element may be in i. 3. A similar temper to that of the scoffers is perhaps reflected in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, and somewhat close analogies with 2 Peter iii. 14 are presented by 1 Thessalonians iii. 13, v. 23. Also Romans ii. 4, ix. 22, and in fact the general teaching as to the fulness of the times, agree with the Petrine doctrine of the divine long-suffering (2 Pet. iii. 9, 15). Those who abused Christian freedom (2 Pet. ii. 18, 19)

may have justified themselves by a distortion of Pauline teaching (iii. 16).

Attention has often been drawn to coincidences with the Pastoral Epistles. Both contain similar phrases and ideas. Such words as these are in mutual use *αἵρετικός* = *αἵρεσις*, *ἀνθίδης*, *ἀρνεῖσθαι*, *βλασφημεῖν ἐμπλέκειν*, *ἐντολή*, *ἐπίγνωσις*, *ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* = *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, *εὐσέβεια*, *μιαίνειν*, *μίασμα*, *μιασμός*, *μῦθος*. But they may be paralleled in Philo or the language of the time. The doctrine of the false teachers of the Pastorals is a "teaching of demons." They are blasphemous, and walk according to their own passions. Maintaining that the resurrection is already past they deny the Parousia (2 Tim. ii. 18). Self-aggrandizement is their motive (1 Tim. vi. 5; Tit. i. 11). They are a sign of the last days (2 Tim. iii. 1). These similarities, however, may be accounted for by the religious conceptions that were widely current in the Orient, and by the common vocabulary for such ideas, which would be more or less familiar to an amanuensis from a Greek city of Syria or Asia Minor. They are outbalanced by fundamental differences of situation and error, which, we shall see, forbid our assuming any kinship between the writings.

The most perplexing feature of the relation to Paul remains in verses iii. 15, 16. Our author evidently puts the letters of the Apostle Paul on the same level as his own (15); and that this is not quite so high as the Old Testament is clear from two considerations: (1) His own writings are a reminder of the Gospel preached by himself and other Apostles, but not yet written (i. 12, 15, 16). His readers are to hold fast to "written prophecy" along with the commandment of the Lord delivered to them by their Apostles (i. 19, ii. 21, iii. 2). (2) The prophet of the old Testament was controlled by the Holy Spirit and spake as God gave him utterance (i. 21), whereas Paul wrote with wisdom (iii. 15). Now in his own letters Paul claims that

the true Christian may possess such wisdom (1 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 13, xii. 8), though he himself has special revelations from God (1 Cor. ii. 16, xi. 23 ; 1 Thess. iv. 15), and is peculiarly inspired (1 Thess. ii. 13 ; Gal. i. 8, 9, 11). But he places the other Apostles alongside himself. His letters or written commands are of equal authority with the word of mouth (2 Thess. iii. 14 ; 1 Cor. v. 3 ; 2 Cor. x. 11). 2 Peter and the Pauline Epistles present similar points of view. Apostolic writings do not rank quite with the old Testament, but they are of no less importance than oral teaching. It is difficult to see why τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς might not mean such apostolic letters. We know from 2 Thessalonians ii. 2, iii. 17 that forgers had set to work early ; and these false teachers also might have had little hesitation in distorting Christian literature to suit their own ends.

Further, verse 16 leaves the impression that the writer was acquainted with all the letters of Paul, though his readers were not. The passage would suit a situation in which Paul was still writing. At least there is no sign that any collection of his Epistles was circulating anywhere. In view of the impression made on 1 Peter by the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians we are bound to put 2 Peter, assuming it to be genuine, at an earlier period of the Apostle's career. On the other hand, if 2 Peter be not genuine, how are we to explain the fact that one who claims to have known all Paul's writings, and who intends to convey the idea that he was on friendly terms with him, has escaped with such meagre traces of his influence ? For after 90 A.D. or thereabouts sub-apostolic literature is saturated with Pauline thought. It is indeed questionable whether "distort" is the word that would be employed to describe the attitude of immoral Gnostics of the second century towards the Old Testament. Most of them rejected its authority entirely ; and how would a wresting of the Old Testament Scriptures be used to sanction an abuse of freedom ?

Even the errorists of this letter, who are presumably like those described in iii. 16, seem to have despised the Old Testament, if we may so infer from the repeated injunctions to give heed to prophecy (i. 19-21; iii. 2, 4-7). The words *αἱ λοιπαὶ γραφαί* imply that apostolic doctrine is one, and that to distort Pauline doctrine or any other is to reject a common Gospel (2 Thess. ii. 15; Gal. i. 6-9; ii. 7-9; Rom. xvi. 17, Tit. i. 9; Heb. xiii 8; 2 John 9; 2 Pet. ii. 21, iii 2; Acts. ii. 42). We have only a suggestion here and there of the large correspondence that must have passed between the Christian Churches, besides the writings of the Apostolic Age that remain to us, just as the glint on a solitary sail may be all that tells out on the ocean of the vast commerce of the high seas.

Hebrews. This Epistle presents more affinities with 2 Peter than any single letter of Paul's. Similar conceptions of the fulfilment of prophecy in the utterance of a Son occur in 2 Peter i. 17-21, and Heb. i. 1; and of danger from apostasy, coupled often with warnings from the history of Israel, in 2 Peter ii. 1, 5, 6, 19-22, iii. 4-7; Heb. iii. 6-iv. 13, vi. 1-8, x. 26, 27. Delay of the Parousia is a fertile source of discontent in both (2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, 9, 10; Heb. x. 37-39). Other parallels are the use of "the fathers" of old Testament prophets (2 Pet. iii. 4; Heb. i. 1); "honour and glory" of Christ (2 Pet. i, 17; Heb. ii. 9). *Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως* (2 Pet. i. 4) may be compared with Hebrews iii. 14, xii. 10; 2 Peter i. 10, 11 with Hebrews ix. 15, xii. 28. On the other hand, there is not a tinge of Alexandrian thought in 2 Peter. The author is a Hebrew with a strong ethical sense, and no speculative idealism of any sort.

3. *Non-canonical writing.*

The Book of Enoch. The construction of Peter's world-system is based on Genesis and the Prophets, and far surpasses that of Enoch both in simple dignity and the awfulness of its future. But Peter ventures on the swirl

and riot of the apocalyptic current, though it is only to snatch a piece of flotsam wherewith to illustrate his warnings.

The description in 2 Peter ii. 4 is evidently suggested by the punishment of the angels in Enoch x. 4-6, xviii 11-xxi. The abyss, chaotic and horrible, in which the angels are confined in preliminary punishment is called Tartarus in the Greek version (xx. 2). "Pits of darkness" might come from x. 4-6, and "plunging them down to hell" from xviii. 11-xxi. If in 2 Peter ii. 11 *δόξας* be taken in its most obvious meaning to describe the fallen angels of ii. 4, leaders in the hierarchy of evil powers, which were supposed to envelope the world like a spiritual atmosphere (Eph. vi. 12), we have here a strong resemblance to Enoch. In Enoch ix. 1 it is said that the four archangels, Michael, Gabriel, Uriel and Raphael ("angels greater in might and power") look down from heaven and see the evil wrought by the fallen angels (*τὰ ἄσπρα, αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, Enoch xviii. 14). The souls of men cry out to them, "Bring our judgment (*κρίσιν*) to the most high" (cf. "to bring before the Lord *βλάσφημον κρίσιν*," 2 Pet. ii. 11). The angels cry in response, "Lord of lords, God of gods, King of kings, the throne of Thy glory standeth unto all the generations of the ages . . . all things are naked and open in Thy sight . . . See then what Azazel hath done, how he hath taught all unrighteousness on earth. . . . What are we therefore to do in regard to this?" Then the Lord gives the archangel authority to bind Azazel and place him under jagged rocks in the desert and cover him with darkness until the final day of judgment (2 Pet. ii. 4). Again in Enoch lxviii. Michael and Raphael stand appalled at the sight of the wickedness of the angels, and the majesty of the Divine presence. This conduct is an extreme contrast to that of the false teachers who rail irreverently at what they assert to be an impotent spirit world.

It is just possible that the comparison of the libertines with

“unreasoning beasts” (ii. 12) may have been suggested by Enoch lxxxvi.–xc., where we have an account of how the fallen stars mingling with the sons of men beget evil offspring symbolized by wild beasts. The doom of the errorists will be that of the fallen angels (*αὐτῶν* probably refers to *δοξαί*).

R. A. FALCONER.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A.	
Barnabas and his Genuine Epistle	409
Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, M.A.	
The New Testament and Jewish Literature	52, 135
Rev. Professor J. H. Bernard, D.D.	
The Baptismal Formula	43
Rev. Armstrong Black, D.D.	
Ruth: A Hebrew Idyll	360
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
The Twelve Legions of Angels in the Valley of Jehoshaphat	215
Right Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.	
Some Proper Names	65
Rev. Professor Charles, D.D.	
The Messiah of Old Testament Prophecy and Apocalyptic and the Christ of the New Testament	241
Very Rev. Charles F. D'Arcy, D.D.	
St. Paul on Life and Immortality	428
Late Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt.	
Jacob at Peniel	176
Very Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury.	
The Minor Prophets.	81, 271
Rev. Professor R. A. Falconer, B.D.	
Is Second Peter a Genuine Epistle to the Church of Samaria?	459
Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, D.D.	
Fides Victrix	287

	PAGE
Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, M.A., B.D.	
Studies in the "Inner Life" of Jesus.	
I. Introductory	34
II. The Virgin Birth	126
III. The Growth in Wisdom and Grace	260
IV. The Vocation Accepted	366
V. The Temptation	435
Rev. Professor G. Buchanan Gray, M.A.	
The Lists of the Twelve Tribes	225
Rev. M. Kaufmann, M.A.	
Psalms of the East and West	446
Professor J. Rendel Harris, M.A.	
A Curious Bezan Reading Vindicated	189
On a Recent Emendation in the Text of St. Peter	317
Rev. Joseph B. Mayor, M.A.	
A Puritan and a Broad Churchman in the Second Century	401
Rev. George Milligan, B.D.	
The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus	72, 148
Rev. James Moffatt, B.D.	
The Adoration of Jesus	302
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
The Jews in the Graeco-Asiatic Cities	19, 92
Rev. E. C. Selwyn, D.D.	
Dialogues on the Christian Prophets	1, 109, 195, 321
J. Y. Simpson, D.Sc., F.R.S.E.	
Professor A. B. Davidson	161
Henry Drummond	343
W. B. Stevenson, M.A.	
The Interpretation of Habakkuk I., II.	388
Late Rev. Professor D. H. Weir, D.D.	
Notes on the Text of the Psalms	156
Rev. Prebendary B. Whitefoord, M.A., D.D.	
The Christian "Nil Desperandum": a Study of St. Luke vi. 35	218
Rev. Canon Winterbotham, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B.	
Bitter or Honeysweet?	377

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis vi. 2	149	Amos ix. 15.	84
xix. 14, 15	115	ix. 12.	46
xlv. 9.	225	Micah i. 10-16	89
Exodus iv. 22	149	Haggai i. 1-11	276
Numbers ii. 18	234	ii. 1-9	277
x. 14-29	238	Zechariah i. 8-15	8
Joshua xiii., xv.	227	ii. 1	8
xxi. 4-7	227	ii. 10.	334
Ruth i. 1	360	xiv. 5.	217
2 Samuel vii. 13	46	Matthew ii. 5-6	89
vii. 14	149	23	63
1 Kings x. 14	205	iii. 16	73
1 Chronicles iv.-viii	227	iv. 17	72
Psalms i. 1.	404	v. 17	241
ii. 7	150	v. 43	63
viii. 4	76	vi. 9	153
xxix. 3	451	viii. 11-12	248
xl. 6	62	viii. 17	369
xlix. 5	456	ix. 6	78
lxxx. 2	233	x. 37	257
lxxx. 17	76	x. 41	47
lxxxix. 26-27	149	xi. 4	73
xc. 4	460	xvi. 27	28
xci. 1	217	xviii. 20	47
ciii. 20	217	xxi. 5	280
Isaiah i. 2	11	11	110
ix. 6	46	43	248
xviii. 7	46	xxii. 41	249
xxviii. 16.	14	xxiii. 35	124
xxxv. 5	73	xxiv. 5	136
xlii. 1-4	369	xxiv. 10-12	295
liii. 4	369	xxiv. 30	75
lvii. 15	247	xxvi. 53	215
lxii. 1	73	xxvii. 9	138
Jeremiah xiv. 9	46	xxviii. 19	43
xxv. 10.	200	Mark i. 2, 3	138
xxvi. 8-24	88	i. 9	47
xxx. 21.	252	i. 14	72
xxxi. 31-35.	247	ii. 20	73
li. 45	115	iii. 12	72
Ezekiel i. 22.	332	ix. 1	249
xvi. 24	332	ix. 13	63
xxvii. 2-33	198	x. 45, 78	257
Daniel vii. 13	75	xiii. 14	136
Hosea ii. 21	73	xiv. 51	413
xi. 1.	87	xv. 28	369
Joel iii. 11-14.	216	Luke iii. 22	73

	PAGE		PAGE
Luke iv. 17-20	55	1 Corinthians v. 9-11	107
iv. 43	72	ix. 5	413
vi. 35	219	x. 2	48
vii. 20	248	xii. 3	45, 292
x. 22	258	xiii. 7	218
xi. 29	283	xv. 55	87
xi. 29-32	139	Galatians i. 8	469
xiv. 26	258	ii. 9	416
xxi. 10	136	iii. 27	48
xxii. 37	369	v. 18, 25	300
xxiii. 30	87	v. 22	295
xxiii. 46	413	Ephesians iv. 11	16
xxiv. 47	89	iv. 19	218
John i. 12	46	Philippians ii. 11	45
iii. 5	72	Colossians iv. 15	95
vii. 38	64	1 Timothy i. 1	220
vii. 42	89	2 Timothy ii. 18	468
xi. 48	121	iii. 1	468
xii. 34	74	iii. 12	385
xii. 38	369	iii. 15	55
xvii. 21	300	iv. 13	55
xix. 22	119	Hebrews i. 5	150
Acts i. 6	413	ii. 17	155
ii. 26	220	v. 7	414
ii. 38	43	x. 5	62
vi. 9	412	James ii. 15-17	297
vii. 56	80	1 Peter i. 10	15
viii. 12	45	ii. 10	87
viii. 16	43	iii. 24	318
viii. 28-32	55	2 Peter iii. 1	459
x. 48	43	1 John iii. 3	220
xv. 12	246	iv. 14, 15	290
xv. 15-17	85	v. 1-5	287
xv. 17	46	2 John 7, 9	292
xvi. 13	22	Revelation ii.-iii.	336
xix. 5	43	ii., iii.	112
xix. 19	55	xv. 3	137
xxiv. 5	116	xviii. 8	114
xxviii. 20	220	xviii. 10	111
Romans ii. 14	429	10-13	196
vi. 3	48	22	200
vii. 26	89	xx. 11	326
ix. 25, 26	87	xxi. 2-7	323
x. 9	45	3-4	6
xvi. 7, 11	94	9-20	333
xvi. 14	65	xxii. 3-11	323
xvi. 14	423	9	123
1 Corinthians i. 13	48	18, 19	208
ii. 9	64		

