

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Purchased from

Sweet Fund.

Nº 65461

THE EXPOSITOR
VOL. VII.

List of Contributors to Volume VII.

- REV. PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROFESSOR W. EMERY BARNES, D.D.
W. M. CALDER, B.A.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
REV. R. H. CHARLES, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. A. COOKE, M.A.
REV. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES DENNEY, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., LITT.D.
PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D.
REV. PROFESSOR H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc.
REV. PROFESSOR KIRSOPP LAKE, M.A.
AGNES SMITH LEWIS.
REV. STEPHEN LIBERTY, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Phil.
J. D. MAYNARD, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR J. B. MAYOR, LITT.D.
REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, D.D.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON, M.A., LITT.D.
PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.
JOHN ROSS, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES STALKER, D.D.
REV. CANON E. C. SELWYN, D.D.
REV. F. R. TENNANT, D.D.
LIEUT.-COL. W. H. TURTON, D.S.O.
REV. A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, M.A.

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

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

SEVENTH SERIES

Volume VII

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C

MCMIX

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

6546!

DR. MILLIGAN'S EDITION OF THE EPISTLES TO
THE THESSALONIANS.¹

AMID many editions of the Pauline letters, that are appearing in rapid succession, almost all of them, containing good work and some quite remarkable work, I may be pardoned for devoting a special measure of attention to the elaborate edition of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians by Dr. George Milligan, who shows himself heir to the taste, the industry, and the love for learning of his distinguished father. I had the pleasure of counting him for a short time among my earliest pupils, when I first entered on the work of University lecturing; and for this reason I began to read his book with a special interest, which was increased in perusal by its merits. Dr. Milligan's edition marks in several important respects a distinct progress in method beyond the customary style of commentary on the Pauline Epistles. It not merely contains a learned and carefully pondered treatment of all the topics and subjects of discussion arising out of the Epistle, which would form the staple of a commentary of the usual kind; but in addition it essays the difficult task of placing before the student a summary of all that recent research in certain other directions has contributed to the illustration of the Epistles.

The kind of work that I mean is especially noticeable in two directions. In the first place, much has been learned through recent discoveries about the ancient customs and

¹ *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians.* The Greek Text, with Introduction and Notes. By George Milligan, D.D. Macmillan & Co., London, 1908.

usages in letter-writing ; and the letters of Paul now appear to us as examples of a class of work which approximated in varying degrees to the literary standard according to the amount of education, literary faculty, and philosophic insight possessed by the writers, and which reveals the character of the individual writer more clearly than any other class of composition—more truly than even the formal autobiography, because the revelation is for the most part unconscious—and yet obeys certain general principles of form and arrangement, principles which were not prescribed and taught by rhetorical teachers, but which grew naturally out of the character and customs of human beings in the society of the eastern Roman Provinces. Dr. Milligan not merely has a most interesting and thoroughly well-informed Note of ten pages on St. Paul as a letter-writer, but also shows in many places that he has constantly in mind this point of view in his Introduction and Commentary and concluding Notes.

A few examples may be given of the treatment of words. The adjective *ἀτακτος* and its derivatives, the adverb *ἀτάκτως* and the verb *ἀτακτέω*, all occur in Thessalonians ;¹ but none of the three is found elsewhere in the New Testament. The adjective occurs in 1 Thessalonians v. 14, and the adverb in 2 Thessalonians iii. 6 ; and I confess that my own inclination, based on the probabilities and on the general usage of good Greek literature, would in both cases be at first to take them in the severer sense of “disorderly living.” The verb in 2 Thessalonians iii. 7 suggests a different conclusion, and the point deserves fuller consideration.

The Authorized Version uses the translation “unruly” in one case, “disorderly” in three : the Revisers, conformably to their general principle of employing the same English word to represent a Greek word, have “disorderly” in all

¹ The adverb twice, the adjective and the verb each once.

four cases. Several commentaries, while following these versions, whittle away the meaning of "unruly" and "disorderly," until they bring it down in 2 Thessalonians iii. 7 to imply nothing more than neglect and idleness, though sometimes they cling to the stronger meaning in 1 Thessalonians v. 14. Now the context in 2, iii. 7 ff., so far as I can judge, places it beyond doubt that idleness is the idea involved in the words. Paul says, "As you know, my conduct at Thessalonica might in this respect be taken as an example to illustrate my precept; for I did not show myself an idler, but earned my living by hard work at a handicraft." The run of the reasoning is confused and lost, if "disorderly" in the common sense of the word is substituted for "idler"; hence the commentators just mentioned refine the meaning down till they make it into "idle." But iii. 7 is professedly given as an illustration in practice of the advice given in iii. 6, therefore the adverb in iii. 6 must be interpreted conformably to the verb in iii. 7. Consideration of the adverb in 2 Thessalonians iii. 11 raises this conclusion to certainty. If that be so, there can be no justification for clinging to the harsher meaning in 1 Thessalonians v. 14.

Here we have an illustration of the fact that a word may in the New Testament convey a different innuendo from that which is usual in the earlier literature; and, contrary to the general tendency of words to degenerate, this word changes from the worse to the less bad meaning. Dr. Milligan quotes two telling examples from papyri found at Oxyrhynchus, in which the verb refers to idleness, and rightly infers the probability (p. 154) that the ordinary colloquial sense of the word (as proved by those two cases) was intended by St. Paul "to describe those members of the Thessalonian Church who, without any intention of actual wrong-doing, were neglecting their daily duties and

falling into idle and careless habits, because of their expectation of the immediate Parousia of the Lord.

On pp. 7, 8, is an interesting note illustrating the phrase "brethren beloved of God" from the expression on the Rosetta stone about Ptolemy, "beloved of Phtha" (the same verb), and showing that the use of ἀδελφοί to denote "members of the same religious community" (though probably taken over from Judaism) was in common use in the pagan religious expression of the time. In modern times, the singular is used among the Greeks by the common people in addressing familiars, but the plural is almost confined to sermons (as the English word is among us). Dr. Milligan quotes Harnack's account of the change in the use of the word.

On p. 35, the statement that the general Biblical use of στεφάνος is to indicate the wreath or garland of victory, is hardly quite accurate if the word "general" is intended in the sense of "universal" or anything approaching to universal. But the rest of this interesting note gives some idea of the wide use of crowns or garlands in ancient life, which suggests that the Biblical use is sometimes, or perhaps often, unconnected with the idea of contest and victory. Especially the wearing of garlands as a sign of religious duty by all who were engaged in religious service was probably the true cause of the connexion between the ideas "crown" and "rejoicing." The wearing of garlands at feasts and other ceremonies was due to the original religious character of all such occasions.

The long notes on παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια, pp. 145-9, may be briefly noticed as very instructive; also those on ἀποδείκνυμι, p. 100, on φιλοτιμείσθαι, p. 53. On p. 49 telling examples are quoted of the use of κᾶσθαι in the popular language, for the better illustration of the difficult passage 1 Thessalonians iv. 4. In 2 Thessalonians iii. 2

the translation, "perverse" or "froward" for *ἀνόμιος* is supported on good grounds of common usage in preference to the rendering "unreasonable," which is given in both the Authorized and the Revised Version. We might readily quote a dozen more examples.

In the second place, our knowledge of the ordinary colloquial language of Greek-speaking society in the eastern Provinces about the time of St. Paul has much increased in recent years. Formerly the special character of the Greek used at this epoch was little known: almost all pagan Greek writers of the period had been lost: those of a somewhat later time employed a rather artificial literary language which was far removed from the common speech of the people. Even the language of Philo the Alexandrian Jew was more literary in type than that of the early Christians, who used, as a rule, the speech of the common people. Paul himself was a man of good education: and he employs in his letters an educated yet a colloquial language, setting before readers of a not very highly educated class the deepest thought of a new philosophy.

Until recently there was a strong general tendency to regard all phenomena of the New Testament speech which diverged from the literary Greek as peculiarities of the Christian Greek. They are now known to belong, for the most part, to the conversational and popular tongue, and to have been in general use among pagans as among Christians. From the papyri of Egypt, and the stones of the eastern Provinces generally, many contemporary documents have been gathered, some of a humbler, some of a more educated character: but all expressed in the kind of Greek which was popularly spoken and understood in the lower or higher strata of society.

It may, however, be doubted whether there is not a certain tendency among some scholars to go too far in this direction

and to eliminate too completely the old idea of a "Christian Greek." Even though the same words were used by the pagans, it may be the case—I would go so far as to say it certainly was so—that there were some, perhaps many, which acquired a special and distinct meaning to the Christians, as suited to express certain ideas of the Christian religious thought, and which thus immediately became characteristic and almost positive marks of Christian writing. The early writers did not, of course, invent new words; they took the words used in society; but the new thought gave a changed content to the existing words, e.g. *ἀγάπη*.

This class of evidence Dr. Milligan has studied deeply, and his commentary everywhere bears the impress of the knowledge which he has collected.

It would be less than fair to refrain from mentioning that the edition is founded, not only on study of these sides of a commentator's work, but also on very wide reading in almost every department of modern comment on the New Testament and the period of early Christianity. Dr. Milligan seems to have acted according to the great German scholar Lachmann's rule: to read over the whole range of applicable literature in order to comment on these two letters. I find the edition is instructive to a degree unparalleled in recent English work in this respect. It is not the work of a polymath, whose judgment is crushed by weight of knowledge about other people's opinions. There are books which show quite as wide and thorough reading and yet are far less educative as regards the range in which one may profitably look for illustration. As one who has studied the original texts rather than modern opinions about the text, and who has stood apart from or deliberately thrown aside most of the modern writers, I find Dr. Milligan's work exceptionally helpful in this respect.

Before laying aside the book, we may glance at one or two more general topics that are suggested by it.

The question is raised on p. 125 f., "How much was St. Paul in the habit of leaving to his amanuensis? Did he dictate his letters word for word, his scribe perhaps taking them down in some form of shorthand? Or was he content to supply a rough draft, leaving the scribe to throw it into more formal and complete shape? It is true that to these questions no definite answer can be given. In all probability the Apostle's practice varied with the special circumstances of the case, or the person of the scribe whom he was employing. More might be left to the discretion of a Silvanus or a Timothy than a Tertius."

It is true that no certain answer can be given to such questions as are here raised. But it may be permitted to express opinions and hypotheses on the subject, as the present writer has for many years kept these questions constantly before his mind, and been looking for indications of an answer to them. That Peter, for example, owed much to the secretary who wrote his letters for him, seems highly probable: it was the secretary who gave to the "rough draft," the "formal and complete shape" in which his first Epistle lies before us. That Paul's letters owed anything of consequence to the amanuensis seems to me in the last degree improbable. Can one imagine that the amanuensis to whom the Galatian Epistle was dictated contributed anything to the thought or the expression of that most wonderful of all letters? The whole seems to have been poured forth at one effort, like a flood of lava from a volcano. Others of his letters have evidently or probably been dictated in parts, and we can trace the points where the Apostle stopped and began again after an interval—in one case, as I believe, after a long interval;¹ but even where the interval was short there is perceptible a certain change in the tone

¹ See EXPOSITOR, sixth series, iii., 1901, pp. 224-240.

and the emotion. In those Pauline letters which were dictated in parts the influence of an amanuensis is not so inconceivable as in Galatians; but even in them such influence seems to me to have been a negligible quantity, except perhaps in the Pastoral Epistles.¹ In all the rest the stamp of Paul is too clearly and deeply impressed to allow the suspicion of extraneous influence.

Dr. Milligan justly lays stress on the consistent use of the first person plural throughout the whole course of the two Epistles, a fact which is unique, and connects it with the opening address: both letters are addressed by Paul and Silvanus and Timothy to the Church of the Thessalonians. This point of view seems to me to be inevitable. It is involved in the very idea of a letter. As was stated long ago with regard to the opening address of Galatians,² a clear distinction must be drawn between messages and salutations at the end of a letter, which are expressive merely of love, goodwill and sympathy from well-wishers, and the formal statement at the beginning that the letter proceeds from several associates. This is part of the ancient form of epistolary composition. The opening formula always was the same; so-and-so to so-and-so. When several persons are associated in the opening address, the recipients of the letter understood that the sentiments expressed emanated from these several persons jointly. But from this it does not follow that all these persons took an equal part, and it is possible that most of them took no part in the actual composition of the letter. Just as the letter of Clement nominally emanated from the Church of Rome, and yet was indubitably the composition of the

¹ I make this exception not from positive theory on the subject, but on the negative ground that I have not as yet studied the three from this point of view.

² *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, p. 253 f.

individual who was charged with the duty of writing the letter, so it is quite allowable to suppose that the letters to the Thessalonians emanated from the three associates who had evangelized in the city and stood in a position of authority to it, and yet was the composition of Paul alone. Not that Paul can be thought to have simply assumed their agreement as a matter of course, or even to have placed their names at the beginning as merely a courteous acknowledgment of their authoritative relation to Thessalonica. The invariable use of the first person plural throughout the two letters is, I think, rightly taken by Dr. Milligan to indicate something more. The case is markedly different from that of Second Corinthians, which emanates from Paul and Timothy, or of First Corinthians, which emanates from Paul and Sosthenes ; in them the first person singular is used generally throughout the Epistle, and the autobiographical touches prove beyond question that Paul was throughout the letter thinking of himself alone. In these cases we must conclude that the mention of Sosthenes and Timothy is merely a matter of politeness : “ it belongs to that fine courtesy which was part of the fabric of St. Paul’s mind, that he never omitted to recognize in the fullest degree the authority that belonged to another.” Hence, since Sosthenes and Timothy had each played an important part in the organization of the Corinthian Church, he could not but associate them with himself in writing authoritatively to that Church, when they were in his company at the time. In fact, it is quite safe, as I believe, to infer that Sosthenes was not with Paul when he wrote the second letter, nor Timothy when he wrote the first letter, to Corinth.

We must, I think, agree with Dr. Milligan here. Probably the whole situation was carefully discussed by the three, and the general sentiment to be expressed in the letter as their joint opinion was agreed upon ; the composition was left to

Paul, as no one will doubt ; and yet the agreement dictated the consistent employment of the plural form. Here, more than in any of the later letters, we may reasonably ask whether Paul was perhaps to some extent influenced by the opinion of others. It is a case diametrically opposite to that which we find in Galatians. There " all the brethren which are with me " are associated in the opening address with the Apostle ; but the letter is most intimately personal and individual to Paul in subject and expression. The association of " all the brethren with me " in the address showed to the recipients that the history and the sentiment contained in the letter were guaranteed by the whole Church of Antioch (if I be right in arguing that the letter was written there) : the place of origin was well known to the first readers, though it is now obscure to us, but the letter acquires an unsuspected authority and impressiveness and wealth of meaning in certain parts when this is recognized. Professor Zöckler, in his commentary on Galatians, has admirably expressed the intention of this conjoint address prefixed to the letter :¹ " he does this in order to give the more emphasis to what he has to say. He writes indeed with his own hand, but in the name of a whole great Christian community. The warnings and exhortations which are to be addressed to the Galatians go forth from a body whose authority cannot be lightly regarded." There has generally been a tendency to regard the conjoint form here, on the analogy of those just mentioned, as indicating a certain set of evangelizing fellow-travellers. But Zöckler rightly felt that this interpretation was out of keeping with Paul's mind and habit : it loses the impression of authority which would be conveyed by mentioning the individuals of the company, and it would associate with the writing persons who as individuals cannot have had any right to be regarded

¹ He of course takes it as written from Ephesus.

as authoritative in Galatia in the sense in which Silas and Timothy were authoritative in Thessalonica. But the association of a whole Church, especially if it was the Church of Antioch, the first and the leading Gentile Church, must have added greatly to the impressiveness of the Galatian letter. This is the one Pauline letter which claims the authority of a whole congregation; and we must acknowledge that the occasion and the contents are peculiarly worthy of the authorization.

This long discussion may seem to wander from our proper subject; but I believe that it is calculated to enforce the value of Dr. Milligan's reasoning, and to show how much importance must be attached to the superscription of the Pauline letters by those who would fully comprehend their practical power. Moreover in this direction may lie the solution of several difficulties, as for example the origin of Second Peter. That letter cannot be reckoned among the pure forgeries, a weak and valueless class of literature. Equally impossible is it, according to almost unanimous opinion, to reckon it as the work of the author of First Peter. It comes from some one who believed that he was authorized and qualified to write the message of Peter in Peter's name, possibly even after Peter's death.

Dr. Milligan is in entire sympathy (see p. xlv.) with the views of those who hold that Paul, from a comparatively early stage in his missionary career, had wide plans in his mind, that he interpreted in a very full sense the Saviour's command to His disciples to preach the Gospel to the whole world, and that he regarded himself as being the Apostle whose special work was to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles, and especially that portion of the Gentiles with whose ways and mind he was acquainted, viz., the Roman Empire. In fact, as a Hellene and a Roman, his immediate views were, doubtless, limited to what was currently reckoned "the world,"

i.e., the civilized world, the world of Greeks and Romans. His language seems in some cases to reach to a wider horizon, and, in a sense, he thought of the whole world, but practically his outlook was restricted to the Roman world.

It is one of the curious features of modern scholarship that this estimate of St. Paul's plans is by many, especially those of the old-fashioned and narrow "critical" ideas about the New Testament history,¹ regarded as inconsistent with his eschatology.

The conception of a quickly approaching return of Jesus the Messiah to reign on earth and of the speedy end of the world in its existing arrangement is supposed to have been so firmly fixed in his mind that he was incapable of entertaining any far-reaching plans: he was hurriedly doing a little unorganized and unplanned evangelizing, such as was possible in the short time that remained. No idea in modern scholarship has been so falsely and wrongly used as this "eschatology": no idea has been more productive of erroneous views and mistaken criticism. Paul's ideas on this subject had been misunderstood by the Thessalonians, and the very same error that they made of shortening his eschatological view has been committed by many modern writers. The old converts and the modern scholars alike failed to appreciate his philosophic thought. When he is speaking of the end of the world, he is, so to say, outside of time; he is contemplating the world from the point of view of the Divine and the Eternal; but in explaining his ideas he is obliged by the poverty of human thought and human speech to use the words that belong to time, and express conceptions of time. In the view of Eternity that which is certain is immediate, is now; but though the apocalyptic

¹ But it has been, unfortunately, by no means confined to this school.

outlook sees the truth as present, yet if we proceed to interpret this directly, as if that which is declared were actually beginning at the moment in the evolution of the world, we should be guilty of the profound and hopeless blunder that the Thessalonians made and the moderns are so often making, and we should be showing ourselves incapable of appreciating the higher range of religious thought.

The results of this incapacity are serious in many directions. It has led the logically minded critics, with their strict but narrow ratiocination, to reject as interpolations of a later period every expression that indicates a wider outlook in the primitive Christian history and every interpretation which finds a broader view in the plans of the Apostles. All the Apostles alike were on this theory bound fast in the fetters of this "eschatological" idea, and the Church was incapable of shaking itself free from the bonds, until the lapse of time convinced it that the facts were inexorably contradictory. Such is the modern eschatological mirage. When you find the eschatological myth in a modern book, you may at once recognize that the writer's historical view is distorted by his philosophic myopia and judge his results accordingly.

In the case of Paul this mirage is peculiarly misleading, because he combined the vision of the apocalyptic seer with the practical sense of the born administrator. In Thessalonians especially the effects are disastrous, because in this Epistle the apocalyptic point of view is most apparent, though it is never able to extinguish the practical outlook upon facts. The Roman order was the handmaid and servant of God, ordained and arranged to play its part for a season in the world and aid the Divine purposes to their fulfilment. Yet it had in it the seeds of all evil. It was capable of being perverted to the worst ends at the present; and in the future those seeds must inevitably

mature and produce their fruit. There must hereafter come the great and final conflict between Good and Evil. The lawlessness, which is for the present restrained by the Roman order will then find its leader and chief in the Emperor himself. But this gathering together of all the powers of evil will only give the better opportunity for the complete triumph of right, when the Messiah shall destroy his banded enemies.

If we admit that Jesus ever instructed His disciples to preach the Gospel to the world, not merely to Jews, if we admit that He had an outlook wider than the limits of Palestine, how can we in reason deny that the Apostles who knew those words and quoted them might have the intention of acting upon them? If they had this intention, and especially if the Roman-born Apostle of the Gentiles had the intention, how can reasonable persons maintain that he was merely skirmishing vaguely in the open, without plan or strategic intention, as he moved on from Province to Province, and metropolis to metropolis?

I have discussed this subject, from a different point of view, and in very inadequate fashion, in the *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 425-429; and in that passage a brief comparison is made between the Apocalypse of John and the Apocalypse of Paul, and the essential similarity of thought and view between them is shown, while the dissimilarity in style and method of conceiving the thought is illustrated. It is there pointed out that, whereas John was very strongly affected by the Jewish Apocalyptic literature and his Apocalypse is moulded in the same type, Paul's Apocalypse follows a different type and expresses a more philosophic conception of the same truth. "He shared in the views of John, but he expressed them differently." I used the words that "Paul stood beyond the influence of this [Apocalyptic] class of literature, thanks to his

Hellenic education." By this I meant to lay emphasis on the very marked contrast between his and John's expression of the same idea. Some have found fault with my statement, taking it to mean that Paul had not read this class of literature, which would be an absurd and ridiculous statement, the very opposite of what I intended. I have reiterated in almost every book that I have published the opinion that the motive power and by far the strongest element in the complex character of Paul was the Jewish, but there was superadded to this the Hellenic sense of measure and "grace" (to use the term which was such a favourite with him in religious expression), together with the Roman practical sense of order. He was educated in all the Jewish learning and law; but a person who has once acquired the Hellenic philosophic insight can never let the expression of his thought be guided by the more concrete, symbolic and sensuous imagery of the Jewish apocalyptic literature. Paul's apocalypse moves on a more philosophic plane, and yet it expresses fundamentally the same view of the relation between the Church and the Empire that John expresses, viz., the conflict in which the Empire shall be annihilated, with the exception that Paul sees and lays strong emphasis on the remoteness of this conflict and the fact that the ultimate enemy is for the moment an instrument in furthering the Divine purpose, while John sees only the conflict and the victory. In John's time the hostility of the Emperors had been long made open and declared, the enemy was drunk with the blood of the martyrs, and all memory or feeling that the Imperial order had once been the protector of the infant Church was lost. There lies an age between the one and the other.

It is true that my expression was perhaps too strong; the process of correction with me is largely a toning down of too emphatic statements; and the concluding pages of

the book just quoted had not undergone the chastening experience of time, but were printed as they were first conceived. Still I might have expected that one who wished to understand would gather my meaning from the general character of my work. I am, however, grateful to those who have called my attention to a sentence which can be suitably toned down to the level of the context and of the general thought.

To many friends who have kindly communicated criticism, privately or printed it publicly, I am deeply obliged; and even where their criticism implies misapprehension of my meaning, it guides me to remove a cause of misunderstanding. Sometimes, however, they assume a very humble degree of intelligence or education on my part, as when once a Cambridge scholar whom I did not know wrote to point out that "picker up of learning's crumbs," which is quoted in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 243, was taken from Browning and not original to Farrar. I write always unconsciously on the assumption that the great poems of Browning are known to all readers of modern books about St. Paul; and, on the whole, I believe that the assumption is justified.

In conclusion I may be permitted to add a paragraph of acknowledgment, which was crowded out of my article in the *EXPOSITOR* for December, 1908, apropos of Mr. Calder's recent discovery, which restored to us the text of a document known only from a copy so bad as to be useless. It is one of the most pleasant experiences of the scholar's life to confirm the conjectural interpretations or readings advanced by himself or others; and I am extremely glad to have the opportunity of mentioning that the correction *κεντήσεων* in 1. 16 was proposed by Mr. H. Stuart Jones in a review of my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, vol. ii., which he published in the *Oxford Review*, 1899, p. 202, com-

paring the same passage of Epictetus which was quoted by Mr. Calder in the EXPOSITOR, November, p. 406.

I should also take the opportunity of correcting some mistakes in the titles attached to illustrations in my book *Luke the Physician*: these crept in through error of mine in correcting the final proof. On p. xiii., no. 6: delete the words "Christian Star as a Decorative," and insert them in No. 7 in place of "Symbol of the Cross as a Decorative." On p. xiv. delete the correction on p. 328. On p. 330 fig. 7 instead of "Cross" read "Christian Star."

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

SECOND THOUGHTS.

As the discussion between "X" and myself has now been continued through four numbers of the *EXPOSITOR*, not to mention the original article in the *Church Quarterly*, outsiders will probably think that there has been enough of the *tierce* and *quarte* of debate, and will not object to my turning aside to consider how the course of the argument affects my own statement of the matter in the first chapter of my *Introduction to St. James*, which I am now revising with a view to a new edition.

One feature of the discussion which impresses itself strongly on my mind is the frequent complaint made on either side that the opponent is beating the air, that he misses the point, that his arguments are all beside the mark. I am disposed to think that this arises from our starting with different canons of logic, and in a later page I have given an example of what I have called "X's" "transcendental logic," i.e., a logic passing my own understanding. It is evident that, where there is such a fundamental disagreement, no progress is possible. Each disputant must despair of convincing his opponent, and must leave his arguments to carry such weight as they may with those who accept his own methods of reasoning.

The points with which I deal in what follows are for the most part of a different character. I confine myself to the consideration of cases in which I can see real force in my opponent's arguments, and feel that the discussion has thrown real light on the subject.

The first case which I will consider is concerned with Lightfoot's statement as to the testimony of Hegesippus, which appears in p. 277 of his edition of the Epistle to

the Galatians. Lightfoot quotes from Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 20, where Hegesippus speaks of the grandsons of Jude, who was called the Lord's brother according to the flesh (*τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*), adding, "In this passage the word 'called' seems to me to point to the Epiphonian rather than to the Helvidian view, the brotherhood of these brethren, like the fatherhood of Joseph, being reputed, but not real." Again on p. 276 he says that the Clementine Homilies "speak of James as being called the brother of the Lord (*ὁ λεχθεὶς ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου*, xi. 35), an expression which has been variously interpreted as favouring all three hypotheses (Hieronymian, Epiphonian and Helvidian), and is indecisive in itself." To this he appends the following note: "The word *λεχθεὶς* is most naturally taken, I think, to refer to the reputed brotherhood of James as a consequence of the reputed fatherhood of Joseph, and thus to favour the Epiphonian view."

In p. 170 of the August EXPOSITOR I carelessly took these words of Lightfoot to imply that *κατὰ σάρκα* here had much the same meaning as in *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε* (John viii. 15), and that the whole phrase *κατὰ σάρκα ἐλέγετο* was to be regarded as equivalent to "wrongly reputed," a mistake to which "X" very properly called attention in the EXPOSITOR for November. My excuse is that I was suddenly called away from other work to reply to the article in the *Church Quarterly*, and took less trouble than I should have done to make sure that I was not attributing to Lightfoot an interpretation which had occurred to myself as not improbable. The phrase *ὁ κατὰ σάρκα λεγόμενος ἀδελφός* is, I think, unusual. If, with Lightfoot, we take *κατὰ σάρκα* as qualifying *ἀδελφός*, it implies that Jude had been described not simply as brother of Christ, but definitely as his brother according to the flesh, and it is interesting to find this statement referred to as an old tradition in the preceding sentence of

Eusebius : παλαιὸς κατέχει λόγος τῶν αἱρετικῶν τινὰς κατηγορήσαι τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἰούδα, (τοῦτον δὲ εἶναι ἀδελφὸν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτήρος) ὡς ἀπὸ γένους τυρχανόντων Δαβὶδ καὶ ὡς αὐτοῦ συγγένειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ φερόντων. ταῦτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὧδέ πως λέγων ὁ Ἡγήσιππος. Here it is asserted that "Jude was after the flesh brother of the Saviour," and it seems natural to explain the following τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου as referring to the παλαιὸς λόγος, which affirmed as a fact that Jude was κατὰ σάρκα a brother of the Lord. Can this phrase here mean anything else than it does in Romans ix. 3 τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, and in the other examples quoted in EXPOSITOR, p. 170? If Jude was ἀδελφὸς κατὰ σάρκα, he must have been son of Joseph and Mary, for if he were merely son of Joseph by a former wife he would have been in no real sense "brother of the Saviour according to the flesh."¹

I return now to Lightfoot's explanation of such words as λεγόμενος, φερόμενος, χρηματίζων (*Gal.* p. 283, n.) when standing alone with ἀδελφός. As is acknowledged by Lightfoot, these are not inconsistent with any of the three hypotheses which we are considering. They simply repudiate the Ebionite view that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary. Christians who accepted the Gospels of Matthew and Luke in their entirety, and believed, in opposition to the Ebionite view, that Jesus had no earthly father, found a difficulty in

¹ This interpretation is confirmed by the words of Epiphanius (*Haer.*, 78,7) ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ Ἰάκωβος καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ὁμότροπον, οὐχὶ κατὰ φύσιν . . . ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰωσήφ, μὴ σχῶν κοινωνίαν πρὸς τὴν γέννησιν τὴν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτήρος, ἐν τάξει πατρὸς λογίζεται. The "transcendental logic" which I referred to above has to do with this use of κατὰ σάρκα. I had quoted Rom. i. 3, where Christ is said to be κατὰ σάρκα son of David, κατὰ πνεῦμα Son of God. So, I said, Jude, if he were son of Joseph and Mary, might be called κατὰ σάρκα, but not κατὰ πνεῦμα, brother of Jesus, seeing that it could not be said of him, τὸ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἅγιου. From which "X" infers that I am bound to regard "poor Jude" as being carnally, not spiritually-minded, "σαρκικός only, not πνευματικός."

using the simple language of the first generation of Christians, and speaking of Joseph as His father, or of the sons of Joseph and Mary as being His brothers.

Going back to the words of Eusebius, it is interesting to have his testimony to the fact that there was an old tradition (*παλαιὸς λόγος*) asserting that Jude was *κατὰ σάρκα* brother of the Saviour. To this same tradition Eusebius was indebted for the story of the charge brought against the grandsons of Jude as belonging to the royal line of Judah and kin to the Messiah (and therefore likely to take the lead in any insurrection against Rome). In the next sentence he tells us that this story was recorded by Hegesippus, whose testimony he quotes in a slightly altered form (*τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου ἀδελφοῦ*), mentioning Jude's brotherhood as asserted by another, not directly affirmed as a part of his own belief. The introductory words *ταῦτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὧδε πως λέγων Ἡγήσιππος* seem to involve an inconsistent, *κατὰ λέξιν* meaning "word for word," and *ὧδε πως* "somewhat as follows." At other times Eusebius uses stronger expressions to denote his own accuracy in quotation, such as *τούτοις αὐτοῖς ἐκτιθέμενος ῥήμασι*, of Africanus (*H.E.*, i. 7), *συλλαβαῖς αὐταῖς* of Josephus (*H.E.* i. 11). Possibly he may have thought the words of the old tradition (*κατὰ σάρκα εἶναι*) too strong, and modified it by the saving *λεγομένου*. That the addition was not due to Hegesippus is not only suggested by the form of the preceding sentence, but by another quotation from him contained in *H.E.*, iii. 23, *διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν . . . ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰάκωβος*. At the beginning of the same chapter Eusebius uses the same language, "after their attack on Paul had failed through his appeal to Caesar, the Jews turned their attention to James, τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου ἀδελφὸν, who had been appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles."

A second point in which I should somewhat modify my

statement in consequence of "X's" criticism is in regard to my remark that the apocryphal Gospel of Peter is tinged with Docetic heresy. According to "X" the fact that the author of this Gospel held Docetic views only enhances his authority as a witness to the truth of the Perpetual Virginity; because, if the Divine Christ did not unite Himself to the man Jesus until the baptism by John, there was no reason for the miraculous birth. And so we are told that Cerinthus "rejected the doctrine of the miraculous conception and taught that Jesus was, according to the ordinary course of human birth, the son of Joseph and Mary; that He differed from other men only as being unusually righteous and wise; that, on his baptism, Christ descended upon him in the form of a dove, that He had been thereby enabled to preach the supreme God and to work miracles; that before his crucifixion Christ withdrew himself, leaving Jesus to suffer and to rise again, while Christ, as a spiritual being, remained impassible."¹

But this was not the only, nor indeed the most common form of Doceticism. Cerinthus was a Jew and an Ebionite. The Docetae were more commonly Gentiles and Gnostics.² Dr. Salmon gives an abstract of Hippolytus' account of this sect (*Hippol. Ref. Haer.*, viii. 10; *D. of Chr. Biogr.*, i. 866), the substance of which is that the "Aeons" begat of one virgin a joint offspring, the Saviour of all, co-equal with the primal Deity in every respect, except that He was begotten,

¹ See Salmon's article on Doceticism in *D. of Chr. Biog.*, i. p. 868.

² That it was easier for Greeks than for Jews to accept the doctrine of the miraculous birth appears from Justin, *Apol.*, i. 20, where the stories of Hercules and the Dioscuri are cited as parallels, while the Jew Trypho, on the contrary, says that the Christians ought to be ashamed to support their cause by the ridiculous fables of the heathen (*Dial.*, 67). In the edition of the Gospel according to Peter by Robinson and James, attention is called to the writer's dislike of the Jews (p. 27), and to the two marks of Doceticism noticed in the Gospel: (1) that Jesus felt no pain when crucified (p. 18), (2) the cry uttered on the cross, "My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me" (p. 20), which they compare with what we read of Valentinus in *Iren.* i. 8. 2.

while the latter was unbegotten (p. 867). The Saviour passed into this lower world, unseen, unknown, not believed in. An angel who accompanied him from above, made the annunciation to Mary, as it is written in the Gospels. At His baptism He received in the water a form and impress of the body conceived of the Virgin. [I suppose this new body was imagined to be a spiritual body inclosed in the outer fleshly body.] The Saviour received this body in order that, when the " archon " had condemned to death the flesh that was his own creation, the Saviour's soul, having stripped off the fleshly body, and left it nailed to the cross, might yet not be found naked, being arrayed in the body received at baptism. Here the Docetic principle seems to apply only to our Lord's resurrection-body.

To much the same effect Irenaeus (i. 30, 12) says of the Ophites, "*Jesum quippe ex virgine per operationem Dei generatum, sapientiorem et mundiorem et justiore[m] hominibus omnibus fuisse . . . (Ibid. 13). Descendente autem Christo in Jesum, tunc coincepisse virtutes perficere et annuntiare incognitum Patrem (Ibid. 14). Confirmare autem volunt descensionem Christi et ascensionem ex eo quod neque ante baptismum neque post resurrectionem aliquid magni fecisse Jesum dicunt discipuli.*" Salmon remarks (p. 868) that with two exceptions, or perhaps only one, all the sects known as Gnostic ascribed to the Saviour a superhuman nature, their main assaults being made on the doctrine of His perfect humanity. Thus Valentinus held that the body of our Lord came from heaven and was not formed from the substance of the virgin; she was but the channel through which it was conveyed into the world (p. 869).

It appears then that Doceticism formed no obstacle to the acceptance of the miraculous conception. If it might be understood, as by Cerinthus, to render this unnecessary, it might also be used, as by Valentinus, to

explain it; while it further accounted for the absence of miracles before the baptism; gave full meaning to the words reported to have been heard at the baptism, "This day have I begotten thee"; agreed with the appearances after the resurrection, the power of passing through closed doors, etc.; and seemed to afford an explanation of the resurrection, if the fleshly body remained on the cross, and the spiritual body supplied its place.¹

The reference to the Docetic Gospel of Peter is introduced by Origen with the words *τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς Ἰησοῦ φασὶ τινες εἶναι (ἐκ παραδόσεως ὀρμώμενοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου) υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ ἐκ προτέρας γυναικός*. I had cited this as showing that Origen believed this account to have been derived from the Gospel of Peter or the Protevangelium. "X" considers that this is an incorrect rendering, and that Origen here expressly speaks of the "elder brother theory" as a tradition recorded in the Protevangelium and corroborated by its occurrence in the Gospel of Peter. I do not think this is the necessary interpretation of these words. Literally translated they mean, "Starting from tradition (viz., the so-styled Gospel of Peter or the Protevangelium." Origen knows of the story as contained in these two books and does not care to discuss which is the older of the two. Even if the Greek had been *ἐκ τῆς παραδόσεως ὀρμώμενοι τῆς τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Π. Ε.* it would not require us to believe that the story, which had come down to Origen's time from the Gospel of Peter, was already a tradition to the author of that Gospel. When Clement speaks of *ἡ πάντων τῶν ἀποστόλων παράδοσις* (*Str.*, vii. 108),

¹ Thilo, in his *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, p. 378, goes so far as to say that the doctrine of the perpetual virginity, as stated in the Protevangelium, and generally accepted and defended in the Roman and Anglican Churches, is due to the Docetic fancies of the Gnostics: "dubitari vix potest, quin Gnostici primi illo commento usi sint, ut suae de putativo vel aethereo Christi corpore sententiae fidem facerent."

he does not refer to tradition as coming to the Apostles but as coming down from them to later generations of Christians.

In p. 171 I spoke of the attempt made to interpret the ambiguous language of Hegesippus by the unhesitating assertions of Eusebius. I referred there to Zahn's *Brüder u. Vettern Jesu*, as throwing a new light on the subject, and in my present paper I have brought forward other considerations which seem to show that Hegesippus himself held what we know as the Helvidian view. Of the Eusebian passages quoted on the other side, I said that, with the exception of one taken from a disputed treatise, they did not seem to me decisive. One passage is, however, cited by Professor McGiffert as conclusive against the Helvidian view. It is the awkward sentence in *H.E.*, ii 1, Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὠνόμαστο παῖς, τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ πατήρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ, ᾧ μνηστευθεῖσα ἡ παρθένος πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου—τοῦτον δὴ οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰάκωβον . . . πρῶτον ἱστοροῦσι τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγχειρισθῆναι θρόνον (we are told that the bishopric of Jerusalem was first held by James, the reputed brother of the Lord, because He too was called son of Joseph, and Joseph father of Christ). The pronoun οὗτος might be understood, as Lightfoot says, of Joseph, but I agree with him that it is more natural to take it of Christ, in which case it certainly appears to be opposed to the Helvidian view. It seems to me, however, that Eusebius is unsettled in his own opinion: he never pronounces decidedly for the Epiphonian view, which must, undoubtedly, have been known to him, and of which he would naturally have given an account if he thought it worthy of trust, as he does of the relationship of Symeon to our Lord. Of the Hieronymian view he could have known nothing. It is noticeable also that he sometimes inserts, sometimes omits the λεγόμενος before ἀδελφός.

Another passage which calls for further consideration is the narrative of the attempt of the mother and brothers of Jesus to interfere with His ministerial work, contained in Mark iii. 20-35. The immediate occasion of this attempt was the pressure of the multitude, which made it impossible for Jesus and His disciples even to eat bread. His family thought that His mind was overstrained,¹ that He must be compelled to take rest. This idea was encouraged, perhaps originated, by the scribes, who had come from Jerusalem to prejudice His followers against Him, as they had already tried to prejudice His disciples by the question, "Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?" and the disciples of John by Christ's apparent neglect of fasting. So here they try to prejudice His own family by the suggestion that His mind was disordered, or, as they would phrase it, "that he hath a devil," which we know from St. John's Gospel to have been a common allegation on the part of the Jews.

Thus in vii. 20, when our Lord asks, "Why seek ye to kill me?" the multitude answer, "Thou hast a devil. Who goeth about to kill thee?" Again in viii. 48, "Say we not well, Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" and in verse 52, after Christ's words, "If a man keep my word, he shall never taste of death," the Jews said, "Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my word, he shall never taste of death." So in x. 20, after Christ had said, "I lay down my life that I may take it up again," many Jews said, "He hath a devil and is mad; why hear ye him?" Others said, "These are not the sayings of one possessed with a devil. Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?" Westcott's note on vii. 20 is as follows: "Compare Matt. xi. 18, Luke vii. 33, where the same phrase is used of John the Baptist, as one who sternly and, in men's judgment, gloomily and

¹ Compare 2 Cor. v. 13, *εἶτε ἐξέστημεν, Θεῷ εἶτε σωφρονούμεν, ὑμῖν.*

morosely withdrew himself from the cheerfulness of social life. So here perhaps the words mean no more than 'thou art possessed with strange and melancholy fancies; thou yieldest to idle fears.' In a different context they assume a more sinister force, viii. 48, 52; x. 20. Yet even in these cases the sense does not go beyond that of irrationality."

In the EXPOSITOR for July (p. 33) I said that the narrative of St. Mark seemed to me best explained by the supposition that the relations of our Lord all shared a common anxiety when they heard that the Son and the Brother was so absorbed in His work of teaching and healing that He took no thought of the necessaries of life; and that Mary herself was the one who would feel most eager to suggest some way of inducing Him to take rest. This does not please "X." He doubts whether "to accuse another of having an unclean spirit can by any manipulation be made to express solicitude for his welfare" (EXPOSITOR for November, p. 475). But where does he find the remotest hint that Mary and the Brethren accused Jesus of having an unclean spirit? The phrase is used in Mark iii. 30 of the scribes from Jerusalem, to whom our Lord, in the absence of His relations (for they were still vainly endeavouring to find entrance from the outside) addressed the stern warning against blaspheming the Holy Spirit. It is even a question whether this discourse is rightly placed here by St. Mark. Dr. Edersheim (*Life of Jesus*, i. 573) thinks that St. Mark is here combining two events, one recorded in Matthew ix. 34, the other in Matthew xiii. 20-32; and he believes that the greater part of our Lord's answer to the blasphemous accusations of the scribes, as given in St. Mark's Gospel, was spoken at a later period, when the opposition of the Pharisaic party assumed much larger proportions. His comments on the latter are contained in vol. ii. 197 foll., where he describes the ministry in Perea. "X" writes (in p. 470) as if he thought the Brethren were

somehow implicated in the blasphemy of the scribes ; but the feeling expressed by the word ἐξέστη is entirely alien to it. Is it conceivable that those who, even if they had not themselves been present at the Baptism, the voice from heaven, the testimony of John, must at least have known of them from others ; those who had heard His teaching and witnessed His miracles ; who had lived in His company and felt for themselves the perfect beauty of His character—that such men could have listened to the charges brought by the scribes without an outburst of flaming wrath, such as stirred the sons of Zebedee on much smaller provocation ? James and Jude, we know from their Epistles, were not at all the men to bear with meekness insult and injustice done to a brother. If they could have listened in silence to such a charge, they would have been worse than the scribes ; for to whom much is given, from them much is required. What they could not help hearing was the common talk of the Jews, of which St. John tells us, and which was really suggestive of their ἐξέστη. “ X’s ” attempt to screen the Virgin from blame is scarcely less unsatisfactory than his condemnation of the Brethren. He thinks she was led to join in their interference owing to her jealousy of the “ many women, some probably nobly born and certainly wealthy, who ministered to Him of their substance.” “ It was hard for her to see others allowed to be taking that care of Him, which for so long had been her sole privilege.”

This passage of St. Mark is used by the Epiphanians to prove that the Brethren were older than our Lord and therefore felt themselves entitled to press their own plans upon Him. “ X ” endeavours to support this by referring to the profound respect felt by younger brothers for their eldest brother in an Indian family. I see no signs of this in the relations between Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Moses and Aaron, David and Eliab, Solomon and Adonijah ; or

between Judah, Joseph and Benjamin, as contrasted with Reuben and Simeon. If it be said that in these cases there was a special divine intimation, setting aside the prerogatives of seniority, how much more in the case of our Lord!

In my edition of St. James (p. xxv.) I had referred to Dr. Edersheim's remark that, if the Epiphanian theory were true, our Lord would not have been the heir to David's throne according to the Genealogies, as an elder brother would have ranked before Him. This is denied by "X" in p. 476: "That He should be the firstborn is no part of the divine revelation." I have not myself given any special study to this point, but I observe that, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Lord A. Hervey, who is, I suppose, the chief authority on the subject, writes as follows under the head "Genealogy": "The genealogy of St. Matthew is, as Grotius most truly and unhesitatingly asserted, Joseph's genealogy, as legal successor to the throne of David, i.e., it exhibits the successive heirs of the kingdom ending with Christ as Joseph's reputed son. St. Luke's is Joseph's private genealogy, exhibiting his real birth, as David's son, and thus showing why he was heir to Solomon's crown"; and the same view is taken by the writer in *Hastings' Dictionary*. I think, too, that this is the natural inference from the allusions to the Messiah in the Old Testament.

PS.—I should like to add, in reference to my note on p. 288 of the *EXPOSITOR* for September, that I have since heard from Mrs. Gibson, to the effect that Professor Kautsch, of Halle, agrees with her view, that there is no reason why a prefixed *ἰδοὺ* should forbid us to interpret the present participle in the Hebrew of Genesis xvi. 11, as referring to present time. The Palestinian Syriac has the present participle in Luke i. 31, where the Greek has the future. It appears to me, therefore, that the angelic speaker may well have used the prophetic present, "Thou conceivest, thou bearest,"

the first appearing in the foreground, the second in the background of the vision; while Mary, taking the present in its usual sense, may have hastily denied that such was, or could be at present, the case with her.

J. B. MAYOR.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.

(1) PAUL'S knowledge of Jesus began with the sight of the Risen Lord on the way to Damascus. This appearance he regards as of the same kind as those to the other witnesses of the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 8). One of his claims to apostleship is that he has seen Jesus (ix. 1). The attempt to treat this appearance as of the same kind as "the visions and revelations of the Lord" in an ecstatic state, of which Paul elsewhere speaks, is futile (2 Cor. xii. 1). The conditions for a subjective vision were absent in Saul the persecutor; the striking and sudden change wrought in him by the sight of Jesus is a proof of its objectivity. The emphasis Paul lays on the burial of Jesus indicates that for him the body of Jesus was included in the resurrection. A continuance of the spirit after death would not have been described in the words, "He hath been raised on the third day." The description Paul gives of the general resurrection is evidently applicable to Christ as "the firstfruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor. xv. 20). If the body buried was *natural*, the body raised was *spiritual* (ver. 44). The possibility of the transformation of the one into the other is assumed regarding those who may survive until the general resurrection: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (verses 51 and 52). It is probable that Paul considered

the body of Jesus as having undergone a similar transformation. It is as risen that Christ is "the second man from heaven," whose heavenly image those who are raised from the dead in Him will bear (46-49). It is as risen also that He is the "life-giving spirit" in contrast with Adam: "the living soul." This contrast is not between Adam as he originally was, and Christ in His pre-existence; it is as subject to mortality, the mortality he brought on himself and mankind (Rom. v. 12), that Adam is contrasted with Christ, as by His own resurrection the victor over death, and the giver of immortality to all who are His. Any reference to the pre-existence of Christ as a heavenly man antecedent to the Incarnation would have been quite irrelevant to the argument in this passage; and it is quite a mistake to suppose that Paul is here borrowing this notion from Jewish speculation. It is certain, however, that the Risen Lord is for him endowed with *corporeality*. "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (*σωματικῶς*, Col. ii. 9). The body of humiliation of believers is to be fashioned anew into conformity to "the body of His glory" (*σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*, Phil. iii. 21). Glory is perfection outwardly manifested. "We all with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 18). It is in virtue of this glory that Christ is "the image of the invisible God," *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (Col. i. 15). This glory is evidently thought of as light of a dazzling brightness, so dazzling that Paul when he beheld it was blinded by it (Acts xxii. 11). Although our present experience may afford us no data in confirmation of Paul's statements regarding the corporeality of the Risen Christ, or the transformation of the natural into the spiritual body, it would be rash to base a denial on our ignorance.

(2). The Risen Lord with His body of glory is *life-giving spirit* (πνεῦμα ζωοποιού). If we are to understand Paul's doctrine of Christ we must rid ourselves of the current conception of spirit as abstract consciousness, detached from and even opposed to body. In accordance with the Old Testament conception spirit is the divine energy, which not only gives knowledge, skill, wisdom, but is the source even of physical life. To say that it is substance rather than subject is to import into Paul's thought later distinctions of which he was not aware. The conception does not exclude the mental, but is wider. Divine life is in the spirit imparted to man, and as the divine life is marked by moral perfection, the spirit is holy. But the moral transformation wrought by the spirit is not distinguished from, or opposed to, the invigoration of the entire personality of man, including even his physical organism. For Paul the Risen Lord was such divine energy, for he had himself experienced a complete inward renovation. While, as in the apostolic benediction, the Lord Jesus Christ is distinguished on the one hand from the Father, and on the other from the Spirit, yet the Lord is also identified with the Spirit: "Now the Lord is the Spirit," "the Lord the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18). The power to produce a new creation, a sinless and immortal humanity, is what Paul on the basis of his own experience ascribes to Christ. Christ is the power of God as well as the wisdom of God (1 Cor. i. 24). Paul can do all things, Christ strengthening him (Phil. iv. 13), for Christ's strength is perfected in weakness (2 Cor. xii. 9). It is the omnipotence of God Himself which manifested in the Resurrection of Christ is mediated by Christ. "What the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe according to the working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and made Him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places" (Eph.

i. 19-20). Christ wields this power because He, by His resurrection, is invested with divine authority.

(3) For Paul the resurrection was of utmost significance for Christ Himself. It raised Him to a position, invested Him with an authority, and furnished Him with a power which had not during His earthly ministry been His. It was an exaltation after humiliation; and an exaltation which appears to have been conceived as not merely a restoration of prerogatives and privileges laid aside in the humiliation, for the exaltation was a reward for the humiliation. We must return to Paul's teaching about the pre-existence of Christ in the famous Christological passage in Philippians ii. 5-11; but at this stage of the discussion we must note that it teaches that God bestowed on the Risen Lord what He had not before possessed. "Wherefore also God highly exalted Him, and gave unto Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father" (vers. 9 to 11). What the confession of Jesus as Lord implies will immediately engage our attention. But we must first of all notice another passage which teaches this same truth regarding the resurrection of Jesus. In the opening verses of the Epistle to the Romans Paul defines the Gospel of God as "concerning His Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead" (i. 3, 4). The word *ὀρισθέντος* is inadequately rendered by the R.V. "declared," as the verb *ὀρίξειν* means to set a boundary (*ὄρος*). Hence Christ was marked off, set apart by the Resurrection as the Son of God with power. There was not merely a proclamation, but an investiture,

ordination, enthronement. I may be allowed to quote the note on this word in my commentary on Romans (p. 83). "The Greek word means either 'designated' or 'ordained' (Acts x. 42; xvii. 31); but Paul's meaning cannot be decided by the sense of one term. As Paul taught the pre-existence of Christ as Divine (2 Cor. iv. 4, viii. 9; Col. i. 15-19) he cannot mean that Christ became Son of God at His resurrection; yet, as he regarded the Incarnation itself as an act of self-humiliation by Christ, so he represented the Resurrection as an exaltation of Christ by God (Phil. ii. 5-11). We must take the word rather in the second¹ sense, but must understand, not an assumption of Divine nature at the Resurrection, but the entrance by Christ into the full possession and free exercise of the dignity and authority not merely which belonged to Him as pre-existent 'in the form of God,' but which was conferred on Him as Son of God as the reward of His obedience unto death. We empty Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Philippians of its distinctive significance, as well as this passage here of its more probable meaning, if we assume that Christ's exaltation at His resurrection was merely a return to His pre-existent state."

(4) "The earliest creed of Christendom," says Stevens (*The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 389), "consisted of two words, κύριος Ἰησοῦς—Jesus is Lord" (1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9). When Christ appeared on the way to Damascus, Paul asked, "Who art thou, Lord?" (Acts ix. 5) and, "What shall I do, Lord?" (xxii. 10). As the apostle of Christ he preached not himself, but "Christ Jesus the Lord" (2 Cor. iv. 5) as a saving message for all men. "There is no distinction between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon Him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Rom. x. 12, 13). This quotation from Joel ii. 32

illustrates Paul's practice of referring to Christ passages in the Old Testament which refer to Jehovah. (Compare 1 Cor. x. 22: "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy?" from Deut. xxxii. 21). Paul prayed to Christ as Lord. "Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me" (2 Cor. xii. 8). He assumes this as a general practice among believers, describing them as "all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. i. 2). This title *Lord* is evidently "the name above every name" (Phil. ii. 9). God has subjected all things to Christ (1 Cor. xv. 27). In opposition to polytheism and idolatry Paul confesses his monotheism in the words: "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him" (1 Cor. viii. 6). How can the Lordship of Christ be reconciled with the unity of the Godhead? We are not warranted in assuming that Paul ignored that problem; for Judaism represented with ardent conviction the creed of monotheism in antagonism to the prevalent polytheism. The passage just quoted indicates the subordination of the Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father. The Father is the ultimate source (*ἐξ οὗ*) and the final purpose (*εἰς αὐτόν*); Christ is the mediating agency (*δι' οὗ* and *δι' αὐτοῦ*). It is by the free will of the Father (*εὐδόκησεν*) that the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Him (Col. i. 19). The name above every other name is His by the gift of the Father (*ἐχαρίσατο*, Phil. ii. 9). His Resurrection is ascribed to God's act of power, "God both raised the Lord, and will raise up us through His power" (1 Cor. vi. 14). The subordination of Christ to God is compared to the subordination of man to Christ. "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's" (1 Cor. iii. 23). When all has been subjected to Christ, then He Himself will be subjected, that "God may be all in all" (1 Cor.

xv. 28). The interpretation of Romans ix. 5 is much disputed. Even if the construction favours the ascription to Christ Himself of the clause, "Who is over all, God blessed for ever," rather than the rendering as a doxology, "He who is God over all be blessed for ever" (R.V. margin), yet the utterance of passionate emotion cannot be regarded as qualifying the distinctly expressed doctrine of the subordination of the Son to the Father. This must be kept in mind in reviewing the passages in which divine prerogatives and functions are ascribed to Christ.

(5) One of the most significant passages is in Colossians i. 13-17, in which Christ is described by three epithets: (1) "The Son of His love"; (2) "The image of the invisible God"; and (3) "The firstborn of all creation." As the false teachers against whom this Epistle is directed assigned dignity and authority to angels, the term Son is intended here to assert Christ's absolute superiority to the angels, as in the opening argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 1-ii. 8). In this connexion it is especially appropriate as the whole clause "Son of His love" defines Christ as both the object and the medium of the love, which is the essence of the Father. As absolutely possessing the nature of God, Christ perfectly reveals it. This is asserted in the second epithet, "the image of the invisible God." As this manifestation of the nature of God is the final purpose of the Universe, He in whom it is made is prior to as well as supreme in the universe; for the clause "the firstborn of all creation" does not include Christ among the created. The phrases "the firstborn from the dead" (i. 18) and "the firstborn among many brethren" are not strictly parallel, as the reference in them is to the state of humanity after the Resurrection, of which Christ's victory over death was both pledge and pattern. Further in the immediate context Christ is described as the Divine Agent in creation.

“ In Him were all things created, in the heavens, and upon the earth . . . all things have been created through Him and unto Him ; and He is before all things ; and in Him all things consist ” Col. i. 16, 17). While the passage does not allow us to think of Christ as a creature, yet the relation of the Son of God to the creation is not exhaustively or adequately stated, when His priority and superiority are simply insisted on. Both as the Son of God’s love and as the image of the invisible God He is the firstborn in the Creation in a sense not altogether dissimilar to that in which He is the firstborn in the Resurrection. He is as Son of God eternally, the reality of self-expression and self-communication in which is rooted the possibility of the Creation. In the Son is the eternal pledge and pattern of the truth and grace of God expressed and communicated temporally in nature and history. Our judgment of the *truth* of Paul’s statements regarding the *cosmic* significance of Christ will depend on our sense of the *worth* of the salvation in Him. If man’s relation to God is the supreme interest of the Universe, we can accept this view.

(6) Still more deeply does Paul cast the plummet of his thought into the abysmal depths of the personality of Christ in the classic passage on the *Kenosis* in Philippians ii. 6-8. This passage brings before us the Incarnation of the Son of God as a voluntary act of self-emptying. It has been in every phrase and almost every word the battle-ground of scholars, as though Paul were here giving definitions with the precision of dogmatics, and not in impassioned language presenting a sublime moral example for human imitation. “ Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus ” (ver. 5) might have warned the scholastic theologian off the ground. The questions which must be briefly discussed are : (1) the meaning of the phrase *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*. Does it mean essence or accident ? (2) The reference of the

phrase τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ either backward to the "existing in the form of God," or forward to "the name above every name." (3) The action implied in the word ἀρπαγμόν. (4) The consequent content of the *Kenosis*, or self-emptying, the divine nature itself, or the state of equality with God. As regards the first point it may be admitted that Paul did think of Christ as essentially divine, as possessing the divine nature, and not merely as exercising divine functions or enjoying divine privileges. As regards the second point it seems to the writer more probably true that the equality with God is not identical with the form of God, but means position rather than essence. Nature is not that which can be held fast, or snatched at, but dignity or authority is. But this granted, the further question arises : Is this equality with God the position already held by the Son of God as the agent of God in Creation, or the position attained by the exaltation to lordship at the Resurrection? The answer to this question depends on how we deal with the third point. Is the prize already possessed and to be held fast, or is it as yet unattained, and to be snatched at? The word itself does not decide the matter. We must consider the passage as a whole. The mind of Christ does appear more significant as an example to be imitated, if the prize was something yet to be attained, and in the attaining of which two courses of action seemed open to the Son of God ; He might have claimed the position as of right ; but He preferred to receive it by free gift of His Father as a reward for His humiliation unto sacrifice. The lordship is the prize ; this is the equality with God. The *Kenosis*, to pass to the fourth point, does not mean the surrender of divine essence, but the surrender of divine functions and privileges in order that the sacrifice to be thus rewarded might become possible. So far we may go in the exposition of Paul's thought.

Can we form a distinct conception of the process here described? It is obvious that here Paul has left the solid ground of experience, and that he has essayed a bold flight of speculation into a sublime region that lies beyond our ken. It is the Risen Lord whom he projects into the pre-existent state. This he conceives as similar, if not identical with, the exaltation after the Resurrection. Between the two lies the earthly life, which in comparison with the one or the other must be regarded as a humiliation. The descent into it is described metaphysically as a self-emptying. A sober exegesis can find in this *Kenosis* no more than is involved in the contrast between the outward conditions conformable to the essential divinity and the outward conditions involved in the Incarnation of Christ. But it is not a metaphysical process which concerns Paul; it is a moral motive. The glory of the Risen Lord has not been grasped by ambition, but earned as a reward of humility. The metaphysical process here described involves insoluble problems for our thought. In the first place the *historical individuality* of Christ is transferred to the pre-existent Son of God; and thus the unity of the Godhead is made incomprehensible, for the Son cannot be conceived as a distinct personality from the Father. We must candidly admit that here Paul is exercising his imagination rather than his intellect; that, before we can appropriate his thought and fit it into a credible conception, we must translate his *Vorstellung* into a *Begriff*. It was the divine *mode* or *principle* (it is difficult to find an appropriate term since the word "person" has acquired so different a connotation from that it had when first used in the creeds) of the Son in the Godhead that became a concrete individuality, a distinct personality only through the process of Incarnation. In the *second place* to the Son of God, thus conceived, is ascribed a single temporal act of *self-emptying*. Expositors

have made much of the aorist ἐκένωσεν: but it is doubtful wisdom to emphasize the niceties of Greek grammar in regard to a pre-temporal act. It seems to the writer much more intelligible that the Incarnation should be the consummation of a process of divine self-expression and self-communication in human history, and that this process should involve as the ground of its possibility an eternal act of self-emptying in the Godhead. The Son Himself is this *Kenosis* of the Deity, this self-emptying for self-expression and self-communication. For a concrete individuality and a temporal action we must substitute an eternal act in the Godhead, which we call Word or Son, which is the necessary condition of not only the Incarnation, but of the whole process of divine immanence in the Universe of which the Incarnation is the consummation. In the *third place* it is the moral significance of the Incarnation as self-sacrifice about which Paul is primarily concerned here, as in 2 Corinthians viii. 9. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich." The different metaphysics, which our thinking leads us to, does not at all lessen the worth of the Incarnation in this respect. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" we conceive even more distinctly than Paul does in this passage as the historical manifestation and communication of the eternal nature of God as love.

Doubtless Paul was affected in some degree by the current Jewish belief in the pre-existence of whatever has value, as the temple, the Messiah, etc. But this Jewish belief does not adequately account for his doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ as the Son of God, taught in this passage, as also in those passages in which the coming of Christ into the world is described as His being sent by the Father (Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3). It was the absolute value of Christ to Paul

in his experience that compelled him to regard Christ as essentially divine. Christ had done for him, and was to him, all that God could be, and what God alone could be. This confession of divinity involved the belief in pre-existence ; as the divine eternally is, and does not come into being in time. That Paul thought of the Son of God as eternally existing in the concrete individuality of the Risen Lord was inevitable ; it did not require any external suggestion. He knew the Risen Lord, and thought of Him as eternally the same. The modification which we have suggested as necessary in Paul's doctrine does not make the pre-existence of the Son of God *ideal* ; for there is eternally in God as the reality of His nature as love this *Kenosis*, which we call Word and Son, and which became incarnate in the Lord Jesus Christ.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

CHRISTUS ÆDIFICATOR :

*A COMPARISON BETWEEN ST. JOHN II. 19 AND
ZECHARIAH VI. 13.*

THERE are three separate reports of our Lord's saying about the rebuilding of the temple. Two of these occur in the evidence given by the false witnesses in the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. And, although the witnesses were false, it by no means follows that the testimony itself was false throughout. It is possible, and indeed probable, that the misleading character of the evidence consisted in the interpretation of the words rather than in the report itself.

Each of the three separate reports differs from the other two, and each contains distinctive points of great interest and importance.

These differences may be accounted for by supposing that our Lord gave utterance to these words on more than one occasion in slightly varying form. Or the two false witnesses may have gained their knowledge of the saying from different informants neither of whom had preserved the authentic form of the saying, or who had both wilfully perverted it.

St. Matthew's account is as follows: "Now the chief priests and the whole Council sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death; and they found it not, though many false witnesses came. But afterward came two and said, This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days" (xxvi. 59-61).

What is specially to be noted here is the extreme importance of this evidence in the eyes of the judges. Until the two false witnesses appeared no testimony was forthcoming on which a capital charge could be founded. St. Matthew, writing for Jewish readers, records with emphasis the precise testimony which would have a fatal significance before a Jewish tribunal.

According to St. Mark's report Jesus is represented as saying, "I will destroy this temple," instead of "I am able to destroy the temple of God." This is probably nearer the truth than the testimony of the witness as it appears in St. Matthew's Gospel, both because it approaches St. John's report more closely, and because in this connexion it is more likely that Jesus used the expression "this temple" than "the temple of God."

The most important point, however, in St. Mark's report is the introduction of the words "made with hands" (*χειροποίητον*) and "made without hands" (*ἀχειροποίητος*) (xiv. 58). The word *ἀχειροποίητος* is used of that which is immaterial and spiritual (2 Cor. v. 1 and Col. ii. 11, where see Bishop Lightfoot's note; comp. Acts vii. 48). It is a

phrase which gives the true interpretation of the saying of Jesus, and it is inconceivable that the word could have been invented by the false witness. Either it was an exact reminiscence of the saying, or else the words in question are a late insertion in the Gospel itself—a very improbable hypothesis, as the text is based on undisputed MS. authority.

It is, however, to St. John's Gospel that we must turn for the circumstances in which this memorable saying was first uttered; and it is possible that here only we have an authentic account of the words.

In St. John's narrative the incident of the cleansing of the temple had just taken place. It was an act which implied divine authority; and accordingly "the Jews," probably the temple officials, asked, "What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple (*λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον*), and in three days I will raise it up" (ii. 18, 19).

Whatever may be thought of the other versions of our Lord's words this must be accepted as an authentic record of what was actually said on this occasion, and of the circumstances which gave rise to the saying. It was essentially a mystic saying and required interpretation. To the Jews who took the words in their bare literal sense Jesus would appear to have vouchsafed no answer, or else one which involved an impossible act on their part and an impossible claim on His. But the Evangelist, with deeper penetration, in one of those "notes," which taken together form the first commentary on the words of Jesus, adds an interpretation. "He spoke," he said, "of the temple of his body." And this interpretation, according to the Evangelist, was accepted by the disciples of Christ after the Resurrection: "When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remem-

bered that he spake thus ; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.”

But if the Master's words were mystic and symbolical, the disciples' interpretation also requires explanation and development. The prophecy was indeed fulfilled by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. The raising of the body of Jesus Christ was a rebuilding of the temple in a profoundly true and spiritual sense. The Jews did literally destroy the temple of the body of Christ. And that body did literally and in reality rise from the dead. But did this explain all ? Was there not a sense in which the temple, and all that was implied by the temple, was destroyed, and with Christ rose again in a purified and enduring form, when Judaism was replaced by the Church of Christ ?

All the best commentators have seen this truth, which is indeed unmistakably exhibited in the writings of the New Testament. “ Know ye not,” writes St. Paul, “ that ye are a temple of God (*ναὸς θεοῦ*) and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you ? ” (1 Cor. iii. 16); and again, “ We are a temple of the living God ; even as God said, I will dwell in them and walk in them ” (2 Cor. vi. 16). Compare also 1 Peter ii. 5, “ Ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house.”

The same thought is incorporated in a passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which bears closely on the subject of the present paper, because it deals with the participation of the Gentiles in the privileges of the new Covenant and with the revelation of “ the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things ” (Eph. iii. 9). The Christian community is there described as “ of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone ; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple (*εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον*) in the

Lord ; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit ” (Eph. ii. 20–21). Is it too much to infer that this conception of the Christian community as a temple of God built on the foundation of the risen and ascended Christ is derived from the saying which we are discussing as interpreted by St. John ? and that the “ other temple ” raised by Christ was this new Society, with its attributes of peace and holiness and universality ?

But if our Lord’s words in this way receive their interpretation in the future, have they not also a retrospective meaning which would in a true sense make them a sign to the Jews, as, on another occasion, the sign of the prophet Jonah was given in response to a similar demand ?

The object of this paper is to show that there was actually a prophetic conception which must have been vividly recalled by thoughtful students of Messianic prediction, and which we may reverently believe to have been in our Lord’s mind when He spoke the words which we are considering.

The conception referred to is expressed in Zechariah vi. 13, and in the context which follows, including the two following chapters.

The external circumstances of that epoch were not in some respects dissimilar to those of the time of Christ’s earthly ministry, during the whole of which the temple of Herod remained unfinished. Zechariah was one of the prophets of the Return. He was an eye-witness of the rebuilding of the second temple, now within two years of its completion. At that point of time an incident occurred which gave rise to the prophecy in which the Messiah is described as the Branch—a term which through the LXX rendering by *ἀνατολή* had come to signify to the Hellenistic Greek the Dayspring or Dawn (Luke i. 78)—a true and beautiful, but inaccurate, interpretation of the original word.

A deputation had arrived from Babylon bearing offerings to the temple in Jerusalem. The prophet was commanded to go to the house of Josiah where these men were lodging, and to take of him silver and gold, and make crowns and set them on the head of Joshua, the son of Josedech the high priest, and to say to him, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying :

Behold the man whose name is the Branch,
and he shall grow up out of his place.
And he shall build the temple of the Lord ;
Even he shall build the temple of the Lord ;
And he shall bear the glory,
And shall sit and rule upon his throne,
And he shall be a priest upon his throne.

And they that are far off shall come and build
in the temple of the Lord.¹

The Messianic significance of the passage is acknowledged, and the completion of the temple by One who should be both Priest and King lifts the conception to a spiritual level far above any hopes which might have centred in the material building then rising from its foundations. The same union of the regal and high priestly office in the Messiah is recalled in Psalm cx., which Christ expressly refers to Himself (Matt. xxii. 41-46), and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which more than any other book of the Bible points to the mystic and preparatory character of the material temple and the priestly ritual.

The royal priesthood of the Messiah, then, was in the past the sign conveyed by our Lord's answer to the Jews, who required a sign in vindication of His authority. Closely allied to that is the glorious vision of the gathering of the

¹ For the purpose of this paper it is not necessary to go into the question of the proposed alteration of text, according to which the crowned one is Zerubbabel, and Joshua the priest on his right hand. According to the text, as it stood in the days of Christ, Joshua is priest and king.

nations to the spiritual temple of the Messianic Priest and King, and of the change from the severe ceremonial of the captivity to the joyous church and kingdom of the Christ (Zech. viii. 19).

To grasp the full significance of the words, "He will build the temple," consider what the temple was to the Jew. It was the centre and symbolism of Judaism; it was representative of the national polity, even of the national existence, so much so that its seeming indestructibility was appealed to by the false prophets as a guarantee of security: "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these" (Jer. vii. 4). To the true Israelite the temple was the abode of Jehovah; his one wish was, "to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of his life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to look with pleasure on his temple" (Ps. xxvii. 4). To be in the temple was to be in the presence of Jehovah, to be taught His secret, and to enjoy His protection.

This it was that the Messiah, prefigured as the mystic Branch, was to rebuild; and in glowing terms the prophet Zechariah describes what that rebuilt temple meant, in other words what the ideal of the future, the golden age of the Messiah priest and king should be.

It is impossible not to see in the prophetic picture of a restored and renovated society those features which the Evangelists of the New Testament rejoice to note as actually existing in the Church of Christ. If in the prophet's words "they that are far off shall come and build in the temple of the Lord" (vi. 15), St. Paul rejoices that "Now ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ" (Eph. ii. 13). If the Evangelist warns them to flee from "the wrath to come," the prophet tells of "a great wrath from the Lord of hosts" (vii. 12). Then the whole passage which follows is explanatory of the spiritual building up

of the house of God, the mode, that is, in which the new spirit will break forth from the old. "There shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts (viii. 19) instead of fasting, for the Lord will return to Jerusalem and dwell in the midst of Jerusalem. "Many people and strong nations will come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem and to pray before the Lord" (viii. 22). There will be a recognition of truth in the revelation to Israel; they will acknowledge that "God is with him" (viii. 23).

The prophet, by his God-given spiritual instinct, was certain that the principles of religion which he had grasped, and the character of Jehovah which had been revealed to him, would in the end prevail; they would reach and convince the religious consciousness of mankind. Those that "were far off" would come to feel that nothing else satisfied their religious sense and yearnings. This was the true building up of the temple of the Lord which would attract men from every land.

If this relation between the saying of Christ and the prophecy of Zechariah can be affirmed and accepted, it was a sign indeed. This Person who had asserted His authority in the temple was "the Branch" of Messianic prediction, the Priest and King, who had foretold that He would rebuild the temple; and the mystic answer had a literal fulfilment.

It is quite in accordance with our Lord's usual method of teaching that the sign should be conveyed by a reference to a Messianic passage in the Old Testament, clear to those only who had eyes to see and hearts to perceive (Matt. xiii. 13). Thus on one occasion to the scribes and Pharisees who sought a sign He answered, "There shall no sign be given, but the sign of Jonah the prophet; on another the disciples of St. John the Baptist are bidden to compare the works of Jesus, which they had witnessed, with the works predicted of the Messiah (Matt. xi. 4, 5). Again the fellow-

citizens of Jesus at Nazareth are taught by an incident in the Old Testament that the rejection of a prophet by his countrymen does not invalidate a prophet's claim (Luke iv. 24 foll.). Other instances are the vision of Jacob (John i. 51), the gift of manna (John vi. 30 foll.), and the serpent lifted up in the wilderness (John iii. 14).

All these examples point to the inference that in the saying under discussion our Lord was also directing the deeper thoughts of His hearers to an Old Testament incident, which would not only indicate His claim to authority, but also open out the significance of the temple itself in the light of prophecy.

More than that, it is one of those words of Christ which help us to understand—and how far are we from fully understanding?—how “all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man” (Luke xviii. 31). It is a fragment of that lost Gospel according to Christ Himself when, “beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself” (Luke xxiv. 27).

ARTHUR CARR.

*THE DAVID OF THE BOOK OF SAMUEL AND THE
DAVID OF THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES.*

IN the book of Chronicles the history proper does not begin until 1 Chronicles x. In that chapter the disastrous battle of Gilboa is narrated (but for a few small changes) in the words of 1 Samuel xxxi., the Chronicler adding his own comment, “So Saul died . . . because of the word of the LORD which he kept not . . . Therefore the LORD slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse.” This is the Chronicler's introduction of David

to his readers; the LORD, he tells us, deposed a disobedient and unfaithful king, and put David in his place.

The whole of the remainder of 1 Chronicles, i.e. chapters xi.-xxix., is devoted to the story of David. As the Chronicler tells it, it begins with a reference to the LORD'S choice of David to be king, and immediately proceeds to describe how David chose Zion to be his city.

The religious motive of this beginning is at once apparent; we are introduced to the chosen king and to the chosen city (1 Chron. xi. 1-8). Three chapters (xiii., xv., xvi.) give an account (much fuller of ritual than that given in Samuel) of the two attempts, the second successful, to bring up the ark into the "city of David." Immediately on this follows the story (repeated from Samuel) of David's consultation with Nathan the prophet, and of the prophet's announcement that David himself was not to be the builder of JEHOVAH'S temple (chap. xvii.). After a section on certain wars of David (borrowed directly from the text of Samuel) the Chronicler narrates the Numbering of the People, an event which immediately led to David's choice of the site of the Temple, a choice providential'y guided (chaps. xxi. 18, xxii. 1).

From this point for eight chapters onward the story of the reign of David becomes the story of the preparation for building the Temple and for organizing its worship. The last words and acts of David recorded by the Chronicler deal with the building of the House of the LORD. In the whole account of this king's reign (1 Chron. xi.-xxix.) no fewer than twelve chapters (xiii., xv.-xvii., and xxii.-xxix.) are devoted to the ark, the organization of worship, and the Temple. David is represented as a warrior only when the text of Samuel is followed; when the Chronicler writes independently David is the organizer of the temple psalmody and service, and indeed the true Founder of the Temple.

How much we find missing from Chronicles which occupies an important place in Samuel! How much is missing from Samuel which looms large in Chronicles! If we regard the two accounts as biographies of David, we find the proportions so much altered, that the features of the hero of the one are hardly to be recognized in the other.

Thus in Chronicles the long civil war with the house of Saul (2 Sam. ii. 12-iv. 12) is barely glanced at (1 Chron. xii. 23). The brief account of the two Philistine raids is taken almost unchanged from Samuel. After chapter xvii., however, the Chronicler devotes three chapters (short ones indeed) to David's foreign wars. In these narratives he follows again the text of Samuel, and in these occurs the omission which has given most offence to his critics. This instance needs a somewhat full consideration.

In chapter xx. the Chronicler begins to reproduce from 2 Samuel xi. the story of the Ammonite war. He follows his authority closely and copies down the clause, "But David tarried at Jerusalem." In Samuel these are significant words, for they introduce the story of the king's temptation and fall. But the Chronicler, standing on the brink of the story of Bath-sheba and Uriah, continues his narrative of the Ammonite war without making a single allusion to David's double sin.

This omission leads directly to others. In the story as told in Samuel, a connexion of cause and effect is traced between David's sins against Uriah and the sins of Amnon and Absalom against their father (2 Sam. xii. 11). But these domestic tragedies are passed over by the Chronicler. For him Amnon and Absalom have no history (1 Chron. iii. 1, 2); Bath-sheba (called "Bath-shua") is identified only as "the daughter of Ammiel" (v. 5), and Uriah the Hittite is only a name in the long list of David's mighty men (xi. 41).

At this point, before giving a more decisive reason for the omission of the story of Uriah's wife it is only fair to say that the Chronicler may have been moved by a desire to be brief. The story is indeed a very long one, and it is not easy to break it off when once begun. The sequel of "Set ye Uriah in the forefront of the hottest battle that he may die" (2 Sam. xi. 15) is not "I have sinned against the LORD" (xii. 13), but "O my son Absalom, would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" (xviii. 33). The story of Uriah is told in Samuel as if it covered a third of David's life.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that the Chronicler wished to represent David as a sinless character. From his great omission in chapter xx. he passes on in chapter xxi. to tell in full the story of the Numbering of the People. He clearly regards it as a great sin, and he attributes the whole responsibility for the act to David alone. On this last point he emphasizes the verdict of the book of Samuel by adding a few words of his own (1 Chron. xxi. 7). Why does the Chronicler narrate the Numbering? *His reason for recording in chapter xxi. is the counterpart of his reason for silence in chapter xx.* He is silent over Uriah the Hittite because the story has nothing to do with the history of the Temple, but he tells in full the story of the Numbering, because it culminates in the providential choice of a site for the Temple (chap. xxii. 1).

Indeed it was no part of the Chronicler's aim to re-tell the story of David. His interest was not in the Acts of Hebrew kings so much as in the religion of the Hebrew people, that religion which had been handed down from father to son until it became his own. It is true that in treating of the Davidic era he could not shake himself altogether free from the lines of the well-known story of the Hebrew hero. The freebooting life of David is acknowledged in the

list of his early adherents given in 1 Chronicles xii., and the narrative of one group of his wars is copied from the book of Samuel in chapters xviii.—xx. But the Chronicler tells only enough to enable the reader to identify *his* David—the ultimate Founder of the Temple—with the David of the book of Samuel—the warrior king. With this he is content. For the full story of David—shepherd-lad, free-booter, and king—he refers to “the words of Samuel the seer” and “the words of Nathan the prophet” and “the words of Gad the seer” (1 Chron. xxix. 29, Rev. Vers. margin).

Almost similar procedure is followed with regard to Solomon. The story of the Queen of Sheba is taken over in full from the book of Kings as sufficient to enable the reader to identify Solomon the *grand monarque* of Kings with the Solomon of Chronicles, the successor of David in the building of the Temple. The remainder of the account of Solomon’s secular glories is omitted.

The Chronicler essayed a task somewhat different from that of the author of Samuel and Kings—the task of writing a history of the religion of his people. The thread of history which he followed was the history of the fortunes of the Temple, for the Temple was in his experience the centre and stay of Hebrew worship, and so ultimately of Hebrew religion.

The Chronicler closes his history with an extract from the memoirs of Nehemiah which tells how the cupbearer of Artaxerxes cleansed the priesthood and took measures for the maintenance of worship at the Temple (Neh. xiii. 29–31). But at what point should this history begin? “With Solomon of course,” some would answer, “who built the Temple.” But there are two reasons why a starting-point farther back should be selected. In the first place the story of the providences under which the Temple was built and preserved does not in fact begin with Solomon.

The city which was to shelter the Temple had first to be won for Israel; ¹ it was won by David, the man whom the LORD had chosen "according to His own mind" ² to be the first of a line of kings. The Temple in turn was built to shelter the ark, the symbol of JEHOVAH'S presence, to the care of which David devoted himself early in his reign.³ Behind the actual building of the Temple are David's choice of a city, David's care for the ark, and the LORD'S choice of David himself.

Secondly, the Chronicler wrote with the direct evidence of 2 Samuel vii. and 1 Kings v. 2-5 before him as to David's interest in Temple-building. This evidence is to be added to the evidence supplied by 2 Samuel vi. that the ark, the sacrifices, and religious music were all objects of David's care. The general action of the Chronicler in carrying back his religious history past Solomon to Solomon's father David is amply justified.

But the Chronicler has gone beyond a general statement and entered with fulness into particulars. On a few hints of the earlier authorities he has reared a superstructure of detail which most modern critics criticize and a few make a mock of. Thus there are definite statements that the organization of the Priests (1 Chron. xxiv. 6 ff.) and of the Levites (xxiii. 2 ff., xxv. 1 ff.) was due to King David. Speeches (xxii. 7 ff., xxviii. 2 ff.) and a prayer (xxix. 10 ff.) are ascribed to him, which are not to be found in Samuel or Kings. David is credited with definite preparations on a large scale for the building of the Temple, and he is said

¹ 2 Samuel v. 6 f.

² 1 Samuel xiii. 14, "The LORD hath sought him a man after his own heart." The title "the man after God's own heart" is founded on this passage, but not justified by it. According to Hebrew idiom the phrase "after his heart" qualifies the verb, not the object. "JEHOVAH after His own mind (i.e. uninfluenced by human motives) sought Him a man." Acts xiii. 22 gives a midrashic paraphrase.

³ 2 Samuel vi. 1 ff.; vii. 1 ff.

to have given precise instructions to Solomon as to the plan of the work (xxviii. 11-19). As to all this the earlier authorities are silent.

Now it is impossible to prove a negative ; we dare not say that this account of the Chronicler is necessarily untrue. Yet weight must be given to the consideration that few, if any, of the Old Testament scholars of to-day suppose that the Chronicler had other good authorities (now lost) for the mass of details not found in Samuel or Kings which fill the last eight chapters of 1 Chronicles. Even the most cautious critics feel that for this superstructure the Chronicler is drawing on his own imagination.

Practically we must allow that the imaginative element predominates in the account of David's activity in relation to the Temple and its worship. On the other hand, as we have seen, the Chronicler follows his authorities somewhat closely in other narratives concerning David.

The Chronicler thus appears in a double character. At times he is a faithful transcriber of the early annals. At other times he makes free additions to the annals, evidently with some purpose not historical in mind. This purpose may have been in part antiquarian, that is, the author may have wished to restore by conjecture a picture of the origins of the Temple worship. But on such a subject the antiquarian interest runs easily into the religious interest, and we cannot doubt that the latter was predominant with the Chronicler. His object is to impress his own generation with his own conviction of the importance of the Temple-worship ; in the exhortations which he puts into David's mouth in chapters xxii., xxviii., xxix. he shows himself a great religious teacher, a "scribe" perhaps, and yet a worthy successor of the Prophets. In his teaching he used the kind of historical narrative which was then current, namely, that which passed easily and unconsciously from

fact to the embellishment of fact, unfolding both by fact and by parable great religious lessons.

Undoubtedly such a blending of literal narrative and illustrative narrative, such a mixture of historical fact and "fiction with a purpose," is irritating to the modern logical mind, which asks that the spheres of history and of imaginative literature should always be kept separate. But the Chronicler lived in simpler times, and we have no right to judge and condemn him by purely modern standards. He comes to us as a religious teacher, not as an additional authority for the annals of a Hebrew king.

We have now reached one of the conclusions of this paper. The David of Chronicles is on a different plane from the David of Samuel. From the latter to the former there is a transition which is in the main from history to theology. We cannot combine the two in one historic picture of the man. David is used in Chronicles as an example, an illustration, in a story which the Chronicler tells to recommend to others the piety which he himself cherished. We may not suppose that David actually said and did all that is ascribed to him by the latest of the Biblical annalists.

And what are we to say of the religious teaching which the Chronicler seeks to convey to us through the words and the deeds of *his* David? This is after all a more important question than the question, Is the David of the Chronicler, as distinguished from the David of Samuel, a historical figure? Are we to say that because the Chronicler's interest is so closely bound up with the Temple and its worship, that his religion is for us mere antiquarian formalism, and that it has no message for modern minds? Our first impulse is perhaps to say, Yes, to this question. Some modern scholars have said that the Temple was in Judah just what the sanctuary at Beth-el was in Israel, merely the king's private chapel. Moreover it is a fact that at more than

one period of the history both sanctuaries shrink into insignificance by the side of the activity of the great prophets of the North, Elijah and Elisha, Amos and Hosea. Judging Hebrew religious phenomena with the help of the experience of many Christian centuries we are often led to pronounce the verdict that the ordered worship of the Temple is of small significance beside the Preaching and the Teaching of the Prophets.

But such a verdict has to be modified on further reflection. The Prophet, though great, was only a revivalist, a religious help appearing fitfully from time to time, while the Temple and its services, save for the great break after 586 B.C., were always present. Nor must it be supposed that all religious instruction depended on the Prophets. The Temple itself was a centre of organized religious teaching. This teaching contained, we may believe, moral as well as ritual elements. The Law, the *Torah*, grew up in the Temple. Some long history of an oral tradition growing up among the Priests and embodying itself in a written book must lie behind the great event of the discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 8). We have the suggestion of one landmark in such a history in the person of Jehoiada the priest, who put down Baal worship with more success than Elijah himself. The "testimony" which he put upon the young king Joash (2 Kings xi. 12) may well have consisted of some passage from the Law of Moses as it then existed—some earlier form perhaps of Deuteronomy xvii. 14–20.¹ It is in any case striking that after this mention of the "Testimony" it is recorded of Amaziah the successor of Joash (2 Kings xiv. 6) that he

¹ I cannot accept Wellhausen's wanton emendation of "bracelets" for "testimony" in 2 Kings xi. 12. The wearing of a document is not alien from Eastern modes of thought. See the note on the passage in the *Cambridge Bible* (1908).

acted in accordance with the Law of Moses in Deuteronomy xxiv. 16. Four reigns later we find Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 4, 22) acting in accordance with a well-known law preserved to us in the book of Deuteronomy,¹ and thus again the suggestion comes to us that the Law of Moses in some form oral or written had its home among the priests in the Temple. Finally it is hardly necessary to record again in black and white the well-known fact that from the recovery in the Temple of the Lawbook—lost or hidden during the days of Manasseh—came the great religious awakening of the reign of Josiah.

I have made much of the Temple as the shelter beneath which the *Torah* grew up, because this aspect of it hardly receives as much notice as it deserves. In another aspect, of course, the Temple was the home of a formal public worship. But there is yet a third aspect which ought not to be overlooked. The Temple was the house, the place of meeting, to which on special occasions of stress the worshipper resorted that he might meet with God. To the Temple Hezekiah went up with Sennacherib's threatening letter to spread it before the LORD (2 Kings xix. 14). The Temple was the outward sign of God's presence with His people; its destruction by the Chaldeans brought about the apostasy of the remnant of the Jews from the service of JEHOVAH to the worship of the Queen of Heaven. All this the Chronicler found written for him in the earlier records.

The Chronicler himself in the opening chapters of the so-called book of Ezra, has recorded the great religious revival which followed the edict of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the Temple. With the Temple for nearly a hundred years from that time (as the succeeding chapters show) the fortunes of the Jewish people and of the Jewish religion were

¹ There is nothing to suggest in the alternative that the impulse came from Isaiah.

inextricably bound up. At a later time, as the prophecies of Joel and (still more) of Malachi show, prophecy itself found the centre of religion in the Temple and its worship. The Chronicler, writing in the third century B.C., could look back upon a long religious history during which the Temple and the Priesthood had exercised an influence as great, if not as deep, as the Prophets had exercised in the best days of prophecy.

In the Chronicler's time there was "no prophet more." Indeed there was, so far as we can judge, little room for prophetic activity. The Temple, with its regular ministrations of priests, was fulfilling its work worthily. There was zeal for worship and for the Law. Thus the Temple-religion (if we may use the phrase) appealed with living force to the Chronicler. It must not be thought that this, as the Chronicler held it, was wanting in life, because in it the forms of worship and the organization of Priests and Levites loomed so large. The ritual in which he delighted enshrined a living faith. The burst of praise gathered with a free hand from the Psalter in 1 Chronicles xvi., the splendid thanksgiving of King David in 1 Chronicles xxix., the prophecy of Azariah, the son of Oded, in 2 Chronicles xv. 2-7, and the utterances of Hezekiah in 2 Chronicles xxx., especially his prayer in verses 18, 19, are enough to show that the Chronicler's religion was inspired by an inward faith. His religion at the heart of it was indeed the religion of David, as it is still the substructure of the religion of all Christian men.

W. EMERY BARNES.

JESUS' ESTIMATE OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

MANY attempts have been made to appreciate the spiritual influences which told upon Jesus during the years in which His life is hidden from us. He had, of course, like all Jews, the great inheritance of the Old Testament ; and if we may judge from the evangelists, He had been peculiarly impressed by Deuteronomy and the Psalter, by " the Second Isaiah " and the apocalypse of Daniel. How His environment affected Him—what the early interactions of His spirit were with the various types of popular religion—we cannot easily tell. The only one of His contemporaries by whom He was deeply impressed, and on whose appearance he reflected profoundly, was John the Baptist. John is in his mind from the beginning of his career to its close, and His thoughts about John throw a vivid light on His consciousness of Himself. It is by comparison and contrast with John that He shows us what He Himself is.

To begin with, Jesus had an immense sympathy with John. When Luke introduces the Baptist's ministry it is with the Old Testament formula, which occurs here for the first and last time in the New Testament, " the word of God came to John " (Luke iii. 2). With this estimate of John Jesus was in agreement : to Him John was a true prophet. His conviction that the Kingdom of God was at hand, and that it must be prepared for by repentance, was one which Jesus unreservedly shared. Perhaps no one can tell how the word of God comes to a man—how the immediate religious certainty is given to him that God is about to do something decisive, that a crisis in man's relations with God is impending, and that it is " now or never " if men are to come safely through it. Such a certainty, however, with all its strain and exaltation, was the very element in which

both John and Jesus lived, and we can well believe that the sense of it in the Baptist's preaching attracted Jesus to him. When they came face to face, although they must have had some such consciousness of their relative positions as is implied in Matthew iii. 14 f., the ground they held in common would only seem the more important. If He had not heartily believed in John's mission and message, Jesus could not have submitted to be baptized by him.

The baptism, however, has a significance of its own. If Jesus could not have accepted it unless He had believed in John, the wonderful experiences which accompanied it must have magnified, even for Him, the greatness of the prophet by whom it was conferred. John in his preaching habitually distinguished baptism in water from baptism with the spirit, but in the case of Jesus the two baptisms coincided. The baptism with the spirit was part of the same experience as the baptism in Jordan. From that hour a new divine power invested Jesus. He could do mighty works, such as He had never done before, such as the Baptist himself was never able to do; He had seen the heavens opened, and heard the Father's voice pronounce Him the well-beloved Son. If we have the revelation here of that in which Jesus transcended John, standing alone among the children of men and above them, we must nevertheless remember that the revelation was made to Jesus Himself in connexion with His acceptance of John's baptism, and must have given Him a new conviction of the unique place which John filled in the carrying out of the purposes of God. It was through him that the new era was ushered in; and though its character might in the long run prove to have transcended John's anticipation, that did not alter the fact that he had stood, so to speak, at its threshold, and heralded the King. If Jesus thought of Himself as the Messiah, He would naturally think of John as His forerunner—the prophet who should come

in the spirit and power of Elijah (Mal. iv. 5) to prepare the way of the Lord.

The strong impression made upon Jesus by John is reflected to some extent in the language common to both. John addresses the Pharisees and Sadducees, according to Matthew (iii. 7), the multitudes, according to Luke (iii. 7), as *γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν*; and the same terrific expression occurs on the lips of Jesus in Matthew xii. 34, xxiii. 33. Both have the sentence, "Every tree that beareth not good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire" (Matt. iii. 10, vii. 17). Both have the figure of gathering the wheat into the granary, and of burning the chaff or the tares (Matt. iii. 12, xiii. 30). The axe is laid at the root of the tree in Matthew iii. 10 and also in Luke xiii. 7-9. It may be said that these are commonplaces of pictorial preaching, found also in the Old Testament, and possibly due to the evangelist rather than to proper historical tradition, but in view of the known relations of Jesus and John such suppositions are gratuitous. All the probabilities are, that not only in his fundamental convictions about the imminence of the Kingdom and the true preparation for it was Jesus in thorough sympathy with John, but that through that sympathy He appropriated instinctively some of the vivid features of the Baptist's speech. It does not derogate from His originality that He did so, any more than that He found in the Old Testament the forms of thought and language He required to body forth His mind to men. He attached Himself to John as a living representative of God, and He caught in his company some reflection of his living and characteristic tones.

This unity of John and Jesus is what strikes one at the outset of the Gospel. It is not, however, a permanent or unqualified unity. On the contrary, no sooner has John been "delivered up" and Jesus come forward independently than differences emerge. One of the earliest scenes in the

Gospel narrative (Mark ii. 18 ff. ; Matt. ix. 14 ff. ; Luke v. 33 ff.) directs attention to these differences. The disciples of John fast, while those of Jesus do not, and the difference is submitted to Jesus for remark, perhaps by John's disciples themselves. It is assumed that the disciples in each case represent the practice or the spirit of their masters, and it is implied that those who fast can hardly reconcile with moral earnestness like their own and the Baptist's what they evidently regard as a lower type of life. The answer of Jesus vindicates Himself and His disciples, but without making any reflexion whatever at the cost of John. It is entirely free from resentment or even from criticism. "Can the children of the bridechamber fast as long as the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast. But days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in that day." It has long been customary with some critics to question the last sentence here on the ground that it is irrelevant, and depends upon an "allegorizing" of the parabolic saying of Jesus: the taking away of the bridegroom is a gratuitous and unmeaning supposition unless the bridegroom is first identified, allegorically, with the Speaker. But as Wellhausen has remarked, the first sentence is just as meaningless and inapplicable as the last unless it is allegorically interpreted, i.e., unless we admit that Jesus somehow identified Himself with the bridegroom of His pictorial utterance. On the strength of this observation Wellhausen consistently goes all the way with his critical logic, and denies that Jesus spoke any of these words at all. It is not imputing motives to say that the motive of such criticism is clear. It lies in the assumption that Jesus could not say things either about Himself or about His death which imply that an incomparable and solitary significance belongs to Him and to it in the relations of God and men. If we

reject this assumption—and unless the Christian religion is to be pronounced a complete mistake from its birth, we are bound to reject it—we have no reason to doubt that Jesus said what the evangelists here ascribe to Him. The point at present is that according to these words the mood of Jesus and His disciples was that of a marriage party, a mood quite unlike that of the Baptist and his adherents. In spite of that early sympathy with John which is not disclaimed, Jesus is filled with the sense of something new, original, and joyous. He does not so much defend it as take it for granted. It is not to be judged or measured even by John. It is like new wine which is not to be put into old bottles, like unshrunk cloth which is not to be used to patch an old garment. No attack is made on the old even while its right is asserted for the new. On the contrary, one of the evangelists has preserved in this connexion a beautifully tolerant saying of Jesus in which we can read his indulgence for those who, having been trained in one religious habit, find it hard to renounce it even for a higher. “No one who has drunk old wine wants new; for he says, the old is good” (Luke v. 39). *Good*, not *better*, is the true reading; a tolerant, not a censorious, lover of the old is entitled to equal tolerance from those who have discovered the worth of the new. In these utterances we see Jesus, without the slightest touch of censure or disparagement, take His stand apart from John, and in the single, significant word “bridegroom” hint at His own unique place.

The relative attitude of Jesus and John, as we should infer it from this passage, is emphasized in that to which we now proceed. If it were legitimate to make comparisons in such matters, it might not be rash to assert that the eleventh chapter of Matthew is the most wonderful page in the life of Jesus. Where besides can we find words so original, so unmistakably attesting themselves as the vehicle

of revelation, so charged with the goodness and the severity of God, so spontaneous, poetic, inimitable? The close parallelism of Matthew xi. 2-19 and Luke vii. 18-35 shows that the part of them with which we are here concerned goes back to that common source of Matthew and Luke which has generally been regarded by scholars as the most ancient and authoritative record of the words of Jesus. It is occupied throughout with John the Baptist, and it contains an express appreciation and criticism of him by Jesus.

John has heard in prison the works of Jesus—works so congruous to the Messianic character that the evangelist calls them directly the works of the Christ—and sends by his disciples to ask, “Art thou he that should come, or must we expect another?” It has become a tradition of criticism to assume that this question represents the first emergence in John’s mind of the idea that Jesus might be the Christ, and that he submits his nascent faith to Jesus Himself for approval or disapproval. Of course this is quite inconsistent with the account given by Matthew of the baptism of Jesus, and it is not every critic who has the candour and the courage to say with Johannes Weiss that the evangelist “has manifestly forgotten” what he said in the third chapter, and that here he pays tribute to the truth of history, unconsciously and almost against his will, by showing that John in the first instance knew nothing of the Messiahship of Jesus and at most only suspected it from afar.¹ Even an evangelist is not to be discredited without cause, and there is no good cause for supposing that the writer of our first Gospel had forgotten anything. He knew that all faith is open to trial, and that under the stress of trial it may prove even in the greatest spirit to be at fault, and it is such a fluctuation of faith that he here exhibits in John. The mention of the

¹ *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, i. 291.

prison by Matthew is not in vain. The hopes which John had cherished of Jesus at an earlier date languished in Herod's dungeon: he felt less able to believe that the destined King of righteousness was in the world when Jezebel could still crush Elijah. This, which we must assume to be the meaning of the evangelist, is also the mood to which the answer of Jesus is addressed. He refers the Baptist's messengers to His works: "The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, to the poor the Gospel is preached." To Jesus Himself, as to the evangelist, these are "the works of the Christ"; what He does identifies Him as what He is. Nor must we say that these are all ethical works which have been materialized into miracles by unintelligent reporters. They are *δυνάμεις*, or mighty works, such as further on in the chapter are said to have been done in Bethsaida, Chorazin and Capernaum; they attest the continual presence and operation in Jesus of the Divine power with which He was endued at His baptism. Happy is he to whom they do not appeal in vain.

Perhaps we are too apt to read the closing words of Jesus' answer, "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me," as if they were only a warning. They do indeed contain a warning, and in that sense they are less appropriately addressed to incipient faith, feeling its way to Jesus through perplexing thoughts, than to faith which is in danger of lapsing to lower levels of hope and insight. As a warning, therefore, they suit the evangelist's understanding of the situation, and not that of the critical tradition above-referred to. But they are as much encouragement as warning. A beatitude of Jesus always describes a rare and high felicity, the felicity of a heroic virtue, and it is this to which John is summoned in his despondent hour. It is not for Jesus to break the bruised reed or quench the glimmer-

ing wick ; on the contrary, He appeals to the native courage of the man not to forfeit the happiness which is within his reach. It was difficult to think that the destined Liberator was there, and yet to rot in prison ; but no one—not John nor Jesus Himself—is too good to suffer for righteousness' sake ; and happy are they who, when they see Jesus at work, cannot be put at fault about Him by any personal considerations whatever.

The evangelists connect with this appeal of John to Jesus an express appreciation of the Baptist by our Lord (Matt. xi. 7 ; Luke vii. 24). There is no reason whatever for questioning this connexion, even though later references to John in what seems the same discourse may be due to compilation. John had been a great figure in the recent religious history of Israel ; great responsibility attached to all who had been in contact with him, and yet many had dismissed him from their minds only too easily. As the fourth Gospel has it, He was the lamp that burned and shone, and men were willing *for a season* to rejoice in his light (John v. 35). It is this temporary interest which is ominous to Jesus. In a striking parable he compares those who had yielded for a time to John's influence to the man from whom the evil spirit departed only to return to his untenanted abode with seven other spirits more malignant than himself (Matt. xii. 43-45). The forgotten prophet has brought himself again for a moment into the public mind by his message to Jesus, and Jesus avails Himself of the occasion to bear a striking testimony to him, a testimony which must have awakened in the consciences of all who had heard John the sense of responsibilities to which justice had yet to be done.

What, he asks, did you go out into the wilderness to see ?
reed shaken by the wind ? In spite of the dubious attitude of the Baptist to Jesus, as suggested by his question,

this was no description of the man. But it may quite possibly have been one of the pleas on which his appeal to conscience was discounted. Nothing is commoner than for men to assume that the person through whom a spiritual movement is initiated must be an easily excited, hyper-sensitive, hysterical person. The settled order of life, it is argued, the solid common sense of mankind, is not to be discomposed because some light or shallow nature sees visions or dreams. If religion did not over-stimulate such a nature, something else would, and in any case we pass it by. But although this assumption is commonly made it is commonly wrong. Excitable and fickle natures may become prominent in a revival, but the real conductors of spiritual force are of another type. It would be difficult to name more level-headed persons than John Wesley and D. L. Moody. The Baptist, Jesus implies, was the very opposite of a reed shaken with the wind. If passing excitability was to be spoken of, it was in the hearers of the desert prophet, not in the steadfast preacher himself.

Another ironical question follows, probably with a similar moral point. "What did you go out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment?" This also suggests a way in which the prophet is still discredited. His disinterestedness is called in question. To say he is clothed in soft raiment, though his camel's hair or sackcloth is conspicuous, means that he is feathering his own nest somehow; he is getting what he wants out of his prophetic calling; he is made much of in ways which are dear to human vanity; he travels and is handsomely entertained without expense; he has a royalty on the hymn-books; he is flattered and deferred to; the sense of his own importance grows upon him and he enjoys it. Very likely there were people who hinted at charges against John conceived in this spirit, but for Jesus he was beyond suspicion. He was as disinterested

as he was strong. If we wish to find men wearing soft raiment, we know where to look for them, but it is not where John is to be found.

With His next question Jesus drops irony entirely. 'What did you go out to see? a prophet? Yes, I tell you, and far more than a prophet.' It is hardly necessary to take this as signifying that the multitudes who went out to see John did so in the vague expectation that he might possibly be no less than the Messiah (Luke iii. 15; John i. 20);¹ Jesus is rather expressing His own opinion about John than their former expectations. It is to him that John is at once prophet and far more than a prophet—a true messenger of God, and yet one who stands in such a relation to the final accomplishment of that purpose of God which is attested by all the prophets as sets him in a place apart and confers on him an incomparable distinction. It is difficult to understand how Jesus could define this greatness by applying to John the words of Malachi iii. 1 in the peculiar form in which they occur in all our Gospels (Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke v. 27), and it is quite possible that Matthew xi. 10 is due to the evangelist.² This does not, however, throw any uncertainty on the greatness just ascribed to John, a greatness in respect of his place and calling in the carrying out of God's purpose. This is secured both by the connexion which we have already seen between the baptism of Jesus by John and His entrance on His Messianic work, and by the subsequent identification of John with Elijah (Matt. xvii. 12). But in the solemn and emphatic words which follow Jesus

So recently J. Weiss.

The difficulty is that in Malachi Israel is addressed, in the Gospels the Messiah; which necessitates changing "before me" into "before thee." There is some doubt as to the order of the sentences in Luke. Sethe readings of D in Luke vii. 26-28. From this it has been inferred that ver. 27 did not originally stand in Luke, and therefore did not stand in the source common to the first and third Gospels; that is, it is an interpretive addition by Matthew to the words of Jesus.

assures us that the personal greatness of John was adequate to his high place. "Verily I say unto you, there hath not arisen among them that are born of women a greater than John the Baptist." It is an extraordinary estimate of the wilderness preacher, and the shock of astonishment with which we hear it is not abated when Jesus adds, "Yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."

It is idle to evade, or to try to evade, the contrast which is suggested by the last words. It is in principle the same as that which we have already seen when the question was raised about fasting. It is part of the consciousness of Jesus that with His own appearance on the stage of history a new era has dawned, the privileges and blessings of which transcend all that man has hitherto known. He speaks here, in pronouncing upon John, in precisely the same mood as when He says to His disciples, "Happy are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear. For I tell you of a truth, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see what you see, and saw not, and to hear what you hear, and heard not" (Matt. xiii. 16 f.). Jesus habitually spoke of His disciples as "these little ones," *οἱ μικροὶ οὗτοι*: and here He says that even the least of them, the one who by comparison with the others is the less, *ὁ μικρότερος*, is greater than John. Having entered into the enjoyment of the privileges and blessings which are identified with the presence of Jesus in the world he stands on a spiritual level to which the greatest of prophets, as long as for any cause he is even momentarily at fault about Jesus, has not attained. There is no disparagement of John in this; what it reveals is Jesus' sense of His own transcendent significance in the spiritual world. The kingdom of heaven, in the sense in which it is here spoken of, is conceived to be present where He is present; a place in it is conditioned by a certain relation to Him, and exalts its possessor above all that has hitherto been

known of spiritual worth and greatness. Even the least in it is greater than the greatest who has only prepared its way.

When we come to what follows in Matthew xi. 12-15, it is probable we have to do with compilation by the evangelist ; at least there is no evident connexion with what precedes. The subject is still John, and the speaker Jesus, but the occasion may have been later. The very terms, indeed—"from the days of John the Baptist until now"—have led some to argue that the days of John are evidently conceived as belonging to a remote past, and that the speaker, therefore, cannot be Jesus, who only survived John a few months. It is the Church, we are told, which is reflecting here on its own history in relation to the work of John, and expressing its mind on John's significance and on the good (and evil ?) of the movement which originated with him. Even of those, however, who are nonplussed by the expression "from the days of John the Baptist until now," some have found it hard to refuse to Jesus the main proposition, "the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and violent men seize upon it." With all its opaqueness it has the ring of originality which attests the master. The parallel in Luke (xvi. 16) shows that in the earliest record of the teaching of Jesus there was a saying currently ascribed to him in which the kingdom of God was connected somehow with the idea of *βιάζεσθαι*. In Luke it is made quite unambiguous. "From that time—i.e., from the time of John—the kingdom of God is preached, and every one forces his way into it." The "force" used is presumably that which is necessary and proper to secure entrance—the response to Jesus' command, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." In Matthew it is perhaps fair to argue that the meaning is the same. The second clause—*βιασταὶ ἄρπάξουσιν αὐτήν*—must be allowed to interpret the first ; in other words, *βιάζεται* in the clause *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται* is passive. The kingdom of heaven is the

object to which force is applied ; men who have summoned up all the force at their disposal seize it as their prey. The general idea is that a powerful spiritual movement had originated with John, which when these words were spoken was not yet spent. Perhaps in the choice of terms like *βιάζεσθαι* and *ἀρπάζειν* there is an ironical allusion to the aspect which this movement presented to those who did not participate in it. It was the publicans and the harlots, Matthew tells us elsewhere (chap. xxi. 32), who believed John, and entered the Kingdom of God before the professedly pious ; and we can well believe that to the latter the whole spiritual movement of the time seemed an audacious invasion of what they regarded as a preserve of their own. The publicans and the harlots—people like Zacchæus, or like the woman of whom we are told in Luke vii. 36 ff.—stormed their way into a place which the respectable had set apart for themselves. There is a touch of scorn in the words with which Jesus describes the movement as from their point of view. The *βιασταί*, the *ἀρπάζοντες*, in spite of these questionable names, were His friends. It is part of the greatness of John that a movement so powerful actually dates from him. His “ days ” need not be distant, if only they are past ; and they were past not only when the evangelist wrote, but within the lifetime of Jesus. As Jesus looked back to those early days when the voice of the prophet first stirred the souls of men in the wilderness of Judæa, and thought of the irresistible impulses which it had generated, and how it had fallen silent for ever, it is not difficult to believe that He spoke the words of the verse exactly as they stand. The chronological interval may have been short, but chronology is not the only measure of time. Jesus saw John in his place in a divinely guided history, a place of critical importance. He stood on the borderline between the old and the new, of both and yet of neither. The law

and the prophets fulfilled their function *until* John, but with John the new day began to break. To some it might be a hard saying, but he was the true Elijah who heralds the day of the Lord (Mal. iv. 5 f.). Again it must be repeated, Jesus reveals *Himself* here even more signally than He interprets John. He can speak of John as Elijah only because He thinks of Himself as Messiah. The Messiah may not, any more than the Elijah, answer exactly to Jewish anticipations, but for this He is prepared. John's destiny is untoward, and so will His own be (Matt. xvii. 12). As on many other occasions where more is meant than meets the ear, he adds the arresting word, "He that hath ears, let him hear."

What has just been said covers the reference to John in the last week of our Lord's life when he was challenged at Jerusalem to tell by what authority He taught and acted (Matt. xxi. 23 ff.). If the Jewish authorities had dealt fairly with their consciences in relation to John, they would have had no difficulty about Jesus. It only remains to refer to the passage in which Jesus most explicitly contrasts Himself and John. It is that in which He reproaches His contemporaries with a childish wilfulness that will not be in earnest with goodness in any form. No matter how God appeals to them, they will find reasons for evading His appeal. "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He has a demon." That is, "It is not sane to behave in this way. It would bring society and civilization to an end. All we can do is to ignore it." "The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold, a man gluttonous and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." That is, "There is no trace of piety here. This is not a religious life at all. Rather is it a life which insults and flouts religion, and which the good are entitled to resent on that ground." It is not easy to understand a scholar who finds in these words the mind of the Church, not the mind of Jesus,

merely on the ground that the past tense is used—John came, the Son of Man came. If anything is certain in the Gospels, it is that Jesus reflected on his coming, and did it in precisely this form. “I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.” “I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.” “The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost.” So here, “The Son of Man came eating and drinking.” He came on the level on which men lived, taking life and the world as God had made them and as His brethren had to face them, discovering or evoking in those whom others despised the root of good things toward God. This is *His* greatness. He does not here, any more than elsewhere, disparage John; on the contrary, according to the most probable interpretation, John and Jesus are both presented here as children of the Divine Wisdom; and diverse as they are, Wisdom is justified in sending both. Even amid that childish generation their labour is not in vain.

It is perhaps a fair inference from the fact that John's disciples long survived as an independent religious party, that John himself died without defining his relation to Jesus further. In the fourth Gospel he figures simply as a witness to Jesus; yet when he is asked whether he is Elijah, the forerunner of the Messiah, he answers No. Nothing could show more clearly the ambiguousness of his situation. Jesus, we conclude, knew him better than he knew himself, and had a sense of his greatness, both in function and in character, which in himself would have been improper. It has been too much the custom to use him simply as a foil to Jesus, and to contrast his mind with that of our Lord as at all points narrow and unspiritual, but there is something in this which is quite wrong. The least in the kingdom of heaven is, no doubt, greater than he, but we wrong John himself, and we wrong the judgment of Jesus concerning him, if we do not along with this truth catch upon our minds

the sense of an astonishing spiritual grandeur. How can any one speak lightly of a man who so profoundly impressed Jesus ?

JAMES DENNEY.

ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΣΘΑΙ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE active voice *ἐνεργεῖν* occurs in the New Testament twelve times, *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* nine. Translators have all taken the latter form for the middle voice, and have rendered both exactly alike, by *operator* in the Vulgate and *work* in the English Revised Version. There are considerations, however, which might incline us to take *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* as a passive. One would scarcely expect St. Paul to use the two forms indiscriminately in the short Epistle to the Galatians. The promiscuous use of *αἰτεῖν* and *αἰτεῖσθαι* is not an analogous case.

In the Septuagint *ἐνεργεῖν* occurs six times and *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* once; 1 Esdras ii. 20, *ἐπεὶ ἐνεργεῖται τὰ κατὰ τὸν ναόν*. Here it is clearly passive. In ecclesiastical Greek *οἱ ἐνεργούμενοι* means demoniacs. Here again the verb is passive. In classical Greek the form is rare, but seems always to be passive. As all the external evidence is thus in favour of the passive voice, not a single instance of an undoubtedly middle being found, so far as I know, there is a presumption that the usage in the New Testament may be the same. We may therefore examine the various passages and see if a passive rendering of the word suits the context and is in agreement with the general teaching. They would read thus :—

James v. 16. "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much if it is wrought in him," sc. by the Holy Spirit. Moulton (*Prolegomena*) says the Revisers had in

their first draft "inwrought." St. James must have known well that not every sick person was cured by the prayers and anointing of the elders. But he was familiar with the gift of healing "by the same Spirit."

2 Corinthians i. 6. "It is for your comfort which is wrought in the patient endurance," etc.

2 Corinthians iv. 12. "So then death is wrought in us, but life in you."

Galatians v. 6. "Neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith which is wrought through love." This is psychologically true and in agreement with St. Paul's teaching that love is the greatest of the graces. It is also the marginal reading in the Revised Version. Perhaps "rendered active" is nearer the sense intended.

Ephesians iii. 20. "Now unto him that is able . . . according to the power that is wrought in us." Cf. Philip-
 pians ii. 13, *θεὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν.*

Colossians i. 29. "According to his working which is wrought in me."

1 Thessalonians ii. 13. "As it is indeed the word of God, which also is rendered active in you that believe." The word must be "mixed with faith" in order to be *ἐνεργής*. Cf. Aristotle, *De Anima*, 427 a. 7, *δυνάμει γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἀδιαίρετον πάναντία, τῷ δ' εἶναι οὐ, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐνεργεῖσθαι διαιρετόν.* That is, "when thrown into activity," sc. by the sense object.

2 Thessalonians ii. 7. "The mystery of lawlessness is already being worked." Satan is the worker (v. 9). The reference is presumably to some secret illegal plot against the Christians at Thessalonica, engineered by a thaumaturgist.

Romans vii. 5. *τὰ παθήματα, κ.τ.λ.* "The consequences of the sins . . . were wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." *Consequences* is perhaps too tame

a word. These *παθήματα*, inflicted by Sin, personified as a tyrant, are vividly described in chapters vi. and vii. The word *παθήματα* occurs sixteen times in the New Testament, and everywhere, except here and in Galatians v. 24, is translated by the Revisers "suffering." *Πάθος*, passion, in the ethical sense, is found three times, and in 4 Maccabees passim. St. Paul uses *πάθη* for passions, Romans i. 26, and *παθήματα*, sufferings, Romans viii. 18, which makes it highly improbable that "sinful passions" is the correct rendering in this passage.

JOHN ROSS.

ST. PETER'S SPEECH IN ACTS I. 15-22.

THE purpose of this paper is to plead for a return in one more instance to the sound exegetical instinct of the "Authorised" translators from the hasty conclusions of modern scholarship which were too often imposed upon the Revised Version of the New Testament. The interpretation of this particular passage maintained in the following pages is in part that put forward by Mr. Rendall in his admirable *Acts of the Apostles in Greek and English* (1897); but it appears to have obtained very little notice among editors; and I trust that incidentally a fresh discussion of the point will be interesting as showing the disadvantages of marking parenthesis in our texts of the New Testament. Our new knowledge of colloquial Greek has discredited the device in one striking instance. Even A.V. had felt compelled by considerations of grammar to disjoin the apparent nominative case of "full of grace and truth" from "the only begotten of the Father" in St. John i. 14. Now we know that the Greek for "full" was indeclinable, and can be interpreted, as its

position and the logic of the sentence demands, in close connexion with *μονογενούς*. (See Deissmann, *New Light*, Eng. ed., p. 44.) It would seem safer in all cases not to prejudge interpretation by the use of brackets, unless the cast of the sentence makes it absolutely clear that that was the writer's own intention.

For the sake of easy reference in a somewhat complicated argument, I will first venture to give the whole speech with the renderings and arrangement that will best make clear the view that is maintained—noting in the margin the chief alternative ways of presenting the passage that have been adopted by various authorities.

- I. 15. And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the brethren, and said:—the number assembled was about 120 persons—..^a (Quotation of Ps. lv.) . . .
16. Sirs and brothers, there had^b to be a fulfilment of this^c scripture, in which the Holy Spirit through David's mouth referred beforehand to Judas, who was guide to them that took
17. Jesus—I mean, as regards^d his having been numbered among us and having received his part of this ministry.^e
18. Now, he purchased a field with the reward of iniquity, and in a headlong fall he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels
19. gushed out. This became known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, earning for^f that field in their language the name "Aceldama," i.e.
- ^a The dots and insertion refer to a suggestion made below.
- ^b Reading *ἔδει*: *δεί* D* and Vulg.
- ^c Reading *ταύτην* with D, Iren., and the Textus Receptus. Most modern editors omit it.
- ^d Giving to *ὅτι* the sense of "that" with Rendall. Most interpreters, including A.V. and R.V., "for."
- ^{e-f} Parenthesis marked by Westcott and Hort, R.V., and others.
- ^f This free rendering is adopted to avoid prejudicing the criticism of the passage by a tense in the indicative.

20. "Field of Blood."^c For it is written in the book of Psalms: "Let his homestead become desert, and let there be no man to dwell in it"; as well as^e "His office of oversight let another take."^h It is necessary, therefore, from the men that went with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us
22. beginning from the baptism of John to the day that he was received up from us, that one of these, I say, should be appointed as a witness with us of his resurrection.

^{c-g} Blass suggests marking off this section as standing apart from the rest, and adopting the variant $\delta\epsilon\iota$ in verse 16.

^{e-h} Rendall makes this the parenthesis.

The salient fact here is that Westcott and Hort and the Revised Version (who form the court of appeal for the average student of the New Testament) place verses 18 and 19 in a parenthesis; thereby implying that the words from the Psalms in verse 20, or at any rate those composing the former of the quotations (Ps. lxxix. 26), are the passage of Scripture referred to in verse 16, while the narrative of Judas' death is an explanatory insertion due either to the speaker or to the author. According to the clearest exposition of this view known to me (in Messrs. Page and Walpole's edition, 1895) the quotation of the passage in the speaker's mind is suspended till two explanations of its applicability have been furnished. Having first reminded his hearers that Judas was an apostle ("because he was numbered," etc.), and then recounted the story of Aeldama, St. Peter can without fear of misunderstanding adduce, as the prophecy that was bound to be fulfilled, the words of the Psalmist about the *abandoned homestead* of one who held an *office*. A variation on this view, as

we have already mentioned, is to take the second explanation (the story of Aceldama) as the author's insertion. And Blass, in his "Editio Philologica" (1895), seems to suggest that at one time the speech ran thus: "It is necessary (reading $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$) that the scripture be fulfilled, which, etc. (continuing through vers. 16 and 17, but then going straight on to ver. 20 and giving there only the second quotation), for it is written: His office let another take." All these explanations, however, agree in the assumption that the passage of Scripture mentioned in verse 16 is not quoted or indicated till verse 20; and that interpretation has been riveted on our most popular texts by the use of brackets.

Now it must be owned that, if this view is correct, the citation of the Psalter in verse 20 strikes the careful reader as very inadequate and inappropriate for the purpose. Neither of the passages quoted has any special connexion with the treacherous friend of the Messianic prophecies; and, looking to the actual history of Judas, the ill repute of his field seems a somewhat insignificant detail to prove to the Apostle's mind the divine predestination of the tragic gap in their ranks; nay more, those words from Psalm lxi. are especially foreign to the main argument of the speech, because they might be interpreted as a command *not* to appoint a successor. Or, if the chief stress be laid on the second quotation, that of Psalm cix. 7, it is equally difficult to believe that the reference to the "overseership" seemed of such importance to St. Peter that he should make its fulfilment, as it were, the general premiss which was to prove the particular practical conclusion—"it is necessary, therefore, to appoint a successor." Unless, with Blass, we surrender the impressive inference from past to present ($\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\ \pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta\gamma\alpha\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \omicron\upsilon\nu\ .\ .\ .$) by reading $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ in the former place, the logic of the situation

demands a wider reflection on God's mysterious dealing with His servants than the noting of a popular nomenclature or of one aspect of the fallen man's previous position. Another *primâ facie* objection to the use of brackets as in W-H. and R.V. is that it breaks the simple and natural connexion between the story of Aceldama and the words "For it is written: Let his habitation be desolate, etc." Every detail of the historical statement—the ownership of the farm, the public knowledge of Judas' bloody death—leads up to the quotation of Psalm lxix. 26, just as that quotation is pointless without its historical explanation. Supposing that it were necessary to identify the words of the Psalmist as the "scripture" referred to in verse 16, still the explanation (whether of the speaker or of the historian) is so completely dovetailed into the argument of the speech, that it is a violation of language to place a bracket between verses 19 and 20.

But it is by no means necessary to look for the "scripture" at all in verse 20, seeing that St. Peter has already identified it, or at least indicated it, himself, in verses 16 and 17. It is with regard to the interpretation of these verses that I would draw attention to the sound instinct which led the scholars of 1611 to refer in their margin to another passage of the Old Testament than those given in verse 20, in explanation of the "scripture" "(ver. 16), and to refrain from marking any parenthesis in the subsequent verses. It was the good fortune, also, I believe, if not the merit of those translators, to give from the text they used the "*this (scripture)*" (ver. 16) of Codex Bezae and other authorities, which possibly supplies a clue to the reason why the particular allusion to the Old Testament does not appear so definite as usual. But leaving aside for the moment what is only a conjecture, it is strange that so many commentators have failed to see that the

speaker himself gives the *substance* of the scripture he is referring to in the clause introduced by ὅτι (ver. 17), which (with Mr. Rendall) may be quite well here translated "that," and not "because." It might be an interesting study in itself to "settle Hoti's business" as far as the New Testament is concerned; the investigation would very likely reveal that such dependent clauses seldom bear a more definite relation to the main sentence than is expressed by the original meaning of the particle "as to the fact that"; and that the translation "for" or "because" is only in a limited class of cases demanded by our idiom to express the relation. For our present purpose it is enough to contend that verse 17 must be taken in close connexion with the foretelling of the Holy Spirit, and not as an independent statement of the speaker. For an exact and conclusive parallel to this form of speech in drawing attention to the fulfilment of prophecy the commentator need go no further than the next chapter of this book. In Acts ii. 31 St. Peter, after quoting at length from a Psalm, goes on to make the comment that David by his foresight spake *concerning the resurrection of the Christ that he was not left in hell, nor did his flesh see corruption*. We note how the latter-day fulfilment of the prophecy is assigned as the scope (περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως) of David's words, and the substance of them is introduced by ὅτι, but stated *in the terms of their historical fulfilment* (ἐνκατελείφθη . . . αὐτοῦ—with change of tense and person). So in our speech, whether St. Peter had really begun with a verbal quotation or not—a suggestion to be considered presently—he in the same way states the true scope of David's utterance ("concerning Judas"), and then *gives its substance in the terms of its historical fulfilment*—"that he was numbered among us," etc. No one thinks of translating ὅτι "for" in that other pas-

sage ; that it has been generally so translated here is doubtless the principal cause of the confusion into which the interpretation of this speech has fallen. It may be noted, in passing, that Latin versions do not determine the translation either way ; the best text of the Vulgate has "quia," which of course means "that" as much as "because" ; while the "quoniam" given in Irenaeus iii. 12 is equally indeterminate, for that writer's Latin translator again and again uses "quoniam" in the declarative sense.

So far, I venture to think, a strong case has been made out for two guiding principles in the interpretation of this speech ; (a) that we cannot with appropriateness connect verse 20 with the reference to scripture in verse 16, or suppose that the quotation from Psalm lxix. ("Let his habitation . . .") has any wider application than its fulfilment in the story of Aceldama. Both these erroneous suggestions are involved in the bracketing of verses 18 and 19 : (b) that the substance of the scripture referred to in verse 16 is, according to a just interpretation of the Greek words, indicated by verse 17 ; the gist of the prophecy being there declared to be the inclusion of the traitor within the Apostolic circle. This natural connexion has been obscured by the translation of $\delta\tau\iota$ "for" or "because."

There remain, however, some considerations of a more conjectural character which may be set down here with the hope that they may contribute something to the elucidation and criticism of this ever fascinating book.

(1) What was the passage of the Old Testament which the speaker said was bound to be fulfilled ? The margin of A.V. refers to Psalm xli. 9, "Yea, even mine own familiar friend," etc., doubtless on the ground that that verse is used by our Lord in the same connexion in St. John xiii. 18. But that verse stands alone in the psalm as a reference

to the treacherous friend of the Messiah, and for a formal justification of the ways of God to man as regards the Betrayal, such as we suppose St. Peter to have been making, it seems far more likely that his thoughts should have turned to Psalm lv., where the significant allusions are more extended: "For it is not an open enemy that hath done me this dishonour . . . but it was even thou, my companion, my guide, and mine own familiar friend; we took sweet counsel together, and walked in the house of God as friends. . . . He laid his hands upon such as be at peace with him, and he brake his covenant: the words of his mouth were softer than butter, having war in his heart," etc. I have never seen it suggested, but it seems not impossible, that the rather strange phrase "*guide* to them that took Jesus" in verse 16 was used with allusion to "my guide" (*ἡγεμών*, LXX) in the Psalm. And if this psalm was the recognized starting-point among the disciples for the interpretation of Judas' fall, the words "Let death come hastily upon them . . .," occurring as they do in close connexion with the lament over the friend's treachery, would, for the historian if not for the Apostle, lead on irresistibly to an account of God's judgment upon the traitor such as we have in verse 18.

But:—

(2) Whatever the prophecy was, is there any hint of a verbatim quotation, or is the author content with the mere mention of a *γραφὴ* and a brief indication of its substance? Three parallels in justification of the latter view can be adduced from St. John's Gospel, vii. 38, xvii. 12, and xx. 9, where definite "scriptures" are mentioned but not identified. That in xvii. 12 concerns Judas; and xx. 9 is strikingly apposite, because, as here, the substance of the prophecy is given in a *ὅτι*-clause. No instance, as far as I know, can be adduced from other parts

of *St. Luke's* writings. We should, however, I think, be compelled to take this view, supposing the reading τὴν γραφήν of most modern editors to be right. The bare article would seem to imply that the scripture is now mentioned for the first time—at any rate by the historian; if the Apostle may be supposed to have quoted at length, the author (granted that reading) has for the sake of brevity given only the gist of the scripture “proof.” On the other hand, it must be confessed that verse 16 sounds far more like an orator’s actual comment on a text already quoted (“These are the words of the Holy Spirit, and they were spoken beforehand with special reference to Judas,” etc., cf. ii. 30-1) than a historian’s sole representation of what the orator had said on the point. I should like, therefore, on the respectable authority of D and Irenaeus’ Latin interpreter, to go back to the τὴν γραφήν ταύτην of the Textus Receptus—to suppose that the speech as we have it begins with the second section, Psalm lv. having first been quoted at some length, as Psalm xvi. is quoted in ii. 25-8—and to conjecture either (a) that we have here an abbreviated edition of the book, ταύτην being a trace, inadvertently suffered to remain, of the longer form which gave the quotation in full; or (b) that St. Luke never gave the quotation, assuming that his readers would take it for granted and would quite well understand what “this scripture” meant in St. Peter’s mouth; or (c) that the first part of the speech with the full quotation was in the original text, but dropped out at an early stage of the transmission of the book owing to the eye of the scribe passing from one “Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί” to another (see the speech in chap. ii. passim).

It is, in any case, in favour of this reading and interpretation that the phrase “this scripture” is twice used by St. Luke elsewhere in referring back to a passage of the

Old Testament already quoted at length—in our Lord's discourse at Nazareth (St. Luke iv. 21), and in Philip's interview with the eunuch (Acts viii. 35), whereas "the scripture," without quotation, cannot be paralleled from his writings. It is also textually improbable that *ταύτην* is the insertion of a scribe, for it does not serve to identify the "scripture" with verse 17 any more clearly than the simple article; and, if the wish had been to identify it with verse 20, *ἐκείνην* would have been a more likely gloss; on the other hand, *ταύτην* would easily drop out as unnecessary when the true course of the speech, as we have conceived it, became obscured.

(3) Lastly, no one attempting to elucidate this speech can avoid forming some theory as to the literary character of verses 18–20—the story of Aceldama and the remaining quotations from the Psalter. There are grave reasons for thinking that the narrative in verses 18–9 bear only the most distant relation to any original words of the Apostle. Not only is there the phrase "their own language" and the translation of Aceldama into Greek, but the whole tone of the statement is too historical and "detached" to represent at all closely the words of an orator referring to what (*ex hypothesi*) could only have happened a week or two since. Indeed, could a popular nomenclature, such as that described, have possibly grown up in the time? It might fairly be urged, also, that the significance evidently attached in verse 20 to the word *ἐπισκοπή* belongs to the author's historical interest in the apostolic office rather than to St. Peter's thoughts of "ministry"; and that the grossness of the story and its likeness to other discoveries of divine judgments for the enemies of a good cause are in striking contrast to the tenderness and reticence of verses 16 and 25 ("from which Judas went astray"). All this, in my opinion,

puts verses 18-20 on a different level of *originality* from the rest of the words assigned to the Apostle. But that, is not to say that they, or any part of them, can be marked off, as regards the author's intention, from the rest of the speech. Mr. Rendall closes a parenthesis after verse 20, which is the least objectionable place for a bracket, if there is to be one at all; but the collocation of "His bishoprick let another take" with "Therefore one of these," etc., is too obviously apposite for us to suppose that the author intended any break there in the logical sequence. The simple connexion "and" forbids a break between the two quotations in verse 20, as the text stands at present; and the disjunction of the former quotation from the narrative of Judas' death has, I hope, been shown in these pages to be impossible.

I would suggest that the literary character of verses 18-20 is something like this. St. Luke in any case is obliged to give a strictly compressed account of St. Peter's address, which would very likely be an exposition and argument of some hours' duration. After giving the Apostle's treatment of the chief Old Testament passage which was interpreted as referring to Judas (vers. 16 and 17), he bridges over the transition to the practical business of the meeting with a rapid statement of the remaining Scripture "proofs" of Judas' history which were current in his own day—viz., of the horror which surrounded the traitor's death, and of the rightness of appointing another Apostle in his place. He supplies, also, in connexion with the former theme the particular tradition about Aceldama which he prefers. So he passes on naturally to the last section of the speech, beginning verse 21. He has not attempted or professed in the intervening passage (vers. 18-20) to give an exact account of the speech as actually delivered, but still he means the words to read as part of the literary "speech."

How closely St. Luke was here representing in abbreviated form corresponding matter in the original speech, and what materials he had for doing so, we can never determine, except conjecturally from internal evidence. At least let us take the speech as he gives it, and not pre-judge the interpretation and criticism of such passages by the indolent and rash use of brackets.

STEPHEN LIBERTY.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE POPYRI.¹

XII.

εἴσοδος.—Notwithstanding Grimm's dictum that in the N.T. *εἴσοδος* is used only of "the act of entering," there seems little doubt that it refers to "the entrance" itself in Hebrews x. 19 (cf. v. 20) and 2 Peter i. 11. This latter is the predominant sense in the papyri where the word is constantly found of the "entrance" of a temple, or a house. For the more metaphorical meaning as in 1 Thess. i. 9 *ὁποῖαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, cf. the Latin papyrus letter of ii/A.D., OP 32¹³¹, in which a military tribune commends a certain Theon to the good offices of Domitius, "et ideo peto a te, ut habeat introitum at te" (cf. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 129).

εἰσπηδάω.—This strong verb, which is found in the N.T. only in Acts xvi. 29, *αἰτήσας δὲ φῶτα εἰσπηδήσεν*, may be illustrated by OP 37¹⁶ (A.D. 49), *εἰσπηδήσεν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου οἰκίαν καὶ τὸ σωματίον ἀφήρπασεν*, "made an incursion into my client's house and carried the foundling off" (G. and H.); TbP 304¹⁰ (ii/A.D.) *μετὰ ξύλων ἰσπηδήσαι*, "rush in with staves" (*ibid.*).

¹ For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) *ΕΠΧΡΙΣΤΟΒ*, pp. 170, 262.

ἐκβάλλω.—For the literal usage of this word as in Matt. xxi. 12, ἐξέβαλεν πάντας τ. πωλοῦντας . . . ἐν τ. ἱερά, and numerous other passages, cf. the early BM III. p. 16^f. (iii/B.C.), ἐγβέβληκέ με ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν μερῶν τῆς αὐτῆς τῆ βίαι χρώμενος. The sense of banishment from a family or society, as in Gal. iv. 30 (from Gen. xxi. 10), 3 John 10, may be paralleled from BU 1050¹⁵, a marriage-contract of the time of Augustus, where a man is bound over not to ill-treat his wife, μὴδ' ἐγβάλλειν μὴδ' ἄλλην γυναῖκα ἐπεισάγειν, "nor to divorce her, nor to marry another woman in her place" (note also MP 12^{11 f}, ἐγβαλεῖν με ἐκ τῶν κλήρων); while for the meaning "bring forth," "produce," as in Matt. xii. 35, ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθά, we may point to BU 197^{12 f}. (beginning of i/A.D.) "de agrorum proventu," τῶν ἐγβαλ[λομένων] καθ' ἔτος ἐκ τοῦ κλήρου γεννημάτων καὶ ἐπιγεννημάτων.

ἐκδίδομι.—With ἐκδίδομαι="let out for one's advantage," as in Mark xii. 1, ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν [sc. ἀμπελῶνα] γεωργοῖς, may be compared the sense of "apprentice" found in the papyri, e.g. OP 275^{6 ff}. (A.D. 66) ὁ μὲν Τρύφων ἐγδεδόσθαι τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν Θεῶνιν, "Tryphon agrees that he has apprenticed to Ptolemaeus his son Thoönis," TbP 385^{3 ff}. (A.D. 117) ἐξέδοτο Τεφερσάεις . . . τὸν ἑαυτῆς υἱὸν Κρονίωνα, "Tephersais has apprenticed her son Cronion." Similarly the fragment of a marriage-contract, dated A.D. 74-5, OP 372, begins ἐξέδοτο Ταοννώφρις (the mother of the bride): cf. OP 237^{vii. 23} (ii/A.D.) τῆς παιδὸς τῆς ἐκδεδομένης, "a daughter given in marriage." For the general sense "issue," "give out" cf. PP III. p. 123⁶, ἐξεδόθη, and TbP 397¹ (ii/A.D.) ἐξεδό(θησαν), both of the giving out of certain contracts. The adj. ἔκδοτος (as in Acts ii. 23, τοῦτον . . . ἔκδοτον διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε) is found in *Syll.* 190¹³ (iii/B.C.) δέδωκεν ἐγδότους τῆι πόλει.

ἐκδικέω.—With Luke xviii. 5, *διά γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόπον τὴν χήραν ταύτην ἐκδικήσω αὐτήν*, cf. AP 134¹⁰ (early ii/A.D.) a summons ἐκδικῆσαι “to vindicate” a certain Peteus who had been wrongfully carried off. For the stronger sense of “avenge” see the striking Jewish prayer for vengeance for a murdered girl, *Syll.* 816, which Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 314) carries back as far as the second century B.C., where the “most high God” is implored ἵνα ἐγδικήσης τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἀναίτιον ζητήσης (-εις Deissmann) καὶ τὴν ταχίστην, “to revenge the innocent blood, and that as quickly as possible”: cf. Joel iii (iv.) 21 A, ἐκδικήσω τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν.

ἐκδίκησις.—A striking curse from Phlius may be cited from *Syll.* 810, to illustrate Rom. xii. 19. The fragment runs [καὶ ὅτι ἂν ποιῆς, το[ῦτο] εἰς σεαυτὸν τρεπέ[σθω] ταυτά σοι εὐχόμε[θα]. εἰ δέ τι ἐκὼν ἐξαμαρτ[ήσει], οὐκ ἐμὸν ἐπαράσ[ασθαι], δίκη δὲ ἐπικρέματα[ι] τιμωρὸς ἀπελθόν[τι] ἀπειθῆς Νεμέσε[ως], “it is not mine to invoke curses, but the inexorable vengeance of Nemesis hangs over you as you go.”

ἐκεῖσε.—The “pregnant” construction Acts xxii. 5 τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας, “those who were (collected) there” is illustrated by PP II. 45^{ii. 3f}, where (if we may trust the restoration) the writer—probably Ptolemy III. himself (cf. PP III. p. 336)—describes how certain ships, acting in his interest, sailed along the coast of Cilicia to Soli and took on board τὰ ἐ[κεῖ?]σε κατασκευέντ[α χρή]ματα, “the money that had been seized (and carried) there.”

ἐκθεσις.—In TbP 410 *verso* (16 A.D.) we have a short account, with the heading ἐκθεσις τιμ(ῆς) προβά(των). *Syll.* 929³⁷ (ii/B.C.), *περὶ ἧς καὶ τὴν καθήκουσαν ἔχθεσιν πεποιήμεθα*, has the same spelling as in Wisdom xi. 14 SAC. In calling attention to the needless margin here (where the ἐχθ. spelling seems to have been taken as a form of

ἔχθος), Mr. Thackeray * has achieved the rare feat of catching Hort and his colleagues tripping, in the R.V. Apocrypha.

ἐκλεκτός.—In Rein P 43⁹ (A.D. 102) a “choice” or “beautiful” lodging for a man which is being let is described as ἐκλεκτὸν ἀντρῶνα (=ἀνδρῶνα): cf. Isaiah xxviii. 16 (cited 1 Pet. ii. 4), λίθον . . . ἐκλεκτόν, where the sense of “choice” passes into that of “chosen.” The latter is the distinctive Biblical use of the word, and may be illustrated by such a passage as *OGIS* 499³ (ii/A.D.), τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ δικαιοσῶν, with which Dittenberger compares *ibid.* 567¹⁰ (ii/A.D.) ἐπίλεκτον κριτήν, the *iudex selectus* of the Latin inscriptions. Ἐκλογή occurs in an illiterate papyrus of the early Empire, BU 1013¹⁶.

ἔκπαλαι.—This late word, which in the N.T. is confined to 2 Pet. ii. 3, iii. 5, is found in the fragmentary *OGIS* 584⁵ (ii/A.D.) δι’ ὧν ἔκπαλαι αὐτήν (sc. τὴν πατρίδα) εὐεργέ[τησεν].

ἐκπηδάω.—A good example¹ of this expressive compound (Acts xiv. 14 ἐξεπήδησαν εἰς τὸν ὄχλον) is Par P 14^{27 ff.} (ii/B.C.) ἀφορήτω δὲ ἀνομία ἐξενεχθέντες καὶ ἐκπηδήσαντές μοι καὶ μίαναντες—a petition.

ἐκπληρόω.—For the meaning “make good,” in Acts xiii. 33 (τ. ἐπαγγελίαν ἐκπλ.), cf. an interesting letter from Petenephiës, apparently a priest, requesting the release of certain persons that they may be able to furnish the supplies of food for the sacred crocodiles, TbP 57^{12 ff.} (ii/B.C. = Witk. 76), τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ζώων σειταγωγίας ἐκπληρῶσαι.

ἐκτελέω.—This word, which in the N. T. occurs only Luke xiv. 29, 30, is well attested, especially with reference to the performance of religious duties, e.g. TbP 302³⁰ (A.D. 71–2) ἐκτελοῦντες τὰς τῶν θεῶν λειτουργίας, and *ibid.* 293^{20 f.} (ii/A.D.), a report regarding the circumcision of an aspirant to the priesthood, as otherwise he cannot perform the

* In his forthcoming *Septuagint Grammar*.

sacred offices—*διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι τὰς ἱερουργίας ἐκτελεῖν.*

ἐκτίθημι.—The literal sense, as in Acts vii. 21, may be illustrated by Par P 49^{3f.} (ii/B.C.=Witk. 45), *βανασίαν* (handicraft) *ἐκτέθεικα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις.* In EP 18¹ (iii/B.C.) *εἴ τι ἐκτίθενται ἐν οἷς ἔχεις ὀφειλήμασιν,* the reference is to those “noted” or “posted up” in the receivers’ list as debtors.

ἐκτινάσσω.—See *Notes* iii. p. 429, and for the subst. cf. FP 114^{21f.} (A.D. 100) *μὴ οὖν ληρήσης τὸν ἐκτιναγμὸν σου,* “don’t talk nonsense about your threshing” (G. and H.). It is used metaphorically in Nahum ii. 11, *ἐκτιναγμὸς καὶ ἀνατιναγμὸς, καὶ ἐκβραγμὸς καὶ καρδίας θραυσμὸς.*

ἐκχέω.—With Matt. xxiii. 35, *ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,* cf. *Syll.* 816⁵ (ii/B.C.), *ἐγγέαντας αὐτῆς τὸ ἀναίτιον αἷμα ἀδίκως* (cited above under *ἐκδικέω*).

ἐλαττονέω.—“Not found in prof. auth.” according to Grimm, but now certified not only by Arist. *de plant.* 2, 3, p. 825^a, 23, as Thayer has shown, but also by a passage from a Magdola papyrus of iii/B.C., *BCH* xxvii. p. 181¹², which, according to Wilcken (*Archiv* iv. p. 53), should read *ἐπαναγκάσαι αὐτὸν ἀπ[ο]δοῦνα[ι] ἡμ[ε]ν τὸ δια[φέρων] τῶν ἐλαττονούντων ἰδ’ κεραμίων ὅσον ἂν κατομοσώμεθα.* *Ἐλαττώω* is common.

ἐλέγχω.—For the milder sense “expose,” “set forth,” which best suits this word in John iii. 20, 1 Cor. xiv. 24, Eph. v. 11 (where see Robinson’s note), cf. such a passage from the vernacular as HbP 55^{3f.} (iii/B.C.) *ἄγων καὶ τὸν ποιμένα τὸν ἐλέγξοντα περὶ ὧν μοι εἶπας,* “bring with you the shepherd in order that he may give evidence in the matter about which you told me” (G. and H.).

ἔλεος.—The masc. form of this word, which in the N.T. is wholly rejected by WH., and which in the LXX is comparatively rare (e.g. Ps. lxxxiii. (lxxxiv.) 11), is found in

Syll. 376²¹, καὶ νῦν δὲ οὐ δι' ἔλεον ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ δι' εὐνοίαν εὐεργετῶ, Nero's address to the Greeks at Corinth: the Emperor's composition-master took care that he Atticised properly in this great oration.

ἐλευθερία.—For the historical background which lends so much significance to the Pauline descriptions of the ἐλευθερία which His people enjoy in Christ, we must be content meanwhile to refer to the important discussion in Deissmann's new book *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen, 1908), p. 234 ff.

ἐλλογῶ (-εω).—To Lightfoot's examples of this word from the inscriptions in his note on Philem. 18 τοῦτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγα, may now be added several occurrences in the papyri. Thus the technical sense of "set to one's account," as in the Philemon passage, is well brought out in Str. P 32^{9f}; (iii/A.D.), δότω λόγον, τί αὐτῷ ὀφείλεται . . . ἵνα οὕτως αὐτῷ ἐνλογηθῆ. The more metaphorical usage of Rom. v. 13, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογᾶται μὴ ὄντος νόμου, may be paralleled from an interesting rescript of the Emperor Hadrian, in which he authorizes the announcement of certain privileges to his soldiers: BU 140^{31f}, οὐχ ἔνεκα τοῦ δοκεῖν με αὐτοῖς ἐνλογεῖν, "not however that I may seem thereby to be commending myself to them." The form ἐνελογήθ(ησαν) is found *septides* in BU 1028 (ii/A.D.).

ἐμβάλλω.—With the solitary occurrence of this common word in the N.T. (Luke xii. 5 ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν), may be compared Par P 47^{8ff}. (ii/B.C.=Witk. 64), ἐνβέβληκαν (sc. οἱ θεοὶ) ὑμᾶς εἰς ὕλην μεγάλην, where apparently ὕλην must be understood metaphorically, Dante's "selva oscura."

ἐμβατεῦω.—For ἐ.= "take possession of" as in Josh. xix. 51, ἐπορεύθησαν ἐμβατεῦσαι τὴν γῆν, cf. a will of iii/B.C., EP 2¹⁴, where, in the event of their parents' leaving debts, right is reserved to the sons not to "enter on" the inheritance—ἐξέστω τοῖς υἱοῖς μὴ ἐμβατεῦειν, ἐὰμ μὴ βούλωνται. The thought of forcible entry (1 Macc. xii. 25, οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν

αὐτοῖς ἀνοχὴν τοῦ ἐμβατεῦσαι εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ) is well brought out in BM II. p. 14¹⁹ (ii/B.C.), βιαίτερον ἐμβατεύσας εἰς τὸ δη[λούμενο]ν ἔδαφος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος. On the form of the word, in which δ and τ are freely interchanged, see Mayser, *Gramm.* p. 176; and for the technical use of τὸ ἐμβαδικόν as the tax paid by tenants to the owners of the land see Wilcken, *Ostr.* i. p. 190 f.

ἐμμένω.—As showing the persistency of the legal formula, ἐμμένω with or without ἐν followed by the dat. of a participle, of which apparently we have a reminiscence in Gal. iii. 10, we may add to Deissmann's examples (*BS* p. 248 f.) the late PFi 93²⁹ (vi/A.D.) ἄκοντα ἐμμεῖναι πᾶσι τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις. In *Syll.* 879²⁰ (end of iii/B.C.) the verb is construed with the simple dat., ἐπέυχεσθαι τοῖς ἐμμένουσιν καὶ ταῖς πειθομένας τῶιδε τῶι νόμῳ εἶναι: cf. TbP 382²⁰ ff. (B.C. 30–A.D. 1), ὀμνύο Καίσαραν θεοῦ υἱὸν Ἀυτοκράτορα εἰ μὴν ἐμμενεῖν καὶ ποιήσῃν πάντα, “I swear by Caesar son of God and Emperor, that I will truly abide by and perform all.”

ἐμπλοκή.—With 1 Pet. iii. 3 cf. *Syll.* 653²² (i/B.C.) μὴ ἐχέτω δὲ μηδεμία χρυσία . . . μηδὲ τὰς τρίχας ἀνπεπλεγμένας, regulations regarding the *ἱεραὶ* in the celebration of the mysteries of Demeter and Kore: cf. *ibid.* 939¹⁰.

ἐμφανίζω.—The quasi-technical sense of this word in Heb. ix. 24, νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, may be illustrated by the corresponding adjective in the legal OP 260¹¹ f. (A.D. 59), ἔσασθα[ι ἐμ]φανῆ τῷ Σαραπίωνος ἀρχιδικαστοῦ βήματι, “I will appear at the court of the chief justice Sarapion” (G. and H.). How readily the meaning passes into “report or inform against,” as in Acts xxiv. 1 (ἐνεφάνισαν . . . κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου), xxv. 2, 15, is shown by EP 8³. (iii/B.C.), ἐμφανίζω σοι Ὠρον Πασᾶτος, a report to the Praetor, and TP I, 8, 12, ἐμφανιστοῦ καὶ κατηγοροῦ (with Peyron's note).

ἐναντι.—That ἐναντι with the gen., as in the phrase

ἐναντι τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts viii. 21), can no longer be confined to biblical Greek (as Grimm) is proved by its occurrence in the translation of a Roman senatus consultum, *Syll.* 300⁵² (ii/B.C.) *περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος ὕστερον ἐναντι Γαίου Δοκρετίου βουλευσασθαι ἔδοξεν*: cf. also for imperial times OP 495⁵ (A.D. 181-9), *ἐναντι Πέλα*. Wackernagel, *Hellenistica*, p. 1 ff., shows that the word came into the *Κοινή* about 300 B.C. from Cretan, Delphian, or a like dialect, helped by the fact that the Attic *ἐναντίον* had this sense.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "EXPOSITOR."

SIR,—

I am much perplexed by a statement which "X" has made in his interesting paper published in the December number of the EXPOSITOR, p. 535. He says:

"We meet the same contradictory phenomenon in the recently discovered *Syr.-Sin. Palimpsest*, which reproduces a codex of the earliest date, worked on in all probability by a thoroughly heretical scribe; *so much so indeed as to require very drastic treatment at the hands of the orthodox librarian, even to erasure with a knife.*"

Does this refer to the self-contradictory passage in Matthew i. 16?

I may safely say that no one has studied the Sinai palimpsest for a longer time, nor examined it more carefully than I have done. In 1895, on my third visit to Sinai, I filled up most of the gaps in the published text, which, for want of time, had been left by the three decipherers of 1893 (the larger portion of these having been left by the late Professor Bensly). They naturally occurred in the most illegible por-

tions of the MS. I examined all difficult passages again and again during my subsequent visits to Sinai in 1897, 1902, 1903 and 1906, working at it eight hours a day for ninety-six days. And I have at the present moment a new and more complete edition of the whole text in the Press. It will be published next year by Messrs. Williams and Norgate.

I am, therefore, in a position to state :

I. That the page containing Matthew i. 16 shows no signs of scraping or erasure, but that it is distinctly legible throughout. It is one of the best preserved pages in the whole MS.

II. That, while several other pages have been scraped as with a knife, this scraping has been done impartially, with the sole apparent purpose of getting a clear surface whereon to write the "Stories of Holy Women," edited in the seventh or eighth century by John of Beth-Mari.

III. I have never observed any case of an erasure in the interests of orthodoxy or the reverse. Nor has any rumour reached me that such a case has been noticed by one of the other decipherers.

I do not now enter on the question of the peculiar reading in Matthew i. 16. I am concerned only to correct a misstatement, due probably to "X" having put together, in his own mind, the fact of an apparently heretical reading existing on a very legible page, and the fact of a knife or some other sharp instrument having been used, in the seventh or eighth century, *on some other pages*. It is curious that so serious a misapprehension should have arisen with regard to a document which actually exists in our own time, and has been open to inspection by any Syriac scholar who may have visited the Convent of St. Catherine since its text was first published in 1894.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
 AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND THE LOWER CLASSES.¹

I.

IT is the custom of the Evangelical Social Congress² to devote some of its working hours to a subject that necessitates withdrawal from the noisy arena of present-day problems. We retire to the quiet study of the scholar and the man of theory, there to examine ourselves awhile—to reflect, it may be, on the latest principles of social ethics, or to consider historically some characteristic social phenomena of the past.

In choosing as my subject “Primitive Christianity and the Lower Classes” I have had in view the historical variety of self-examination. The subject is an inquiry into the relation in which the Gospel and its makers stood to the great mass of the small and the weak. It thus undertakes, we may say, to apply the historical test to our old watchwords, “Evangelical Social” and “Christian Social.” Not one of us who has been actively engaged in the social movement during the last twenty years can say that the subject is unfamiliar. In many of us it awakens memories of delightful old wanderings in search of a social-political programme

¹ Address delivered at the Evangelical Social Congress, Dessau, June 10, 1908, by Professor Deissmann, and translated for the EXPOSITOR by Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., Lector of English in the University of Heidelberg. In substance, and occasionally also in form, Professor Deissmann’s remarks are based upon earlier works of his, particularly his recently published book, *Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen, 1908. (Where no reference is given the New Testament passages are such as can be easily found.)

² The Evangelical Social Congress was inaugurated in 1890. Its objects are to investigate impartially the social conditions of Germany, to test them by the moral and religious standard of the Gospel, and to make the Gospel teaching more efficacious and fruitful than hitherto in the economic life of the present day. The President of the Congress is now Professor Adolf Harnack.

which we felt could be found in the Gospels with as little trouble as the text for a Whitsun sermon.

The psychological explanation of the attempts to found a social-political programme on the New Testament is simple enough. After the foundation of the German Empire the work of Adolf Stöcker ¹ and Friedrich Naumann ² brought social questions down like devouring flames on the consciences of the rising generation, and many felt instinctively that if they were to abide by the old Gospel they could not help being interested in social questions. Those who were not already by education and temperament linked heart and soul with the lower classes were filled by the spirit of the New Testament with unquenchable sympathy for the humble masses. With hearts thus stirred it was almost a matter of course for many to reformulate the old Protestant Scriptural principle by saying that the New Testament must be the normative authority for social politics.

The counterpart to this Christian Social romanticism of the earlier period was to be found in certain convictions that sprang up amongst the lower classes of our population under the influence of Socialism. They flourish still, and not unfrequently find expression in newspapers, cheap pamphlets, public meetings, and correspondence columns ³ as the voice of the labouring people. Certain beliefs have gathered round the figure of Jesus, the social reformer. As a "carpenter's son" He appeals naturally to the proletariat, and they have come to regard Him as a martyr for communism and the social revolution, one who fell fighting against the exploiters.

¹ The veteran court chaplain and member of the Reichstag, author of *Christlich-Sozial* (1890) and many subsequent works.

² Another politician who has stood in the pulpit. He is editor of *Die Hilfe* (since 1895), author of many books, and still in the prime of life.

³ Cf., for instance, "Religiöse Fragen aus der unteren Schicht" in *Patria* (Jahrbuch der Hilfe), 1905, p. 144, No. 33.

The spontaneous emotions of the social-democratic proletariat,¹ however, are not without some sort of learned support from educated men. Karl Kautsky² has explained Primitive Christianity as being essentially the outcome of the communistic movement under the Roman Empire. The great feuilleton-writer, Albert Kalthoff,³ of Bremen, gifted with a still greater amount of inventive imagination, has derived Christianity from the combined effect of the ancient popular philosophy, the proletarian spirit of communistic associations, and the passion of the Jewish Messianic hopes.

Taken as a whole, these hypotheses must be altogether rejected. Any permanent importance that they possess is due not to their authors' knowledge of the historical sources, nor to their considered judgment in working up and arranging facts, but to their instinct. It is the same instinct which fills the social-democratic proletarian with sympathy for the carpenter's son, no matter how much he mistrusts the official church. The same instinct coined the watchwords "Christian Social" and "Evangelical Social" and threw the New Testament into the social ferment of our day. It is the pure sense-impression that (to put it quite generally) there was a close connexion between Primitive Christianity and the lower classes.

The weakness of Kautsky's and Kalthoff's hypotheses, apart from their more or less consistent exclusion of creative personalities from all share in the origin of Christianity, is

¹ Cf. the excellent statement and criticism of these theories by Ernst Troeltsch in his important series of essays in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, vol. 26, and Adolf Harnack's review of the same in the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, vol. 131, part 3.

² A Socialist journalist of over thirty years' standing. He is the founder and editor of *Die Neue Zeit*, a weekly organ of the German Social Democrats. He recently published a book, *Der Ursprung des Christentums, eine historische Untersuchung*, Stuttgart, 1908.

³ Author of *The Rise of Christianity*, translated by Joseph McCabe, London (Watts), 1907.

obvious enough. Chiefly it lies in their venturing to solve one of the most tremendous problems of historical science solely on a dilettante book-knowledge of the Roman Imperial age, derived at second or third hand from works that in many of their details are now out of date. Blinded by doctrinaire prepossessions, they misunderstand and do fantastic violence to the New Testament, the one main source of information, while the other complex of sources they have not regarded seriously at all : I mean the original documents, left by the lower classes contemporary with Primitive Christianity, which have been made newly accessible to scholars by the archaeological discoveries of the last twenty or thirty years.

In the present generation some at least of the German educated classes, particularly members of the academic class, have learned to look on social facts of the present day in the light of actuality and to see in the existence of different social levels a living cultural force. It will always remain a most remarkable fact that in the same generation the discovery of abundant new texts on stone, earthenware, and papyrus has for the first time brought the study of antiquity into real touch with the lower classes of the age in which Christianity grew up.

Our previous knowledge of the world contemporary with Primitive Christianity was in all its essentials derived from the remains of classical literature.

In the literary memorials, however, what we have is practically the evidence of the upper, cultivated class about itself. The lower classes are seldom allowed to speak, and where they do come to the front—in the comedies, for instance—they stand before us for the most part in the light that is thrown on them from above. The old Jewish literature, it is true, has preserved along with its superabundance of learned dogma much that belongs to the people—the

Rabbinic texts are a mine of information for the folklorist to explore—yet it may be said of the Graeco-Roman literature of the Imperial age that it is on the whole the reflection of the dominant class, possessed of power and culture ; and this upper class has been almost always taken as identical with the whole ancient world of the Imperial age. Compared with Primitive Christianity, advancing like the under-current of a lava-stream with irresistible force from its source in the East, this upper stratum appears cold, exhausted, lifeless. Senility, the feature common to upper classes everywhere, was seized upon as characteristic of the whole age in which the great religious revolution came, and thus we have the origin of the gloomy picture that people are still fond of drawing as soon as they attempt to sketch for us the background of Christianity in its early days.

This fatal generalization of course involves a great mistake. The upper class has been simply confused with the whole body of society, or, to use another expression, Primitive Christianity has been compared with an incommensurable quantity. By its social structure Primitive Christianity points emphatically to the middle and lower class. Its relations to the upper class are very scanty at the outset. Jesus of Nazareth was a carpenter, Paul of Tarsus a weaver of tent-cloth, and the words of St. Paul at the close of the first chapter of his first Epistle to Corinth, about the origin of his congregations in the lower classes of the great towns, form one of the most important testimonies, historically speaking, that Primitive Christianity gives of itself. Primitive Christianity is another instance of the truth taught us with each return of springtime, viz., that the sap rises upward from below. Primitive Christianity stood to the upper class in natural opposition, not so much because it was Christianity, but because it was a movement of the lower classes. The only comparison possible, therefore, is that between the

Primitive Christians and the corresponding class among the pagans.

Until recently the men of this class were almost entirely lost to the historian. Now, however, thanks to the discovery of their own authentic records, they have suddenly risen again from the rubbish-mounds of the ancient cities, little market towns, and villages. They plead so insistently to be heard that there is nothing for it but to yield them calm and dispassionate audience. The chief and most general value of the non-literary written memorials of the Roman Empire, I think, is this: They help to correct our picture of the ancient world, which has been viewed hitherto exclusively from above. They place us in the midst of that class in which we have to think of the Apostle Paul gathering his early Christian recruits. This statement, however, must not be pressed. Of course among the inscriptions and papyri of that time there are many that do not come from the lower class but owe their origin to Caesars, generals, statesmen, municipalities, and rich people. But side by side with these texts lies evidence of the middle and lower classes, in countless depositions made by themselves and recognizable in most cases at once as such by their contents or the peculiarity of their language. These are records of the people's speech, records of the insignificant affairs of insignificant persons. Peasants and artisans, soldiers and slaves and mothers speak to us of their cares and labours. The unknown and the forgotten, for whom there was no room in the pages of the annals, come trooping into the lofty halls of our museums, and in the libraries, folio on folio, are ranged the precious editions of the new texts.

We have to do chiefly with Greek and Latin inscriptions, inscribed sheets of papyrus, and earthenware potsherds. The bulk of the inscriptions are on stone, but to these must be added inscriptions cast and engraved in bronze or scratched on tablets of lead or gold, a few wax tablets, the

scribblings (*graffiti*) found on walls, and the texts on coins and medals. These inscriptions, of which there are hundreds of thousands, are discovered on the site of the ancient civilized settlements of the Graeco-Roman world, in its fullest extent from the Rhine to the upper course of the Nile, and from the Euphrates to Britain.

The papyri come almost invariably from Egypt. They have generally been dug out of the dust-heaps of ancient towns and are non-literary in character. For instance, they include legal documents of all possible kinds: leases, bills and receipts, marriage-contracts, bills of divorce, wills, decrees issued by authority, denunciations, suings for punishment, minutes of judicial proceedings, tax-papers in great numbers. Then there are letters and notes, schoolboys' exercise books, magical texts, horoscopes, diaries, etc. As regards their contents these non-literary documents are as many-sided as life itself. Those written in Greek, several thousand in number, cover a period of roughly a thousand years. The oldest go back to the early Ptolemaic period, i.e., the third century B.C.; the most recent bring us well into the Byzantine period. All the chequered history of Hellenized and Romanized Egypt in that thousand years passes before our eyes on those tattered sheets. The Greek documents are supplemented by large numbers of others in Aramaic, Demotic, Coptic, Arabic, Latin, Hebrew and Persian. Of the most ancient hieroglyphic papyri we here say nothing, but there should be no possibility of disagreement as to the value of those we have mentioned for the scientific study of antiquity in the widest sense. They mean nothing less than the reconstitution of a large portion of the life lived by the ancients. They bear witness to the condition of affairs in the past with a freshness, warmth and sincerity such as we can boast of in no ancient writer and in but very few of the ancient inscriptions. The record handed down by the ancient authors is

always, even in the best of cases, indirect, and has always been somehow or other touched up or toned down. The inscriptions are often cold and lifeless. The papyrus sheet is far more living. We see the handwriting, the irregular characters; we see men. We gaze into the inmost recesses of individual lives. The souls of these men of old, seemingly long since perished, live once more. Fate is indeed kind to the scholar who will study the lower classes at the turn of the new great epoch in religion. He can take in his hand, for example, the original letter¹ sent by a Roman soldier of the second century A.D. to his father, and he can read what the young man, just arrived in Italy, wrote home to his native village in Egypt:—

“Apion to Epimachos, his father and lord, many greetings! Before all things I pray that thou art in health, and that thou dost prosper and fare well continually together with my sister and her daughter and my brother. I thank the lord Serapis that he saved me immediately when I was in peril in the sea. When I came to Miseni I received as viaticum (journey-money) from the Caesar three pieces of gold. And it is well with me. I beseech thee, therefore, my lord father, write unto me a little letter, firstly of thy health, secondly of that of my brother and sister, thirdly that I may behold thy hand with reverence, because thou hast taught me well and I therefore hope to advance quickly, if the G[o]ds will. Greet Kapito[n mu]ch and m[y] brother and sis[t]er and Se[reni]lla and m[y] friend[s]. I sent [or “am sending”] the[e] by Euktemon a little [pic]ture of me. [More-over] my name i[s] Antonis Maximos. Fare thee well, I pray. Centuri[a] Athenonike. There saluteth thee Serenos the son of Agathos [Da]jimon, [and . . .]s the son of [. . .]r

¹ Papyrus in the Berlin Museum. Text, facsimile, and commentary in Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 116 ff.

and Turbon the son of Gallonios and [. . .] . . . [. . .]
 . . . [. . .] [. . .] . [. . .] . [. . .] .”

The address on the back :—

“T[o] Ph[il]adelphia for Epim X achos from Apion his son.”

Two lines running in the opposite direction have been added :—

Give this to the first Cohort X of the Apamenians to (?) J[uli]a[n]os
 the Liblarios, from Apion so An . [. . .]
 that (he may convey it) to Epimachos
 his father.

Deciphering another original letter ¹ of the same period we light upon a most affecting picture, a living illustration of our Saviour’s parable of the Prodigal Son. These are the cries that reach us from the mangled lines—a prodigal’s cries for help, addressed to his mother :—

“Antonis Longos to Neilus [h]is mother ma[n]ly greetings !
 And continually do I pray that thou art in health. I [mak]e
 supplication for thee daily to the lord [Ser]apis. I would
 thou shouldst understand that I had no hope that thou
 wouldst go up to the metropolis. And therefore I came not
 to the city. But I was a[sh]a[m]ed to come to Karanis,
 because I walk about in rags. I write [or “ have written ”]
 to thee that I am naked. I besee[c]h thee, mother, be r[e]con-
 ciled to me. Furthermore, I know what I have brought
 upon myself. I have been chastened every way. I know
 that I have sinned. I have heard from [Post]umos, who
 met thee in the country about Arsinoë and out of season told
 thee all things. Knowest thou not that I had rather be
 maimed than know that I still owe a man an obol ?
 come thyself ! I have heard that I beseech
 thee I almost I beseech thee I will
 not d[o] otherwise.”

¹ Papyrus in the Berlin Museum. Text, facsimile, etc. in Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 123 ff.

Here the papyrus breaks off. On the back is the address :—

“[.] the mother, from Antonios Longos her son.”

A letter¹ dated June 17, of the year 1 B.C., permits us a shuddering glimpse of the fortunes of a proletarian family. With a curious mixture of the sentimental and the brutal, Hilarion, an Egyptian labourer, writes from the capital, Alexandria, to his wife, whom he had left at the little town of Oxyrhynchos expecting her confinement :—

“Hilarion to Alis his sister, many greetings! Also to Berus my lady and Apollonaris. Know that we are still even now in Alexandria [*sic*]. Be not distressed if at the general coming in I remain at Alexandria. I pray thee and beseech thee, take care of the little child. And as soon as we receive wages I will send thee up [*mistake for* ‘send (them) up to thee’]. If thou — — art delivered, if it was [*mistake for* ‘be’] a male child, let it live); if it was female, cast it out. Thou saidst unto Aphrodisias, ‘Forget me not!’ How can I forget thee? I pray thee, therefore, that thou be not distressed. (Year) 29 of the Caesar, Pauni 23.”

On the back the address :—

“Hilarion to Alis. Deliver.”

The inscribed potsherds, which few scholars yet care to take any notice of, lead us still lower in the social scale. The ostraca, as the potsherds are called, come like the papyri in thousands from the rubbish-mounds of ancient places in Egypt. In a climate like ours the preservation of the papyri and ostraca for such a long space of time would indeed have been impossible. After the fire that took place in the Rathaus at Heidelberg in March, 1908, the debris was carted away to the rubbish-shoots of the town. Then indeed it was possible to pick out from the charred bundles of archives of the Board of Guardians documents not unlike the ostraca in

¹ Papyrus published by Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (iv.), No. 744. Facsimile, etc. in Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 106 ff.

their social import. But, written on such poor stuff as our paper, how long would a widow's application for relief be preserved in the earth of our rubbish-heaps? On the other hand, the dryness of the Egyptian climate and the excellent quality of the ancient writing material have rendered possible the preservation of texts that were thrown away as worthless thousands of years ago, and it happens that quite a number of widows' petitions have come to light amongst the discoveries from those ancient times. The writing material in special use by the poor, viz., the potsherd, was endowed with immortality. In spite of its durability it was also the cheapest of writing materials, obtainable by every one gratis from the nearest rubbish-heap. For this reason it was so admirably adapted for recording the vote of the Demos in those attainders by potsherd at Athens of which we used to hear at school under the name of ostracism. The ostrakon was beneath the dignity of the well-to-do. As a proof of the poverty of Cleanthes the Stoic it is related that he could not afford papyrus and therefore wrote on ostraca or on leather. In the same way we find the writers of Coptic potsherd letters even in Christian times apologising now and then to their correspondents for having made use of an ostrakon in temporary lack of papyrus. We, however, have cause to rejoice at the breach of etiquette. The ostraca take us right to the heart of the class to which the Primitive Christians were most nearly related, and in which the new faith struck root in the great world. Most particularly the potsherds enable us to see into the economic life of the poorer classes, for the writing they bear is most often a tax-receipt. St. Paul's injunction (Rom. xiii. 7) to the Christians to pay their taxes properly ("tribute to whom tribute") acquires a new significance when we learn that 218 different sorts of dues are known from the ostraca to have existed in Egypt alone. So too upon the family life of the poorer people much

light is shed by the potsherd letters and other allied documents.

We have every right to say that an entirely new world is opened up to the student in this multitude of ancient lower-class documents. Where formerly there was nothing but a great grey expanse we now see the most brilliant variety of colours in every degree of shade. Once it was all promiscuous scrimmage, the swarming masses presented nothing but insoluble historical riddles ; now single individuals emerge, clean cut and tangible types of the life lived by the masses at the turn of the new great epoch in religion—men who worked with their hands on field and dyke, in the scribe's chamber, aboard the Nile boat. We can check their accounts for wages, taxes, and rent. The prices of corn and oil, fish and sparrows, how much was paid for a draught-camel and how much for a slave, what a wife brought with her as her portion and how the husband was to treat her—all this we can calculate to the last obol and date to the year and the day with the original memoranda of the persons lying before us. The period of dreams, in which Kautsky and Kalthoff rhapsodized and preached about the life of the ancient proletariat, has given way to the age of factual research—painful research into minute facts. To one engaged in this research there often comes a feeling as if some invisible authority, sovereignly disposing of the centuries, had held a deferred inquiry into the social conditions of the early Roman Empire. In hundreds and thousands the single texts come pouring in upon the historian's desk, and with them he is to construct in mosaic a complete picture of the life of the masses in antiquity. These ancient materials, however, are altogether more straightforward and trustworthy than the replies reluctantly penned to so many modern inquiry schedules that issue from official quarters.

It is true, not every one engaged in research has the eyes to read these materials and the mind to appreciate them. There are still antiquarians to whom the mutilated fragment of a commonplace Alexandrian hexameter is more interesting than an original letter written by a poor widow or the original contract for the sale of a slave. Anything with a shimmer of culture in it is still so vastly over-valued, anything in the shape of a book is still held in such special veneration, that many people fail to realize how greatly a bit of ancient life, a fragment of ancient naïve reality, exceeds in value a fragment of ancient artificiality. But there is no doubt that attention paid to social problems of the present day will react beneficially upon the study of the life of the people in ancient times. It will help to spread the conviction that the innumerable popular texts recently discovered are not curiosities to be dismissed with a blasé smile by dwellers in our modern great cities, but that, taken together, they afford invaluable and irreplaceable material for the reconstruction of the civilization amid which Christianity arose and within which its chief work lay during its creative period.

The study of the civilization of the ancient lower classes is still in its infancy. One problem in particular is still far from being solved, viz., the problem as to the actual amount of division between the classes. It is still uncommonly difficult to separate sharply from one another the three classes, lower, middle and upper, which we should expect to find on *a priori* grounds.

What we can perhaps already make out is that the lower classes are divided off from an upper class distinguished by the possession of power, literary culture, and wealth. We must guard against expressing this contrast as though the whole mass of the uncultured were below and the sparse number of cultured persons above. Even in the classes that

I call "lower" there was not a complete absence of culture, as was pointed out very rightly by Adolf Harnack not long ago; and, on the other hand, the upper class is not without crass examples of the reverse of culture. If we regard culture as a factor in the division of classes among the ancients, the point of importance is rather the opposition between the more literary, reflected culture of the upper class and the more non-literary, naïve culture of the lower classes. St. Paul, who was keenly alive to this contrast, gives expression to it with a fine irony that discloses his strong sympathy for the lower classes. He places on the one side the "wise men," and on the other side those whom the world considers "foolish" (1 Cor. i. 26 ff.). Of course he does not mean to say that they really are stupid. This remark applies also to the emphatic words of Jesus (Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21), to which St. Paul was perhaps alluding, that God had revealed Himself not to "the wise [and prudent]" but to "babes." What wealth of spiritual culture there was in those lower classes, dull and apathetic as they were deemed by many, and how remarkably open-hearted and responsive they were in their inmost lives, is shown to us by some of the papyrus letters written by unknown Egyptian men and women in that critical epoch of the world's religion.

But if we are thus able to mark off the lower classes from the upper, it follows from what has been said that we must avoid the error of regarding the lower classes as a uniform complex. Indeed, there can be no doubt that amid the non-literary masses of the Hellenistic East with which we are concerned there was a further marked subdivision into classes. The difference between the lower classes in the great towns and those in the small towns and villages must have been considerable. Our subject will bring us back to this question of differentiation once again later on.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

*THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE
PATRIARCHS IN RELATION TO
THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

AT the request of several scholars I have undertaken to write an answer to Dr. Plummer's review of my edition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. I have edited many non-canonical Jewish works and written much on this literature, but hitherto I have only once replied to a review on any of my books. For controversy of this nature I have no leisure. Hence it is with extreme reluctance that I write the subjoined *notes* in order to oblige my friends, and to prevent those who are not specialists in this subject from being misled by Dr. Plummer's criticisms. The consideration of Dr. Plummer's criticisms has confirmed me as to the justness of my views on the Testaments.

1. *Original language of the Testaments.*—The Testaments were written in Hebrew. This is now universally acknowledged, although only twenty years ago it was universally believed that they were originally written in Greek.

2. *Place of writing.*—The Testaments, like the Book of Enoch, were written in Galilee. Their author definitely mentions the places in Galilee where certain of his visions took place. In Galilee there was greater religious and ethical freedom than in Judea.

3. *Time of writing.*—I cannot here enumerate the various grounds for assigning the Testaments to the close of the second century B.C. They are given at length in my *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (A. and C. Black),¹ and have been so cogent as to convince practically all my reviewers save three, and these, I feel confident, will in due course yield to the arguments, which have convinced all students who

¹ I have published a series of studies of the Testaments, beginning with the year 1899 and closing with the two volumes published last spring.

have made a first-hand study of this literature. Thus this second century B.C. date is accepted by Bousset, in the *Zeitschrift f. d. Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1900, pp. 187-197; by Professor Beer, of Strassburg, in the Article on "Pseudepigrapha" in the new edition of Herzog and Plitt's *Real-Encyclopaedie*; by Dr. Köhler, in the Article on the Testaments in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*; by Dr. Perles, in a review of my edition and an original study of the text in this year's *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*; by Père Lagrange, in his work on *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, 1908; by Professor Burkitt, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908; by Dr. Oesterley, in *The Doctrine of the Last Things*, 1908, and by many other scholars.

Yet in the face of the arguments that have convinced the above Christian and Jewish specialists Dr. Plummer writes: "Let us take any time between B.C. 100 and A.D. 50 for the Hebrew original." In my opinion the origin of the book within these dates is inexplicable, and in this view I believe I am at one with those who know this period best. Dr. Plummer quotes Professor Harnack in support of this late date. But though I have the greatest respect for this scholar on the field of Christian literature, he has made no first-hand study of Jewish Apocalyptic literature. Besides, when he assigned the Testaments to the beginning of the Christian era, he had not at his disposal adequate material on which to form a just conclusion.¹

4. *Christian Interpolations*.—But even though we accept the questions of language and data as settled, there still remains the possibility that the conclusions arrived at may be true only of the ground-work of the book, and that other

¹ The Testaments are not intelligible unless we suppose them to be written in a period when Israel was flourishing and independent in Palestine, and under the sway of Maccabean priestly rulers. There are half a dozen chapters containing a bitter attack on the Maccabeans. These are at variance with their content and are later Jewish interpolations.

parts of it, i.e. those that are most akin in character to the New Testament, may have been subsequently added by Christian scribes. To a very limited extent this is quite true, but, after all, these interpolations are not very numerous—moreover, they are not ethical but dogmatic statements, and as a rule they are easy to detect. One Testament is wholly free from them in all the chief authorities, while, in the last two Testaments of Joseph and Benjamin, of the eight interpolations in the Greek Version only one is found in the Armenian. Thus as late as the sixth century some of the Testaments were free from Christian additions. Moreover, even passages where the diction seems Christian it is sometimes genuinely Jewish. Thus in T. Levi ii. 11, after the words, “And through thee (i.e. Levi) and Judah the Lord will appear to men,” we have the apparently suspicious line *σώζων ἐν ἑαυτῷ* (*v.l. αὐτῷ*) *πάν γένος ἀνθρώπων*. In my text I obelized the phrase *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* as a Christian interpolation or as unintelligible. Now I find that it is a literal reproduction of the Hebrew *בְּעַצְמוֹ*, which should here have been rendered by *αὐτός*. In other words, the passage describes a theophany, such as is found eight times in the rest of the Testaments, and the second line should be rendered, “He Himself saving every race of men.” The same Hebrew idiom is similarly rendered in T. Sim. vi. 5. The text thus refers to God Himself. Now in Ben Ammi, a writer of the second century A.D., we find practically the same statement as in our text. After declaring that in the past partial salvations had been wrought by individual men, as Moses, Elijah, etc., he goes on to say that God Himself would effect the final salvation of Israel—*אנא בעצמי נואל אתכם*—*ἐγὼ αὐτὸς σώσω ὑμᾶς* (Midr. Wajjikra on Lev. xvii. 3).

5. *Unity of the religious and ethical basis of the Testaments.*—When the above score or so of Christian interpolations have been excised, as well as some later Jewish interpolations

of the first century B.C., we have a book exhibiting a remarkable unity in religious and ethical thought. The phrases and clauses in this book, which find remarkable parallels in the New Testament, *belong essentially to its very texture*, and not in a single instance are they out of harmony with the uniform tone of the book. The writer was a member of the Chasidim who had taken up and developed the best elements in the Old Testament. Thus our author is the first Jewish writer to quote with any adequate recognition of their significance the notable words of Genesis i. 27, "God created man in His own image."¹ Starting from such a foundation it is not strange that, like the greatest prophets of the past, he should look forward to the salvation of the Gentiles—a belief that he expresses repeatedly. Again, as the mind of our author was of a profoundly ethical character, it is natural that he should look forward to the achievement of salvation through character rather than through outward ordinances as the author of the contemporary Book of Jubilees did. The Law furnished the norm according to which character should be shaped. Nay, more, it was a spiritual guide and a light to illumine man on the way that led to God; for, as a later member of this school taught, "the Law was given to lighten every man" (T. Lev. xiv. 4—circa 50 B.C.). Our author thus believed that salvation was designed by God for all men and was to be realized through character—character, that is, won gradually in the spiritual fulfilment of the Law given of God.

6. *Thus the Testaments constituted a book of religious ethics.* Ethics and religion were never sundered for the true Chasid. The Ethics of the Testaments spring naturally from the fundamental principles of our author combined with the special character and incidents recorded of each of the patriarchs.

¹ Never quoted subsequently in the Old Testament. First quoted in Sirach.

Let me take as an example the Testament of Gad. Now the leading ideas of this Testament are envy, hate and love. At the outset Gad confesses (i. 9; ii. 1-2) that He hated Joseph from his heart and sought to destroy him, but that God delivered him out of his brethren's hands (ii. 3-5). Next he proceeds to set forth before his children a series of remarks on the evils of hatred, how it hates truth, rejoices in slander, joins hands with envy against a prosperous rival and mates with lying (iii.-iv. 1-5, v. 1). Then he presses on them the duty of love; "For the spirit of love worketh together with the Law of God" (iv. 7). That this love they can attain through right-doing; for "righteousness casteth out hatred, humility destroyeth envy." Hence "he that is righteous and humble is ashamed to do what is unjust, being reprov'd not of another but of his own heart" (v. 3). Such truths Gad declares he learnt not from man but through repentance and spiritual experience (v. 2, 6, 8). But the true Chasid is to be free not only from the hatred that springs from envy at another's success, but also from the hatred that arises naturally from the wrong done by a neighbour. Here it is that the Testament reaches its natural climax in the great passage on forgiveness, wherein Gad instructs his children how a man is to be delivered from the sin of hating his neighbour, however deeply he wrongs him—nay, more, how he is to seek to deliver his neighbour from his wrong condition, and under all circumstances to maintain a right attitude towards him free from all personal animosity (vi. 3-6). This chapter contains the most noble and remarkable statement on the subject of forgiveness in all ancient literature. Its originality in its present context cannot, I hold, be reasonably questioned nor its influence on the sermon on the Mount. The next chapter (vii.) follows with teaching no less lofty. As in the case of a man who has wronged us we are to banish all feelings of

personal resentment, so in the case of a successful rival we are not only to banish all feelings of envy or jealousy, we are to do more, we are also to pray for him that he may be prospered to the full (vii. 1). "Put away, therefore, envy from your souls, and love one another with uprightness of heart" (vii. 7).

Before I leave this subject I may point out that the existence of a high conception of the doctrine of forgiveness in certain circles in Palestine is attested by the fact that it made its influence felt even on such a cultured man of the world as Sirach, whose statements on this question give, no doubt, but a pale reflection of the reality, but are, nevertheless, invaluable in showing that Jewish thought in the second century B.C. had advanced beyond the Old Testament stage.

By a close study of the other Testaments it could be shown that the same high ethical teaching is present in each—not as an interpolated element, but as an essential characteristic.

The preceding facts are, I conceive, sufficient to prove that where a close affinity exists between the New Testament and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the relation of the latter to the former may be taken with some exceptions to be one of dependence, and therein an answer is virtually given to Dr. Plummer's objections. But before I close this reply I wish to pass a stricture or two on Dr. Plummer's criticism, and also to remove, if possible, some of the special difficulties he feels in the matter of the Testaments.

First of all, Dr. Plummer fails to attach the adequate weight to the evidence I adduce as proving the dependence of Hermas on the Testaments. Seven of the eight parallels I give occur in the course of a single short chapter of less than 300 words. The fact should *not* be ignored. The evidence, moreover, in such a case is cumulative. Further, if Dr. Plummer had consulted either

the English or Greek index he would have found that the use of "spirit" in a good or evil sense is characteristic of the Testaments, being found nearly seventy times. Again, a reference to the index would have shown him that the phrases "the spirit of truth," "the spirit of error," occur not once, but several times in the Testaments. These facts, taken in conjunction with what precedes strongly presume the priority of T. Jud. xx. 1: δύο πνεύματα σχολάζουσι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ τῆς πλάνης, to *Hermas, Mand.* vi. 2. 1. δύο εἰσιν ἄγγελοι¹ μετὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἷς τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ εἷς τῆς πονηρίας—in fact, the evidence for the direct derivation of the latter from the former is practically conclusive. But, again, Dr. Plummer has ignored the strongest parallel that I gave. This parallel is as follows:—

T. Iss. iii. 8. πᾶσι γὰρ πένησι
καὶ θλιβομένοις παρέιχον ἐκ τῶν
ἀγαθῶν τῆς γῆς ἐν ἀπλότητι
καρδίας μον.

Hermas, Maud. ii. 5, οἱ μὲν
γὰρ λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι—4.
ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου πᾶσιν ἰστέωρη-
μένοις δίδου ἀπλῶς.

I hold, therefore, that nothing has been advanced to show that *Hermas* is not dependent on the Testaments.

In the next place, Dr. Plummer asks how it is possible that the Testaments could have had such a great influence on the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline Epistles and yet have exercised none on Clement, Ignatius, Barnabas, Aristides, Justin Martyr, 2 Clement, etc. To this I might rejoin: How is it that the Gospel of Mark exercised such a preponderating influence on the First and Third Gospels and yet has left no certain trace in Barnabas, the *Didaché*. 1 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, 2 Clement? Or, again, how is it that the Similitudes of Enoch exercised such a great influence on the Fourth Gospel and certain passages of the Synoptics

¹ ἄγγελοι is characteristic of this part of *Hermas*.

² The present text of St. Mark is, as Professor Burkitt has pointed out, derived from a single mutilated MS.

and yet are not quoted by a single Apostolic Father? Or how is it that 1 Thessalonians, the earliest Pauline Epistle, has left no trace on Barnabas, the Didaché, 1 Clement, Polycarp, 2 Clement? But I need not further press this argument. Dr. Plummer's question is answered satisfactorily by the fact that, when the New Testament books were published, they speedily ousted from circulation the very books on which the Jews who embraced Christianity had been brought up, and by which they had been prepared for the higher revelation.

One more note and I have done. Dr. Plummer cannot understand how it is that the Testaments have so largely influenced St. Matthew and St. Luke and have hardly if at all influenced St. Mark. Here again the answer is obvious. The influence of the Testaments as an essentially ethical work is naturally seen in the First and Third Gospels, which record the ethical teaching of our Lord. There is little room for the exercise of such influence in the Second Gospel, which confines itself to narrative.¹

R. H. CHARLES.

STUDIES IN CONVERSION.

I. JUSTIN MARTYR.

IN the thirteenth chapter of St. Matthew, besides the Parable of the Sower, there are three pairs of parables, in which the commencement, the development and the consummation of the kingdom of heaven are respectively set forth—its commencement in the Parables of the Treasure Hid in a Field and the Pearl of Great Price, its development in the Parables of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, and its consummation in those of the Wheat and the Tares and the Drag-net.

¹ The eschatological element naturally had some influence on the New Testament, but this was wholly secondary.

The two parables dealing with the commencement of the kingdom are tolerably like each other. Both represent Christianity as the supreme good—as a prize so valuable and dazzling that he who finds it will abandon every other pursuit in order to attain it ; and he will be justified in so doing. Yet there is a difference : the finder of the treasure hidden in the field comes upon the prize by chance, when engaged in a pursuit of a totally different nature ; while, on the contrary, the finder of the pearl of great price is in search of pearls, the finding of which is his occupation.

This was a prophecy that, in the history of Christian experience, there would be two kinds of conversion : some people would be suddenly awakened to the consciousness of there being in the Gospel an object worthy of the most ardent and exclusive pursuit, whilst their attention was fixed upon an object entirely different or wandering from one worldly object to another ; whereas others, being formed of finer clay and cast in a less worldly mould, would be bent not on the pleasures of sense, but on the satisfactions of the soul, and, whilst thus engaged, would, after enduring many illusions and disappointments, come at last, in Christianity, on the perfect satisfaction of all their longings.

This prophecy of the Author of Christianity has been fulfilled in every generation. Sometimes the conquests of His Gospel have been won from the ranks of the worldly or the dissipated, whom the vision of the facts of the world unseen has drawn away from the pursuits of business or pleasure with the irresistible force of religious conviction ; at other times those destined to become Christians have been votaries of art or science, of literature or philosophy, when the call of the Gospel has come to them ; they have been athirst for truth, beauty or goodness, and have been pursuing it wherever they have considered it likely to be found ; till it has dawned upon them that Christ is the way and the truth and

the life ; and at last their weary wanderings have terminated at His door.

Of the latter type an early example is to be found in the conversion of Justin Martyr.

This man was a Samaritan, as we learn from the opening sentence of his First Apology, where he introduces himself thus—"I, Justin, the son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine," this being the Roman name for the place known to all readers of the Bible as Shechem. Though, however, a Samaritan by birth, he was not either Samaritan or Jew by religion, but a heathen. He appears to have been a person of independent means ; for he was able to devote his entire time to the study of philosophy, and he wore in public the philosopher's cloak. It may have been the thirst for knowledge that carried him to the West, where the foremost representatives of philosophy were then to be found. We read of him at Ephesus, and afterwards at Rome, where he died a martyr's death, probably a little after the middle of the second century. His life may not have been long. One ancient authority mentions that at the time of his death he was only thirty years of age ; and there is nothing about his writings that can be called decisive to the contrary ; for they are of limited extent, and they bear the stamp of youthful enthusiasm and conviction. His Second Apology was an indignant protest against an act of injustice to a Christian perpetrated beneath the veil of authority ; and there may have been something youthful in the confidence that in such a case anything could be accomplished by such an appeal. His own condemnation appears to have come from the same official whom he had thus attacked, and he may have sacrificed his life to his zeal. But he met his death like a man. Indeed, in his Second Apology he had expressed the expectation that martyrdom would be his own fate ; but he was

not afraid of it ; for it was a maxim of his, that persecutors may kill but cannot harm God's true people.

It was not in the religion in [which he had been brought up that Justin found a preparation for Christianity. On the contrary, the scandals of the mythology of Parnassus, and especially the tales related of the Father of the gods, had entered deeply into his soul, and none of the early Christian writers are more severe than he on these inconsistencies of the popular religion. It may be that there are heathen religions capable of satisfying in some degree the cravings of the religious nature and conducting their votaries a certain distance in the right direction ; in which case it may be the true policy of missionaries to avail themselves of the opportunities thus made to their hand and to acknowledge the good elements even in systems that as a whole are false ; but, in Justin's age, the religion of the classical nations was not worthy of any such commendation. Those athirst for God had to turn away from it ; and the point to which they were attracted was philosophy. Justin speaks of wisdom as " the most valued possession, the most valued by God, to whom it alone leads back and unites us ; for those are, indeed, holy who have applied their minds to philosophy."

If this expresses accurately his mental condition when he was a votary of philosophy, it shows how pure and refined were his aspirations even before he became a Christian. It is not surprising, therefore, that, when the great change took place, it was not necessary at all points to break with the past. He continued to wear the philosopher's garb, because, he found, it helped him to get into conversation with persons disposed to talk on serious subjects. Thus the Jew Trypho, a dialogue with whom is one of Justin's principal works, was drawn into conversation by the bait of the cloak. Justin was one of those of whom there have

been too few, who have "talked" rather than preached the Gospel. It may have been from him that the custom was derived of calling Christianity by the name of "philosophy"—a suggestive trait of early Christian literature. The same influences led him to take a sanguine view of the destiny in the next world of those who had in this world been earnest cultivators of philosophy; and he expected to meet such worthies as Socrates and Plato in the kingdom of heaven.

At first, however, he was very far from the kingdom himself; for, having heard nothing of the followers of Christ but the vilest slanders, he believed them to be persons whom a man like himself should carefully avoid. The love-feasts of the early Christians, their figurative language in speaking of the Lord's Supper, and the absence of any representations of the Divinity in their places of worship were construed by the heathen in the most sinister sense, the children of darkness interpreting the children of light by the knowledge of what they would be doing themselves in similar circumstances. But it is probable that, when he came to Ephesus, Justin had more ample opportunities than before of observing the behaviour of actual Christians. These he watched, when he got the chance, at first with suspicion, but by degrees with an open mind; and the result was that, even when still a pagan, he came to the conclusion that the deeds of darkness alleged to their discredit were calumnies; and to such a degree did this discovery move his indignation that, he says, he longed for a rostrum, from the top of which he might denounce and shame the heathen for imputing to the Christians the sins which were their own. This also is the prevailing tone of his two Apologies, which were addressed to the highest authorities in the state, the author assuring them, that the Christians, instead of deserving persecution, were worthy of praise and encouragement as the best citizens which any government could possess.

In spite, however, of the partiality for intellectual pursuits retained by Justin, philosophy had proved a failure in his case ; and it was by the despair thus produced that he was driven to the more excellent way. In the dialogue already alluded to, he is led, for the sake of assisting another, to detail at some length his personal experience.

He does not tell how the thirst at first had awakened in him ; but it was at once a thirst for knowledge, a thirst for happiness, and a thirst for God ; and he does tell us how he tried to satisfy it. He put himself under a Stoic, a member of the philosophical sect to which at that time many of the best people belonged ; but this man, while devoted to certain aspects of wisdom, had apparently nothing of the instinct for God, and, indeed, confessed that he did not know what it meant. His next venture was with a Peripatetic, or follower of Aristotle, who appears to have had an abundant share of the matter-of-fact and utilitarian spirit of his master ; for, after a few days, he began to talk of his fee, about which he seemed to have more concern than about either his subject or his student ; and so Justin fled from him, accounting him to be no philosopher at all. The third he tried was a Pythagorean, who had an air of wisdom, but considered the secret so recondite that he would impart it only to one who could profess to have already studied music, astronomy and geometry ; and the soul of Justin was too passionately desirous of satisfaction to tolerate so long delay. So he withdrew from this teacher also and tried another, a Platonist, who proved to be the most attractive he had yet experienced ; for, as the master expounded the Platonic doctrine of ideas, the disciple felt as if the wings of his soul were budding, and that he might soon hope to reach the vision of God after which he was aspiring.

All this is narrated not without humour. Here was a soul athirst for the highest good and trying cistern after

cistern ; but it was an apparently fortuitous circumstance that was destined to bring home to him the bottomless emptiness of the endeavour. One day he was walking not far from the sea, in what town we know not, in a sequestered spot, where he was wont to meditate, when a stranger, an old man, made up to him and, entering into conversation, proved to be one who had gone through the very same round of philosophical inquiry as Justin had been pursuing, with the same negative result. But he was able to tell of a source of knowledge quite different from any yet tried by the younger man. This was in the Old Testament, of the prophets of which he spoke with such kindling enthusiasm as to excite the desire of his fellow-inquirer. He led Justin from point to point, so as to bring home to him the consciousness of how completely at the essential points he had, by the way of philosophy, been brought up against a stone wall, and then he drew him aside and pointed out the more excellent way.¹

So completely was the old man's communication a reproduction and completion of Justin's own experience that some have looked upon the messenger as merely a fiction, used for the purpose of showing dramatically how the service rendered by philosophy was exhausted and another guide had become necessary. But there is no real reason for doubting that this momentous encounter was an actual event ; at the crises of religious experience such providential meetings are not uncommon.

¹ It is not easy to follow some parts of the Dialogue with this anonymous interlocutor, which Justin reports ; but the drift of it seems to me to be as indicated in the text. From the close of the report the following words may be worth quoting :—"When he had spoken these and many other things, which there is no time for mentioning at present, he went away, bidding me attend to them, and I have not seen him since. But straightway a flame was kindled in my soul ; and a love of the prophets, and of those men who are friends of Christ, possessed me ; and, whilst revolving his words in my mind, I found this philosophy alone to be safe and profitable."

At all events this is obviously the record of a spiritual crisis. In this old man's demeanour Justin saw the evidence of Christian experience and felt the charm of spiritual peace. Under the direction thus obtained he betook himself to the holy oracles, and the copiousness of his own quotations from the Old Testament proves with what result. These Scriptures pointed the way to Christ, for whom he was led to entertain a glowing faith and love. In Christ he embraced with special fervour the gift of immortality, as did the generation of the martyrs to which he belonged ; and this glorious hope enabled him to meet with calmness and dignity the fate to which he was early destined.

Justin Martyr is not by any means the only figure in the ancient world whose experience illustrates the parable of the Pearl of Great Price. To many besides, philosophy served as a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ. And instances to the same effect could easily be adduced also from modern times. Indeed, the Reformation itself was introduced by the Renaissance, and Rationalism was undermined by both literature and philosophy before it was overthrown by the Evangelical Revival. We too readily think of those beyond the pale of Christianity as abandoned by God ; but Justin's perception was truer when he spoke even of heathenism as sown with the seeds of the Logos. Origen bears witness that Christianity gained more adherents from the thoughtful and virtuous elements in heathenism than from those of an opposite tendency. The work of the Holy Spirit is far-reaching ; it is not confined to Christians or even to Christendom ; and ambassadors for Christ will do well to make those the objects of their special aim whom this divine Guide has been leading towards the light.

JAMES STALKER.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.

(7) THE earthly life of Jesus was in contrast both to the pre-existent state and the Risen Glory a humiliation. It was throughout a proof of the grace of the choice of poverty instead of wealth. The Synoptists see the glory of the Son of God in the words and works of Jesus; the author of the Fourth Gospel as an eye-witness beholds in the Incarnate Word "the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (i. 14). While it would be an unwarranted use of the argument from silence to infer that Paul was ignorant of the facts of the ministry of Jesus, and that the Gospel-story had no place in his preaching, yet we do seem entitled to argue that the earthly life cannot have meant to him as much as to the writers of the Gospels, even as much as to the modern reader of the Gospels, for, if it had, he could hardly have avoided more frequent allusions to the facts than we find in his Epistle. Should we not frankly recognize that so distinctive and intense an experience as Paul's brings with it its own limitations? He was so absorbed in the Crucified and Risen Lord, that much which now appears to us of primary importance in the complete revelation of God in Christ was to him comparatively indifferent. Apart from the appeals to the teaching and example of Jesus for practical purposes, the facts about the earthly life of Jesus which are of importance for him are the following. The human birth of Jesus is referred to in the phrases, "born of a woman, born under the law" (Gal. iv. 4), and "born of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3). In both of these passages a contrast is presented; in the first it is God's own Son who is thus sent forth; in the second He is instituted Son of God with

power according to the spirit of holiness. Without any desire to find evidence in Paul's letters for the virgin-birth, I cannot altogether escape the impression that in the first passage there is an allusion to it. The participle *γενόμενον* does not require the mention of the mother any more than of the father; it is a neutral word. Why then the phrase *ἐκ γυναικός*? Does not the preceding phrase *ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ* exclude a human paternity, but admit an entrance into the world of the Son on His mission through human motherhood? The allusion to the Davidic descent in the second passage does not contradict the virgin-birth. The Gospels which record the virgin-birth also give the genealogy of Joseph. The legal and putative paternity of Joseph is an adequate explanation of this claim of Davidic descent for Jesus. It is to be noted that this Davidic descent is not mentioned as the reason for claiming the Messiahship of Jesus. What the pious and patriotic Jew regarded as one of the brightest glories of the Messiah, Paul deliberately uses to describe what he regarded as the lower side of the personality of Jesus. As a Jew Paul was proud that "Christ as concerning the flesh" was of Israel (Rom. ix. 5); yet in his doctrine of Christ the Jewish nationality and the Davidic descent both belonged to the temporal and local conditions in contrast with the divine, eternal and universal import of the person of Christ.

(8) It is possible that the phrase "born of a woman" had no more significance for Paul's doctrine regarding Christ than the Davidic descent; it is certain, however, that the phrase, "under the law," was of the greatest importance. Although the R.V. renders, and our English idiom demands the rendering "under the law," yet the Greek is without the article. Paul has undoubtedly the Jewish law mainly in view, as it was to it that the Judaizers were seeking to bring the Gentiles into bondage, but the context shows

that the reference is wider. It is the legal relation to God which is contrasted with the filial. The end of the deliverance from the law is the adoption as sons of God. The principle of redemption Paul here states is presented to us, as we shall see, in various forms ; its *rationale* must be reserved for a subsequent discussion ; meanwhile we are concerned only with Paul's conception of the earthly life of Jesus as determined in its distinctive character by this principle. The principle may be briefly stated thus. Jesus became what men were that men might become what He was. He took to Himself man's lot that He might give to man His life. For mankind the moral relation to God is that of subjection to His law. As long as human wishes and the divine will are not coincident, the righteousness of God presents itself to man as command or restraint. Of this legal relation Judaism presented the classic example, both *objectively* in the extensiveness and minuteness of the code imposed, and *subjectively* in the spirit of *legalism* which was characteristic of Pharisaism, the logical outcome of this conception of the relation of God to man. That Jesus shared the spirit of *legalism* Paul does not affirm ; but he does teach that Jesus submitted Himself to this code, which He did experience as a contradiction to His own spirit of sonship. The Gospel record offers us a commentary on this statement of Paul's in the incident of the temple-tax with Jesus' comment, " The sons are free. But, lest we cause them to stumble . . . give unto them for Me and thee " (Matt. xvii. 26-27). But is Paul's meaning in the phrase adequately explained by this external conformity ? Must we not ask further, Did Jesus ever Himself experience the strain of the divine will in His wishes ? His saying to the rich young ruler, " Why callest thou me good ? There is none good save One, even God " (Mark x. 18) seems to be the confession of one who felt that He had not yet reached

the goal, but was still in the labour of the race. Was not His warning to the disciples in Gethsemane, "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Mark xiv. 38), uttered out of His own troubled soul? It may be doubtful whether Paul knew these sayings or not, or, knowing them, found in them the meaning they suggest to us; but it does seem to the writer that this principle of the Pauline theology—Christ's self-identification with the sinful race—must have led him to the conclusion that in His earthly life Jesus, too, sometimes felt the will of God as command and restraint, and thus, inwardly as well as outwardly, was, in spite of His filial consciousness, "under law."

(9) This conjecture gains confirmation from the next statement regarding the earthly life of Jesus which calls for examination. Paul's use of flesh for the lower side of Christ's nature has already been noted. In neither of these passages is there any moral reference in the term flesh, and so they throw no light on Paul's conception of the experience of Jesus. It is otherwise with Romans viii. 3: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of flesh of sin and for sin (as an offering for sin) condemned sin in the flesh." The impotence of the law to restrain man from sinning in consequence of the sin which has its seat and vehicle in the flesh has been proved by our appeal to Paul's own experience in the preceding chapter (vers. 7 to 25). The phrase, "flesh of sin," does not mean that the flesh as material substance is necessarily evil, but that "there is as a matter of fact a close and constant connexion between sin and flesh." That connexion it is not necessary here to define more exactly. There being such general connexion, but not necessary identity between flesh and sin, the whole clause "in the likeness of sinful flesh" may be taken as asserting not merely a similarity with some difference, but

even a sameness of human nature in Christ and mankind. To Christ is assigned a material organism, and all which that necessarily involves in man's moral experience—liability to temptation, and conflict with evil—but in Christ's case it does not involve that the flesh is the seat and the vehicle of sin. The following phrase, "for sin," is rendered in the text of the R.V. "as an offering for sin." This is not a translation, but an interpretation, for which, however, a good deal can be said. "This phrase is found constantly in the Greek Old Testament as an equivalent for the 'sin-offering.'" As such Paul regards the death of Christ in chap. iii. 25. But the context seems to point to a wider meaning. The Son of God came to deal effectively with sin as the law had failed to do. Exposed to temptation, He resisted it; beset by evil, He overcame it. His sinlessness is the proof that for mankind, whose nature He made His own, sin is unnecessary and unjustified. The condemnation of sin lies in His conquest of it as man. While this does appear to be the interpretation suggested by the immediate context, yet it must be admitted that Paul's mind was so concentrated on the Cross, that it is not improbable that for him the condemnation of sin lay not so much in Christ's victory over temptation as in His endurance of the consequences of sin in His death. He has not the same interest as the writer of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* in the moral experience of Jesus as making Him perfect as the High Priest who can offer Himself as the efficacious sacrifice. Nevertheless if the last clause, "for sin," does refer to the death of Jesus as a sin-offering, the preceding clause, "the likeness of sinful flesh," cannot but refer to the moral experience of Jesus. It is with Christian experience Paul is in this passage dealing, and there can be no doubt that he does here appeal to Christ's conquest of evil as typical.

(10) The relation of Christ to sin is further defined in 2 Corinthians v. 21, "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." The first clause affirms unequivocally the absolute sinlessness of Jesus, and not merely as a fact, but as the fact on which depends the efficacy of His sacrifice for sinners. We are not warranted in assuming that Paul inferred the sinlessness from the value he assigned to the death of Christ. Where so much depended on the fact, we may assume that as in regard to the Resurrection of Christ, he made sure of the sufficient evidence ; but whether he simply accepted the general testimony of the eye-witnesses, or drew his own conclusion from the traditions he received of the words and works of Jesus we have not the means of deciding. That God made the sinless sin can mean nothing else than that God willed that the sinless on behalf of sinners should be treated as a sinner, that is, should Himself experience the consequences of sin. To avoid misunderstanding it is better not to use such phrases as "He was held guilty" or "He was punished"; but, nevertheless, it must be insisted that Paul regarded Christ's death as an endurance by the sinless of the death which is the penalty of the guilty. The contrasted phrase, "the righteousness of God" clearly indicates that it is not moral character, but relation to God's law that is here in question. Paul here is concerned only with God's appointment ; how it was possible for the sinless to be made sin is a question which must meanwhile be reserved.

(11) From this passage it is easy to pass to Galatians iii. 13, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us ; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a tree." In the previous study it was argued that the common Jewish belief that death by crucifixion was accursed had been one of the greatest

hindrances to Paul's belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. That hindrance had been removed only by the conviction that Jesus had risen from the dead. But Paul does not altogether abandon this Jewish belief; he transforms it to become an element in his Christian faith. All explanations of these words seem to be far-fetched, which discover in them a condemnation of the law which thus condemned Jesus the Christ, and as a consequence an emancipation of believers from the claim of the law so discredited. To Paul the mode of the death of Jesus may have been significant, owing to this saying in Deuteronomy xxi. 23, as it is not to us; but the curse Jesus endured has the wider reference of the quotation in verse 10 from Deuteronomy xxvii. 26, "Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them." The penalty of the transgression of the law—death, and death viewed as a curse—is what Christ endured on our behalf, and what we in Him are saved from. Doubtless Paul conceived the death of Christ as invested on account of this its distinctive character with unique terror, darkness and desolation, as the story of the passion would not be unknown to him.

(12) In all these respects Jesus put Himself in the place of man, He was subject to law, liable to temptation, endured the consequences of sin, although Himself sinless, and suffered even the extreme consequence death as divine condemnation. It was through death, however, that He was Himself delivered from all relation to sin. "The death that He died He died unto sin once; but the life that he liveth He liveth unto God" (Rom. vi. 10). Until the crucifixion sin with all its consequences was His environment; at His Resurrection God became wholly His home. This final separation from sin was not an involuntary consequence of His death, but He Himself freely willed His

death as such a condemnation and execution of sin. He so absolutely willed the perfect fulfilment of the holy will of God in His sacrifice that His relation to sin in any form of necessity ceased. The next verse, in which Christ's example is applied to the Christian, "Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus," shows that in the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus we are concerned not with physical events merely, but with physical events as the expression and consequence of moral processes. Christ died because He absolutely condemned and executed sentence on sin; Christ rose again, because He absolutely consecrated Himself to the will of God. It is one moral decision in its negative and in its positive aspect which is manifested in His death and rising again.

(13) This moral act is more fully discussed in Romans v. 12-21. Christ is contrasted with Adam not as in 1 Corinthians xv. 45-49 in respect of nature as the Risen Lord and the Life-Giving Spirit, but in respect of character as obedient to the will of God. Sin, with its consequence death, entered into, took possession of, gained dominion over mankind through the disobedience of Adam. Grace, with its gift of eternal life, has come into the world, and is more exceedingly abounding through the obedience of Christ. Paul's teaching regarding sin, death, the fall of man will be discussed in a subsequent study, and must now be passed over. For the present purpose what alone claims attention is Paul's conception of the sacrifice of Christ as an act of obedience, and one of so immeasurable value that it is more than a compensation morally for the loss involved in Adam's transgression. It is not in the penalty of sin endured by Christ instead of sinners that the virtue of His sacrifice lies, but in His obedience to the will of God in submitting Himself to the consequences of sin on behalf of sinners. If Paul

does not make as prominent as does the writer of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* the moral quality of the sacrifice of Jesus as that which alone gives it efficacy, this passage shows that this conception was not absent from his mind. We may even conjecture that to a man of his moral seriousness it was thoroughly congenial, and only the necessity of meeting the Judaizers on their own ground forced him to give greater prominence to the more legal aspect of the sacrifice.

(14) The Cross is not only an act of obedience, it is also a gift of grace ; and injustice has often been done to the teaching of Paul by not adequately emphasizing what he teaches on this subject. The Apostolic Benediction sums up what Christ is and does in the phrase, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," and Paul has himself given us a concise description of grace in the words, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich." Self-sacrifice for the salvation of others is what grace means. The heights from which, and the depths to which love as grace stoops are vividly presented in the passage already discussed in connexion with Paul's doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ (Phil. ii. 5-8). The self-emptying in the Incarnation of the Son of God has its culmination in the obedience unto death, yea, the death of the Cross. Grace toward man has its fulfilment in obedience to God. It is in submitting to the will of God that He should endure the consequences of sin, that Christ perfects His grace for the saving of men ; in Him love and law are one, for "all's love and all's law." Why the will of God required this sacrifice is a question to be answered in dealing with Paul's doctrine of the atonement. What has here to be emphasized is that in Paul's conception of Christ it is grace, self-sacrifice for the salvation of others, which is the supreme moral quality.

(15) It is the grace of Christ which explains the inner life of Paul. For him the Son of God, the Risen Lord, the Life-giving Spirit is the close and constant companion, nay, is more than any human companion could be, for Christ Himself is Paul's own inmost self. "I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live ; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me ; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, Who loved me, and gave Himself up for me " (Gal. ii. 20). This intimate communion is, however, no mystical absorption, in which personal distinctness is lost. Paul conceives Christ as a distinct personality, and he does not lose his sense of his own individuality. Christ's experience on separation from sin (in His death), and dedication unto God (in His rising again) has its counterpart and consequence in Paul's own experience and character. It is personal affection inspired by gratitude which is the motive of his consecration. "The love of Christ constraineth us ; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died ; and He died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again " (2 Cor. v. 14). He is confident that Christ is still interested in him ; for the sorrows he endures are "the sufferings of Christ " (2 Cor. i. 5 : "As the sufferings of Christ abound unto us, even so also our comfort aboundeth through Christ"). Christ's self-identification with him of which he was conscious is surely the clue to the voluntary substitution of Christ for mankind in His death. As Christ so loved Paul as to make his sorrows His own (see the *Expositor's Greek Testament* on Colossians i. 24), so He loved sinful mankind so much as to become one with it in its sin and curse. It is true Paul does not himself make this application ; probably because he did not perceive that in vicarious suffering there is a problem to be solved.

However close his communion with Christ, yet Paul felt it was not yet perfect. In two ways did he look for the fulfilment of his desire. On the one hand he took over the eschatological beliefs of the primitive Church, and shared its ardent hope that Christ would appear bodily in power and glory to establish His kingdom. Sometimes he expected to survive to the Resurrection of the dead, and thus to be brought into the Presence of his Lord. There is no evidence that he ever consciously changed his beliefs, or abandoned his hope of the Lord's coming. But on the other hand he does at times appear to expect that it is death which will take him home. "Being therefore always of good courage, and knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight); we are of good courage, I say, and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord" (2 Cor. v. 6-8). This wavering of judgment, due probably to change of mood, regarding the mode of his introduction into the full glory and blessedness of his Lord does not affect his constant conviction that Christ has not yet manifested to himself, or to the world, all the fulness of Godhead it has pleased God should dwell bodily in Him.

(16). In closing, two questions which the previous discussion raises may be briefly answered. (1) Was Paul's Christology original or derived? (2) Was there development in his own conception of Christ? As regards the first question it has been pointed out that we need not assume that Paul's teaching about the man from heaven or the personal pre-existence of Christ is borrowed; both conceptions follow naturally from the course of his argument. In the *Epistles of the Captivity* the angelology is that of the Gnostic heretics. Paul's assertion of the absolute supremacy of Jesus in the world as well as over mankind is the inevitable

reaction of his Christian faith against error which challenged the Christian estimate of Christ. The angelology is no essential element in his doctrine. His argument shows that he was prepared to maintain the absolute worth of Christ as Saviour and Lord against all rivals. Even if current beliefs affected his mode of statement to a greater degree than it seems necessary to the writer to assume, yet such beliefs were not added to his Christian faith. At the most they only made explicit what was implicit in it. The answer to the second question has in those sentences been already partially anticipated. Although the teaching of the later Epistles differs from that of the earlier, yet that difference is due to the variety of the errors against which it was directed more than to any development in Paul's own thinking. That Paul's mind, as living, was also growing need not be denied; nor that in controversy he defined his own beliefs more distinctly, nor even that, when necessary, he adapted the language of his opponents to his own uses. But it does seem that the revelation of the Son of God in Him came not in the gleams of dawning day, but in the blaze of glorious noon. In his conversion was implicit his experience and his theology. His contact with the common faith of the Christian Church, his conflict with Judaizers on the one hand and with incipient Gnosticism on the other, the passing of the first Christian generation without the Return of the Lord, the evolution of the Christian Church, of which he was spared to see the beginnings, into a world-wide community, in which Jew and Gentile were reconciled, by all these factors was his inner development affected; and so his conception of Christ enriched and enlarged. What has to be insisted on is that the process was a living growth, an assimilation, and not an accretion. No change of thought in his later life can be compared in decisive significance with the change of the persecutor into the

apostle. With a nature like Paul's, intense, passionate, one may say explosive, one may easily attach too much importance to development, and may unduly depreciate what may be described as the revolutionary in his experience. Although the writer is aware that in the representation he has given he has detached himself from a great mass of current opinion, which minimizes originality, and magnifies development, yet this is the impression Paul makes upon him, and he has endeavoured to report it faithfully.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE UNIO MYSTICA AS A THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTION.

IN recent years a tendency has been shown on the part of some prominent theologians to question, if not the Christian character of the "mystic union," at all events its value as a doctrinal concept. Professor Denney, who has been one of the most unrelenting critics of Ritschlianism in this country, joins with Ritschl in protesting that the idea is one of which we should do well to clear our minds, and has expressed something like gratitude that the phrase is not to be found in the New Testament.¹ What Ritschl complains of is the sentimental associations of the phrase, and the ease with which those who employ it rise superior to the idea of justification through trust in the historic Christ ;² what Dr. Denney finds unsatisfactory is the way in which the term "mystical," suggestive rather of that which has not yet reached the moral level, such as the union of nature with God, is brought in to describe something which professedly transcends moral relations.³ Both writers, on

¹ EXPOSITOR, Oct. 1903, p. 256.

² *Justification and Reconciliation* (Eng. Trans.), p. 112.

³ EXPOSITOR, Feb. 1904, pp. 155 ff.

grounds of the sort I have indicated, make no use of the idea in their theological constructions, not altogether, as it appears to me, to the advantage of the whole.

It is of course impossible to deny that good cause for these complaints, or for at least some part of them, is furnished by the language in which orthodox writers of the post-Reformation period felt free to indulge. Thus we read in a standard work that the Unio Mystica "is the action of the Holy Spirit, whereby the *substance* of believers is joined, most closely, though without intermixture, to the *substance* of the Holy Trinity and the flesh of Christ."¹ The conjunction is elsewhere characterized as "special" and "intrinsic"; it is set forth as being a case of consubstantiality, two essences becoming one; although it is only fair to say that this is usually followed up by an explicit repudiation of Pantheism. One can see elements in such a description which were sure to offend a later age. Take the use of the term "substance." This was the category, of course, by which writers of that day indicated the highest degree of reality; it was indeed their loftiest idea of God Himself. Nothing so adequate or exalted could be said of Him as that He was the ultimate or universal Substance. In moments of personal devotion, no doubt, this idea was put aside; for no one can really pray to a substance; but when a need was felt for the intellectual definitions of the text-books, it was resorted to unsuspectingly once more. This being so, it is not surprising that men should have spoken of a substantial union of man to God. A substantial union was the deepest and most real that the human mind could imagine; it seemed to have in it a secret or inexpressible somewhat far transcending all conscious ethical relations, with an intimacy

¹ König; quoted by Rothe, *Dogmatik*, zweiter Theil, zweite Abtheilung, p. 250.

and intensity to which ethical words fail to do justice. But it would be generally felt now that if the term is taken in its highest sense, no relation can be more intimate or intense than an ethical one; or at least that the deepest and most passionate experiences do not cease to be also ethical. And even those who feel that they need the word "mystic" do not, or at least ought not to, mean by it anything which is defined by contrast with "ethical," but rather, I think, ethical relations of a kind more profoundly intimate than any that obtain between one man and another.

It is, therefore, no argument against the reality of the mystic union, or its value for the interpretation of Christian truth, that people used once to describe it by conceptions which are now felt to be inadequate. To be described at first by inadequate conceptions has been the lot of most great things. Even if writers of the seventeenth century made the union of the believer and the Lord a "substantial" one—existing between two mysterious impersonal substances—even if they held, at all events in some cases, that the flesh of the believer and the flesh of Christ are mysteriously united and identified, this ought not to deter us from seeking a more worthy interpretation of the real fact they had in view. There was a day when it was thought a sufficient definition of electricity to say that it is a property of amber; that early idea indeed settled how the new phenomenon should be named; but no one now receives that description as sufficient, or, because it is obsolete, holds that electricity does not exist. What we have to do, therefore, in regard to our present subject, is to put aside the category of "substance," and try to think out the matter in terms of personality. On the accepted principle of modern philosophy that there are degrees of reality, a personal union must be regarded as infinitely more real than a "substantial" one.

It is well to recall the fact, however, that the conception of a mystic union is one that in no way depends upon the authority, be it great or small, of post-Reformation systems of theology. Its roots 'go much deeper in spiritual life, as well as much farther back in Christian history. If the phrase is not in the New Testament, the thing is on every page of St. Paul and St. John. Take for example a startling sentence like that of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians vi. 17: "He who cleaves to the Lord is one spirit." As it is said elsewhere of man and wife that they two are one flesh, so, the Apostle implies, a spiritual unity no less real and close in its far higher sphere is established by saving faith between a man and his Redeemer. It is a union that lasts as the other does not, and has effects the other can never have. Again, there is the ever recurrent form "in Christ," with its converse "Christ in you"; both to be found now and then almost within the limits of a single verse. How the words "in Christ" stretch through all time! How they cover not the present merely, but eternity before and after! We were chosen "in Him" before the foundation of the world; we are made to sit with God in heavenly places "in Christ"; and all in order that in the ages to come He might show the exceeding riches of His grace in kindness towards us "in Christ Jesus" ¹ The *locus classicus* is of course Galatians ii. 20: "I am crucified with Christ; no longer do I live; Christ liveth in me," where the very breathlessness of the verse betrays the pent-up feeling with which St. Paul wrote it. We can hear the triumph in his voice. He feels as if he had lost his old self, and all but changed his identity. There has been the importation of another's personality into him; the life, the will of Christ has taken over what was once in sheer antagonism to it, and replaced the power of sin by the

¹ Eph. i. 4, ii. 6, 7.

forces of a divine life. As an old writer quaintly puts it : " If any one should come to Paul's doors and ask, Who lives here ? he would answer, In this body of mine lives not Saul of Tarsus, but Jesus Christ." ¹ What he was had ceased to be, and what remained had a better right to Christ's name than his own. No doubt the verse was written at a white heat ; no doubt the Apostle, if he had been cross-examined, would have admitted that he did not mean, after all, that Christ and Paul were so utterly identical as now to be indistinguishable ; but this implies only that language has broken down under an intolerable strain, and that words which at their best must always be general are insufficient to express a fact that has no real parallel or analogy anywhere. It is one thing to assert that a given formula exactly coincides with the reality it represents ; this no one would claim even for a Pauline expression in any connexion whatever. It is another thing to hold that a given formula looks in the direction of absolute truth, and *is infinitely nearer to that truth than its negation would be* ; and this, surely, we may claim here for these passionate apostolic words.

A full discussion of St. Paul's conception of union with Christ, however, would virtually mean the detailed treatment of his entire system of doctrine. His whole view of Redemption is implicitly present in it. It is a spiritual union ; a mutual appropriation and interpenetration of spirit by spirit. The bond between them is sufficiently powerful to support the assignation of the same predicates to both. Our solidarity with Christ is such that in His death we also die ; in His grave we are buried ; with the

¹ Cf. Luther, in his exposition of the passage : " Thou art so entirely and nearly joined to Christ, that He and thou art made as it were one person. . . As touching my natural life I am dead, and now I live another life. I live not now as Paul, but Paul is dead. Who is it then that liveth ? The Christian."

Risen Lord, and in Him, we too rise to newness of life. Nor can an attentive reader fail to notice that St. Paul's greatest words on the subject of Atonement occur in this connexion. Romans viii. 1 is typical: "There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." By faith we have made Christ's death for sin our own, our old man being crucified with Him; the law therefore has lost its rights over us, for he that hath died is justified from sin. If the conception can be put more clearly still, this is done in 2 Corinthians v. 14: "We thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died." The sentence of death, executed on the Head, takes effect *eo ipso* on the members, not by a legal transference of rôle, but in virtue of a personal incorporation. In such a form of words more than substitution is implied, though there is a hint of substitution also in the statement that "one died *for* all." It was His death primarily, theirs only in Him, and through the mediation of faith. The believer, in the familiar phrase, has an interest in Christ's death because he has an interest in Christ Himself, and has so lived himself by faith into Christ's personal being that old things have passed away and all things—including and centring in his old self—have become new. I think most students of the Pauline theology would concede that, wherever its circumference may be, its very heart is here.

St. John, to whom it was given to speak the last and deepest word on the great Christian certainties, repeats still more convincingly the assertion that union with Christ is the secret of redemption. "This doctrine of a mystical union," says Mr. Ernest Scott, "in which the higher life flows uninterruptedly from Christ to the believer, contains the central and characteristic thought of the Fourth Gospel."¹ It is true that Mr. Scott proceeds to argue that a totally

¹ *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 289.

unethical and realistic factor enters into the Johannine conception. Metaphysical categories, in his opinion, have ousted the moral and religious categories of earlier Christian thought, or at all events relegated them to a secondary place, all possibility of man's participating in the Divine life being foreclosed until the very constitution of his nature has been radically changed by the infusion of the higher essence present in Christ. But I feel it to be very difficult, if not quite impossible, to reconcile this view with the emphasis which the Evangelist uniformly lays on faith. Clearly the experience of abiding in Christ is represented as conditioned by "believing," not in the sense of acquiescence in a prescribed dogma, but as trust in a living Person. This is obviously the conception which pervades the First Epistle of St. John; there, union with Christ is the result, as well as the basis and foundation, of ethical and spiritual experiences. It is relative to personal apprehension of the "word of life"; "if that which ye heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall abide in the Son and in the Father" (ii. 24). So too in the Gospel it is through "belief" in the sense of spiritual apprehension and self-committal that the impartation of the life which resides in Christ is mediated to His people. As Bernhard Weiss has expressed it: "The object in which the believer sinks himself when abiding in His words . . . always is just Christ Himself."¹ The crowning proof, indeed, that it is a mistake to interpret St. John's symbolic phrases in a literal or realistic sense is the fact that these very phrases, or their equivalents, are used freely by every powerful religious writer to this day, not least by those—like Mr. Scott himself²—to whom the realistic view is abhorrent.

The images by which St. John expresses union with

¹ *Der johanneische Lehrbegriff*, p. 78.

² Cf. *op. cit.* p. 294.

Christ are familiar to every one. Christ is the Vine, in which His followers are engrafted as living branches. He is the Bread of Life by eating which they live for ever. Just as in St. Paul, the mystic union is contemplated alternately from either side, and can be described equally by the phrases "ye in Me" and "I in you." The former appears to mean that the Christian's life is rooted in Christ and has in Him its encompassing vital element and medium; the second that He Himself is present in His people as the living centre, the animating principle, of their inmost being. Now in all such passages we feel that the distinction between Christology and soteriology, never more than provisional anyhow, has simply disappeared. Christ is definable as the Person who can thus be our inward Life, while on the other hand it is because He is this Person that His relation to us can be of this interior kind. Personality and possession mutually condition each other. To sustain this unparalleled relation to men, to impart Himself to them so that they have Him within and can hold fellowship with Him as with their own souls—this is a capacity or act which we can only interpret as specifically Divine. Not only so; the fellowship thus established with Christ is in express terms set forth as being intrinsically, and purely in itself, fellowship with God. To have the Son is to have the Father also. Precisely identical phrases are employed, in the Gospel and the First Epistle, to signify our relations to God and Christ respectively. In both cases a mutual inherence is affirmed, mediated in each case by the trustful acceptance of "His word."¹ The fact that Christ is thus felt to sustain a relation of indwelling in unnumbered souls, to which their indwelling in Him corresponds, points to the real argument for the higher being of Christ which we feel to be implicit in the New Testament as a whole.

¹ St. John xv. 7, 10; 1 John iii. 24.

Turning now to the doctrinal bearing of this great conception, I should like to put forward the plea that Union to Christ is the fundamental idea in the theory of redemption. It is from this centre alone, as it seems to me, that we can interpret luminously all the problems which gather round justification and sanctification, and which have so often been construed in a way that sacrificed either the moral or the religious interests at stake. The mystic union is the pivotal and organizing fact. If we start from the experimental certainty of coalescence between the Redeemer and the redeemed, we can understand some things about the Christian life, and its relation to God, which, at least to me, would otherwise remain darkly inscrutable. I do not mean that they cease to be mysteries, but only that they are no longer merely mysteries. Light penetrates them at least a certain way. We can draw lines of interpretation which go so far, and even if we soon have to stop, we can perceive that the lines have a real tendency to converge, and therefore may be presumed to meet somewhere, even if it be beyond our range.

But before we attempt to illustrate the centrality of Union with Christ in the theological scheme, there are two questions of a preliminary kind to be considered. We have already touched on one of these. First, what is meant by the term "mystical," and is it legitimate to define it in contrast with "moral"? Now, as we have seen, no experience is possible to man which gets above ethics, which has not an ethical content or is not fraught with ethical issues. In Professor Denney's words: "When two persons, two moral natures, are to enter into union with each other, then their union, no matter how intimate and profound it may be, must at the same time be personal and moral. . . . We must not forget that personality lives only in a moral world, and that its most intense and passionate experiences

are moral to the core.”¹ But while this is so, I think there are certain aspects of Union with Christ which are insufficiently described by the epithet “moral,” and which many people have dimly in their minds when they still hanker after the word “mystical.” In the first place, they feel that the Union in which they are personally identified with Christ is far and beyond anything they have experienced in their relations to fellow-men. To the term “moral” there always seems to cling a certain externality; it appears to describe and regulate affairs between persons that after all are separate, each possessing the solid rights of independent being, which in many cases it is their duty to assert and enforce. Somehow in our relation to Christ that separateness has disappeared; things happen as if it were no longer there. I do not say it is non-existent, or that there may not be varying degrees of it; but I do say that great saints, who were also great theologians, have felt that language which spoke of its absence was far truer than language which assumed its presence. Hence, while even in our relations to Christ our experiences remain ethical, in the sense that it would never be right to call them unethical, yet they are also more than ethical; they are religious. Between the parts of a living body there are always physical and chemical relations, and these the presence of life does not abrogate; yet a rapidly growing number of biologists would also hold that vital interrelations are the highest of all, because they take up the rest into a richer unity, not by destruction or suppression but by transmutation. This analogy may help us believe that there is a real sense in which we may say that Union with Christ is more than moral. It is the experience, or the fact, in which morality, carried up into its highest and purest form, passes beyond itself.

¹ EXPOSITOR, Feb. 1904, p. 156.

And this is one aspect of the truth, I think, which many have tried to express by the word "mystic."

The second aspect is very much akin to the first. Those who plead for the word "mystic," and are dissatisfied with the word "moral," feel, I think, whether consciously or not, that to describe Union with Christ as moral, and no more, makes no provision, or only a quite insufficient one, for the fundamental truth that the Union is initiated on *His* side and sustained at every point by *His* power. It is a commonplace of the preacher that our hope lies not in our hold of Christ, but in His hold of us; but is it not just in such certainties, familiar as the sunshine though they be, that the power and glory of the Christian gospel dwells? Are we really to say that our connexion with Christ consists in, and is exhausted by, the conscious feelings and motives which pass through our minds; that if I get up some morning with my soul dead and my gratitude dumb, with faith so darkened that I cannot utter a sincere prayer, my relation to Christ is, for the time being, at an end? By all means let us beware of construing personal religion in mechanical terms, or of speaking as if the life of God could be passed into the human soul like a stream of electric force; but do not let us forget that a man is more than his conscious thoughts and feelings, though certainly what he is depends to an indefinite extent on what his conscious thoughts and feelings have been. Not a few passages in the New Testament suggest that regeneration makes a man Christ's in a deeper fashion than he himself may ever dream. "We know not what to pray for as we ought," says the Apostle, "but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered"; the suggested truth being, apparently, that in the Christian there is a Divine presence other than, and yet one with, his own consciousness, a larger and fuller indwelling of

the Spirit of Christ than he himself may as yet have awakened to. So again in the great Colossian passage : "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." I do not like to introduce at this point the idea of "the subliminal consciousness," or categorically to suggest that it supplies a sphere within the personal life to which the indwelling of Christ may be assigned ; for "the subliminal consciousness," as to which our information is so largely hypothetical, threatens to become rather a nuisance to those who care for clear thinking, and is already populous with unsolved mysteries. At the same time, I think it is worth while looking in that direction ; provided we make it clear that the presence of Christ in our life at all, and therefore also in that hidden region of personality, is always mediated by conscious ethical motives on our side.¹ But, however this problem may finally be solved, at all events the fact that Christ can and does breathe His life into us, taking the first step in this true miracle of a communication of spiritual life, "is one aspect of the whole fact which the term "mystic" is chosen to indicate rather than the term "moral."

It may be, of course, that our conception of personality must be revised before we can make much in a philosophical way of a fact like the mystic union ; indeed, some of the most suggestive writers on these topics have begun to point quite clearly towards something of the kind. We are far away now from the point of view of Strauss when he wrote that "Personality is that self-

¹ To say that Christ dwells in the buried life of the soul is not in any sense to discount the spiritual character of our relation to Him. For that buried life also receives its quality from what goes on in consciousness. It is indeed the permanent deposit of conscious processes. Just as the "underworld" in a bad man is likewise bad, because his conscious thoughts and feelings are, and have been, bad ; so the "underworld" or subliminal self in a believer is pervaded by Christ because he has turned to Christ in conscious faith and love.

hood which shuts itself up against everything else, thereby excluding it from itself.”¹ This may be called the adamantine theory of personality ; the world of persons, it implies, is best illustrated by a number of marbles in a box, as to which the truest thing we can say is that each of them is utterly and completely outside its neighbour. But thinkers like Dr. Moberly and Professor Lofthouse have outlined a theory which, *primâ facie*, does more justice to the actual experiences of life. “Personality, in fact,” writes Professor Lofthouse, “is not exclusive but inclusive. We are persons, that is to say, not by our power of self-isolation, but by our power of transcending that isolation and linking ourselves to others, and others to ourselves.”² We all know the lines of Matthew Arnold, with their touch of divine despair :

Yes ! in the sea of life enisled,
With echoing straits between us thrown,
Dotting the shoreless watery wild,
We mortal millions live *alone*.³

But is that the whole truth ? Is it even the best part of the truth ? I do not doubt that those who have tasted the sacred joys of that human love which is our best analogue to religious communion, will feel that impenetrable solitude of spirit is not the deepest thing in us. On the contrary, it is possible, in some real degree, to escape from ourselves, and mingle in love and thought and will in the lives of others. And if, as Lotze has so impressively argued, personality in us is incomplete, and exists perfectly in God only, may we not say that this self-communicating power which we possess only in part will have its perfection and fulness in Him, and therefore also in Christ who is God appre-

¹ *Die christl. Glaubenslehre*, i. p. 504.

² *Ethics and Atonement*, p. 117.

³ *To Marguerite—continued*.

hensible by us ? And since this interpenetration, if it is real at all, is reciprocal, may we not find that it is only an extension of principles already implied in our social existence as human beings when we go on to speak of a true solidarity of life, a spiritual coalescence, between Christ and His people ?

It is of no slight importance to bring out clearly the fact that the Union we are speaking of is, as I have just said, a Union between Christ *and His people*. For various writers, like Erskine of Linlathen and Maurice in a past generation, and Dr. Moberly in our own, have asserted rather a Union between Christ and the race. As Maurice unequivocally puts it : "The truth is that every man is in Christ . . . except He were joined to Christ he could not think, breathe, live a single hour."¹ And in the same way Moberly dwells on "this mutual inherence, this spiritual indwelling, whereby humankind is summed anew, and included, in Christ."² Is this the teaching of the New Testament ? No one would say that it is Johannine, and careful exegesis seems to prove that just as little it is Pauline. Can it be maintained seriously that when St. Paul wrote, "There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," he meant that there is now no condemnation for any man? But, apart from this, to say that the race is in Christ is to say something that has no relation to experience. One can understand what is meant by a Christ who is vitally one with believers ; for this is interpreted to us by first-hand acquaintance with the Christian life, and the psychological coefficients involved in it can be pointed out. But if we refuse to depersonalize Christ, or to think away the ethical qualities revealed in His career on earth, the statement that He is vitally one with all men, even a Caesar Borgia, becomes, I submit,

¹ *Life and Letters*, vol. i., p. 156.

² *Atonement and Personality*, p. 90.

quite unintelligible. The tendency of such a view, in short, is to bring salvation down to the level of a natural process. We are in Christ just as our bodies are in the atmosphere, and in either case we may undergo the specific effects of the encompassing medium without knowing it. Can salvation be kept spiritual on such terms? Are ethical experiences, are faith and love, of so little value that it matters nothing to redemption whether they enter into it or not? One feels that there is something wrong somewhere; and in the minds of those who resort to these more sweeping and universal expressions a consciousness of this seems at times to stir faintly. This is shown by the qualifications which are sure, in the long run, to be inserted somewhere. All men are one with Christ, it is said, at least ideally, or implicitly, or potentially. But when we scrutinize these adverbs closely, it turns out that what they mean is not that men are in Christ simply in virtue of their being men, but only that so far as God's will of love is concerned, or their own constitution, there is no reason at all why through faith they should not be in Christ. It is worth while to note, ere we leave this point, that to deny that all men are in Christ is not the same thing as saying that they have no relation to Him at all.¹

¹ I mean that "in Christ" is a New Testament phrase, with a quite clearly defined significance. It denotes that any one who can be spoken of as being "in Christ" is saved in virtue of that union. This is what the expression implies properly, as a designation of the believer's self-consciousness; and in accordance with the right usage of words it ought not to be wasted on any lower idea. It ought not to be natural to those who take their religion from the New Testament to say that—in the right sense of the words—a man who hates or despises the Cross is nevertheless "in Christ." But to insist on this truth is not to lift man as such away from any and every relation to the Exalted Lord. Though a man may resent the very thought of it, Christ is still seeking him, blessing him, gathering round him all the appealing influences of the Kingdom of God on earth. And from that universality of living power and sufficiency, which resides in Christ always—yesterday, to-day and for ever—may spring up at any moment the spiritual redemptive relationship of personal indwelling. This seems

In conclusion, a few words may be said upon the centrality of the mystic union in the organism of Christian doctrine.

1. As to the Atonement. The difficulty that has always counted for most here has been the difficulty of perceiving how the expiatory suffering of one person could benefit, or avail for, any other. And if Christ were just one more human individual, as separate from us as we are from each other, this objection undoubtedly would be fatal, alike from the standpoint of logic and morality. But if, with St. Paul, we refuse to think of Christ as one isolated person, and the Christian as another, then the representative action of Christ in His sacrifice becomes quite another thing. The union, just because it is a union, has two sides. His self-identification with us involves consequences for Him, and it involves consequences for us. I venture to quote, as the best statement known to me of this point of view, a few sentences from a recent sermon by Dr. W. M. Macgregor. "Jesus," he writes, "who sought in all things to be one with His brethren, emboldens us to seek in faith for oneness with Himself; and in virtue of that mystical union our pardon is secured. As He associated Himself with us, so we associate ourselves with Him both in His doing and in His suffering. We make His confession ours; the homage due to the righteous will of God, which we cannot render of ourselves, we find in Him. We have no desire to stand apart, living out our lives in ways of our own; we wish to be found in Him, and judged only in relation to Him."¹ The false step in many theories

to be truer to the facts of New Testament religion and personal experience than to say that all men are in Christ by birth, and continue to be in Him unless they definitely thrust themselves out by unbelief. On the bearing of this problem on the question of Conditional Immortality I express no opinion.

¹ *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, pp. 74-5. Cf. Luther (*ut supra*): "Thou mayst boldly say, I am now one with Christ, that is to say, Christ's righteousness, victory and life are mine. And again, Christ may say, I

of Atonement, I feel, is that they first abstract the Christian from Christ, and then find it hard, naturally, to put them back into such a oneness that what He did and is affects our relation to God. But if all Christian theology, by its very nature, is an interpretation of believing experience from the inside, oneness with Christ is our *punctum stans*, and the attempt to put it in abeyance is illegitimate. We do not have to prove it, or to make a doctrine of the Atonement apart from it; we assume it rather, and seek to draw out its implications for the sinner.

2. As to Christian morality. "The ethics of the Sermon on the Mount," said the late Dr. Dale, "have their root in the mystical relations between Christ and His people."¹ If we have forgiveness in Christ, we have also holiness in Him. We cannot join ourselves to Him by faith, so admitting Him to heart and life, without thereby receiving into our being the germ and principle of perfection.² The moral resources of life are now in Christ. This is an experimental truth, against which the argument of this or that man that he does not have any such experience has no cogency. Men do pass out of themselves to make the will of Christ theirs and their will His; having died with Him they also live with Him. In Him they share the relationship of sons of God, and are supported in the struggle with self and evil by His sympathy and communion. They share, they really share, His conflict and His triumph. Not only is it true that the law of life that is in Christ Jesus makes them free from the law of sin and death, but they partake in His service to the world. As members of His body they are His hands and His feet, doing His will for men.

am that sinner, that is, his sins and his death are mine, because he is united and joined unto me, and I unto him."

¹ *Fellowship with Christ*, p. 12.

² Cf. Simpson, *Fact of Christ*, p. 163 f.—a noble passage.

3. As to the truth of the Christian Gospel. The consciousness of union with Christ—a fact as real as the consciousness of right and wrong—is the greatest apologetic asset of the Church. It is unaffected by controversies as to the date or authorship of documents, though it has a very direct bearing on the question of the truth of their message. It is unaffected by differences of doctrinal interpretation. And as we look around us, in the society of believers in Jesus, and mark the beauty and devotion of character displayed in thousands of His people, it is the mere instinct of truth to say, “We know that He is alive from the dead, for He lives in them.”

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

AN EMENDATION TO 1 PETER II. 8.

IN studying the text of the first Epistle of Peter the conviction has been deepening with me for a long time that it contains a large number of residual errors, such as cannot be cured by the aid of the manuscripts which are at present at our disposal. Perhaps this may be due, in part, to the antiquity of the document, of which we may say that, as a whole, it is one of the best attested compositions of the New Testament. But this presumed antiquity can hardly be a complete explanation of its errors, supposing, that is, that we agree that the text still needs mending. For, after all, the difference in the length of life between this composition and other similar compositions in the New Testament is small enough, even if we were sagacious enough in our criticism to establish definitely a chronological order for the books and pamphlets and letters which make up the New Testament. And it is, therefore, wiser to say that if residual errors should be detected or suspected in

one particular book or tract, the reason must lie in the paleographical fortunes of the book itself, and in its pre-canonical life, before it came to be part of a recognized collection and treated like the rest of the books of which the collection is composed.

In the present brief article I want to discuss the original form and meaning of the closing words of 1 Peter ii. 8, which stand in our Authorized Version in the form, "Whereunto also they were appointed"; the Revised Version does not suggest any change in the rendering of the original text *εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν*, nor does it decorate its margin with an alternative either to text or translation; from which it may be inferred that they had no fault to find either with the one or with the other. Whether they liked the doctrine, as in all probability the Revisers of 1611 did, will not, of course, appear, as we have no printed reports of the proceedings in the Jerusalem chamber. If they did not like it (and it is one of the strongest pieces of Predestinarian doctrine in the New Testament), they had no way of expressing it, for no one has any right, in editing a text, to say whether he likes the text when he has edited it, or, to put it more exactly, to edit the text because he likes it. We have no control over the thoughts or expressions of Peter and Paul, because we may agree or disagree with them in the matter of the Freedom of the Will, for the Freedom of the Will in a critic or a translator is a very limited Free Will, inside the circle of Free Will generally and very near the centre. So we must be cautious in saying that the text is wrong, merely because we may not like the statement that the unbelievers stumble at the Stone of Offence, *and were appointed so to do*. The harshness may be the inevitable concomitant of the writer's theology, and in that case what right have we to suggest a change? On the other hand, it is not impossible that the harshness may be an importation or a

misunderstanding, and if we can find any evidence that bears upon that point, it is not improper to produce it.

But, first of all, let us examine the passage at length to which the words under consideration are a pendant. It is well known that this famous statement about the place of the Stone Rejected of the Builders in the Divine Architecture is one of the passages which are held to prove the dependence of Peter upon Paul. The argument is as follows: here in Peter we have the statement, "Behold I lay in Sion a stone, elect, a corner-stone, a precious stone, and he that believeth in Him shall not be confounded. To you, then, that believe He is precious; but to the unbelieving the stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence; who stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed."

Now in this passage we have a combination of two passages from Isaiah with a passage from the Psalms, the latter being also quoted in the Gospel of Matthew (xxi. 42), the two passages being Isaiah xxviii. 16 and Isaiah viii. 14. And in the quotation from Isaiah xxviii. 16 the writer is not working, as we should expect, from the text of the LXX; if he had been, he would have begun his quotation with *ἰδοὺ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σίων* instead of *ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σίων*, to say nothing of some other changes; so we have here either an independent translation or a reformed rendering of the LXX by reference to the original Hebrew.

Then it is further noted that the same two passages of Isaiah are found combined in Romans ix. 32, 33; "they stumbled at the Stumbling Stone, even as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, and he that believeth on him shall not be ashamed," where we see the same modified rendering of Isaiah xxviii. 16. And from thence it has been inferred that Pauline

material has been worked over by Peter, for which opinion confirmation has been suggested in other quarters.

The same divergence from the LXX to the Hebrew will be found in the other quotation from Isaiah (viii. 14), for here the LXX have wrongly οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι: and it is this repeated coincidence between Peter and Paul in the selection and use of material that furnishes the ground for a belief in a connexion between the two writers. Dr. Hort states the case thus: "St. Paul substitutes a literal rendering of the Hebrew and St. Peter follows him."

But then Dr. Hort goes further and points out that the single word *σκανδάλου*, as used in this connexion by St. Paul and St. Peter, pointed back to characteristic language of our Lord Himself as well as of the Evangelists on His being a "stumbling-block" to the Jews who refused Him; as St. Paul elsewhere pronounced a crucified Christ to be to the Jews distinctly a "stumbling-block."

But if this idea of stumbling at the stone of scandal is so widely diffused in the Gospels and Epistles, the question arises in our minds as to whether the teaching is not a part of the earliest Christian tradition, and whether the agreement between the two Apostles cannot be explained by the use of this tradition, without the necessity of quoting one another. The use of the same passages of Isaiah in the same translation, and that an independent translation, points at once to the use of a Book of Testimonies antijudaic in character; if we can show reason for such a hypothesis, we can liberate Peter from the control of Paul, at least as far as this passage is concerned, and make them independent channels for the propagation of a primitive Christian argument. Now it is well known from the surviving collections of Testimonies against the Jews, and from quotations which may fairly be traced to such collections, that one of the

earliest arguments embodied in them was based upon the statement that Christ is in the Old Testament known as the Stone. To establish this at length would take far too much space, and I will only refer to the matter very briefly ; if we look at Cyprian's *Testimonies*, we shall find in the second book three sections devoted to the establishment of the following points :—

(a) That Christ is called the Stone ;

(b) That then the same stone should become a mountain and fill the whole earth ;

(c) That in the last times that mountain should be made manifest, on which the Gentiles should come and into which all the Just should ascend.

The proof-texts in Cyprian are Isaiah xxviii. 16 followed by the passage from the Psalm (cxviii. 22). Cyprian does not, however, quote the second passage from Isaiah, and in the first passage he appears to follow the LXX rather than the Hebrew (or is it a Latin text based upon the LXX ?) ; for he reads :—

“Apud Isaiam prophetam sic dicit Dominus : Ecce *ego immitto in fundamenta* Sion lapidem pretiosum, electum, summum angularem,¹ honoratum : et qui crediderit in eum non confundetur. Item in Psalmo cxvii., etc.”

Cyprian may then be taken as evidence for (1) the doctrine that Christ is the Stone, and (2) for the line of proof ; although it does not run back demonstrably into the ancestry of the Peter-Paul quotations. Still the substance of the argument against the Jews is there, and we shall find presently the same variation in the Epistle of Barnabas. So we suggest that the agreement between Peter and Paul is due to the use of a Book of Testimonies. The following further passage from Dr. Hort will now require modification. *Comm. in 1 Pet.*, p. 116.

¹ The two words *summum angularem* are a translation of ἀκρογωνιαίον.

“It is morally certain that St. Peter borrowed from St. Paul those peculiarities in his mode of quoting the passage which he has in common with him ; and hardly less so that St. Paul was not following any antecedent version other than the LXX, but freely adapting the LXX itself. Neither he nor St. Peter had occasion to cite the reference, twice repeated in the Hebrew and the LXX, to the laying of foundations.” The first sentence in this passage needs now the expansion, “or quoting from some collection of prophetic testimonies available to them both.”

And now I want to draw attention to a curious passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, where we shall again come across traces of a similar gnosis with some striking variations ; the text is as follows :—

καὶ πάλιν λέγει ὁ προφήτης, ἐπεὶ ὡς λίθος ἰσχυρὸς ἐτέθη εἰς συντριβήν· ἰδοὺ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον πολυτελή, ἐκλεκτὸν, ἀκρογωνιαῖον, ἔντιμον. εἶτα τί λέγει ; καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.¹ Ἐπὶ λίθον οὖν ἡμῶν ἡ ἔλπις ; Μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ ἐν ἰσχύϊ τέθεικεν τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· λέγει γάρ· καὶ ἔθηκέν με ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν.² λέγει δὲ πάλιν ὁ προφήτης· Λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας.³

The variations in the text are curious, and the argument obscure ; but it will at once be noticed that Barnabas is quoting the same passages from Isaiah and the Psalms that we found in Cyprian, and quoting Isaiah xxviii. 16 as Cyprian does from the LXX. There can, then, be no doubt that Barnabas is using familiar matter from the Testimony Book.

Upon looking more closely at his statement we find him saying that Christ was set as a strong stone *for breaking* (εἰς συντριβήν) ; and here we have an echo of the other passage from Isaiah concerning the Stone of Stumbling and

¹ Isaiah xxviii. 16.

² Isaiah I. 7.

³ Ps. cxviii. 22.

Rock of Offence. Accordingly Funk adds a note on this clause to the effect that Barnabas here seems to have in mind Isaiah viii. 14 in the Hebrew text. If this be so, we have the same Testimonies in Barnabas as in 1 Peter, and Barnabas becomes the connecting link between Cyprian and Peter-Paul. In this respect, then, the reference to Barnabas is important; but there is more to come from it. Not only does he hold the doctrine that Christ in the Old Testament is represented as Stone and Rock (*λίθος* and *πέτρα*), but he plays on the word *τίθημι* (which Peter and Paul employ in quoting from Isaiah) in such a way as to suggest that he knew the other rendering from the Hebrew, in spite of the fact that he quotes the LXX. The proof of this lies in the Greek of Barnabas which is before us:

ὡς λίθος ἰσχυρὸς ἐτέθη εἰς συντριβήν·
 ἐν ἰσχύϊ τέθεικεν τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος·
ἔθηκέ με ὡς σπεραὲν πέτραν·

and the repetition suggests a knowledge of the text

ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών κτέ

instead of ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών.

And the importance of this observation is that it at once suggests to us, from the repeated statements about Christ, that the words in 1 Peter with which we started refer to Christ and not to the disobedient or unbelievers, and that the text should be corrected from εἰς ὃ ἐτέθησαν to

εἰς ὃ ἐτέθη.

When this is done, the passage becomes quite clear, for just as Peter takes up the various terms in Isaiah and comments on them, playing on the word *ἔντιμον* by a following *ἡ τιμὴ* and reflecting the *λίθος ἐκλεκτός* in *γένος ἐκλεκτόν*, so he carries on the thought of the laying of the foundation stone ("Behold, I lay, etc."), and sums up the results of the laying of the stone in the words, "For which cause also the stone was laid," (εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθη). It is curious how near

Dr. Hort came to this explanation of the obscure clause in Peter : he remarks as follows :—

“ Ἐτέθησαν, a somewhat vague word in itself, expresses simply the ordinance of God, perhaps with the idea of place added, that is place in a far-reaching order of things. *The coincidence with Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον* in verse 6 can *hardly be accidental* ” (italics ours).

Certainly the coincidence is not accidental, and the reference to Barnabas enables us, by a simple conjecture, to make it exact. It is a case of deliberate repetition from the opening words of the passage quoted and commented on.

Assuming this to be correct, the exegesis of the passage is much simplified. As long as it was a case of the dependence of Peter upon Paul’s quotations, it was almost inevitable that his argument should follow the Pauline direction. From this point of view Dr. Hort said very properly that “ all attempts to explain away the statement [εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν] as if e.g., it meant only that they were appointed to this by the just and natural consequences of their own acts, are futile.” When, however, we see that it is the Stone that is the ordinance of God, and not the stumblers, the statement which Dr. Hort takes exception to ceases to be futile, and exactly expresses St. Peter’s mind. Something of the same kind is true with regard to the following sentences : “ These four mysterious words become clearer when we carry them back to what is doubtless their real source, those three central chapters of Romans of which the apostasy of Israel is the fundamental theme.” The words are no longer unduly mysterious, and they are to be understood without any reference to St. Paul. I do not, of course, forget that this still leaves St. Paul’s argument against the Jews, by way of prophetic testimonies, to be dealt with, and it may be difficult to extract from them any interpre-

tation that must not be described as Predestinarian. All that we have urged is that the difficult words in Peter are to be interpreted without aid from Paul and in a different sense. In conclusion I may remark that the corrections and interpretations here offered have come to me gradually : the recognition that we were dealing with extracts from the Testimony Book came first ; but here one was held up by the fact that the agreement with Cyprian was inexact. After that I came to suspect the genuineness of ἐτέθησαν and made the necessary marginal correction ; it was only recently, however, that I saw that Barnabas had been on the same track, that he agreed with Cyprian on the one hand, and probably with Peter on the other, and that he furnished a remarkable confirmation to the emendation which I had made. So we may leave the matter to be further tested, and cover the final judgment with the words, " He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

JUSTIN MARTYR AND THE TEXT OF HEBREWS
XI. 4

Πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ Καὶν προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ.

THERE are two difficulties in this verse, (1) the interpretation of the words πλείονα θυσίαν, which in their most obvious sense, a "larger" or "greater" sacrifice, do not suit the context ; (2) the text of the words given by Westcott and Hort as αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, but of which they say in their appendix that Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the passage in *Stromata* ii. 4, 12, has probably preserved the true text (αὐτῷ, as above), while all the MSS. have become corrupt. This article is concerned principally with the first point ;

but if the argument is even partially justified, we shall have still earlier indirect evidence for Clement's text of the latter part of the verse.

Πλείονα is difficult to interpret. The word requires to have a meaning for which we can find some justification either in the Old Testament or in Jewish tradition. For the instances of faith in Hebrews are all instances as familiar to the readers, either through recorded or traditional history, as the famous events of English history to us. There is no evidence to show that the advantage of Abel's sacrifice was ever held to consist in its mere quantity. Translators have recognized this and given a metaphorical sense to *πλείονα*. Though the Vulgate is literal with "plurimam hostiam," Beza's Latin gives "majoris pretii," more valuable, and the English A.V. and R.V. "more excellent," both leaving it uncertain in what the value or excellence consists. This translation can be justified from the New Testament, e.g. Matthew vi. 25 (=Luke xii. 23), "Is not the life *more* than food?" Matthew xii. 41, 42 (=Luke xi. 31, 32), "A *greater* than Solomon, or than Jonah, is here." In Mark xii. 33 the MSS. vary between *πλεῖον* and *περισσότερον*, "to love the Lord is *more* than all burnt offerings and sacrifices." But *πλεῖον* is most distinctly elevated to the expression of moral greatness in Mark xii. 43 (=Luke xxi. 3), "This poor widow hath cast in *more* than they all."

But we expect the writer of this chapter to keep close to tradition if possible, and *πλείονα*, however excellent a word in itself, is not easily suggested by any account we have of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, and it does not clearly bring out the point on which stress is laid in the story. "The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering, but unto Cain and his offering he had not respect." The Septuagint suggests some ritual error in Cain's offering: "If thou offeredst rightly, but didst not divide rightly, didst

thou not sin ?” This attempt to account for the different reception of the two sacrifices does not seem to have commended itself to the Jews; but the point of the story is that in some way or other, not clearly signified, Abel’s sacrifice was *more acceptable* than Cain’s, and we expect a word in Hebrews xi. 4 to convey this idea.

Cobet has made the plausible conjecture that a slight corruption of the text has substituted the unsuggestive word *πλείονα* for the right and telling word which calls up the whole story even before Abel’s name is mentioned. He proposes that for ΠΛΕΙΟΝΑ we should read ΗΔΙΟΝΑ. The alterations are three (1) the change in the position of a stroke in Π to make Η; (2) the addition of a horizontal line at the base of Λ to make Δ; (3) the reading of Ι for ΕΙ. In this last matter the orthography of MSS. is so liable to variation (see Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, p. 153) that there is no difficulty in supposing that a scribe who had read ΠΛ at the beginning of the word would imagine that his original had written the word ΠΛΙΟΝΑ and would improve on it with the more correct diphthong. We are thus supplied with the sense of a “more pleasing sacrifice,” which exactly represents the traditional character of the distinction between Abel’s sacrifice and Cain’s. This reading so far commends itself to Baljon that he puts it in his text on the strength of Cobet’s conjecture.

Most students of texts have some difficulty in maintaining a happy mean between reverence for what is written, which may sometimes be mere grovelling reverence for an age-long mistake, and a soaring faith in the verbal inspiration of conjectural emendations. But even those most inclined to the latter state have their faith confirmed when literary support is found for the conjecture. Now Cobet’s attractive emendation finds support in the following passage from Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, ch. 29.

εὐδόκησε γὰρ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἡδίων παρ' ἡμῶν ἢ παρ' ὑμῶν λαμβάνει. τίς οὖν ἔτι μοι περιτομῆς λόγος, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαρτυρηθέντι ;

Here we have the collocation of *θυσίας* with *ἡδίων*, the latter indeed as an adverb, and referring grammatically to the glad reception of the sacrifices instead of to the sacrifices that cause the gladness ; but though not precisely in the same form it is used in the same general sense as in Hebrews xi. 4 as emended by Cobet. It is clear that the emendation is not merely the result of a manipulation of alphabetic signs, but is in accordance with the thought and usage of the church of the second century.

But we can go further, and show that Justin had Hebrews xi. 4 in his mind when writing this passage. He passes immediately from the more pleasing sacrifices to the witness borne by God to him who offers them, again using the language of Hebrews xi. 4 in a slightly different construction. Thus we have the following parallelisms between Justin and Hebrews xi. 4 :—

Heb. [ἡδέιονα] *θυσίαν . . . ἐμαρτυρήθη . . . μαρτυροῦντος . . . τοῦ θεοῦ.*

Justin. *θυσίας ἡδίων . . . μαρτυρηθέντι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ.*

This is not a mere verbal coincidence. The two central ideas of the verse in Hebrews reappear in Justin. The thought of the faithful being testified to by God seems to have been made current among Christians by the author of Hebrews. We are familiar with the idea that the faithful are witnesses who testify to God, and may seal their testimony as "martyrs." But this testimony is mutual: they are equally testified to by God. In Ignatius, *ad Philad.* 5. 2, the Christian prophets (thought of as in the line of the old prophets) are "testified to" by Jesus Christ. In Ignatius, *Eph.* xii. 2, Paul is described as "the sanctified, the one testified to," almost as if *ὁ μαρτυρουμένος* had

become a title of honour. Clement of Rome *ad Cor.* xvii. 1; xviii. 1; xix. 1, borrowing the thought from Hebrews, speaks of the company of the old saints as "those testified to." In Hebrews xi. the expression is used generally of all the ancient saints in *v.* 2 and 39, in *v.* 5 of Enoch particularly, on the ground that he pleased God, and in *v.* 4 of Abel on the ground of his . . . sacrifice. (The adjective is omitted for the present). Abel is the one person "testified to" on the ground of sacrifice. We see then that in speaking of God's testimony to His saints on the ground of sacrifice Justin must have Abel in mind, though he does not mention him by name, and we shall be able to show that it is Abel who suggested to him the passage in Hebrews.

Justin is engaged in arguing to justify to Trypho the absence of circumcision and Sabbath observance among Christians. He has already referred to *those who lived before Abraham* as not being bound by either. He has further said, chapter 28, "If a Scythian or a Persian has the knowledge of God and of His Christ, and keeps the eternal right things, he is circumcised with the good and profitable circumcision and is dear to God, and *He rejoices in his gifts and offerings.*" Here we have the same words from Genesis iv. 4, as are quoted in Hebrews xi. 4, while *χαίρει* (rejoices) fairly represents the thought expressed in Genesis by *ἔπιδεν*. But in using this line of argument Justin does not stand alone. He is using the regular Christian testimonies against the Jews, and the point where we can convict him most readily of using a regular book of testimonies is in the quotation which immediately precedes the passage we are discussing. He quotes Malachi i. 10, 11, "I have no delight in you, saith the Lord, and I do not accept your sacrifices at your hands. Wherefore from the rising to the setting of the sun my name is glorified among the Gentiles, and in every place a sacrifice is offered to my name, a pure

sacrifice. For my name is being honoured among the Gentiles, saith the Lord, but you profane it." By means of this quotation we can trace the argument into Cyprian and Tertullian. Cyprian's *Testimonies against the Jews* are a third century form of the older style of testimony book. It is clearly based on former collections of passages suitable to quote against the Jews. Cyprian's *Testimonies*, book i. chapter 16, is entitled "That the ancient sacrifice should be made void and a new one celebrated," and Malachi i. 10, 11 is quoted under this head. Book i. chapter 8 is entitled, "That the first circumcision of the flesh is made void, and the second circumcision of the spirit is promised instead," and under this heading is the following testimony, "Adam was first made by God uncircumcised, and righteous *Abel*, and Enoch, who pleased God and was translated, and Noah . . . and Melchizedek." These testimonies of Cyprian show us that the thought of an acceptable sacrifice from the Gentiles, and that of the faithful uncircumcised before Abraham, including Abel by name, belong to the stock of testimonies against the Jews.

But Tertullian is the most useful witness to the way of using these two testimonies. In *Adversus Judæos* he applies in great detail the testimonies which we find lying in the armoury in Cyprian, and handled gently, and with a polite and persuasive reserve, by Justin. In chapter ii. he treats of the patriarchs who pleased God though they were not circumcised and did not keep the Sabbath. (The Sabbath argument seems to have dropped out by Cyprian's time.) He has the same list as Cyprian, but adds Lot. Of Abel he says, "God commended Abel who offered him sacrifices, though uncircumcised and not keeping the Sabbath, counting as acceptable (*accepto ferens*) what he offered in simplicity of heart, and reproving the sacrifice of his brother Cain who did not rightly divide what he offered."

After a passing reference to Abel in dealing with the Sabbath question in chapter iv. Tertullian comes in chapter v. to the earthly and spiritual sacrifices, where he quotes the story of Cain and Abel at length, with this introduction.

“So also we show the sacrifices of earthly offerings and spiritual sacrifices to have been predicted, and that from the beginning the earthly sacrifices of the elder son, that is, Israel, have been shown before in Cain, and that different (*diversa*) sacrifices of the younger son, Abel, that is, *of our people*, have been pointed to.” Following the story of Cain and Abel, in due course, comes the quotation from Malachi.

Justin is evidently using a book of testimonies against the Jews, though he does not use it slavishly. The passages in Cyprian and Tertullian show that the book had probably a direct reference to Abel in connexion with Sabbath and circumcision and the better sacrifice. There can be no doubt that when Justin combines in one passage a reference to the more pleasing sacrifices and to the needlessness of circumcision he has Abel in his mind. The thought of Abel calls to his mind the reference in Hebrews, and in the fervour of his conclusion of this part of the argument he falls into its language.

But it is no accident that Justin should fall into the language of Hebrews. He has caught also the spirit of Hebrews. The study of the Epistle must have been part of his preparation for dealing sympathetically with Jews, and this little passage of the *Dialogue* shows that it had helped him to know himself. Hebrews xi. and xii. persuade us, all unconsciously, that the saints of old and the saints of our own time are one community. They are united in the common witness of God to their faithfulness. Abel is “testified to” by God, so is Enoch, as are “all these” ancient saints, who are inseparably connected with “us” (xi. 40, xii. 1). Justin must have had great sympathy with

this sentiment ; he had himself found in the Hebrew prophets the masters of philosophy and they had led him to Christ. He was one of a people still liable to the persecutions and sufferings of the righteous of old time. More thoroughly than either Clement of Rome or Ignatius he has appropriated to himself the language in which the Divine testimony to the righteous is described—*μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαρτυρηθέντι*.

To sum up and return to the question of text. It appears that the acceptableness of Abel's sacrifice to God made it the type of the Christian's acceptable sacrifice, and that it was so quoted against the Jews in Justin's and in Tertulian's time. That Justin in referring to it in the *Dialogue with Trypho* does not mention Abel by name, but has him in mind when he quotes generally those who lived before Abraham as not being bound by Sabbath or circumcision. That in the thick of an argument on the subject Justin falls into the language which the author of Hebrews had used in reference to Abel, and adds a thought which belongs not to the testimony book but to Hebrews. That in referring to Hebrews he uses the same word, *ἡδίων*, in the same degree of comparison, in equally close connexion with *θυσία*, which Cobet has suggested as a substitute for the lifeless word *πλείονα* in Hebrews. The substitution is palæographically easy and greatly increases the force of the passage. Therefore Cobet's conjecture that we should read *ἡδίονα* for *πλείονα* is supported by a passage in Justin which is so full of the spirit of Hebrews and so clearly uses the language of this verse that it deserves high consideration as an early patristic reference. If this argument is accepted, we have textual evidence for Hebrews xi. 4 older than the earliest direct quotation, that of Clement of Alexandria, and this evidence supports the reading *ἡδίονα*.

To come now to the second textual difficulty in this verse.

Quite apart from any evidence respecting *ἡδίονα*, if it is allowed that Justin is referring to Hebrews xi. 4, we have fresh evidence for the uncertain text in the latter part of the verse. Justin has *μοι . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαρτυρηθέντι*. In Hebrews we have first the aorist indicative passive with no agent expressed, then the present participle active. Justin's reference retains the aorist passive but in the participial construction. If we turn his passive into active again, we see that his reading of Hebrews must have been *μαρτυροῦντος . . . τοῦ θεοῦ*. But did he read *αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτῷ*? Justin's *μοι* represents the subject of the passive *μαρτυρηθέντι*, and by it he identifies himself with the offerer of the acceptable sacrifice. What he says (though in the dative case ¹) is "I being witnessed to by God"; and if we are to find an original for every part of that in Hebrews, it was "God witnessing to *him*," and Justin must have read *αὐτῷ*. There is a fair presumption that Justin's reading of the doubtful words was *αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and we have earlier inferential evidence in support of Clement of Alexandria's text, which Westcott and Hort believed to be the true one.

J. D. MAYNARD.

¹ The case of *μοι . . . μαρτυρηθέντι* is of course determined by the construction of Justin's own sentence and has nothing to do with Hebrews.

THE AUTHORITIES USED IN THE ACTS I.-XII.¹

ON what authorities was Luke's History of the early apostolic period based? Its trustworthiness rests ultimately on the answer to this question—at least, for those who are not content with the old-fashioned assumption of direct Divine inspiration, and who have had to dismiss as decisively disproved and inconsistent with known facts the old idea that he was one of the earliest disciples and actually one of the two who were going to Emmaus on the day of the Resurrection.

Luke's history is trustworthy to us, because he had access to good sources of information and made use of his opportunities. He mentions in the opening sentence of the first book of his History that he had come into personal relations with persons "which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word." Those who are going to make a serious study of a historian must begin, and do always in the case of a non-Christian historian begin, by accepting as a foundation for their investigation his own account of his sources and authorities. If they cannot accept this account, they cannot accept the writer as a serious authority. We start from this elementary principle, which lies at the basis of historical study, noticing only that Luke pointedly distinguishes himself from those that "were from the beginning eye-witnesses." He implies that he was not one of the original disciples, and that the first book of his History was composed after reading various written narratives, but that he was in a position to control these documentary sources in a

¹ While I am of course very much indebted to older scholars, especially Blass, Harnack, Bartlet and Knowling, not to mention the greatest and best old edition, which is the foundation of all scholars' work, I have purposely as far as possible divested myself of all other persons' ideas about authorities, and written this article from personal impressions.

degree which he counted immensely important by the oral accounts which he had received from eye-witnesses. It is quite evident that he reckoned the real value of his History to lie in the latter fact : his work was authoritative, because it rested ultimately on knowledge gained direct from the best human authorities. He was in a position to judge and to criticize, and to compare the written narratives ; and he had done so, and therefore confidently sends to Theophilus—a real person, yet at the same time one who was to Luke a typical representative of the congregations drawn from the outer world of the originally ignorant and pagan population—the first book of this History, which is more correct and satisfactory than any of the previously published histories of the Saviour's life.

That this preface to his first book applies—with proper modifications—to his second book may be taken for granted, and needs no further consideration. The difference in historical character between the two books lies mainly in this, that in the later half of the second book either he was himself the eye-witness for part of the narrative, or he had long been in other parts in most intimate relations with several of the actors in the scenes described. But in the first half of this second book he was hardly in such a good position as in the first book. The events described in the first book had overshadowed in public estimation those described in the opening chapters of the second book, both at the moment when they were occurring, and in subsequent history. Peter and the rest of the Twelve, and of the whole Church, had their attention so occupied with, and so concentrated on the past, viz., the life and, above all, the death of Jesus, that the present sank into insignificance as being merely an evanescent state, and only preparatory for an impending transformation. No one seems to have thought that this

present time was worthy of formal historical registration. All lived much in the past and the future.

It is not meant by these words that there was no contemporary writing of events in the first score of years after the Resurrection. To any one who takes into account the prevalence of writing at that time in ordinary life and about everyday matters, such an assertion would be incredible in respect of a congregation consisting of many thousands of persons, a congregation which had attained already, at an early point in this period, a high state of organization, with a church fund managed by a responsible board of seven officials (*septem viri mensis ordinandis*, as they might suitably have been termed in Latin), with a superior board of twelve officials, and an elaborate system of alimention (as the Romans would have called it), i.e. charitable distribution of food to the poor on fixed principles and in a systematic way.

The more closely the history of this first period is scanned, the more striking are the evidences of method and order and permanence in the Church constitution. It was no collection of individuals sitting in momentary expectation of the Coming of the Lord and the end of all earthly things, as many modern devotees of the Eschatological theory love to describe it. It was a firm and definite organization, resting on a strong foundation in the past, and looking forward to a mighty future, fully conscious of the inevitable truth of the Saviour's prophecies, that this organization, as yet confined to one city, was to extend over the whole earth by steps and in ways which they did not venture even to think about, much less to form plans for realizing.

If this had been a congregation of mere eschatological enthusiasts and dreamers, the eagerness with which they were ready to examine dispassionately, and to accept, if

approved, every new step in method would be quite inconceivable and psychologically impossible. Enthusiasts are only too apt to be one-sided : they see their own method with so single and concentrated intensity of gaze that they can see nothing else which differs from it. But it was not the church officially, or its leaders, which made the great steps. Stephen, who found the church at his appointment wearing the appearance of a mere Hebrew sect, commended by the Pharisees as an interesting class which possibly even might have originated through "the counsel and work of God," and who burst these fetters and provoked the bitter hostility of the patriots and Pharisees, was not one of the Twelve, though he was of the Seven. But the Church went with him, and adopted his methods, and regarded his action as epoch-making. Philip, again, had no authorization from the Church, and no commission from the Twelve, when he brought the whole of Samaria into the Church. The spread of the Church to Phoenicia, and to Antioch and north Syria generally, was equally unauthorized ; and was not even engineered by any of the Seven, but only by chance missionaries. But none of these steps were regarded with any prejudice : all were estimated fairly and dispassionately on their merits. No question was asked except one : was the Spirit of God in the work ? Whither the Spirit led, the approval of the Church followed. Such openness, such utter freedom from prejudice, such perfect readiness to learn, to advance, to absorb new ideas, such willingness on the part of the older teachers to listen to younger teachers and to change their own old ways of thinking—cannot be found in a mere body of enthusiastic dreamers about a mistaken eschatological idea. It is only those who have a firm grip of the truth that are able to learn and to change. He who has the truth knows that he has only got a small part of it,

and longs for more, and will do anything, and learn from any one, if only a better and fuller hold of the truth can thereby be attained.

Moreover, an eschatological idea cannot conquer the world, since it is in itself final and cannot stoop to learn (for to learn is, with its devotees, to unlearn). Hence the eschatological mirage has produced this great evil in modern scholarship, that it tends to cause an exaggerated idea of the gap which divided Paul from the Twelve. Paul was one of the outsiders who developed the ideas of the Church, and was accepted by its leaders, though not immediately by the whole Church.

But on this we must not dwell. The purpose of these words is to insist on the evidences of permanent organization in the first Church, and to infer therefrom that there must have been a certain degree of writing involved, of reports, of registration of facts, in order that organization should be carried into practical effect. Every one who learns what were the methods of that period, how administration was carried on, how numberless little religious societies in almost every city of the Graeco-Roman world had their own special assemblies, their assemblies, their officials, their decrees, and their registered acts, knows that something of this kind must have existed in the great assembly of the Church of Jerusalem. To take here only one example—the one which seems to be the clearest—I cannot for a moment doubt that, when the apostles “heard that Samaria had received the word of God,” they heard it by written report from Philip, and not by vague report or by a mere oral message sent up to Jerusalem by Philip through some other person.

This consideration places the early history of the Church on a firmer basis. Yet the *Acta*, as recorded, would be only official, and would be confined to official things, and

would not contain much of the most permanently interesting facts of Church development—since those were, as we have said, unofficial—until the wider development of the Church beyond Jerusalem had occurred. Moreover, it is highly probable that the earlier *Acta* may have perished in the great persecution when the Church was scattered after the murder of Stephen. That this was so is suggested both by the general character of the early chapters, and by one special detail. The order of the lists of names in i. 13, vi. 5 is certainly unofficial, the order of the names in xiii. 1 is apparently official. Assuming for the moment this statement—to which we shall return—we may still infer that, in a community where *Acta* had existed, there was a more orderly and trustworthy tradition, even after the destruction of the *Acta*, than in an unorganized multitude of enthusiasts. That orderly discipline was a marked feature of the primitive Church is shown, not merely by the facts of organization already mentioned, and by the whole spirit of those early chapters of Acts, but in a striking way by the word used in vi. 7: “A great multitude of priests were obedient to the Faith.”¹ A rule and a discipline is here clearly implied, comparable to the rule and discipline of the Levitical system.

In view of these facts regarding the ancient *Acta*² of the primitive Church, may we not ask whether the name of the book in later time, when it was separated from the Third Gospel, does not represent a certain view: viz., that this was the record of the *Acta* of the Church as expressed through its governing body, the Apostles. When in viii. 2 it is said that the Christians were all scattered abroad, except the apostles, this cannot fairly be pressed to imply that all the Twelve remained in Jerusalem (as it often is): the meaning is merely that the government and the governing

¹ ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει.

² πράξεις.

council of the Church continued to be there, though quite possibly some of them may have been absent for a short time, or even for a long time.

We have to ask first whether these opening twelve chapters are based on an oral or on a written source; and secondly, how far the author in each incident and episode depended on some single source or combined at his own discretion information derived from various sources.

In order to make the general drift of the following remarks clearer, it may be well to state at the outset that they start with the opinion that (except perhaps in some small parts) the authority was not written, but that the author used the oral reports of several different persons and the current tradition of the Palestinian Church as he heard it at an early date (viz., A.D. 57-59). We should not assume that in regard to any episode he confined himself to one single source of information. On the contrary, the analogy of many passages in his Gospel, in which he used Mark as his source, suggests that along with the main source he would probably work in details gathered from other authorities.¹ If he did so even when he was using a written source, he was likely to follow the same practice even more freely when he was using oral information.

The best method is to consider one by one the passages from which some hints as to his sources and his method can be gathered.

Instead of going through the opening chapters of Acts regularly from the beginning, I propose at present to set down, in a somewhat haphazard way, some notes that have suggested themselves on various passages. While the evidence is not sufficient to give certainty, it is cumulative in character. Each item stands by itself, and does not depend on the others. Hence even a mistake in estimat-

¹ See *Luke the Physician*, p. 43 f., and other parts of the first article.

ing the value of any one item does not diminish the value of the others.

In the first eleven verses of the Acts the opening three are introductory. Thereafter the scene of 4-11 would naturally be understood to be in Jerusalem: "He being assembled together with them, commanded that they should not depart from Jerusalem": this statement, indeed, does not prove where the scene was laid, but certainly suggests the city. Luke, however, did not assume that this was so: he takes the scene as laid on the Mount of Olives, as in his Gospel xxiv. 50 f., and therefore he continues in verse 12, "Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the Mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a sabbath day's journey." The explanation as to locality is designed by the author to connect the preceding narrative with the other account of the same scene as given in the Gospel; and the explanation as to distance is intended for the benefit of a public ignorant of Jerusalem, i.e. Theophilus and the congregations in Graeco-Roman cities. The two accounts rest on different authorities, and are taken by Luke as equally good (for it would be absurd to suppose that the later statement in Acts is a correction of the earlier in the Gospel), though they differ in details. This difference in details cannot have escaped Luke's attention; he was certainly aware of it, just as he was evidently aware of the differences in details between the three accounts of the conversion of St. Paul, which he records in Acts. He deliberately leaves these differences on record; these are the statements of his several authorities (in one case two statements made by the same authority, viz., Paul, at different times). If he leaves such differences designedly in his history, his reason must be that they were entirely unimportant in his estimation and for his purpose. He thought of the edification and instruction of the congrega-

tions in the west and the Aegean lands. He wished to concentrate their attention on the spiritual facts and truths, not to present a history for scholars and critics to pick to pieces. And, in the larger point of view, he is right. These differences are not in essential details. They are only in the emblematic or symbolical expression of superhuman and spiritual realities in the imperfect language of men. It is inevitable that the eternal realities, which stand outside of the fetters of time and space relations, the same always and everywhere, should be conceived and represented in different ways by different minds, and that none of these conceptions and representations should be completely sufficient, or absolutely true.

The supposition that the author of this history was, through defects of education or intellect, incapable of perceiving the differences in details between the different accounts which he records—a supposition which was, and is still, the platform for some modern writers to build theories upon, and which, when I was young and untrained in historical study, was sufficient for me—must be rejected as entirely inconsistent with the character and standard of the history as a whole. Those for whom that supposition is sufficient are not likely to agree with any historical judgment expressed by the present writer, or to read the present article. For our purpose, the important point to observe is that such differences indicate change from one authority to another in Luke's history, and combine with many other facts to prove that (as he himself tells us in his introduction) his work was composite, bringing together the evidence of many witnesses, all, in his estimation, witnesses of the highest character.

The next section, verses 13-26, contains at least three separate or separable portions. (1) We have in verse 13 the list of the Eleven who "abode" in an upper room—

a remarkable expression. Following this, we should rather have looked for some account of an incident that occurred in the upper chamber. But this incidental detail regarding the abode of the Eleven is introduced for no ulterior purpose. It is simply a little piece of information which came from Luke's informant and has survived to us in his History. It marks the original witness, and it marks the oral character of the source at this point. Luke had talked with one of those who remembered the upper room, because he, or she, had sat in it.

It is difficult to feel clear about the relation of verse 14 to verse 13. Are we to understand that the women and the brothers of Jesus also remained in the upper room, in which case the room is mentioned only as the place in which they assembled every day? Or are we to suppose that the apostles remained in the upper room as a body continuously,¹ waiting for the fulfilment of the Promise, while the others are mentioned as being in less continuous association with them? In a case where there is such a difficulty in understanding the connexion between two statements in Luke, we may always reasonably suspect that two separate courses of information are placed side by side. Where there was a single source for a narrative, the logical sequence in the thought is not doubtful; but where two separate sources are placed side by side, however good each was by itself, doubt might arise as to the relation between them.

Westcott and Hort rightly see that this enumeration in verses 13 f. of the earliest Church is broadly distinguished from the following episode, and mark it accordingly in their text.

(2) We have next the general assembly, the statement

¹ That, of course, would not imply that they were there without any temporary absence.

of their number, 120, and the speech of Peter. We can hardly suppose that this meeting of so large an assembly occurred in the upper room of verse 13; and accordingly Luke must have understood that the apostles lived and waited on in the room, as an abode in the city where they were all strangers, but that a special assembly was held elsewhere of the whole Church for the purpose of filling up the vacancy caused by the death of Judas. Here, again the difficulty in the connexion with the preceding verses rouses the thought of a change in the authority.

That the authority for the speech was not a document written down in this exact form at the time seems highly probable and almost practically certain. How far the speech is due to Luke's editing of an account given to him might be reasonably discussed. The choice of the expressions, "this diaconate" or "ministry," and "his bishopric" or "office," and "this diaconate and apostleship," seems dictated by following history, when the offices of deacon and bishop were important, and it was desired to connect them with the original organization of the earliest Church. The earliest chapters of Acts are full of details, showing that the author had clearly before his mind the important subject of the growth of organization and administrative machinery in the Church. We remember that in the Philippian Church bishops and deacons are mentioned as the only classes of officials,¹ and that Luke was closely associated with the congregation in Philippi. We observe also that, although the Seven are never in the Acts called deacons, or thought of as deacons, but are regarded more as supplementary collaborators and assistants of the Twelve, yet the noun *diakonia*, ministry, and the verb *diakonein*, to serve, are employed with regard to the duty for which they were appointed; they constitute an inter-

¹ Philippians i. 1.

mediate stage in the development of the fuller organization as it existed in Philippi (and doubtless elsewhere) about A.D. 60.

Moreover, the speech of Peter, verses 16-22, is awkwardly composed partly of his sentiments, and partly of explanatory particulars, which were quite needless in such a meeting, and which interrupt the run of the speech. The story of the death of Judas was not required among those who were familiar with events that had occurred in their midst only a few days previously; and it is one that obviously grew up at a later date in Church tradition. Luke inserts it as an explanation required by his readers, without intending to imply that Peter explained the meaning of the name *Aceldama* or rehearsed the details to his audience. But, just as in Galatians ii. 14-21, it is impossible to tell where the speech of Paul to Peter ends and the address to the Galatians is resumed, so it is difficult to tell in Acts i. 16-21 where the interposed explanation ends and the speech of Peter is resumed. This is a fault of composition, but it is one into which Luke might be betrayed as readily as Paul was. This may, perhaps, be reckoned as one of the places in Acts, where the final revision of the author is lacking, as it is in parts of chapter xvi.

(3) The explanatory interpolation in Peter's speech, verses 18, 19, is an addition by Luke for the benefit of his own readers, difficult to connect with the speech, and derived by him from a different source, doubtless oral.

In all these parts, it is not easy to see any sign of a written source. In some cases the oral character of the authority seems evident, and only in the list of the Eleven might one be disposed to think of a written document; but this document was at least not one written down at the moment, for it shows clear signs of the influence of the immediately subsequent history. This is an important and compli-

cated matter which needs larger and more careful treatment.

As to the speech of Peter, it is so much looser in construction and so much less important in its bearing on the development of doctrine than most of the other speeches in the early part of Acts, that it stands apart from them, and we may doubt whether Luke had more than a mere general indication of the purport of his speech in the information that he had received.

The order of enumeration of the Twelve has been discussed by Rev. Cuthbert Lattey in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, pp. 107-116 ; and this article must be studied by every one who approaches the question of these lists.

The parallel between the order in the lists of the Twelve (rather, of the Eleven) and of the Seven in Acts is striking : in each case the order is that of historic importance during the apostolic period, as it appears in the chapters that follow. In the one case Peter and John come first, in the other Stephen and Philip. It is no accident that dictates this order : these were the members of the two colleges that impressed themselves most deeply on the first steps in the development of the Church, as it is described stage after stage in the Acts. Luke places at the head of his list those who play the most noteworthy part in the earlier chapters of Acts, though not in the later chapters. In the later chapters, James appears more prominently than John, or even than Peter ; and the order of importance then is, as in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians ii. 9, James and Peter and John. But at first Peter and John stood out prominently ; and the list is arranged accordingly in i. 13.

Mr. Lattey has shown that this order is an innovation in the Acts ; and he has traced in a convincing way the principle underlying the varying order of enumeration in the Synoptic Gospels : the earliest being that of Matthew,

the intermediate one Mark's, and the latest Luke's,¹ while the list in Acts belongs to a later period. The fact that the order in Luke's Gospel differs from that which he gives in the Acts, taken in conjunction with the other fact that the order in the Acts is that of importance in the earlier, but not in the later chapters of that book, makes it probable that the order in i. 13 was not Luke's choice, but was given him by some authority on whom he depended in that part of his work. The only alternative is to suppose a quite remarkable attention, on Luke's part, to historical accuracy in the minutest matters of detail and arrangement, so that even in the same list of names he varied the order of enumeration in different parts of his work to suit the varying importance of the personages at different stages in the development of history. The latter supposition seems improbable; and we must therefore conclude that popular estimation varied the order of enumeration at different periods in accordance with order of importance.² This variation, then, was taken by Luke from the different authorities whom he used, and was retained by him as characteristic; but one cannot take these authorities as official lists, for official lists would naturally preserve the same order always. Only in unofficial enumerations would the order vary according to varying temporary importance.

The list of the Seven cannot safely be supposed to be

¹ This priority is characteristic of Matthew's list, and its character as a list of pairs suits well the theory as to the contemporary registration in the common non-Markan Source of Matthew and Luke stated in the paper called *The Oldest Written Gospel* (published second in *Luke the Physician*). Luke used that Source, but Matthew's Gospel is founded on it.

² As Mr. Lattey observes and has been often pointed out by older writers on the same subject, these lists of the Twelve must always be taken as arranged in three groups of four; and the variation is only within each group, while the groups are permanent and unchanging.

an official list, determined by order of precedence in selection. It is improbable that the two first in precedence at the original appointment should also be the two who subsequently signalized themselves first and second in actual history. We must, therefore, regard the list as representing the way in which the Seven were arranged in the popular memory, i.e., in the early Church tradition.

Moreover, among the Seven, we observe that the last was a proselyte—Nicholas of Antioch. This would be in itself consistent with either supposition. The proselyte was probably chosen last; and he would also in Palestine naturally be remembered and thought of always in the last place after all the Jews. But it may safely be concluded that there must have already been other proselytes in the Church at this early time, and that Nicholas was chosen to look after them; for it may be regarded as certain that Jews would not be very ready to select an alien, a converted pagan (even although he had adopted the whole Jewish Law), to look after their food. Now, if one of the Seven was chosen to look after a particular section of the Church, it is natural to suppose that the other six had also each a special sphere of duty. Inasmuch as the apostles, in proposing the appointment, mentioned the number seven, and as it is improbable that they merely pitched on this as an old sacred number, we infer that there were seven obvious spheres of duty, and that the intention was to choose one man who should be responsible for knowing the needs and deserts of the poor and the widows in each sphere.¹ The sphere of duty which fell to Stephen may

¹ The distribution of the Church fund for charity, which the Seven had to regulate, could not be fairly performed unless they acquired a correct estimate of the needs of all persons within the section of the congregation for which they were responsible. Volunteers had previously done the work of distribution, with the apostles over them, in a vague, undefined way. Those who had signalized themselves by energy

probably be gathered from vi. 9: his action as a teacher would naturally be exercised most in his own sphere of duty. The other five spheres of duty cannot even be guessed at. It is, of course, quite conceivable that Luke knew what they were, but did not think them worth recording; but the more probable supposition is that the official record had perished, and that he knew neither the official order of precedence in the election, nor the several spheres of duty allotted to each.

On the contrary, in xiii. 1, the order is not determined by importance in subsequent history, but differs notably from it. It does, however, correspond to the order of dignity and precedence at the moment, so far as we can gather what that order would be. First comes Barnabas, as one who was sent with commission from Jerusalem, and thus represented the supreme authority of the entire Christian Church. Next come three persons who presumably had been among the founders of the Antiochian branch of the Church. Last is Saul, a late comer, who had been brought in quite recently by Barnabas as a helper, and who had already signalized himself so much as to have been sent on a special mission to Jerusalem as colleague to Barnabas. He had, therefore, gained a place among the five outstanding leaders in Antioch; but old connexion with the work still dictated an order of precedence, which put him only in the fifth place.

Here we have, evidently, the fact of the moment permanently recorded: in other words, we have the official list as it stood about the year 46 A.D., unaffected by subsequent changes in importance among the five. Totally different is it in the case of the lists of the Twelve and of the Seven,

and ability and devotion (vi. 3) were now chosen as the Seven; but that does not imply the end of voluntary work. Rather, the voluntary work still continued, but it was now under responsible supervision.

which are given according to importance in the historical future: this points to the tradition generally current in the primitive Church, as the source of Luke's information, while the accuracy in detail points to a very early tradition, which had not grown faint and vague through lapse of years.

Hence it is natural to conclude that he gathered this information when he was in Palestine in A.D. 57 to 59, partly from oral information, partly from documents of the period after the first great persecution and dispersion. The order of the Twelve is not that of A.D. 57, or even of A.D. 45, when James is regarded as the head of the Church and the one who finally utters the decision of the whole body. But it is the order of the first ten years or so after the Resurrection,¹ and to this time belongs some written list, or some list preserved in the memory of a person whose activity lay in that period, which was Luke's authority here. The place of honour given to James probably began in the period when the Twelve began to scatter over the world, and to give themselves largely to foreign mission work: James was then entrusted with the leading position in Jerusalem, and it will be necessary to allude to the possibility that he is the Apostle James, son of Alphaeus, placed in this position of dignity as the eldest cousin ("brother") of Jesus. This period may be assumed as beginning with the mission of Peter to Samaria, a year or two after the death of Stephen. Peter, who had hitherto taken the lead in Jerusalem, was henceforth probably much engaged in foreign work; in Samaria, in Palestine generally (ix. 32), in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), and (as I have argued elsewhere) in Corinth and Rome as early as A.D. 54.

¹ Making allowance for the old-standing division into three groups of four, which belonged to the lifetime of Christ, and persisted for some time afterwards, but which was not likely to remain in permanent effect so late as 57 or even 45.

Opinion as to sources in this passage depends largely on the disputed question as to the last group of apostles, James, son of Alphaeus, Simon, and Judas. Are these to be identified with the three "brothers of the Lord," who in that case must be His cousins? The most serious difficulty which that theory of identification has to contend with lies in the present passage, where the brothers of the Lord are so pointedly distinguished from the apostles. If three of the four brothers are already mentioned as the third group of the Eleven, why should Luke add that along with the Eleven there were assembled also the women and Mary, the mother of the Lord, and his brothers?

Suppose we assume that the identification is correct, how can we account for such a double mention of what is almost the same group? It cannot be thought that Luke could have been ignorant of the identity between the last three of the Eleven with three of the four brothers who had met along with the Eleven? Nor does it seem sufficient to say with Mr. Lattey that Luke would probably not have mentioned the four here, had it not been that Joses, the last of the four, was excluded from the number of the apostles. The difficulty appears to me so great as to be almost insuperable, except possibly on the supposition that here we have a case where two authorities have been amalgamated, and that in the amalgamation Luke was led into a careless form of expression by the analogy of a current way of speaking, which is exemplified in 1 Corinthians ix. 5, "the rest of the apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas."

I should not consider that it was justifiable even to mention such a theory as an explanation, were it not that the second half of the chapter, verses 13-26, has long appeared to me apart from, and previous to this question, to be put together with less than Luke's usual skill from more than one source of information.

I do not profess to be able to analyse the first chapter, and divide it between its different authorities. It is not a case where we have to distinguish between formal written sources. I believe that all the sources of Luke's information here were oral (except possibly the list of the Eleven). A writer like Luke, catching up the words of several informants, welds them afterwards into a narrative, in which you may feel vaguely the difference of the parts, but in which the points of juncture cannot be precisely indicated.

As regards verses 13 and 14, we are placed in the position of choosing between two alternatives, one a very simple and easy one, the other a complicated and difficult one. If the "brethren of the Lord" are a group different from the apostles, the list of those who meet in the upper chamber, a sort of inner circle consisting of those most closely connected with Jesus during his lifetime, would appear to be homogeneous and derived from one authority older than Luke. That is a natural and tempting view, but not a necessary view. If the "brethren (i.e. cousins) of the Lord" are identical with the third group of the Eleven, we must suppose that the list of those present in the upper room was made up by Luke himself from two or more different sources of information, and that he put them together rather awkwardly. It is unsafe to assume that the simple must be preferred to the complicated view; the latter has some notable advantages, but also has to contend with some other difficulties; and the question is one that cannot here be treated completely.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(To be continued.)

NOTE ON ἘΝΕΡΓΕΙΣΘΑΙ

I SEE that Mr. Ross writes under the impression that he stands alone in maintaining that ἐνεργεῖσθαι should be taken as passive and not middle wherever it occurs in Biblical Greek. If he looks at my note on St. James (v. 16), he will find some three pages of examples in proof of the same proposition, in answer to the notes of Dean Alford and Bishop Lightfoot. I refer there to the following authorities: Hort on Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. p. 852, § 36, ἡ ἀκοὴ διὰ σωματικῶν πόρων ἐνεργουμένη, where he says ἐνεργουμένη "passive, as always"; Stephanus, after quoting examples of the passive use from Polybius, goes on to say, *invenitur autem in N. T. significatione etiam activa*, which is, however, corrected by the latest editor in the words *immo semper passiva*. St. James' words δεήσις ἐνεργουμένη are translated by Macknight "inwrought prayer," by Benson "inspired," by Bassett "when energized by the Spirit of God," after Bull's *fervere atque impetu quodam divino acta et incitata*. The last, in his *Examen Censurae* (vol. v. p. 22 foll.) says ἐνεργεῖσθαι *fere semper id significat quod Latine dicimus agi, agitari, exerceri, effici*, and he supports this by Tertullian's renderings of Romans vii. 5, Galatians v. 6 and by Chrysostom on 2 Corinthians i. 6, ἡ σωτηρία ὑμῶν τότε ἐνεργεῖται μεζόνως, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ δέικνυται, αὖξεται, ἐπιτείνεται, ὅταν ὑπομονὴν ἔχη . . . οὐκ εἶπεν τῆς ἐνεργούσης, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐνεργουμένης, δεικνύς ὅτι ἡ χάρις πολλὰ εἰσέφερεν ἐνεργούσα ἐν αὐτῷ. I then sum up the discussion in the words, "the passive interpretation being thus supported by the early Greek and Latin commentators, as well as by the constant usage in non-biblical Greek, we are naturally led to ask whether there is any necessity for a different explanation in the

nine passages of the New Testament in which the word occurs, viz., eight times in St. Paul and once here. Dr. E. A. Abbott writes to me that, after careful examination of all the Pauline passages, he is convinced that the passive meaning is not only possible, but in every case superior to the middle; and Dr. Hort in a private letter takes the same view of our text and of Galatians v. 6, without touching on the other examples."

J. B. MAYOR:

*SOME PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL
INTERPRETATION.*¹

LET my first words from this Chair be a tribute of piety to the distinguished scholar, the revered teacher, who has laid down its duties after three and twenty years of service. I have a vivid recollection of attending his inaugural lectures on Ewald in 1886,² and of the impression which they made upon me. They were far above our heads as undergraduates, but they communicated to us the stir of a new experience. Voice and manner at once caught our attention ; it was as though we listened to a poet imparting his vision, or to an artist revealing the aim and secret of his craft ; above all, we gained some conception of what real knowledge means, of the exclusive devotion which its pursuit demands, of the sacredness of the cause of truth. The impression made in those early days has been strengthened by the lectures and writings of the years which followed. Many of us began to study Isaiah and the Psalms under his guidance ; he opened new worlds to us ; and though the author has changed his views since on many points, we still find those commentaries the most helpful in our language. The best kind of teacher is always learning himself and expects his students to learn with him ; he does not do all the work for them, but sets them thinking and exploring on the lines which he points out. Such a teacher Dr. Cheyne has

¹ Inaugural lecture delivered by the writer, as Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, in the Examination Schools, Oxford, January 20, 1909.

² *EXPOSITOR*, vol. iv., 1886, pp. 241 ff., 361 ff.

been. He has never lost his vitality and freshness ; his courage has never faltered, even in days when the principles of Biblical criticism were neither so well understood nor so widely accepted as they are now. The teaching which has come from this Chair has always been on the side of progress. No living master, perhaps, expects more of his learners than Dr. Cheyne in the way of intelligent co-operation ; but the discipline, if sometimes severe, is thoroughly wholesome ; he would spur us on to greater efforts and new points of view ; he would bid us not be afraid of the truth wherever it may lead us, and whatever the cost may be. Both his teaching and writing are coloured by his own strongly marked individuality, and this gives to both a peculiar attractiveness. The most transparent of writers, as he was once called, he takes us all into his confidence and discloses the working of his idea. And since he combines with a learning which cannot be surpassed in this country, or on the continent, the mind of a poet and the fine and beautiful temper of " a man of the spirit," his work has had an influence second to none in authority and range. This is not the occasion to enumerate in detail the immense services which my predecessor has rendered to Biblical science in these fruitful years. If it is the duty of a Professor to teach those who are willing to come and listen, he has an equal obligation towards those who are not within reach of the living voice ; he is called upon to make his contribution towards the advancement of learning by his written works. No one in this University has more amply fulfilled the obligation than Dr. Cheyne ; and no Oxford scholar has counted for more in the great world outside, wherever the Bible is studied. Without forgetting the importance of his other books, I should like to bear my testimony (for what it is worth) to that magnificent enterprise of combined scholar-

ship which will always bear his name, the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. It would be difficult to point to any work of the kind edited with more consummate skill; and the whole of this vast undertaking is penetrated by a dominant spirit, inexhaustible in resource, fertile, original, adventurous. The student has already found in these splendid volumes not only a rich treasury of information but a stimulus to fresh inquiry in almost every department. With the publication of the *Encyclopaedia* Dr. Cheyne inaugurated a fresh epoch in his career as a Biblical scholar. He is teaching us now to look out for more signs of corruption and alteration in the traditional text than we used to suspect, to apply more vigorous tests to current views, and to keep an open mind for fresh discoveries in geography and archaeology and early religion. Whether we are convinced or not by his North Arabian theory, as it may be called for short, we cannot withhold our admiration for the astounding feat of heroism—it can be called nothing else—which has rewritten the work of a lifetime in the light of what he considers to be a discovery of new truth.

In the inaugural lecture of 1886 he quoted some words of Niebuhr: "History has two means by which it supplies the deficiencies of its sources—criticism and divination"; and on these words he based an appeal for "a more penetrating criticism and a better regulated though not more intense divination." The appeal was characteristic, and he has repeated it all through the years of his professoriate. He is not one, however, to despair of the younger generation of students whom he has influenced, because they must needs work on a humbler level according to their own lights. He has bequeathed to his successor a high tradition of concentration, of hard work, of single-minded devotion; and the disciple called to take up the succession, and in all

honesty realizing his unworthiness, is compelled to pray for "a double portion" of the master's spirit.

In thinking over the way in which I might best approach the task which my office lays upon me, the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, it occurred to me that there was something to be learned from a brief study of the principles of interpretation which may be discovered in Holy Scripture itself, especially in that part of it which I have to teach. At the outset the first thing that strikes us is a fundamental difference of method between the ancient and the modern practice. While we write commentaries *on* the text, the early practice was to write commentaries *in* the text; or if the gloss was not actually inserted, it was written on the margin and ultimately crept in beside the original passage. The ancient material of the Old Testament has passed through a long course of editing; it has been altered, adapted, enriched by successive generations of pious commentators. As a rule they interpreted the past by the present, and thus naturally enough transferred to antiquity the ideas and customs with which they were familiar. The interests of edification were supreme; it was not history for its own sake, but history for the sake of its moral which determined how an early document was to be understood. Matters offensive to a growing spirituality of view were expunged; sometimes increased knowledge led to a revision of traditional writings; prophecies, especially unfulfilled prophecies, were re-interpreted to suit new needs. There is hardly a book in the Old Testament which has not been annotated and re-handled in this way: it took the Book of Judges, for instance, some five hundred years to reach its present form; the literary history of our Book of Isaiah covers a period almost as long; in fact the ancient Scriptures as a whole grew with the growth of the people. And what is true

of the Old Testament is equally true of other ancient traditional books. In his illuminating lectures on the Rise of the Greek Epic, my old friend of school and undergraduate days, whom we are proud to welcome to the Chair of Greek, Professor Gilbert Murray, has shown that the Iliad and Odyssey can only be understood if they are regarded not as primitive poems but as the products of a long process of development ; and he makes an effective use of the analogy of the Old Testament to support his argument. Some instances of the exegetical methods of Old Testament editors are two well known to need more than a passing reference. We are familiar with the manner in which the Deuteronomic editor of Judges and Kings interpreted the history of the past by his own standards of doctrine and practice, and consequently seldom allowed the conduct of rulers and people to pass without an unfavourable judgment. The artless enthusiasm of the author of Chronicles, again, leads him into the most courageous treatment of his sources ; a musical Levite, with a passion for the temple and its services, he must needs assign to the arrangements so dear to his heart the prestige of immemorial and unbroken usage, and he rewrites history accordingly. I have mentioned the tendency to get rid of names and things offensive to later religious feeling. There was a time when Israelites could use harmlessly the title Baal when speaking of Yahweh ; Gideon was known as Jerub-baal, Jonathan and David called their sons by such names as Merib-baal, Ish-baal, Baal-yada ; but Hosea found it necessary to protest against the custom ; and in later times the scribes altered Baal to bosheth, "shame," and turned Jerub-baal into Jerub-besheth, Ish-baal into Ish-bosheth, etc. In Chronicles the names were allowed to stand in their original form ; but in Samuel the names were altered, and the change must have been introduced

at some time later than the date of Chronicles, i.e. after the third century B.C.¹ The name of the idol set up by Antiochus Epiphanes upon the altar of burnt-offering must be given an opprobrious disguise; it was an image of Baal-shamaim, Baal of heaven; in Daniel the name becomes "the abomination which appals."² Again, it would never do to allow the patriarchs to set up pillars, or to offer worship under a sacred oak; accordingly the pillar is turned into an altar and the oak into grove.³ Nor must Ahijah carry about for Saul's benefit an ephod, probably the loin-cloth which the priest put on when he wished to consult or to deliver an oracle⁴; so Ahijah is made to carry about with him "the ark of God."⁵ It is not necessary to multiply instances of this kind. But I will illustrate my point a little further. I need not remind you that the stories of the creation, of the antediluvian patriarchs, and of the flood, are told in duplicate; the documents which narrate them are J, J², and P. It is common knowledge that these primitive traditions were more or less influenced by the similar traditions current among the Babylonians, though in passing through Israelite channels they have been purged of the gross polytheism

¹ Hos. ii. 16, 17, ix. 10. Judg. vi. 32, etc. 1 Chr. viii. 34, ix. 40, xiv. 7. 2 Sam. iv. 4, 5, v. 16, ix. 6, xi. 21.

² Dan. xi. 31, xii. 11, cf. ix. 27.

³ Gen. xxxiii. 20; cf. 1 Kings xvi. 32 with 2 Kings iii. 2. Gen. xviii. 1 cf. LXX.; Deut. xi. 30, cf. LXX. and Gen. xii. 6.

⁴ So the ephod is now explained with much probability: Sellin in Bezold's *Orient. Studien*, ii. 699 ff. (1906); Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäologie*,² 347 f. (1907). It might be made of costly materials, as in Judg. viii. 26; in Egyptian and Phœnician figures such richly ornamented loin-cloths are represented. The ephod worn by the high priest and by the priests in later times was also a loin-cloth, but it had lost its ancient significance and become merely one of the sacerdotal insignia.

⁵ 1 Sam. xiv. 18, cf. R.V.M.; similarly the case of Abiathar, cf. 1 Sam. xxiii. 6 with 1 Kings ii. 26. In 1 Sam. xv. 23, *idolatry* has probably been substituted for *ephod*.

which is characteristic of them in their Babylonian forms. Now the curious thing is that Babylonian influence appears most markedly in the document where we should least expect to find it, in the Priestly narratives, Genesis i., v., vii., viii., In the earliest document, J, the tradition is native not Babylonian; in J² a general acquaintance with the Babylonian forms is clear; but in P we trace a knowledge of details, even a studied approximation to Babylonian types, which fills us with surprise. Thus it is P who has preserved in Genesis i. two Babylonian words, the words for "void" and "the deep"; as in the Seven Tables of Creation so in Genesis i. the universe reaches its finished state in progressive stages; beginning with the emergence of light, as in Babylonia with the appearance of Marduk the god of light, and ending with the creation of man in the image of God, as in Babylonia with the creation of man out of the blood of Marduk mixed with earth. Again, in the list of patriarchs before the flood J originally gave seven names, in J² the number is increased to ten, recalling the number of the ten antediluvian kings of Babylon in Berosus' list; but in P this list is worked over, altered in details, and arranged in a more formal genealogy; the patriarchs are credited with fabulously long lives; all in agreement with Babylonian tradition. The duplicate narrative of the flood, again, shows in J² an adherence to the general outline of the Babylonian version, but P knows its very details, the measurements of the ship, the stories, the cells, the order to pitch the ship within and without with pitch. Here, then, we have an instance of a Biblical exegete revising the work of his predecessors in the light of more accurate knowledge gained from outside. During the exile in Babylonia the Priestly writer came into more direct contact with Babylonian traditions than was possible in the land of Judah; and while his own high con-

ceptions of God and the universe remained unaffected by the contact, he did not refuse to derive, even from Babylonian traditions, such information as suited his purpose.

It is instructive to notice how the editorial process, in dealing with old traditions, reflects the gradual development of national institutions, particularly of the hierarchy. A striking instance may be found in Numbers xvi., the story of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. The narrative of course is composite. First of all we pick out the story of Dathan and Abiram ; these make a protest against the civil authority of Moses, " Thou must needs make thyself a prince over us " : the authority of Moses receives an awful confirmation in the earthquake which swallows up the malcontents. We unravel next an account of the rebellion of Korah and his followers ; this is a revolt against the levitical rights of Moses, " Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation is holy, every one of them, and Yahweh is among them " : it is laymen here who are chafing under the domination of Levites ; in the end the tribe of Levi is upheld by the destruction of the rebels in fire from God. But the story of Korah when closely examined reveals yet another contest, or rather another interpretation put upon the last episode ; here Korah and other Levites claim the priesthood, the prerogatives of Aaron himself, " Seek ye the priesthood also ? and Aaron, what is he that ye murmur against him ? " : the result is to establish the priesthood for ever in the possession of Aaron and his descendants. There is one stage further. Among the descendants of Aaron themselves rivalries and jealousies went on until the priesthood became permanently secured ; the true line, therefore, must be singled out and shown to have been settled from the beginning of the national history. We turn to Leviticus x. : there we are told how the two eldest sons of Aaron committed a

serious breach of ritual ; they were punished by the fire of Yahweh, which devoured them ; the elder sons of Levi were thus eliminated, and the priesthood secured to the younger branches of the family.¹ Truly a dreadful page in the record of hierarchical developments ! After the exile, when hopes revived, and there seemed to be a prospect of seeing once more a king on the throne of David and a priest in a restored temple, the prophet Zechariah was told to make crowns out of some offerings which had been presented, and set them on the head of Zerubbabel the prince of the old royal family, and on the head of Joshua the high priest ; the two were to reign over the new community as joint rulers in church and state : “ Zerubbabel shall sit and rule upon his throne, and Joshua shall be priest on his right hand, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.” So the text originally ran ; but it has been altered by a later scribe ; Zerubbabel has been cut out, and all the honours heaped upon Joshua. As time went on, history proved that the hope of a Davidic king was vain ; the high priest became the supreme authority ; and the text was altered to suit the facts. Or was the alteration prompted by sacerdotal jealousy of state interference ? The prophet must not be allowed to enthrone prince and priest side by side. Whatever the reason may have been, the change introduced into the text—it was clumsily done, for we can recover the original reading without much difficulty—reflected the changing fortunes or opinions of the people.

What are we to conclude from our observation of the methods of Old Testament exegetes and editors ? The answer is clear. The Old Testament was interpreted on the principle that it “ was at all times a word full of fresh

¹ See Stanley A. Cook, *Notes on O. T. History*, pp. 75 ff.

life and not a dead book." New truths and discoveries were continually being found in it. "Hence every period, every school, every individuality introduced into the Bible its own way of regarding the contents of the Bible." The Holy Book thus "became the full expression of the higher life of the people." I am quoting some words of Geiger published so long ago as 1857;¹ the illustrations which he gives are inadequate, and will not all bear examination; but the progress of Biblical studies during the last fifty years has only confirmed with increasing emphasis the truth thus declared. As a living word from God, speaking to each generation an appropriate message, claiming from each a response of spiritual intelligence, that is how Jewish students regarded the traditional scriptures of their religion. Like a river fed by the streams which join it along its course, the record of God's revelation has come down to us enriched by those who were able to contribute to it something of their own insight and experience. In a fuller sense than we have been accustomed, perhaps, to think, the Bible is the record of a progressive, historical revelation; it must be studied in the historical spirit. We must learn to appreciate each stage in the long process and assign to each its just value; obviously, too, it is more than ever necessary to devote fresh study to the text that we may be able to detect the handiwork of editors and scribes; and we must be on the watch for new discoveries which may throw light on the historical situation or enable us to account for the particular interpretation put upon the text. The methods indeed of those early students were wholly different from ours and we cannot follow them; we must not read into the past the moral standards or the religious ideas of the

¹ *Urschrift*, p. 72 f., quoted by Cheyne, *Introd. to Bk. of Isaiah*, p. xix.

present ; nor must we expect to discover in the prophets, for instance, New Testament things under Old Testament names. Our methods will be those of our own day, the methods of historical and literary criticism ; but a principle of sound interpretation we may well learn from those devout scholars, our predecessors of long ago, who interpreted their Bible as a living word of God speaking to them in a language which was in touch with realities, and with an authority which was that of the Truth itself.

And there is one other principle of interpretation which I think we may discern in the work of the Biblical editors and scribes ; it is closely connected with the principle of which I have been speaking. These ancient exegetes were students of prophecy, that characteristic product of Israel's religious genius. Their study had trained them to familiarity with the prophetic manner of viewing the history of the past and the movements of the present. For the most part these students of the Bible lived in an age when the voice of prophecy was silent, when faithful hearts were haunted by disappointment ; " We see not our signs," they cried, " there is no more any prophet ; there is not one among us who knoweth how long " (Ps. lxxiv. 9). All the more eagerly, then, the ancient prophetic writings were searched for guidance, for consolation ; they were re-interpreted and enlarged in scope. Men turned from the unhappy present, say, at the end of the Persian period, to fortify themselves by recalling the days of the famous past. In some such way the great persons and the great events of former days acquired ideal proportions ; they became symbols, prophecies capable of far-reaching application. Thus the whole system of Israel's ceremonial and moral statutes came to be known as " the law of Moses," the ideal lawgiver (cf. Mal. iv. 4) ; David, " the darling of Israel's songs " and

her gallant warrior-king, became the typical Psalmist; Solomon, the typical wise man. The Exodus, the overthrow of Midian, the destruction of Sennacherib, were interpreted as types of deliverance and overthrow. At this period the text of Isaiah received additions of a Messianic and apocalyptic character; ¹ in the case of the other prophets, Amos, Hosea, Micah, Jeremiah, passages seem to have been interpolated to relieve the prevailing sternness of the message and introduce a ray of hope.² It is held by many critics that the three famous Messianic prophecies, Isaiah ix. 2-7, xi. 1-9, Micah v. 2-5, belong to the age after the exile; chiefly for the reason that they speak of the royal family as reduced almost to extinction, as a "stump" left in the ground, and that they appear to have made no impression upon the times of Isaiah and of his immediate successors. Jeremiah and Second Isaiah, who are familiar with the writings of Isaiah, know nothing of this coming Saviour, nor does Ezekiel refer to him; Haggai and Zechariah fix their hopes on Zerubbabel, but betray no acquaintance with earlier promises of an approaching king who is to work a deliverance and set up a kingdom of righteousness; in all these prophets Yahweh Himself is the Saviour, not the Messianic king. It must be admitted that there is considerable force in these arguments; and the whole subject of the rise of those hopes and ideals which we are accustomed to call Messianic needs fresh investigation. But I see no reason why this ideal should not have taken shape so far back as the time of Isaiah; the argument from silence is proverbially unsafe; and there is really nothing in the language or terms of the prophecies which compels us to say that they could

¹ E.g. Isa. xxiv.-xxvii., xxxiv., xxxv.

² E.g. Am. ix. 11-15. Hos. i. 10f. Mic. ii. 12 f., iv. 1-5 (cf. iii. 12). Zeph. iii. 19 t. Jer. xxx. 10, 11, etc.

not have been written by Isaiah.¹ But even if we adopt the usual view, and date the rise of this Messianic ideal so far back as the eighth century, there can be no doubt that it took increasing hold of the imagination and hope of the people during the later periods of Jewish history. This is apparent from the undoubted insertions of Messianic passages, and from the enlargements of ancient texts, made by those faithful students who turned to former prophecy in order to strengthen their faith in the destiny of their race.² Few things in the history of Israel's religion rouse our admiration more than the way in which these men clung to their hope in spite of continual disappointment and hardship of every kind. Let me give an instance. Jeremiah had prophesied that the exile should last seventy years (xxix. 10, xxv. 11); then Babylon would be punished, Israel restored to its own land (xxiv. 5, 6), and the good time would arrive under the new David, the righteous Branch (xxiii. 5, 6). The captivity in a sense did come to an end, but the good time did not arrive. Still the seventy years remained a fixed term in prophetic hopes and longings (Zech. i. 12); Haggai and Zechariah hailed Zerubbabel as the expected Branch of David, and they declared that when once the temple was rebuilt the glories of the Messianic kingdom would appear. The temple was rebuilt, but Zerubbabel vanished into obscurity, and no glorious kingdom followed. Generation after generation struggled on, and suffered, and never let go its hope. The seventy years continued to be a

¹ In the case of Mic. v. 2-5 this does not hold good to the same degree: the name Ephrathah is only found elsewhere in late passages.

² E.g. Mic. vi. and vii.; Jer. xxv. 12-14, xxix. 14-15, xli. 25 f., xlix. 23-27, 28-39, etc. In not a few instances the Massoretic scribes have made a pathetic attempt, by altering the vocalization, to interpret as future verbs which were meant originally to be past; see Driver, *Tenses*, p. 216, n. 4; Gray in *New World*, Mar. 1899, pp. 124-143.

rallying-point for drooping hearts. At last, about 168 B.C., the author of Daniel came forward with a happy suggestion : Jeremiah must be re-interpreted ; the fulfilment of the prophecy has only been adjourned ; the seventy years need only be multiplied by seven, i.e. turned into weeks of years ; 69½ are gone, only half a week remains ; in 3½ years Antiochus Epiphanes will meet with his fate, and the kingdom of the saints will fulfil the sure word of prophecy.¹ But the fulfilment was not yet to be. We go outside the canonical writing, and, following the skilful guidance of Dr. Charles, we find in Enoch lxxxix. 59 ff., almost contemporary with Daniel, another device for re-interpreting Jeremiah. The mystical number 70 is now taken to mean the 70 shepherds, i.e. the angelic rulers of the heathen countries. Their government is to come to an end in the present generation ; the Messianic kingdom is therefore close at hand. But again this hope was not realized. Coming down to circ. A.D. 90, after the destruction of Jerusalem, we meet with yet a further attempt to re-interpret Daniel and keep alive the ancient promise. Dr. Charles has called our attention to a passage in 4 Ezra (xii. 11, 12) in which Daniel's prophecy about the Greek kingdom is re-applied to the more formidable tyranny which had succeeded it in the East. The Fourth and last Empire, which the angel in Daniel vii. 19-25 explains to be Greek, is now declared to be Roman ; and God is made to say to Ezra, with naïve frankness, that there had been a mistake : "The eagle which thou sawest rising out of the sea, this is the fourth kingdom which appeared in vision to Daniel thy brother ; but it was not interpreted to him as I now interpret it to thee."²

¹ Dan. vii. 25, 26, ix. 2, 25-27, xii. 7.

² Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 171 ff. ; Beer in *Kautzsch's Apokr. und Pseudepigr. des A. T.*, p. 294 n.

Thus we trace the unquenched vitality of a principle of interpretation which found in the history and promises contained in the Holy Book an ideal, prophetic, mystical element capable of continuous application ; and again I think we may recognize the principle as a sound one. These early students interpreted their Bible in a sense which pointed to some larger issue and encouraged the hope of a higher fulfilment. To call them mystics would be, perhaps, to suggest too much ; but they were men who had strong affinities with what we understand by the mystical temper. Some of their number were no doubt the writers of the Jewish Apocalypses, who, for all their fantastic dreams, were nevertheless men of intensely spiritual vision. They have something to teach us. If we would interpret the Old Testament to the full we must do justice to the ideal element which it contains, to its capacity for re-interpretation in the light of larger experience and new needs. We may call this element prophetic or Messianic ; we may call it the sign of an increasing purpose in the development of religion. In any case it is this which distinguishes the history and institutions of Israel from those of other nations. They point forward ; they are leading up to a fulfilment. The Biblical interpreters understood this thoroughly. And I think that we need to be reminded that the historical spirit is not the only spirit which we must bring to bear upon our task ; at times we are apt to forget that the Bible is something more than a text which offers scope for our ingenuity, or an archaeological tumulus which "awaits the spade of the explorer." The Old Testament is first and foremost a work of religion, and it must be interpreted in the religious spirit. The worthiest interpreter will be in full sympathy with that temper of his distant predecessors which I have described as mystical.

It is significant, and I think not fanciful, that the Word of God is the name given, in the prophetic period, to the message which the prophets received directly from God and uttered as from Him : this was the period of creation. Then followed an age when the Word of God was identified with a written book, Deuteronomy and the codified Law : this may be called the period of reflection. At last the time arrived when the Word of God became flesh and dwelt among us : this is the time of illumination—the time in which we are called to study and to understand. We must be loyal to the whole truth ; following each stage in the process of its unfolding with a trained historical sense, and interpreting it all in the light, the True Light, which has shined for us.

G. A. COOKE.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND THE LOWER CLASSES.

II.

THE student of Primitive Christianity—the classical and creative period, distinguished from all others by the two names of Jesus and Paul—now finds himself in a new position. The lower classes of the period having been rediscovered, he is enabled to test critically the correctness of the first instinctive impression which comes to us of a close connexion existing between Primitive Christianity and the lower classes. And here a remark has to be made. On the one hand we see clearly, in the light of the recent discoveries, that Kautsky and Kalthoff were glaringly mistaken in their hypothesis when they derived Primitive Christianity directly from

movements of social revolution among the proletariat. On the other hand, however, we see no less clearly—the fact indeed is overwhelming—that Primitive Christianity is closely intertwined with the lower classes. More clearly than ever before, Primitive Christianity appears to us to-day as a movement among the lower classes of the early Roman Empire, a movement, however, neither political nor social, but *religious*.

The popular character of Primitive Christianity is reflected first of all in a quarter where there is little scope for imagination, but where by dint of sober attention to details there is much to be discovered, viz., in its language. We possess in the New Testament a considerable number of Greek texts that were either written by leading men of the classical Christian period, or at least preserve fragments of their oral deliverances in the form of very early Greek reports, dating back to the creative period.

It is a matter of old observation that the Greek of these most ancient Christian texts differs markedly from the Greek of the contemporary secular literature. Indeed, the contrast was so strongly felt that, in order to account for it, a distinct form of “Biblical” or “Christian” Greek was postulated, in the formation of which the “Semitic” genius in the language of the Apostles was supposed to have taken a large part. Even in this old way of looking at the language of the Apostles there was an instinctive appreciation of the problem of division between classes, though it was defined as division between races. I believe that much is true in the details of the statements on this head. I fully recognize that there is Semitic influence in the language of the Apostles. But this influence has been beyond measure exaggerated. The *peculiarity* of apostolic Greek can certainly not be grasped by mere attention to the racial division. It is explainable by the facts of class-

division. It was popular Greek that the Apostles spoke : popular Greek with intrusive Semiticisms here and there.

Here the written memorials of the lower classes have come to our aid and helped us to understand the matter more in detail. The inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca are for the most part written in the popular colloquial language of the age. Of course this colloquial language in its turn exhibited various grades, from the vulgarities of the playground and the alley to the more restrained forms in the language of business and the courts. But in spite of its own pronounced variations it is clearly distinguishable as a whole from the Attic then employed for artistic purposes by the leading men of letters. It was bound to be so, for these literary magnates waged vehement war against the encroachments of the popular language, which to them was altogether plebeian. And now we find that the New Testament, in the majority of its component parts, speaks the non-literary language of the people. Hundreds of linguistic details that used to be set apart as isolated peculiarities of New Testament Greek can now be proved by quotations from contemporary inscriptions in Asia Minor, or from Egyptian papyri and potsherds, to have been common to all speakers of popular Greek.

There is no need for me to weary you with details. They have their place in the study and the theological class-room. But I may be allowed to add a short survey of the whole field of the New Testament writings.

The most popular in tone are the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, especially when they are reporting the sayings of Jesus. Even St. Luke, with his occasional striving after elegance, has not deprived them of their simple beauty. The Epistle of St. James clearly re-echoes the popular language of the Gospels.

The Johannine writings, including the Revelation, are also linguistically deep-rooted in the most popular colloquial

language. The Logos in the very first line of the Gospel has blinded most critics to the essential character of a book which, for all its share in the world's history, is a book of the people.

St. Paul, too, can command the terse pithiness of the homely gospel speech, especially in his ethical exhortations as pastor. These take shape naturally in clear-cut maxims such as the people themselves use and treasure up. But even where St. Paul is brooding to himself and takes more to the language of the middle class, even when he is carried away by the priestly fervour of the liturgist and by the enthusiasm of the Psalmist, his Greek never becomes literary. It is never disciplined, say, by the canon of the Atticists, never tuned to the Asian rhythm : it remains non-literary. Thickly studded with rugged, forceful words taken from the popular idiom, it is perhaps the most brilliant example of the artless though not inartistic colloquial prose of a travelled city resident of the Roman Empire, its wonderful flexibility making it just the very Greek for use in a mission to all the world.

We are thus left with the total impression that the great mass of the texts which make up the New Testament, forming at the same time the most important part of the sacred volume in point of contents, are popular in character. The traces of literary language found in some few of the other texts cannot do away with this impression. On the contrary, the contrast in which the Epistle to the Hebrews, for instance, stands linguistically to the earlier texts of Primitive Christianity is peculiarly instructive to us. It points to the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews, with its more definitely artistic, more literary language (corresponding to its theological subject-matter), constituted an epoch in the history of the new religion. Christianity is begining to lay hands on the instruments of culture. The literary and theological

period has begun ; the end of the creative period is in sight.

The modern conception of New Testament Greek is not altogether a new thing ; our advances in knowledge seldom are. Under the later Roman Empire, when the old learning and culture came into hostile collision with Christianity, pagan controversialists spoke mockingly of the language of the New Testament as a boatman's idiom. The Christian apologists accepted the taunt and made the despised simplicity of that language their joyful boast.

I consider that their pride was wholly justified. In my estimation the New Testament, a simple monument of the language of the people, stands high above the artificial products of the contemporary secular literature in gracefulness and sheer native strength. The New Testament springing from the living language contrasts with the artificial, cold, ornamental language of the literary magnates in a way that reminds me of a sight that I have often seen in the East : a field strewn with ruins, ancient marble blocks scattered in wild disorder, and shooting up among them in bright profusion the red and blue flowers of an Anatolian spring.

The significance of the linguistic criticism for our purposes is that Primitive Christianity, from the decidedly popular character of the language of the New Testament, is seen to be most intimately bound up with the non-literary lower classes. The contemporary *litterati*, intent on the pursuit of that delusive phantom, Attic as the language of art, gaze fixedly backward upon the classical past, and are out of all touch with the masses. Primitive Christianity, speaking the language of its time, is in living connexion with its contemporaries. Exalted as it is, in the persons of its great creators, high above the masses and above the upper class, it yet stands firm and immovably rooted *in* the masses.

A similar conclusion would be reached if we were to exam-

ine the New Testament from a literary point of view. We should find that some of the texts produced by Primitive Christianity are not literary at all, while the rest are not artistic literature for the cultured, but popular literature. But for the sake of brevity I will only hint at these considerations here.

Still more important is the fact that the whole cultural background of Primitive Christianity is simply the ancient culture of the people. All attempts to exhibit Primitive Christianity with the ancient philosophy as a background are highly unjust, for they uproot Primitive Christianity and drag it into the sphere of the doctrinaire culture of the upper class. All the ancient philosophy that enters into the background of Primitive Christianity is simply so much of popular wisdom as had filtered down to the lower classes. The great conflict and compromise of the Gospel with high secular culture does not begin until after St. Paul, who for his part still contemplates the wisdom of the world with the consciousness of superior strength.

In its creative period the cultural structure of Primitive Christianity is altogether popular in character. There were, it is true, decided differences in the popular element according as it was rural and Palestinian or urban and cosmopolitan. To understand these differences it is necessary to know what the culture in town and country was like in ancient times. While we were fairly well acquainted with the great cities of antiquity from literary sources, the villages and small country towns, being seldom touched on in the literature, were practically beyond our ken. Archaeology has restored them to us, chiefly by means of the papyri and ostraca that have been discovered. It is the villages and small country towns of Galilee that count for most in the background of the Synoptic Gospels, and we

have at any rate learnt something about such places in the neighbouring land of Egypt.

As regards certain Egyptian villages and small towns we now possess most abundant and vivid materials for the history of their culture. Any one who was country-bred and has still a breath of imagination in him can now without difficulty participate by sympathy in the thousand and one little things that made up the social vortex for the men and women of these places. The same trifles, of daily occurrence among their not very dissimilar neighbours in Galilee at the same epoch, served the Master of parable as symbols of the Eternal. Again and again details of the life of the Galilean people that Jesus has recorded in His parables can be illustrated from Egyptian papyri. Features in the parables of the wicked servant, the good Samaritan, the importunate widow, the prodigal son, thus find parallels. And one who is familiar with the Gospels learns still more from the total impression than from the details : they are the same men of the non-literary classes who meet us in both places. Even before the new discoveries the rural background of the Synoptic Gospels was indeed clear enough. Animals and plants, vineyard and cornfield, sun and rain, sowing and reaping—how often they figure in the words of the Master ! In the parables especially, as already hinted, innumerable incidents in the life of the farmer, the shepherd, the fisherman, and such lowly persons are immortalized. Notwithstanding the various parables of kings one cannot help feeling that the Saviour borrowed most of the forms of His symbolic language from the rural culture of the lower classes.

In contrast to the rural setting of the Gospel of Jesus the background of the Pauline mission to the world is essentially that of the populace of the great cities. Born himself in a great city, and by fate a cosmopolitan, St. Paul has not the same magnificent immediateness as the Master in his rela-

tion to nature. His figures taken from country life tend to be somewhat conventional. But where St. Paul uses legal metaphors, especially those taken from the law of domestic relations, inheritance, and the criminal law, figures from the army and the gymnasium, there the man of towns is in his element. His central conceptions of justification, i.e., acquittal, of redemption, i.e., buying out, adoption as a son, and many others, although they have since been made unspeakably difficult by the theologians, were in fact easily understood by plain men of the ancient world.

The rural element is counterbalanced by others characteristic of the great cities of the world when we come to the Gospel of St. John, the great book which combines the qualities of the Synoptic with the Pauline style. It is neither decidedly rural, nor decidedly urban, but it *is* decidedly popular. Its background, in spite of the Logos in the opening line, is not the colourless, literary culture of the period, but the bright world of early Christian non-literary piety. It is no mere accident that so many scenes and sayings recorded by St. John have found their way to the heart of the people in later Christian generations.

Seen against the general background supplied by the ancient popular element, the two dominant personalities of the creative epoch, Jesus and Paul, now both appear inseparably linked with the lower classes. In speaking of "two dominant personalities" I do not think of Jesus as the first and Paul beside Him as second. To place them thus side by side would be unhistorical—a modern collocation. Their historical position is: Jesus the One, Paul the first after the One, the first *in* the One. From the personality of Jesus there went forth the decisive impulse, the effects of which are felt to this day; historically speaking, Jesus is the origin of our religion. The historical significance of St. Paul is that by insistence on the cult of the ascended Master

he preserved what was precious for men's souls in the revelation of Jesus, saved it from being narrowed by the national religion and from being sacrificed to legalism, and secured it to the heart of the people for ever. He gave to the cult of Christ at once both its popular shape and the outlines of its world-wide organization. The structure of their inner lives is alone sufficient reason to prevent Jesus and Paul from being ranked together. With Jesus all is bed-rock, resting on nothing but itself. St. Paul's masonry needed foundations; Paul is great, but he is great in Christ.

Only from the sociological point of view do Jesus and St. Paul rank together, and this because they do not belong to the thin upper layer of literary culture but have grown up from the mass of the many. As leading personalities they tower high above the many below and the few at the top, but they are not on that account in opposition to the lower classes. On the contrary, they are united to them as closely as head and hand are to the body.

In judging of the underlying popular element in Jesus and St. Paul it is of the utmost importance to remember that Jesus, on good authority (Mark vi. 3), was a carpenter, and, as a prophet, was always poor, while St. Paul was a weaver of tent-cloth. Of St. Paul we know that, even as a missionary, he pursued his trade and supported himself entirely by the work of his hands, so as not to be a burden to his poor congregations. He refers with pride to his own labour (1 Cor. iv. 12). His big, clumsy handwriting, of which he speaks once (Gal. vi. 11, R.V.), may well have been the writing of a tired artisan-hand, deformed by labour, and we can imagine that it was pleasanter for him to dictate his letters than to write them himself from beginning to end. What a suggestive picture of the guild life of the working-classes we have in the Acts of the Apostles (xviii. 1 ff.), where St. Paul, arriving at Corinth, finds lodging and employment in

the house of his guild-brother, Aquila. The passages in the New Testament dealing with work and wages, in the literal and in the figurative sense, sound very differently, and far more life-like, when we know that they were addressed by working men to working men, in phraseology that had long been customary in the workshop. There is a phrase we find on the tombstone of a humble man of the early Empire in a country district not far from the home of St. Paul in the south-west of Asia Minor. To the eye wearied with the bombast of overloaded eulogy in showier inscriptions it appears scarcely noticeable, and yet how eloquent in reality is this simple form of praise: Daphnos, the best among the gardeners, has raised for himself a hero's resting-place (Heroön), and now has reached the goal, "after that he had much laboured."¹ To any one with a sense for beauty in simplicity these lines concerning the much labour of the gardener Daphnos are as a green spray of ivy tenderly clasping the tombstone of its old friend. And the words of St. John, in the Revelation, are no less racy of the people when, recording the voice heard from heaven, he gives a slight Asiatic tinge to an old Biblical phrase, and says that the dead "rest from their labours" (Rev. xiv. 13). St. Paul, however, the artisan missionary, catches the popular tone of his native country even better when he boasts of an Ephesian Mary, while she was yet living, that she "bestowed much labour on you" or "much laboured for you" (Rom. xvi. 6). Again, in a Roman cemetery² of later date, we hear the old popular phrase re-echoed by a wife who praises her husband, "who laboured much for me."

In fact, with regard to all that Paul the weaver of tent-

¹ R. Heberdey and E. Kalinka, *Bericht über zwei Reisen im Südwestlichen Kleinasien*, Denkschriften d. kaiserl. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Classe, 45 Band (1897); Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 227.

² *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, No. 9552; Deissmann, *loc. cit.*

cloth has to say about labour, we ought to place ourselves as it were within St. Paul's own class, the artisan class of the Imperial age, and then feel the force of his words. They all become much more lifelike when restored to their original historical *milieu*. "I laboured more abundantly than they all" (1 Cor. xv. 10)—these words, applied by St. Paul to missionary work, came originally from the joyful pride of the skilled weaver, who, working by the piece, was able to hand in the largest amount of stuff on pay-day. The frequent references to labour in vain are a trembling echo of the discouragement resulting from a width of cloth being rejected as badly woven and therefore not paid for. And then the remark to the pious sluggards of Thessalonica: "that if any should not work, neither should he eat" (2 Thess. iii. 10). I remember a newspaper controversy in which a social reformer, not quite so well up in his Bible as he should have been, denounced this text as a heartless capitalist phrase. As a matter of fact, St. Paul was probably borrowing a bit of good old workshop morality, a maxim coined perhaps by some industrious workman as he forbade his lazy apprentice to sit down to dinner.

In the same way we can only do justice to the remarks in the New Testament about wages by examining them *in situ*, amidst their native surroundings. Jesus and St. Paul spoke with distinct reference to the life of the common people. If you elevate such utterances to the sphere of the Kantian moral philosophy and then reproach Primitive Christianity with teaching morality for the sake of reward, you have not only misunderstood the words, you have torn them up by the roots. It means that you have failed to distinguish between the concrete illustration of a popular preacher, perfectly spontaneous and intelligible in the native surroundings of Primitive Christianity, and a carefully considered ethical theory of fundamental importance to first principles.

The sordid, ignoble suggestions, so liable to arise in the lower class, are altogether absent from the sayings of Jesus and His apostle, as shown by the parable of the labourers in the vineyard and the analogous reliance of St. Paul solely upon grace.

And what Jesus says about the building of houses and towers, sowing and reaping, and many things besides, cannot have come from idle observation of the work of others. It is the reflection of His own experience gained by many a hard day's toil.

A thorough man of the people in His outward appearance, a man of the people, also, as none other before or since in His mastery of language, Jesus, according to the best and oldest authority, often stood literally before the masses when He spoke or acted in public. It is highly significant how often the words "much people" and "multitude" occur in the Gospels when the auditors of Jesus are mentioned. The people surround the house where He is so closely that it is impossible to break through the living wall and so reach the door; a sick man has to be let down by ropes through the roof. An innumerable multitude of people, "myriads," gather together another time about Him, so closely crowded that they tread one upon another (Luke xii. 1). Most vividly of all, however, the pictures of the feeding of the four thousand, and of the five thousand, record this impression: Jesus with the masses.

This pressing of the masses to Jesus is responded to by a strong sympathy of Jesus for the masses. We have proofs enough that His grand consciousness of His mission drove Him to the many. His call goes out to "many." He speaks, in one of His deepest utterances, of the "many" for whom He must lay down His soul as the price of redemption; they are the "many" for whom, as He said at the

Last Supper, according to St. Mark, He would shed His blood. He even appeals to "all," all that are weary and heavy laden, and He looks out over the people as over a broad cornfield that promises a plenteous harvest (Matt. ix. 37).

What He thought of the multitude in His heart may be gathered from the Evangelist's statement—admirably characteristic, and probably reminiscent of some saying of Jesus Himself—that He felt compassion at sight of the people, because they were lying down exhausted, as sheep having no shepherd (Matt. ix. 36). He speaks with especial warmth of His mission to those whom He calls "the lost" or "the little ones." Defiantly, like one of the old prophets, He takes His stand by "the poor," mistrusting altogether "the rich," who in His experience were as a rule not susceptible of the Kingdom of God. Where He has observed cases of the exploitation of the weak by the strong He attacks the exploiter: a typical instance is His upbraiding of the Pharisees, who devour widows' houses (Matt. xxiii. 14; Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47). Full of irony against "them that are full," He sympathizes most deeply with the multitude of the hungry and thirsty, the naked and sick, the strangers and prisoners. How deeply He sympathized with them is strikingly shown by the picture of the Last Judgment, in which Jesus identifies Himself with these unhappy ones, all of whom belong to the lower classes.

Most instructive of all, however, is His own testimony in the solemn prayer of thanksgiving (Matt. xi. 25 ff.; Luke x. 21). Full of deep joy, according to St. Luke, He thanks the Father for having hidden from the wise and prudent the powers at work in His mission, and for having revealed them to babes. Here, on His own experience of life, Jesus draws the distinction between classes: on the one hand the but slightly susceptible upper class, full of obscurantism and self-

exaltation of the wise and prudent, from whom God hides Himself ; on the other hand the babes, judged by God to be worthy of mighty revelations.

The picture of Jesus amid the lower classes repeats itself in its main lines in the case of St. Paul. It is of course obvious that St. Paul achieved no wholesale results on the masses. Such mass-revivals as took place on the first apostolic Whit-Sunday, according to the Acts of the Apostles, were probably never experienced by St. Paul in his evangelization of the world, although he was extremely conscious of the universality of his mission. But the social structure of his churches points none the less clearly to the lower grades of the town population. The names of slaves in the lists of persons to be greeted in his letters are sufficiently typical of this. Still more instructive is the organization of collections for the poor at Jerusalem. The Galatian churches and the Corinthians were advised by St. Paul to raise the money by weekly instalments, payable on the Sunday (1 Cor. xvi. 1 f.). This is advice to poor people, working for a daily wage. In the church of Thessalonica also manual labourers must have been to the fore (1 Thess. iv. 11). St. Paul speaks expressly of the deep poverty of the Macedonian churches (2 Cor. viii. 2). And besides this there is the great confession in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, at the end of the first chapter. In the spirit of the Master's prayer of thanksgiving St. Paul looks out upon those who had been won to the Gospel, and observes that not many men of worldly culture, not many men of influence, not many of good family had been called by God. Things that counted in the world as foolish, weak, and of base extraction, things that were naught—these had God chosen.

From such passages as this we must construct our picture

of the churches of St. Paul, and from the realistic imagery employed by the people we must try to understand the forms of expression that St. Paul created for the new cult. We possess these forms of expression only in fragments, and those fragments scattered up and down the Epistles. Read, however, in their real context, they appear far more simple, far more popular in character than they are usually conceived to be by Pauline scholars. Some details I have alluded to already. To any one at all conversant with Hellenistic popular law the ideas of justification, redemption, and adoption would be at once intelligible. For congregations especially in which the slave element was more or less strongly represented, salvation in Christ could not be illustrated more popularly than by the figure of emancipation for a sacred purpose. The Primitive Christian preaching of Christ crucified, as formulated by St. Paul and other like-minded apostles, is altogether of great popular simplicity in its outlines. The eternal glory of the Divine Child with His Father, His coming down to earth in voluntary self-abnegation and servitude, His life of poverty with the poor, His compassion, His temptations and His mighty works, the inexhaustible riches of His words, His prayers, His obedience, His bitter suffering and death, and after the cross His glorious resurrection and return to the Father—all these episodes in the great divine drama, whose peripeteia lay not in hoary antiquity, but had been witnessed a score or so of years ago, were intelligible to every soul, even to the poorest, and particularly to the poorest. And the titles with which the devotee decked the beloved object of his cult could, many of them, claim domicile in the souls of the poor and the simple: titles such as Lamb of God, the Crucified, Shepherd and Chief Shepherd, Corner Stone, Door and Way, the Corn of Wheat, Bread and Vine, Light and Life, Head and Body, Alpha and Omega, Witness, Mediator and Judge, Brother, Son of Man,

Son of God, Word of God and Image of God, Saviour, High Priest, Lord, King. Unfathomable in intellectual content, giving scope to every variety of personal Christian experience and every motive of self-sacrificing obedience, this series contains not a single title that was likely to impress by mere sacerdotal associations or unintelligibleness. In the same way the gospel tradition of worship, with its sturdy, popular tone, was far superior to the fantastic, hysterical mythologies of the other cults, which piled one stimulant on another. So too the celebration of the mysteries of Christ required no magnificent temple or awe-inspiring cavern: it could take place wherever two or three were gathered together in His name. All great movements in the history of our race have been determined by conditions of the heart of the people, not by intellect. The triumph of the cult of Christ over all other cults is in no remote degree explainable by the fact that from the first Christianity took deep root in the heart of the many, in the hearts of men and women, old and young, bond and free, Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians.

Holding these views we of course run counter to the widely spread theory that St. Paul turned the simple gospel of Jesus into an abstruse theological system. No! Jesus far exceeds him in simplicity and in popularity of appeal, but St. Paul as the evangelist of the great cities has not parted company with the lower classes, nor does he preach above the heads of simple folk. The doctrinaire elements that St. Paul undoubtedly has adopted from the culture of the upper class are altogether eclipsed by the popular build of his personality as a whole.

How truly St. Paul was a man of the people may be seen admirably by comparing him with one of his contemporaries, Philo of Alexandria, who undoubtedly belongs every inch of him to the upper class. A Jew—and, like St. Paul, a Jew of the Diaspora and the Septuagint,—like St. Paul, moreover,

a man accustomed to great cities,—Philo, in spite of these and other noticeable affinities, is nevertheless sharply contrasted with St. Paul. We can perhaps formulate the contrast by saying that Philo, the Platonist and man of letters, stands at the last stage of the ancient culture, unconnected with the masses. St. Paul, the practical man and witness to Christ, stands at the beginning of the religious transformation, surrounded by the non-literary inhabitants of the great city.

The result of our observations so far is this: Primitive Christianity, alike in its leading personalities and in the preponderating number of its adherents, was a movement of the lower classes. The water of life did not filter down from the upper level to the many and the insignificant, but came welling forth from the depths of a soul of Divine simplicity. The first to drink of it were fainting stragglers from the great caravan of the unknown and the forgotten. Again it was a simple man who led forth the waters of the unquenchable spring into the world, for simple men and women to drink at. Let two or three generations pass away, and then the wise and prudent will be thronging to the well-spring.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

WELLHAUSEN AND OTHERS ON THE APOCALYPSE.

THIRTEEN years ago it looked as if the analytic, literary method of investigating the Apocalypse of John had almost exhausted itself. Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos*, published in 1895, opened up a fresh method of research, which promised to solve the problem of the book by exploiting the hypothesis of different eschatological traditions ultimately derived from oriental cosmology and current in the writer's

age. The searching analyses which had been started during the preceding ten years had reached no common goal. Some of them were critical eccentricities, and others were critical outrages. In part, they had been ultra-literary. In part, they had not been conducted upon the principles of genuine literary criticism. In any case, it was argued by the exponents of the newer method, they had failed to take account, or at least proper account, of one vital factor in the Apocalypse, viz., the time-honoured conceptions of Jewish eschatology. This contention was urged in the flush of a critical reform with more ardour than accuracy. It was not difficult to predict that the next advance would be along the lines not of an internecine but of a co-operative relation between these two methods. Instead of one method suppressing the other, both would require to adjust themselves to the special data of the Apocalypse itself, bearing in mind not only its resemblances to previous apocalypses but its intrinsic qualities. As a matter of fact, the newer method has not killed the older. Since 1895, several previous adherents of the literary method have re-adjusted their views to the fresh conditions of the problem, while one or two others have come forward for the first time with independent attempts to exploit the principles of source-criticism.

Of the former class, Charles Bruston, von Soden, and Daniel Völter are the most outstanding. The veteran French scholar had already published an essay on the Number of the Beast (1880), in which (like Gunkel, pp. 352 f.) he attacked the idea of *Nero redivivus*, and denied that such a legend could be present to the mind of the prophet John. This was followed by *Études sur l'Apocalypse* (1884) and *Origines de l'Apocalypse* (1888). The main results of these studies, partially revised in the light of recent research, are now re-stated in his *Études sur Daniel et l'Apocalypse* = (1908). Bruston is quite undeterred by the pretensions of

the newer school. He believes still in his source-criticism. The Apocalypse, according to him, consists of one apocalypse (introduction=i. 4-end, letters=ii.-iii., visions=iv.-ix., x. 1, 2b-7, xi. 14-19, xiv. 2-5, 12-13, xix. 4-10, xxi. 1-8, epilogue=xxii. 6-13, 16-17, 20-21) into which an earlier apocalypse (introduction=x. 1-2, 8-11, vision of Judaism=xi. 1-13, 19a, vision of the Roman Empire and the world=xii.-xiii., xiv. 1, 4f., xv. 2-4, xvi. 13-16, 19b, xvii.-xix. 3, xix. 11-xx.) has been dovetailed by an editor or compiler who added a few passages like xv. 1, 5-8, xvi. 1-12, 17-21, xxi. 9-xxii. 5, and probably xxii. 14-15, 18-19, besides i. 1-3. The earlier apocalypse was composed during the reign of Nero, the sixth emperor (xvii. 10). The second must be dated after the death of John the apostle; it was written by one of his disciples, possibly with the authority, and upon the basis of the visions, of his dead master.

A special feature of Bruston's position is that both of these apocalypses are held to have been not only Christian but originally written in Hebrew.¹ This helps to explain the comparative uniformity of the Greek style² as due to a later editor or translator. It also clears up the problem of the Hebraistic idioms which occur throughout the book. But, while one or two passages in the Apocalypse are certainly to be referred to a Hebrew or Aramaic original (e.g. chap. xi. and xii.), it is extremely difficult to understand how a scrip-

¹ A curt, unconvincing statement of the Hebrew original of John's apocalypse was printed by an anonymous critic in the *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wiss.* (1887), pp. 167-171.

² Dr. Abbott's (*Notes on New Test. Criticism*, p. 113) recent protest, which tallies with Harnack's verdict on the author of Acts, is both timely and sound: "From a grammatical point of view the hypothesis of the compilation of documents is most unlikely. Differences of style undoubtedly exist in different portions of Revelation, but not a tenth part of such differences as separate *The Tempest* from *Richard II.*" The analogy is not on all fours, however. Allowance must be made here and there for John's use of earlier sources, especially of Hebrew or Aramaic ones, if the data of the book are to be cleared up.

ture intended for Christian readers in Asia Minor should have been written in Hebrew. Bruston admits this obstacle to his theory. His solution is that it was at once translated into Greek for the purpose of transmission and circulation. But this only solves one difficulty by raising another.

The hypothesis of a Jewish source (or sources), upon the other hand, has not yet faded from the field entirely. Thus Von Soden, who had already analysed the Apocalypse in the essay which he contributed to the *Theologische Abhandlungen* (p. 115) seventeen years ago, returns to the subject in his *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte* (1905, pp. 171 f. ; Eng. Tr. *The History of Early Christian Literature*, 1906, pp. 337 f.). He finds a Jewish apocalypse in chap. viii. f., with Christian editorial additions in the references to the Lamb, to Christ (e.g. xi. 15), and to the apostles (xviii. 20, xxi. 14), in passages like xii. 11 (xiv. 1-5 ?), xvii. 14, and elsewhere. This first Christian editor, John, is to be distinguished from a second who put John's original apocalypse into its present form. The argument, in short, is that this original apocalypse of John, beginning with i. 4, was subsequently revised (i. 1-3, xxii. 18-21) by another editor who interpolated short notes (e.g. in v. 6, 8, ix. 19, xx. 2, 14, xix. 8, 10, xxi. 8, etc.). The Jewish apocalypse thus incorporated by John was composed between May and August of 70 A.D. John himself wrote under Domitian; he was the presbyter of Asia Minor, not the son of Zebedee. Von Soden rejects the hypothesis of pseudonymity (p. 444).

The twelve criteria (pp. 372 f.) of style and thought which distinguish the Jewish source from the Christian apocalypse are far from adequate, however. One cardinal flaw in Von Soden's analysis is his failure to recognize that even in Jewish and Jewish-Christian eschatology there was seldom any homogeneous view of the future. He neglects the results of

the "traditional" method almost entirely, and this vitiates his adroit hypothesis with an ultra-literary bias.

Much more justice is done to the time-honoured traditions of current eschatology by Völter, though his literary analysis of the Apocalypse is more complicated and violent than that of Von Soden.¹ Völter's latest volume (*Die Offenbarung Johannes neu untersucht und erklärt*, 1904) represents a certain modification of the unwieldy theories which he had previously floated in *Die Entstehung d. Apokalypse* (1882, second edition 1885) and *Das Problem der Apokalypse* (1893). He now postulates an apocalypse written by John Mark (about 65 A.D.: = i. 4-6, iv. 1-v. 10, vi. 1-vii. 8, viii.-ix, xi. 14-19, xiv. 1-3, 6-7, 14-20, xviii. 1-xix. 4, 5-10) and an apocalypse of Cerinthus (written about 70 A.D.: = x. 1-11, xvii. 1-18, xi. 1-13, xii. 1-16, xv. 5-6, 8, xvi. 1-21, xix. 11, xxii. 6), both of which were edited under Trajan² (i. 7-8, vii. 9-17, xii. 11, 18-xiii. 18, xiv. 4-5, 9-12, xv. 1-4, xxi. 22-27, etc.) and Hadrian. Völter accepts Gunkel's principle of tradition. He finds Babylonian and (especially) Zoroastrian elements in the Apocalypse, but he professes that he is unable to account for the internal data and the ecclesiastical traditions of the book without some source-analysis such as he ventures to print.

Three fresh critics have also ridden into the lists. In the same year as Völter published his latest essay, Professor Johannes Weiss of Marburg issued a monograph upon the

¹ Völter thus agrees with Spitta in attributing part of the Apocalypse to John Mark, though Spitta's John-apocalypse is different (i. 4-6, 9-19, ii.-vi., viii. 1, vii. 9-17, xix. 9b-10, xxii. 8, 13, 16a-17, 18a, 20b-21). Spitta's general view, that a Christian apocalypse has been fused with Jewish sources and subsequently edited, is reproduced by J. Weiss among recent critics.

² A Trajanic editor is required in order to explain the ten emperors which Völter finds in xiii. 1. This is even less convincing than the attempt to postulate a Hadrianic editor in order to account for the opposition of the Jews to Polycarp in Smyrna which Völter finds in chap. ii.

sources of the Apocalypse which appeared, oddly enough, in a series devoted to the interests of the "eschatological tradition" school (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, in Bousset and Gunkel's *Forschungen zur Religion u. Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Heft 3). Since then he has written, on the same lines, a brief commentary in his own *Schriften des NT.* (1907). Weiss, like Völter and Bruston, practically bisects the Apocalypse. He posits a Jewish apocalypse (Q), written in 70 A.D.; also a Christian apocalypse (68-70 A.D.), perhaps written by John the presbyter of Asia Minor, and preserved in i. 4-6 (7-8), 9-19, ii.-vii., ix., xii. 7-12, xiii. 11-18 (xiv. 1-5), xiv. 14-20, xx. 1-15, xxi. 1-4, xxii. 3-5, 8 f. These were edited in 95 A.D. by a disciple of John the presbyter. The process of composition may be roughly outlined as follows. First of all we get the Jewish apocalypse (Q) contained in x., xi. 1-13, xii. 1-6, 14-17 (xiii. 1-7), xv.-xix., xxi. 4-27. This collection of small fragments is the *βιβλαρίδιον* absorbed and reproduced, according to x. 2a, 11. Its contents, though not always uniform, were a literary unity before they came into the hands of the final editor.¹ They were composed or rather put together by a Jew who had lived through the dreadful siege of Jerusalem, and seen the *καίροι τῶν ἔθνων* commence, in A.D. 70. His consolation to the saints of Judaism is that the Danielic prophecy (Dan. vii. 21) is now fulfilled; the last enemy of God's people has appeared in the person of the Romans, but the final deliverance of the saints is not far off.

The years passed, however, and the promise of relief

¹ Pfeiderer (*Das Urchristentum*, 1902, vol. ii. pp. 305 f.) also finds the contents of this *βιβλαρίδιον* in the Jewish oracles underlying the following chapters (xi.-xiv., xvii.-xix.). Another Jewish source is detected below xxi. 10-xxii. 5. The former source originated under Caligula; it was expanded under Vespasian, before it came into John's hands. This is a simplified form, of course, of the hypothesis which Weyland and Spitta had already worked out with regard to the *βιβλαρίδιον* as a special source.

tarried. The fresh peril of the Imperial cultus threatened the Church under Domitian, and the final editor took it upon him to re-issue John's Apocalypse along with the Jewish oracles ; he did so, not as a mere literary editor, but as one possessed by the prophetic consciousness that the long-expected hour had now arrived. The traditional prophecies of the Dragon and the Beast were fulfilled in the contemporary attitude of the Empire to the Church.

The arguments by means of which this hypothesis is threatened on its literary side are often unconvincing in the extreme. It is also very difficult, as Weiss himself recognizes, to believe that John's Apocalypse was re-edited and issued by another hand during the lifetime of John himself. But Weiss, in contrast to most of his predecessors, is right in ascribing to the final editor more than purely literary functions. This is one of the truest touches in his theory of the book. Whoever this editor was, he was no mere compiler or redactor, but a man of genuinely prophetic spirit, who saw, as he thought, earlier prophecies on the eve of fulfilment.

This hypothesis of a re-editing is independently employed by Dr. Fritz Barth in his recent *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1908, pp. 250-274), but on much simpler lines than those of Johannes Weiss. Barth recognizes the divergent time-allusions in the Apocalypse ; some point to Nero, others to Domitian. He is unjustly sceptical of all source-criticism, and consequently he argues that the Apostle John, who originally wrote the Apocalypse shortly before 70 A.D., re-issued it himself under the stress of the Domitianic persecution for a wider circle of churches. In so doing he added glosses which have crept into the text as we now have it. These marginal comments, inserted for the purpose of bringing the book up to date and recommending it to the churches in view of the new situation, are to be found e.g. in i. 1-3

(and xxii. 17–21), the series of appeals in ii. 7, 11, 17, 26 f., iii. 5 f., 12 f., 21 f. (here, as we shall see, Barth and Wellhausen independently agree in the main with J. Weiss and others), xii. 11, xvii. 14, and xxi. 7, besides the interpolated appeals of xiii. 9–10, xiv. 12, 13, xvi. 15, xx. 6, and xxii. 6–8*a*, as well as the brief interpretations¹ of i. 20*b*, iv. 5*b*, v. 6*b*, 8*b*, xix. 8*b*, 10*b*, 13*b*, xx. 5*b*, xxi. 8*b*. A hypothesis like this, however, does not go deep enough. The phenomena of xi.–xii. alone demand the recognition of sources.

Wellhausen's notes, in his *Analyse der Offenbarung Johannis* (1907), are free from any such hesitation; they presuppose not only that the author worked over such sources, freely adopting and altering them to suit his purpose, but that a further revision by a later editor can be traced in one or two passages, e.g. i. 1–3, xxii. 18–19. The author, who calls himself John, wrote under Domitian. Wellhausen, like Dr. Abbott, regards that as almost beyond discussion. But the sources he used for his series of tableaux² were earlier, although most seem to have the fall of Jerusalem behind them.

Wellhausen purposely speaks of "editing" in a vague way. To distinguish the various data at every turn leads, as he observes, to dangerous subtlety. The main point in general "is to scrape off the varnish." He proceeds to distinguish the original source from the editorial colouring which overlies them, as follows. From ii.–iii. (the seven letters) he deletes, as later additions, all the promises³ to the *ὁ νικῶν*, together with some of the surrounding material (i.e. ii. 7*b*, 11*b*, 17*b*, 26–28*a*, iii. 5, 10–12, 20–21), besides ii. 9

¹ Wellhausen (p. 9) also regards the interpretations ἀ εἰσιν κ.τ.λ. in iv. 5, v. 6, 8 as glosses, with (pp. 10 f.) viii. 2, 3*b*–4, x. 2*a* (p. 14), xiii. 7*b*–9 (pp. 21 f.), xvii. 5–6*a*, 8, 14–16*a* (pp. 26 f.), xx. 5–6, 10, 14 (pp. 30 f.), etc.

² "Die Apokalypse ist kein Drama, sondern eher ein Bilderbuch" (p. 1).

³ This deletion was suggested by Vischer years before, on the inadequate ground that these phrases presupposed the Apocalypse as a whole.

(ἀλλὰ πλούσιος εἶ), ii. 10 (γίνου . . . ζωῆς), ii. 23–25, and iii. 8 (ἰδοὺ . . . αὐτήν). Similar deletions are proposed throughout the entire book, but mostly upon a small scale. The main interest of the essay lies in the treatment of the three passages, xi., xii., and xvii., in all of which Wellhausen finds two separate sources which have been welded together.

His criticism of the two former passages is not new. It was at this point, especially on the character and form of xii., that he first came into collision with Gunkel ten years ago, and the present essay re-states, in more elaborate form, the conclusions which he then advocated in his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. pp. 215–249. Thus he regards xi. 1–2, and xi. 3–13, as two separate fragments of apocalyptic tradition. The former is an oracle of the Zealots who, during the siege, refused to believe that the temple could perish. A fanatical faith in its inviolable character distinguished them as the seed of the future and the true messianic remnant. On the other hand, xi. 3–13 originally was an oracle for Rome, which has been altered by the Christian prophet into an oracle for Jerusalem. The contents of xii., again, form an oracle, not of the Zealots, but of the contemporary Pharisees, who during the siege held that the messianic hope rested not with those who clung to the Temple but with those who fled from Jerusalem. The oracle is thus a picturesque allegory of Sion besieged and delivered.

The twelfth chapter has been often bisected by critics.¹ But Wellhausen's analysis is unique. He regards it as a combination of (A and B) two independent fragments, which have been linked together with a common conclusion (C).

¹ Weyland and Baljon find the redactor in ver. 11, Spitta also in ver. 6, J. Weiss in 6 and 13, Calmes and Pfeleiderer in 10–12.

(1) καὶ σημεῖον μέγα ὄφθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, γυνὴ περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα, (2) καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα, καὶ κράζει ὠδίνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη τεκεῖν. (3) καὶ ὄφθη ἄλλο σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἴδον δράκων μέγας, ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ διαδήματα, (4) καὶ ἡ οὐρὰ αὐτοῦ σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν. καὶ ὁ δράκων ἔστηκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς μελλούσης τεκεῖν, ἵνα ὅταν τέκη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς καταφάγη. (5) καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, καὶ ἠρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ. (6) καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ τρέφουσιν αὐτὴν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα.

(7) καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ πολεμήσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος. καὶ ὁ δράκων ἐπολέμησεν καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, (8) καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν, οὐδὲ τόπος εὗρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. (9) καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφεις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος διάβολος καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὄλην, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν. (13) καὶ ὅτε εἶδεν ὁ δράκων ὅτι ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐδίωξεν τὴν γυναῖκα ἣτις ἔτεκεν τὸν ἄρσεν. (14) καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικί δύο πτέρυγες τοῦ αἰετοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἔρημον εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἡμισυ καιροῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ καιῶς.

(15) καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ὄφεις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ποταμὸν, ἵνα αὐτὴν ποταμοφόρητον ποιῆσιν. (16) ὄφει ἐβοήθησεν ἡ γῆ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἠνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς καὶ κατέπιεν τὸν ποταμὸν ὃν ἔβαλεν ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. (17) καὶ ὠργίσθη ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ τῶν τηρούντων τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ.

On this scheme, B (7-8, 13-14) is not the continuation of A (1-6) but a variation upon the same theme. The trouble is that B is incomplete. Wellhausen has to conjecture, e.g., that *the great eagle* (ver. 14) must have been already mentioned, while

even in A the editor must have omitted the overthrow of the dragon, without which the opening of verse 4 is unintelligible, and the persecution of the woman on earth. Finally, the entire vision is a fragment, on this hypothesis. The fortunes of the *λοιποί* are left untold. Thus Wellhausen is unable to float his ingenious theory without recourse to a series of abbreviations and omissions. Furthermore, his reference to the Book of Daniel as the source of the allegory does not work out properly. The parallels between it and Revelation xii. are too vague to admit of the former having been the basis of the latter. The originality of John's vision requires other materials, in cosmological tradition, in order to account for its final shape and colouring.

Bisecting chapter xvii. similarly into A (=vers. 3-4b, 6b-7, 10) and B (=vers. 11-13, 16b-17), which have been joined by an editor who has furnished them with an introduction (vers. 1-3a) and numerous glosses, Wellhausen gets in A an oracle, composed during Vespasian's reign, upon the Beast as the Empire (so in the nucleus of xiii.), and in B another oracle which views the Beast as *Nero redivivus*, the eighth head of the Beast (so in additions to xiii.). Verse 8 is the editorial mortar which holds the two sources together. Probably they were independent oracles, in their original form. B is to be dated after A, and is also, though less certainly, of Jewish origin. "Christians could hardly have had any sympathy with Nero or regarded him as the fulfiller of God's purposes; they could hardly have expected that he would actually overcome and exterminate Rome." This is thin reasoning. If later Christians, as we see from the Sibylline oracles and Lactantius, held this belief, why not others in an earlier age?

These are the leading proposals in the field of source-criticism. The Roman Catholic Introductions of Belser (second edition, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1905) and E. Jac-

quier (*Histoire des Livres du N.T.*, iv. 1908, pp. 311 f.) offer no help. The very suggestive work of P. Calmes (*L'Apocalypse devant la tradition et devant la critique*, Paris, 1905) is valuable, mainly, for its employment of eschatological tradition in the determinations of the various symbols and visions. Calmes admits sources used by a redactor, but he also exploits the Babylonian¹ mythology especially with acuteness and sanity.² Baljon's Dutch commentary (*Commentaar op de Openbaring van Johannes*, Utrecht, 1908) contains no introduction. Its critical basis is that already outlined in the author's Introduction (*Geschiedenis van de Boeken d. nieuwen Verbonds*, 1901, pp. 241-265), which approximates roughly to that of Bousset. Baljon, like Calmes, admits the presence of sources and primitive traditions here and there; dates the main composition of the book under Domitian; but puts the final editor in Trajan's reign. The presupposition of the commentary is that which is coming to be shared by an increasing number of critics, viz., that while Jewish or Jewish-Christian sources may be detected behind the canonical Apocalypse, these did not form any coherent apocalypse of any size, and also that it is impossible to differentiate source and editor with anything of the exactness with which Lord Hailes, for example, could point out to Boswell his additions to a law-paper composed by Dr. Johnson.

Wellhausen shares this presupposition. But is his application of it sound? In the first place, the hope that the temple would remain inviolate was not confined to the Zealots. In the second place, as Schürer has already pointed

¹ Cp. his article on "Les Symboles de l'Apocalypse" in *Revue Biblique* (1903), pp. 52-68.

² His fellow-Churchman, Dr. M. Köhlhofer, has written a pamphlet in Bardenhever's "Biblische Studien" (*Die Einheit der Apokalypse*, 1902), which stoutly abjures the whole of modern criticism upon the eschatological traditions and literary analysis of the book.

out (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1908, 41), Wellhausen has overlooked the fact that the capture of the Temple preceded that of the upper city. In the third place, there is a serious practical difficulty in the way of such a hypothesis as he suggests to explain xi. 1-2. The so-called oracle of xi. 1-2 would amount to the tiniest scrap of papyrus. How can we imagine that a diminutive fragment of this kind floated safely through all the perils of the siege and was finally preserved as a memento of the Zealots' hopes, even if we could conceive that these passionate citizens took time to write down any oracles? The impossibility of forming any reasonable explanation of this tiny oracle's composition and preservation tells heavily against all the hypotheses which regard xi. 1-2 as an originally independent source. The alternatives are: (a) to regard it as a fragment of some larger oracle, or (b) to find some links between it and 3-13. The latter seems the more probable line of explanation. Both passages are Jewish sources¹; the second has been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic.

¹ Some spiritual or allegorical significance must attach to xi. 1-2, in the mind of the final editor; otherwise it is impossible to account satisfactorily for his reproduction of an oracle which was no longer literally true. Possibly, as in the case of the eschatological predictions in the Synoptic Gospels, while the crisis of 70 A.D. had widened the horizon of Christian belief in the second advent of Jesus, the literature retained traces of the earlier view which it had outgrown. In this way, the new setting would not quite obliterate the older contour of the oracle. Wrede, in his pamphlet on 2 Thesalonians, prefers to regard xi. 1-2, like 2 Thess. ii. 1-2, outright in view of passages like Clem. Rom. xli., Diogn. iii., Justin's *Dial.* cxvii., Jos. *Ant.* iii. 6-12, *Apion.* i. 7, ii. 6, 23, etc., where the present is used of the Temple, the latter being treated as still standing. In this case, xi. 1-2 would be no proof either of the pre-70 date or of a Jewish origin. Furthermore, it would not be necessarily allegorical. The allusion might be to (a) the expectation of a re-building of the temple (cp. Wabnitz in *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1881, pp. 512 f., 1885, pp. 134 f., and Abbott's *Notes on New Test. Criticism*, pp. 48, 88), or (b) to a traditional reproduction of some feature which had lost its original reference. The former (a) is much the more likely of the two. But it conflicts with the seer's expectation of no temple in heaven, and the problem of the passage is better approached along the lines of a hypothesis which postulates a spiritual meaning superimposed upon an earlier and literal prediction.

The proposed bisection of xii. and xvii. also involves special difficulties. According to Wellhausen we are to think in each case of two sources, originally parallel or at any rate independent, which the editor has abbreviated and interpolated as he fitted them together for his own purpose. Now, it may be granted that without some application of source-criticism, the problems of these chapters remain insoluble. But on Wellhausen's hypothesis the function of the editor is not psychologically credible.¹ It is too intricate a solution to postulate abbreviated sources of this kind. Any editor would surely have either done less or more with his materials. May we not also argue that he would have covered his traces more effectively than, upon Wellhausen's theory, he seems to have succeeded in doing? In chapter xvii. a simpler hypothesis of editorial interpolation will be found sufficient to clear up the perplexities of the oracle. Here, as elsewhere, the road to a satisfactory result lies through a theory of source-composition which is at once less intricate than that of Wellhausen and more thorough-going than that of Barth.

It is on chapter xii., however, that the main interest of Wellhausen's trenchant essay concentrates. Here the dual

¹ Besides, there are two points of difficulty. The résumé of the life of the Messiah as born and caught up to heaven is strange enough, upon the hypothesis of a Christian author. But is it really less remarkable in a Jewish? Again, have we any reliable evidence to prove that the sufferings of the Jews during the siege led pious Pharisees to believe that the Messiah would suddenly be born amid the crisis? It is not enough to point to the predictions of Isaiah and Micah. The Talmudic parallel (*Berachoth* II. 5a) which Vischer relies on for the former view, is not only late but imperfect. The Messiah there is born at Bethlehem and swept away by a storm-wind, just after the fall of Jerusalem. But whither? Not to heaven at all, but into vague space? Gunkel (pp. 178-179, 258, 394) develops a wild theory to prove that the child Messiah, during the interval between xii. and xix., grows into a successful and mature opponent of the heathen (xix. 15, cp. xii. 5). The natural close to xii. is thus xix. 11-xx. 3 (anticipated in xvi. 12-16). But this sort of ἡλικία Χριστοῦ (Eph. iv. 13) is opposed to the Johannine view (John xvii. 4, xix. 30). Besides, the rule of the Christ is already noted in ii. 27,

nature of the cosmological traditions which have been applied to eschatological ends is accepted by most critics. The only question is whether John employed a source (tradition) which already contained the twofold aspect of the woman's flight, or whether he dovetailed two separate sources together. Even in the latter event, it is more likely that the two sources represented different conceptions (the birth of the Messiah in heaven and in the Church on earth) than parallel statements of the same idea. Both Gunkel and Wellhausen fail to link xii. to xiii., and this isolation of the former passage helps to invalidate their respective hypotheses. Even if the two chapters had an originally independent position (Gunkel, 329 f.), they are united by the Christian editor, and the question which the prophet John is answering is one started by the urgent circumstances of the age. Why is Jesus, the true Messiah, absent from the scene? What is he doing whilst his people suffer down below? What is the divine purpose underlying and controlling this exposure of Christians to persecution for refusing to worship the Emperor? John's answer¹ is that the Christ is in heaven, where the Evil Power has been already defeated. The trouble on earth is not merely foreseen but limited; it is only a guerilla warfare carried on by an opponent who has been beaten out of heaven and whose days of power are numbered. *Moriturus mordet*. With dramatic point, John introduces Satan as one who has been already beaten and foiled. The Imperial cultus, which is the acme of his devices, is a last and ineffective resource. In xiii. John describes this at work on earth, but not until he has described the heavenly victory in xii., and the latter description is couched in terms of antique, cosmological tradition. The light of the revelation filters through the lower air. It takes on tints of alien

¹ The Messiah also has been exposed to the persecution of the Evil Power. His triumphant deliverance is a prototype and pledge of his people's.

colour. But it would be absurd to neglect the sunbeam for the motes which dance within its ray.

These motes can be analysed by aid of research into the primitive, Oriental conceptions which are familiar to us in early religions. However far-fetched many of the astrological interpretations of the Apocalypse's imagery may be, yet in view of the ancient recognition of astronomy "as nothing less than a phase of religion"¹ and of the wide-spread use of the constellation figures, e.g. in the Gilgamesh epic, it is difficult to deny that the pictorial language of chapter xii. does not reflect a transcript which is coloured by the planisphere,² where Cetos,³ the aquatic dragon in the southern heavens, which astrologically is a watery, region, cast forth the river of Eridanos (Euphrates). It is too much to say with Mr. Collingwood (*Astrology in the Apocalypse*, 1886, pp. 79 f.), that "a person familiar with constellations may recall St. John's vision on any starry night in the figures of Cassiopeia, Draco, and Hercules," but the dragon of the chaos had once had the signs of the zodiac as his monster allies, in the Babylonian mythology, and the Babylonian traits reproduced in the imagery of chapter xii. in all likelihood are coloured by such primitive conceptions. Even in Bundahis xxxiv. (cp. *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. v. pp. 149 f.) the millennia of the world are calculated by means of the zodiac, and the eighth is that of Scorpio, i.e. Dahak the adversary. As the Pyramid texts also prove, astro-theology lay far back in Egyptian religion. The association of deities and spirits with constellations and the connexion between stellar cults and popular religion are patent in Egypt as well

¹ Cp. R. Brown, jun., *Semitic Infl. in Hell. Mythology* (1898), pp. 162-194.

² On Sabaism, see Sayce's *Gifford Lectures*, 1902, pp. 234 f., 479 f., and Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 389 f.

³ Cf. Aratus, *Phaen.* 45, followed by Vergil (*Georgics*, i. 244-246), on the μέγα θαῦμα of the δράκων or snake with its winding 'coils or streams. Cp. Dr. Abbott's *Notes on New Testament Criticism*, p. 101.

as in Babylonia. It was an Oriental phase of speculation which left many phrases and conceptions lingering on in popular religion long after their original meaning had been lost.¹

The astro-theological elements which here as elsewhere are made the vesture and vehicle of deeper truths are probably to be ascribed to the character of the Babylonian religion² from which such eschatological conceptions were in part adopted by the later Judaism. Babylon, however, will not by itself explain the data of the vision. Wellhausen is right in urging this against Gunkel. The latter has to read the ideas of Revelation xii. into the scattered Babylonian allusions, in order to get his Marduk-myth, and the Etanamyth is too fragmentary to be relied upon as a basis here, though it may have some connexion with Isaiah xiv. 12-15 (cp. Zimmern in Schröder's *Keilinschriften*,³ pp. 564-566). The story of a divine child or hero menaced at his birth is in fact an international myth of the ancient world; it is a favourite topic, which reflects the danger run by the seed sown in the dark earth, and its Egyptian and Hellenic forms are at least as relevant to the imagery of the Apocalypse as its Babylonian (Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 80 f., 22 f.) or Zoroastrian (Völter). The local spread of the Leto-myth is as likely³ as any, if a particular phase of the myth is to be assumed as having furnished the colours for the palette of the seer.

¹ Thus the origin of the phrase *ten days* (cp. Rev. ii. 10) seems to be astro-theological. It denoted the period after which the constellations changed (cf. Diod. Sic. ii. 30). The historical use of *δεχήμερον* among the Greeks was different.

² Cp. Hugo Winckler's *Geschichte Israels*, ii. pp. 275 f., Anz's paragraphs in *Texte u. Unters.*, xv. 4, pp. 65-68, where the influence of astro-theology upon the later Babylonian faith is discussed adequately.

³ It is no argument against this to speak, as Gunkel does, about the Palestinian Judaism of apocalyptic tradition. The Apocalypse of John is as much Asiatic as Palestinian, and elsewhere Gunkel himself (p. 286 note) admits the connexion between early Christianity and the Orphic or Pythagorean circle of religious tenets.

When the myth was employed for the purpose of religious politics, the *θύριον*¹ became the Roman Empire or its head, while the dragon became the world-opponent of God,² and further applications to contemporary history, e.g. in the present case to Herod's persecution of Jesus and to the flight from Pella, were natural. Upon the other hand, no attempt to explain chapter xii. has much chance of success, if it does not recognize that the oracle is more than an allegorizing version of history or an exegetical construction of Old Testament texts or a free composition of the author, and also if it does not recognize the danger of modern scholarship attempting to give an unnatural precision to what in the nature of the case was often vague and undefined tradition.

JAMES MOFFATT.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

IV. THE NEED OF SALVATION.

(1) IN the *First Study* an endeavour was made to present the whole experience of Paul as the basis of his theology. In the *Second Study* the object of his faith—Christ—was described. In this *Third Study* we ask, and seek to answer the question, What need did Christ so fully meet as to become the object of his faith? It was from *sin* that Christ saved Paul. But sin is presented to us in two aspects in his teaching, as it affects a man's own nature, and as it affects his relation to God. While for modern thinking there can be little doubt the former is most important, for Paul's thought it is certain the latter held the foremost place.

¹ *Bellua* (*θύριον*) was not an uncommon term for a tyrant in ancient terminology.

² The Dragon became the symbol and embodiment of the Babylonish spirit just as *renardie* in the thirteenth century stood for the depraving and cruel influences abroad in human society. Cp. Oesterley's *Evolution of the Messianic Idea* (1908), 177 f., for an admirable statement of the relation between *Tehom* and Satan.

To distinguish these two aspects we may use the terms *guilt* and *power*; the first belongs specially to the religious consciousness, the second to the moral character. We may follow the order in which these topics are dealt with in the Epistle to the Romans.

(2) Paul did not hold, as some modern revisers of Christian theology maintain, that God is either because of His infinite transcendence of the world and man, or because of His absolute identification with the cosmic process so indifferent to man's sin that man's relation to Him is not, and cannot be affected by wrong doing. Paul inherited, not only the ethical monotheism of the prophets, who taught a God so holy that He punishes iniquity, and shows pardon only to the penitent; but also the rigid legalism of the Pharisees, for whom man's relation to God depended wholly on his keeping of the law. But it is not only as Jew and as Pharisee that Paul is concerned about the *guilt* of mankind, or his own guilt. He claims—and rightly—that the human conscience is upon his side. There is a witness to God and a witness to right and wrong in the breast of man; and both the moral standards men apply to themselves, and the moral judgments they pronounce on others imply the recognition of a more righteous Will, and the anticipation of a more searching judgment (Rom. i. 28–32; ii. 14–16). It was a fundamental article of Paul's creed that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness" (i, 18). From this universal divine judgment the Jew is not exempted. By his failure to keep the law, of the possession of which he makes his boast, he too is condemned, "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgment of God" (iii. 19). As the objects of the wrath of God, His punitive justice, men are His enemies (*ἐχθροί*, Rom. v. 10, xi. 28),

that is, not only hostile to Him, but, as the context in each case seems clearly to show, exposed to His hostility. The readers of the Epistle to the Ephesians are described as "by nature children of wrath, even as the rest" (ii. 3). In order that God and man might be mutually reconciled "by God's not reckoning unto them their trespasses," that is, by His not treating them as they as sinners deserved to be treated, He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf" (that is, He treated Him as a sinner, 2 Cor. v. 19-21). On those who do not continue "in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them" there rests a curse; and from that curse there is redemption only because Christ has "become a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 10-13). Whether Paul ascribed to God the passion of wrath, the emotional disturbance, or not it is certain that he was sure that sin involved guilt, that is, so changed the relation of the soul to God that it became liable to divine punishment as expressing divine displeasure. Although in the autobiographical passages in Romans vii. 7-25, it is the other aspect of sin which is emphasized, yet there can be little doubt that the wretchedness he there confesses was due not only to the sense of his moral weakness, but also to the dread of the *death*, that is, God's judgment on sin, in which this weakness involved him. He found the wrath, the enmity, the curse of God towards sin in his own soul, nay, it is not improbable that what he met in the microcosm of his own experience he saw writ large in the macrocosm of human history.

(3) Before we go further with our discussion we must ask ourselves whether in this representation of God's relation to sin Paul is simply reproducing the opinions of his own time and people, and not expressing truth of permanent and universal validity. The most important consideration is that Jesus who taught the Fatherhood of God also spoke of the divine judgment on sin and unbelief. "It shall be

more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you" (Matt. xi. 22). This He declared of "the cities wherein most of His mighty works were done." How pathetic is the appeal and solemn His warning to Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 37-39). That judgment of Jesus finds confirmation in the human conscience. Remorse is one of the realities of human experience. Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* cannot be charged with theological prejudice. Even where there is no explicit recognition of God there is the sense that suffering will and must follow sin. Does not human history—the course of events—bear the same testimony? The lot of individual men and the fate of nations alike declare that penalty falls on wrongdoing. The scientific tendency of to-day, with its emphasis on the invariable sequence of cause and effect, is here in accord with conscience and faith. It is the opinion of many who would reject Paul's terms, the wrath, the hostility, or the curse of God as Rabbinisms, that forgiveness cannot prevent the consequences of wrongdoing, that payment must always be to the uttermost farthing. But if the divine immanence is to be understood as personal, can we detach this moral order of the world, with its mirror in the soul of man, from the reason and the purpose of God? It may be granted that Paul's terminology is liable to misunderstanding, that under cover of it unworthy human passions may be ascribed to God; but what those terms seek to express is not an illusion, but a reality. There is an opposition of God to sin, which is felt by the sinner as guilt, and falls on him as punishment; and it is probable that we do err in trying to conceive this antagonism too abstractly. If we may invest God's love with emotional content, may we not also His wrath, remembering always, however, that this is not inconsistent with, but a necessary element in, holy love? The need Paul felt then of being saved from guilt was a real need for him, and is a real need to-day.

(4) The second aspect of sin which Paul presents to us is its power. The classic passage on this subject is Romans vii. 7-25. It was indicated in the *First Study* that the writer must regard this as a confession of Paul's experience before he found deliverance in Christ. Although after his conversion Paul was still subject to temptation, and had to exercise a rigid discipline over himself lest he should fall from grace ("I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage, lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected," 1 Cor. ix. 27), yet it is certain he, as united by faith to Christ, never passed through such despair of soul because of his moral impotence, as he describes in the words, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" (22-24). There he lays bare to us the inward conflict which Christ alone was able to bring to an end with His peace. On the one hand there is his mind which knows, approves, and delights in the law of God as holy, righteous, and good; and on the other there is the *flesh*, in which sin dwells and works, the law in his members. The antagonists are not equally matched, for the lower gains ever the victory over the higher, so that he, identifying himself with his mind as his real self, and distinguishing himself from his flesh though his own, yet alien to him, is morally impotent both negatively and positively; he does not what he would do, and does what he would not do (verse 15). Two questions in connexion with this passage have already been discussed. In verses 7 to 13 is Paul describing a particular occurrence, a moral crisis in his life, when he discovered his moral impotence, and so lost his Pharisaic complacency? Is his use of the term *flesh* as the seat and vehicle of sin to be explained

by a personal peculiarity, a special liability to sensual temptations? The affirmative answer was in the first case regarded as certain, in the second as probable, and the results of this previous discussion may be here assumed.

(5) What Paul meant by the *flesh* is one of the most hotly debated questions in regard to his theology. As a fact of experience he was conscious of appetites, passions, desires, tempers, or ambitions contrary to the law of God, but so strongly entrenched in his nature that he could not of his own will withstand, overcome, and expel them. Had he thought as some modern thinkers do, he would doubtless have found an explanation in his heredity or his environment, and would not have felt the shame, or taken the blame of these tendencies towards evil ever passing into actualities, as he surely did. It is true that he appears to deny his moral responsibility in the words, "So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me" (verse 17); but in the verse that follows he identifies himself with the flesh in which this sin dwells, although elsewhere he distinguishes himself from it. This is not scientific psychology, nor dogmatic theology, but personal experience passionately and vividly expressed. In all his vain struggles against the temptation, whatever it was, which so overcame him, he always felt that his true and abiding self did not consent to this bondage, did not find any satisfaction in the surrender to evil. Had Paul regarded himself as naturalism would have us regard man to-day, as the necessary resultant of the forces of heredity and environment, his subjection to sin would not have been the misery it was to him. Such a confession shows a sensitive conscience and a religious passion or which liberty and responsibility are real. As he has himself told us in his review of his life in Philippians, he was "as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless" (iii. 6), we may infer that his failure was not

in outward conduct, in the standard morality. His reference in this confession in Romans to the commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" (marg. R.V. lust), if combined with this statement in Philippians, seems to indicate that it was sin in the inward parts which was his torment. If this be so, the intensity of his pain shows the loftiness and largeness of his moral ideal; he thought and felt about sin as Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount. That he could not subject feeling and desire to God's holy law, that was his real moral need.

(6) His moral experience, which is common to all morally vigorous natures, explains Paul's doctrine of the flesh without any assumption of the influence of Greek dualism. The arguments need not here be repeated by which it has often been shown that for Paul it is not flesh as material substance which is evil, but that he uses *flesh* as a compendious term for the nature of man as a creature, who not only in weakness as destitute of the indwelling power of God, but in wilfulness opposing himself in his individuality to the holy will of God, becomes in this very nature the seat and the vehicle of sin. On the one hand the works of the flesh are not confined to sensual sins, and on the other the flesh itself is represented as capable of sanctification. Paul's view of this condition of inward conflict in which man finds himself, apart from any explanation he offers of its cause, is not in necessary opposition to more modern views of the moral problem. Mr. Tennant, who seems to have set himself the task of disproving the traditional views of original sin and total depravity, and of demonstrating the scientific view of man's moral life, writes: "The moral life is a race in which every child starts handicapped. the pleasures of forms of conduct which are destined to be forbidden him have been tasted and known; pleasure-giving actions have already become forged into chains of habit; the expulsive power of the new affection which is to establish another rule

cannot at first be strongly felt. When will and conscience enter, it is into a land already occupied by a powerful foe. And, in the opening stages of the moral life, higher motives cannot, from the very circumstances of the case, appeal so strongly as the lower and more accustomed already in possession. Into the 'seething' and tumultuous life of natural tendency, of appetite and passion, affection and desire, is introduced the new-born moral purpose, which must struggle to win the ascendancy." (*The Child and Religion*, p. 178.) This is a description of the moral experience at its commencement. Paul's confession refers to a much later stage, when, while on the one hand the conscience has become more sensitive, yet on the other the yielding of the will to desire has lessened its powers of resistance, and when as a consequence there is a keen sense of blameworthiness as well as of weakness. Whether, as in the older view, the foe in possession at the beginning of the conflict is any inherited tendency towards evil, or, as in this view, natural, and till opposed to conscience non-moral desires, the reality of the conflict remains the same, unless, as will not be the case in any sound moral consciousness, the naturalness of the desires be used as an argument against the authority of the conscience that forbids them. This danger Mr. Tennant does not adequately recognize; and certainly the older view of these desires as not merely natural for man, whatever they may be for the lower animals, but as already morally affected by the sin of previous generations, does guard against this peril. What now may be noted, however, is this, that personal blameworthiness is not represented as less in the newer than the older view, as a man is not personally responsible for inherited tendencies more than for natural desires.

(7) In his representation of the two aspects of sin, as guilt towards God, as power in man, Paul cannot be regarded as antiquated, but as correctly interpreting universal and per-

manent realities. This cannot be maintained, however, regarding his explanations of the origin of sin in man. It seems to the writer to be quite unreasonable to ascribe to Paul two distinct explanations of the origin of sin by altogether disconnecting his doctrine of the flesh from his doctrine of the fall. It is not only a legitimate, but seems even a necessary assumption that he did "think things together" so far as to explain the entrance of sin into, and the operation of sin in the flesh by the disobedience of Adam. But we must not draw hastily the conclusion that the account he gives of the origin of sin is the ground of his belief in the sinfulness of mankind. Because we cannot now accept the story of the Fall as literally history, that does not throw any doubt on the reality of Paul's experience of his bondage to the flesh, or of the wrath of God against sin. The Gospel of Paul does not rest on his view of the origin of sin, but on his own knowledge of man's double need of deliverance from the guilt and the power of sin. Looking more closely at the passage in Romans v. 12-21 we must observe that it is not introduced in the course of the argument to prove either man's sinfulness or even the universality of that sinfulness, for that proof ends at verse 20 in chapter iii. ; but to demonstrate the efficacy for all mankind of the reconciliation in Jesus Christ (v. 20). The first premiss of the syllogism, if for clearness we may reduce the proof to that logical form, is the universality of sin and death as the effect of Adam's disobedience. The second premiss is the necessarily greater effect for man's salvation of the obedience of Christ, as the act of a greater person. The conclusion is the more exceeding abundance of grace than of sin. In this passage Paul sets forth an adequate moral cause for the stupendous moral effect of man's universal sinfulness. Hence he emphasizes the voluntary character of Adam's act. It is *disobedience*. The edge of the argument is blunted in the attempt to find in

1 Corinthians xv. 47 ("The first man is of the earth earthy; the second man is of heaven") an extenuation of Adam's fault. He is not contrasting Adam before the fall with the risen Christ; but Adam as the head of sinful and mortal humanity with the firstborn from the dead among many brethren, the head of the redeemed humanity. We have no warrant to assume that Paul thought of Adam as subject to the flesh as his posterity is. Without assigning to him the extravagant notions of later dogmatics about the perfection of Adam, we must admit that this passage indicates that he thought of Adam as possessing a liberty and responsibility greater than any of his descendants. The animal, just emerging into the human consciousness with a rudimentary conscience and will, as modern anthropology represents the primitive man, has no resemblance whatever to the Adam of Paul's thought. A childlike ignorance and innocence even as the moral condition of the ancestor of the race could not invest his moral act with the significance and consequence which Paul in this argument assigns to it. Let us frankly admit that his view of the origin of sin leaves the problem for us unsolved.

(8) There are two questions dealt with in this passage which, however, deserve further notice. Paul represents death as the consequence of sin. Now it is generally admitted that death is a natural necessity for animal organisms such as man's, and that before man was in the world death prevailed. It seems vain to justify Paul by speculations such as these, that God anticipating sin introduced death into the natural order as a penalty already prepared for sin, or that had man preserved his innocence, he might have risen above this natural necessity. Paul's interest is primarily in the moral character and the religious consciousness. What he was concerned with was man's sense of the mystery and dread of the desolation of death, man's looking for judg-

ment after death. In such totality, including what man thinks of, and feels about, death, surely Paul's view of the connexion between sin and death is not altogether false. It is man's sense of guilt that invests death with its terror. Nor are we warranted in saying that conscience here is playing tricks on man, frightening him with illusions. If there be indeed, as has been argued in a previous section of this discussion, a moral order in the world, an antagonism of God to sin, and if, as there is reason to believe, there is a moral continuity between this life and the next, such a change as death may be conceived as fraught with moral significance, as introducing the soul into such conditions as have been determined by the judgment of God on the moral character of this life.

(9) It seems clearly to be Paul's intention to represent both sin and death as introduced into the world by Adam, and as passing from him to all his descendants; but in his statement he obscures his meaning by an ambiguous clause. We might have expected him to write, "As through one man sin entered into the world and death through sin, and so sin and death passed unto all men"; but he changes the structure of the latter half of the sentence, and writes: "And so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned" (Rom. v. 12). In what sense did all sin? Some hold that all sinned in Adam as the physical source or as the moral representative of the whole race: his sin was also theirs as included physically in him or represented morally by him. Others maintain that Paul simply affirms that all men have by personal choice sinned, and consequently shared Adam's doom of death. But he goes on to argue that in the absence of law sin could not be imputed, and, therefore, the sin of Adam's descendants until the law came could not in his view involve the same personal guilt and consequent penalty as Adam's. The comparison with Christ would be incomplete unless

Adam's disobedience had some causal relation to the sin of his descendants. Accordingly we are driven to conclude that Paul represents Adam's sin as the source of the sin of the human race. Without expressly stating it he assumes the doctrine of original sin in the sense of an inherited tendency to sin, for he does undoubtedly affirm here that both the sin and the death of mankind result from Adam's transgression. Does our modern knowledge allow us to find any truth whatever in this view? It is very often assumed that the whole matter may be dismissed without any further inquiry. It is said, for instance, that breeding means more than birth, that is, education is a more potent factor in development than inheritance. That is not at all improbable, but it does not prove that inheritance is not a factor. And in the education the social inheritance of religious beliefs, moral standards, social customs, which constitute the environment, is potent. If that has been tainted by sin, can the individual life be unaffected thereby? The sin of the race is thus perpetuated and diffused along all the channels of the relations of men to one another. This consideration is too often ignored. But are we compelled to concede that heredity, in the stricter sense of physical heredity, does not affect at all the moral development of the individual? Granted that it is not a strictly correct use of words to speak of original sin, and still less of original guilt, as there is sin or guilt only where there has been free personal choice, and granted that what is inherited is only the raw material for moral choice, is it not likely that the appetites and passions, which may be natural, have been increased in their intensity by the self-indulgence of previous generations? Children do resemble their parents mentally and morally, however we may explain the resemblance. Is not sensuous desire likely to be more ardent in the offspring of the sensualist than of the chaste? Does not the

drunkard bequeath to his children a greater liability to succumb to the temptation from strong drink? Our modern knowledge does not disprove Paul's view, although it may necessitate a change in the form of statement.

(10) There is one statement of Paul's on this subject of sin which demands closer scrutiny. He regards the moral corruption of paganism as the result of its idolatry. Because they "changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things, God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonoured among themselves" (Rom. i. 23, 24). "Even as they refused to have God in their knowledge God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting" (v. 28). We must first of all recognise the Hebraic mode of speech. Paul describes as direct divine action what we should regard as the necessary moral consequences. As God is the Author of the moral order these consequences are willed by God in that order; but it does relieve our moral difficulties to regard God's action as mediated and not immediate. Secondly, it is now impossible for us to hold with Paul that polytheism and the accompanying idolatry were a deliberate choice of a lower religion when a higher religion was equally possible. We regard these as stages in the development of the religious consciousness of the divine. This, however, is not to affirm that human sin did not adversely affect that development. Evolution is not uniform progress. There were dark shades in the picture of paganism which we cannot confidently affirm to have been inevitable. As an ethical monotheist, who was not conscious of the slow growth by which the race to which he belonged had reached this faith, Paul probably painted paganism in darker colours than it altogether deserved, although his qualifications of his description in his

recognition of moral standards and judgments, and of life according to the inner law known even among the Gentiles must not be overlooked. But lastly, that polytheism, and especially the mythology of Greece and Rome, exercised an adverse moral influence can scarcely be doubted. The moral conscience was often in advance of the popular religion. Plato's care about the selection of the tales to be told in the education of the citizens in his model-state is one evidence that immoral views about the gods might inflict moral injuries. Is not Lucretius' passion against the wrongs religion had inflicted another proof that religion may corrupt morals? Can we wonder, then, that Paul connected the gross immorality of paganism with its debased religion? In this statement the principle is recognized that sin itself may be punitive of previous sin, that one consequence of wrongdoing is a tendency towards worse doing, that sin grows from the less to the greater. Here, as in other statements of Paul regarding sin, we are not concerned merely with speculations of the schools, but with realities of man's life. There is the husk of traditional views, and we should freely cast that away; but there is also the kernel of real experience of himself and of the world. The guilt and the power of sin were facts for him; these are facts for us. In these facts is to be found the need of the salvation in Christ, with the nature of which the next Study will deal.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE ASCENSION IN LUKE AND ACTS.

THAT the writer of our Third Gospel and of Acts is the same individual is an established fact of modern criticism. In accordance with tradition we will designate him "Luke," without committing ourselves on the hotly debated question of his identity. It seems to be almost an axiom, however,

with all schools, that this author, "Luke," has contradicted his "former treatise" in his second, on the important point of the date of the Ascension. Whether the critic be engaged, like Harnack, in the ardent defence of the tradition of Lukan authorship, or as ardently opposing it, like Schmiedel, seems to make no difference, save that the assumed contradiction is in the former case a difficulty to be accounted for, even if "Luke" must be supposed to have twice over substituted a later and more legendary form of the tradition for the more authentic obtained in personal interviews with eye-witnesses in Jerusalem¹; while in the latter case it is simply one of many instances to prove the carelessness and inaccuracy of the unknown compiler in fitting together his sources.

To the present writer, whose personal convictions are on the side of Schmiedel rather than Harnack, and who accepts the main results of B. Weiss, Spitta, Jüngst, Clemen, Hilgenfeld and others in their efforts to prove the use in Acts i. of a Palestinian source also employed in Luke xxiv., any evidence of disagreement between the two representations would certainly not be unwelcome, since it would merely tend to confirm similar evidence in Luke xxiv. itself.² And yet as a candid interpreter the present writer feels compelled to challenge the assumption, ancient, general, perhaps universal, as it is.

The ordinary interpretation of Acts i. 3, which regards

¹ *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1908, p. 128.

² The narrative of vers. 36-43, in which the disciples are first "terrified and affrighted" at the appearance of Jesus, then, after the effort to overcome their incredulity, still "disbelieved for joy and wondered," *must* originally have related a *first* appearance. It cannot possibly have been framed to stand after ver. 33-34, in which the two from Emmaus find "the eleven gathered together and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." The impossibility of crowding the events of this chapter into the limits of time allowed by vers. 29, 36, 50 is a further proof of compilation. As it stands, the ascension from Olivet would have to take place at midnight!

the period of "forty days" as terminated by the ascension into heaven described in verses 9-11, is at least as old as the Alexandrian form of the text in Luke xxiv. 51, which omits the words "and was carried up into heaven." Plummer's statement, "No motive for their omission, if they were in the original document, can be suggested,"¹ is correct if we add to it "except the desire to avoid contradiction with Acts." This, however, is just such a motive as would avail to produce the cancellation in our Alexandrian authorities. That the clause *was* understood to contradict Acts is very certain from the Church calendars, which date the Ascension "forty days" after the Resurrection. Even if we cancel it we shall but leave a palpable lacuna. The sense will still require us to assume that the preceding words "he parted from them" are to be understood of something more than an ordinary leave-taking. Thus internal and transcriptional evidence as well as the earlier, "Western" form of the text are in favour of the judgment of the Revisers of 1881 in retaining the clause. And indeed Luke himself has really placed the matter beyond reasonable dispute by his own subsequent references. Twice over (Acts i. 1-2 and 22) he refers to the period of the ministry as extending "from the baptism of John until the day that he was received up from us," and in the former instance expressly states this event to have been included in his "former treatise," which related the things done and taught by Jesus "until the day in which *he was received up.*"

But we are told that the clause in Luke xxiv. 51, even if genuine, is a mere prolepsis. Although verse 50 seems to be continuous with verse 49, and verse 44 with 43, an interval of "forty days" must be understood to intervene at some point, else there is contradiction with Acts i. 3.

Certainly it is the same scene which is more fully recapit-

¹ *International Critical Commentary on Luke*, p. 565.

tulated in Acts i. 6-14. Once more the Eleven are gathered together. Once more the mission to the Gentiles is presented as a necessary preliminary to the Coming and Restoration of the Kingdom. Once more they are bidden to await in Jerusalem the outpouring of the Spirit, and "power from on high." Once more they are commissioned as "witnesses." Once more Jesus is "received up into heaven." Once more they return to Jerusalem "from the Mount called Olivet," and are "continually in the Temple."

But Acts i. 1-5, it is said, cannot refer to the same. True, verse 6 seems to be continuous with verse 5. There is no mention of any interval, no disappearance and reappearance of Jesus, or the like. The question "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom?" follows naturally for a Jew familiar with the prophecy soon to be quoted (Acts ii. 17-21) of the outpouring of the Spirit "before the great and notable Day of the Lord," upon the promise "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." The introductory words of verse 6, "They therefore (*οὖν* resumptive), when they were come together," seem to refer to verse 4, "being assembled together with them he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father." Even if we take the possible alternate reading "eating with them," the reference will still be the same.

But no; there must be an interval of "forty days" interjected here, because in i. 1-6 the author is still speaking of what he had related in "the former treatise." Moreover the reference to the injunction "not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father" is too manifestly a reference to Luke xxiv. 48-49, and especially that of the "eating together" (if that rendering be followed) to Luke xxiv. 43, to permit this scene to be dated "forty days" after the first appearance.

But we have no analogy in the earliest Christian writings

for regarding the ascension as marking the end of the forty days period of manifestations of the risen Lord, and on the contrary several unmistakable indications that it was understood to mark its *beginning*.

Thus in John xx. 17-18 the appearance to Mary Magdalene corresponding to Matthew xxviii. 9-10 is set in striking contrast with those which subsequently are granted to "the disciples," by the fact that Jesus tells her: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go unto my brethren and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." Thereafter (vers. 19-25) comes the manifestation to the disciples corresponding to Luke xxiv. 39-40, in which Jesus "shewed them his hands and his side," with the more specific direction to the doubting Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put it into my side, and be not faithless but believing." Into the hotly contested debate of the period from Paul to Ignatius, "With what body do they come?"¹ Was the risen Christ "in the flesh" or "a bodiless dæmon?"² our Fourth Evangelist interjects his harmonizing combination of both the earlier and later form of Synoptic tradition. Jesus' appearance at the sepulchre itself to Mary was—to use the Pauline expression—"unclothed," not yet clothed upon with the "house which is from heaven," since He was "not yet ascended." There is introduced, therefore, a tacit correction of Matthew xxviii. 9, "They (the women) came and *took hold of his feet* and worshipped him." Per contra, at the promised manifestation to the disciples, "when it was evening" on the same "first day of the week," as described by Luke xxiv. 36-43, and in a supplementary manifestation on the ensuing "first day" for the express purpose of removing all remaining doubt

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 35-45.

² Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* iii.

upon the question, increased emphasis is laid upon the tangible and corporeal nature of the resurrection body. To our Fourth Evangelist accordingly the ascension marks the *beginning*, not the end, of the period in which Jesus "shewed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them (the disciples) by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God."

The same is admittedly true of the *Epistle of Barnabas*. In arguing against the observance of the seventh day with the carnal-minded Jews (xv. 8-9) the author quotes the Isaian "Your new moons and your sabbaths I cannot away with,"¹ and adds, "Ye see what is his meaning; it is not your present sabbaths which are acceptable, but the sabbath which I have made, in the which, having given rest to all things (Gen. ii. 2, 3, Heb. iv. 3-10), I will make the beginning of the eighth (creative) day, which is the beginning of another world. Wherefore also we (Christians) keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead, and having been manifested ascended into the heavens."

In the *Gospel of Peter* we have a more or less confused combination of early sources, so that it is not easy to determine whether the author thinks of the ascension as taking place at the moment of Jesus' expiring cry, which in Mark is given as "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"² or, as *Ev. Petri* renders it, "My Power (controlling spirit), my Power, thou hast forsaken me," in Luke as "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit";³ or whether in the night before the resurrection day. In the former case⁴ the distinctive term is used, "And as soon as he had spoken he was taken up (*ἀνελήφθη*) into heaven." In the latter⁵ we have a description of the spirit of Jesus in gigantic form,

¹ Isa. i. 13.

² Ps. xxii. 2.

³ Ps. xxxi. 6.

⁴ *Ev. Petri*, v. 19.

Ev. Petri, x. 38-42.

his head towering "above the heavens," escorted by angels into heaven. Whichever is taken as the equivalent of the Lukan tradition of the ascension, or "taking up" of Jesus, in either case it *precedes* the appearances to the disciples.

Returning to the representations of the New Testament itself, it is clear that Paul, the earliest of our witnesses, knows nothing whatever of an occurrence such as a visible "taking up" or departure into heaven, dividing his own experience of the manifestation of the risen Lord from those experienced by "Cephas, the twelve, the five hundred, James, and the apostles." The appearance to Paul is simply the "last of all" in an unbroken series of similar experiences. Luke himself, who interjects in Acts i. 3 a general summary of the appearances to the disciples as having covered a period of "forty days," in no way brings out the fortieth day as signaled by any particular occurrence. It is not connected in any way with the occurrences of Pentecost on the fiftieth day from the sabbath of the crucifixion. The entire verse 3 is interjected parenthetically, simply to inform the reader that the main manifestations already related were not the only ones, but that the appearances to the disciples continued for "forty days." True this "forty days" may well be regarded as an invaluable datum of early tradition fixing in round numbers the period covered by the appearances referred to by Paul.¹ This period began with the appearance "to Peter," the occasion of his "turning again and stablishing his brethren,"² an occasion almost certainly to be dated later than "the third day" (or "after three days") from the crucifixion. It may therefore very well have ended with Pentecost, which Dobschütz and others have identified as the occasion in Paul's mind in the statement "then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 3-8.

² Luke xxii. 32.

once." As Luke, like the rest of our Evangelists, has cancelled the story of the appearance to Peter, that most fundamental and critical of all the resurrection appearances, the significance of the traditional datum of "forty days" remains as unintelligible in his narrative as the other references to Peter's "turning again and stablishing his brethren,"¹ the Lord's having "appeared to Simon,"² and Peter's unexplained reappearance as acknowledged leader after the story of his flight and disgrace.³

If, however, we simply regard the whole interjected verse Acts i. 3 as the historian's more or less inadequate attempt to compensate for these omitted traditions, all the difficulties surrounding the relation of this chapter to Luke xxiv. will completely vanish. Acts i. 4, so obviously referring to Luke xxiv. 48-49, and Acts i. 6-11, so clearly continuous with the preceding paragraph, so obviously referring to the same ascension story as Luke xxiv. 50-53, this in its turn continuous with its preceding context, will really refer to the same occasion, if only on the simple principle that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. Moreover, "Luke" will not have contradicted his own "former treatise," nor will he have departed from the standpoint of *all* the testimony available from the apostolic and post-apostolic age, that the ascension was conceived to have occurred *at the beginning*, not the end, of the period of appearances to the disciples.

This seems to the present writer a more probable view than that in this account of the ascension Luke has "twice over exchanged his better knowledge for a later and inferior tradition."

BENJ. W. BACON.

¹ Luke xxii. 32. ² Luke xxiv. 34.

³ Acts i. 15 ff.; cf. Luke xxii. 54-62.

LUKE'S AUTHORITIES IN ACTS I.-XII.

II.

PETER is the leader and, so to say, the hero of the first half of the Acts. All others are quite secondary in comparison with him. Stephen, who seemed to be marked out as a great leader, and who was certainly uncompromising and epoch-making, found an early death. The inference which some modern writers have drawn is that in this part of Acts we have a tradition depending on Peter as its ultimate source. Such an inference seems based on a false principle of judging.

Peter and John are mentioned repeatedly as acting in company. But it is Peter who speaks and acts; John is secondary. The inference which those critics draw is that Peter is the original authority for the narrative. They seem to argue from the analogy of young scholars eager to bring themselves before the attention of their Universities and to obtain calls and preferment to official positions in the educational world by drawing attention to their achievements. On the contrary, I would maintain that, if one of the pair of apostles was the ultimate authority for these parts of the history, John and not Peter was the source of information. The man who tells the story hides his own share in the action and brings the work of his companion into prominence: such is the spirit in which the books of the New Testament were written, as might be shown from many examples: but these will readily rise to the memory of all who are interested in the subject.

But I think that neither John nor Peter was the authority upon whom Luke relied. He depended on a spectator, and not on either of the two principals. I see nothing to

suggest the interposition of Peter or of John as authorities in this part of Acts¹; but much to suggest that another person has played an important part in the narrative.

The speeches of Peter in the first ten chapters of the Acts (with the solitary exception of the address to the meeting of the Hundred and Twenty in chapter i.) convey the impression of being reports by an auditor. They are speeches—condensed, doubtless, but real addresses throughout in tone and style. The sentences are sometimes difficult in respect of construction: there are words which have not an evident relation to any verb; but the awkwardness is that of a speaker who, without being a cool and practised orator, plunges into the utterance of his thought without seeing his way clearly to the other side of his sentence—who, in fact, does not speak in sentences, but in detached ideas. Perhaps the most typical of all the speeches is the one addressed to the little company in the house of Cornelius (x. 34-43). The thought here has burst all the bonds of syntax: it pours out hurriedly, in a series of ideas which trip one another up, as they successively struggle forth.

On the other hand, the address to the Hundred and Twenty is not a speech; it is a mixture of address with explanation and narrative (partly even expressed in the third person). Setting it aside for the moment, we must (as I think) regard the speeches of Peter and Stephen in chapters ii.-x. as the most valuable and absolutely trustworthy part of the narrative. They are like contemporary documents enclosed in a history written in a later period: the history may be excellent in character, and founded on first-rate evidence; but it is a later view of the facts, while the written or spoken words give the facts as they appeared at the moment to the actors. The individuality and freshness of these speeches

¹ It is not intended to express any opinion as to whether Luke had enjoyed personal intercourse with either of the two Apostles.

stamp them as Peter's and Stephen's. They could not be invented at a later time by Luke, or by his informant.

Moreover the parts of the narrative which are most closely connected with these speeches are on the whole the best in this part of Acts. Nothing can surpass the naturalness, the verisimilitude, the photographic detail in the surroundings, that mark the story of the lame man in chapter iii., the account of the trials in iv., v., vii., and of the episode of Peter and Cornelius in x. I cannot resist the conviction that these parts rest on the account of an observant and highly competent witness, who listened to the speeches and marked the surroundings with keenest interest and a retentive memory. On the whole they all¹ strike me as proceeding from the evidence of one witness. While it is not unnatural or in itself improbable that the floating tradition in the Church should preserve more precisely the spoken words than it remembered the ordinary facts of history—for such is, if I judge correctly, the character of popular historical memory in the East—yet there is in those scenes and speeches something that differs from the character of the mere Church tradition, as we have it probably in such scenes as that of Ananias and Sapphira.

How shall we explain the contrast between these speeches and the address to the Hundred and Twenty in chapter i. ? The plain and simple explanation is that they were reported by a witness who was not present among the Hundred and Twenty, and who was himself dependent on subsequent fame for his knowledge of that speech. In other words, the witness was one of the converts at Pentecost and thereafter was a member of the Church, one of the public who after the well-known ancient fashion stood in the circle of spectators (*corona adstantium*) and listened to the trial of the apostles and of Stephen, one who was present in Caesareia

¹ Some exceptions will be noticed in the sequel.

at the moment when Peter with his company entered the house of Cornelius. In thus stating the circumstances, we have practically named the witness, so competent, so observant, evidently such an intense admirer of Peter, and so keenly interested in the affair of Cornelius and the admission of the Gentiles into the Church. He was Philip, one of the Seven.

One of the purposes which is set before me in this paper is to give reasons for thinking that Luke, as a rule, names his authority, but that he does so always indirectly, because to name him directly would involve the use of the first person singular, which Luke avoids except in the purely formal introductions to the two books. He does not directly say, "this I learned from so-and-so"; but he indirectly points out in many cases that people who were on the scene were known to him personally. He leads us to believe that Philip was in Caesareia at the time when Peter visited Cornelius (compare viii. 40 with xxi. 8); and he intimates that he himself had been in a position to learn from Philip and Philip's daughters what they knew, though he never says that they spoke to him. But my belief is that Luke has a definite purpose bearing upon his subject in everything which he records and in every name that he mentions. This point will be illustrated later by other examples. At present we are concerned only with the indications which mark out Philip as a natural, probable, and sufficient authority; and as these indications are undeniably present in the book, it seems irrational to doubt that Luke consciously placed them there as a guide to the reader.

If Philip was an authority on whom Luke depended, it may be regarded as beyond question that he was the source of the narrative about the evangelization of Samaria; and we may take this episode as a specimen of his style and his personal character. Now there is one marked difference

between this episode and the general tone of the early chapters. Here a singularly important step is made in the expansion of the Church, and yet the Divine Spirit does not order the advance. "Philip went down to the city of Samaria and proclaimed unto them the Christ." His action is not said to have been authorized in any way: there was no previous revelation to him of the will and purpose of God. Almost every other step in the progress of the Church, made by a person that is specially named, springs from or is accompanied by the orders and the guidance of the Spirit. One may say also that emphasis is laid on the incompleteness and imperfection of Philip's work. He did not see through the hollowness of Simon's character, who "being baptized continued with Philip." The Spirit was not communicated to any of Philip's converts. There is a strong contrast drawn between him and the power of Peter and John. Philip could only baptize; but the two apostles "laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit." Peter detected and rebuked Simon: Peter foresaw the evil which Simon was destined to work, as a root of bitterness and corruption for the Church into which he had been admitted. The superiority of inspired insight over the juggling of the false prophet is here prominent; but Peter, not Philip, is the man of insight.

Is this consistent with the origin of the narrative from Philip? Would Philip have represented himself as making this great step on his own initiative? At first, to our modern and western view, this seems improbable. We regard it as more presumptuous and pushing to go forth of one's own initiative and make such an important change in the work of the Church. But was that the way in which the men of the first century thought? Are we not in this superficial judgment intruding modern ideas into the first century? It is regarded commonly at the present day as a mark of

humility to place oneself as it were in the hands of God, and to speak of all one's acts as directed by God. But in ancient times and in the East to be guided and inspired by God was the highest privilege and the greatest honour. Paul himself apologized to the Corinthians for his boasting and presumption in speaking of the revelations with which he had been favoured; and he speaks of his Divine authority and Divinely vouchsafed guidance only under compulsion, in order to give emphasis to his message. In the narrative which we regard as originating from Philip, only the humble and unnamed agents who fled before the persecution are not said to have acted under Divine guidance in spreading the Faith. The great agents, Stephen, Peter, Paul, were directed in all their steps by special revelation or accompanied by special Divine grace (as when Stephen's face shone "as it had been the face of an angel").

It was the humility and modesty of Philip that prevented him from claiming Divine direction for his journey to Samaria: and the silence on this point is not to be construed as an assertion that he went there of his own initiative. This silence is a proof of the same modesty that makes him record his own mistake, and emphasize the superiority of Peter's action at Samaria, and omit all reference to himself after Peter appears there, and refrain from mentioning himself in the scene at Caesarea in chapter x.

It may be said that the narrative which lies before us is Luke's, not Philip's; and it may be asked whether Luke would not have set Philip's action before us in its real proportions and on its true plane. To this we must reply that it is in Luke's style always to retain in a remarkable degree the tone and atmosphere of his original source: he treats his source as his own property, making it serve his purpose, and yet with marvellous literary skill he preserves its character, while handling it in some ways with great freedom. I

need only refer here to Professor Harnack's masterly account of Luke's relation to the two sources which are common to him and Matthew, viz., Mark and Q.¹

It forms part of our theory that Philip was not the authority for any part of Luke's narrative after the end of chapter x. The scene then changes to Jerusalem, and does not return to Caesarea until Luke himself arrives at that city in chapter xxi. (the incidental allusion in xviii. 22 forms no real exception to this statement). If there is a change of authority, we may expect that some sign of this change should be perceptible in the style, especially in that of the speeches. Our theory is that the reports in ii.-x. of what Peter said and did are so trustworthy because they are transmitted to Luke through the mouth of one excellent hearer and spectator. But the speeches are condensed, and not verbatim, and therefore they contain something of the expression of the reporter, while retaining much of the individuality of the speaker. Luke regarded this reporter as so competent and so admirable that he treated his accounts with the greatest respect.

The account of the scene in Jerusalem, when Peter's action to Cornelius was challenged, shows some difference in style from those in ii.-x. (amid the general similarity of character that marks Luke's work as a whole). It has been observed by others that there is in the report of Peter's speech at Jerusalem, xi. 4-7 (in which he related to his audience the whole story of what had just happened) a larger element of characteristic Lucan phraseology than in the account of the same incidents as they occurred at Caesarea. To show this I may quote the brief and clear statement given by Mr. Vernon Bartlet: "This speech, re-telling the substance of chapter x., bears more marks of Luke's own style." He quotes the phrase "fastened mine eyes"

¹ Briefly summed up by the present writer in *Luke the Physician*, pp. 47, 71 f., 80 f.

(v. 6), which is peculiarly characteristic of Luke. The non-Greek expression in x. 14, "I have never eaten all that is common and unclean" (which is of Hebraic type and is found also in Luke i. 37, a very Hebraistic passage, and never elsewhere in Luke) is transformed in xi. 8 into the better Greek form "nothing common or unclean hath ever entered into my mouth." This change is very characteristic. Professor Harnack has shown in detail and in perfectly convincing style that Luke very frequently improves the Greek of his authorities, even when he was using a written Source like the Gospel of Mark.¹ In x. 5 and x. 32 Cornelius is merely ordered to send men to Joppa and summon Simon Peter, and his residence is described. In x. 22 the further detail is added that Cornelius would hear words from Peter. In xi. 14 there is a much fuller statement: Peter "shall speak unto thee [Cornelius] words whereby thou shalt be saved, thou and all thy house." These variations are very characteristic of the method of abbreviated reports, such as are customary throughout Luke's history: it is never safe to take the shortest report as most authentic, and assume that details added in longer reports are additions made by the historian. One cannot reasonably doubt that some reason was assigned by the messenger in giving orders to Cornelius; that is proved by the fact that his messengers added in x. 22 a brief statement of the reason, for these trusty and devoted household servants were in the last degree unlikely to add anything to the message which they were charged to deliver. The reason is stated in the fullest form in xi. 14, and this form contains a thought that is frequent in Luke: the whole household of Cornelius is to be saved along with himself. One thinks, for example, of Lydia hearing with open heart the things which were spoken by Paul, and being baptized with her household—

¹ Examples are quoted in *Luke the Physician*, p. 33 ff.

and of the jailor to whom Paul and Silas said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and all thy house," and who was baptized immediately with all his household. These were events that occurred in Luke's own immediate presence or which would be reported to him by the eye-witnesses within a few minutes or hours after they occurred: he saw Lydia as she listened to Paul; he probably may have assisted at the baptism of her and her household: he was in the city of Philippi when the jailor came into relations with Paul and Silas, and was doubtless watching with the anxious eyes of love the issue of their imprisonment moment by moment. This thought of the close relations and common feeling which united a whole household, master, mistress and slaves,¹ was evidently one that was deep-seated in Luke's mind; and he found that the words of xi. 14 were the best expression of the message given by the messenger to Cornelius. One cannot think that this peculiarly Lucan expression was the verbatim message spoken to Cornelius, or that the person who was his authority gave Luke the account in those exact words: but in Luke's free report such was the fair equivalent of what was mentioned to him. Luke gave himself more liberal discretion in chapter xi. than in chapter x.: and this probably, almost certainly, means that his informant in x. was a person in regard to whom he felt more profound respect. Hence he speaks in xi. more as the free historian, even when reporting Peter's speech. The speech is largely a narrative, and Luke assumes that the reader knows the story of

¹ To understand ancient household life rightly, it is necessary always to remember that a man's most faithful and trusted helpers were his slaves, that paid service was always considered untrustworthy and almost degrading, and that close ties bound together master and slaves in the household. The word *familia* includes slaves quite as much as children; and in fact *famulus* (from which *familia*, *famulia*, is derived) came to mean slaves alone, and *familia* came to be used often where slaves alone were meant.

chapter x., for he makes Peter speak of "the messenger" in v. 13, though his hearers were quite ignorant what messenger he was speaking about, whereas the readers of chapter x. understand at once. Other examples of the markedly Lucan tone of chapter xi. might be mentioned; but they will suggest themselves to any careful reader.

It may be urged against our theory that in viii. 26-40 Philip appears as the prominent figure, and a very different picture of him is there presented. That is so; and there we have a different source, which can, as I think, be identified with practical certainty. It has been already pointed out that even "in regard to any episode we should not assume that Luke confined himself to any one source of information."¹ Especially is this caution necessary where a passage contains two separate episodes.

A specially clear example of this principle is found in the two scenes from the life of Philip. We have noted the self-suppression and humility of the first episode. We have seen that Philip is not represented as guided by Divine power, and that Peter's superior insight and authority are brought prominently before the reader. The tone of viii. 5-25 is that of the early history of the Church as it appears in the Acts. But the tone of viii. 26-40 is markedly different: in the Ethiopian episode Philip stands out alone like an old Hebrew prophet: the style and the details put him on the standard of Elijah and Elisha: he is in constant communication with the Divine power: every movement is the result of a message from God. We have here the picture drawn by an admirer, and not one that comes from Philip himself. The hero-worship shown in this part of the narrative is that of an admiring pupil or a loving woman; and the marked resemblance to the Old Testament narratives about the early prophets reveals the hand and

¹ EXPOSITOR, Feb., 1909, p. 178.

mind to which Luke was indebted. The source is one (or all) of the daughters of Philip, the prophetesses. Luke mentions them in xxi. 9, though they play no ostensible part in the action, and have no apparent effect on the history, because they had exerted a real though hidden part in moulding his narrative.

There is no part of the Acts whose reason for admittance to this highly compressed history is so difficult to understand. The law of the book is that only what was really of outstanding importance is admitted, and that while numberless events, important each in itself, are omitted, a very large space is devoted to the critical steps in the development of the Church. The episode of Cornelius, the Conversion of Paul, are described twice and even three times; the trial of Paul in Jerusalem and Caesareia and the progress towards the last stage of the trial in Rome are described at great length. These can all be justified from their comparative importance in the line of development of the Church. The Ethiopian incident, however, lies apart from that line, and affects in no obvious way the main purpose of the book.

So entirely is attention concentrated on Philip in this episode that the religious position of the Ethiopian remains quite uncertain. Was he a native Ethiopian and is this incident recorded as a proof that the Gospel was spreading already at this early period to the outer world? This view seems impossible, unless we understand that he was a proselyte: for the whole plan of Luke's history is to record the steps by which gradually the Church was opened to the Gentiles. The episode of Cornelius loses almost all its importance, and there is no reason why Luke should dwell on it with such emphasis, if a pure Gentile was already baptized on the Divine command by an official of the Church; and the words of xiv. 27 lose all significance, if that were so. Why should Paul and Barnabas regard as the great fact

of their journey that God "had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles," if a Gentile was freely admitted years before? The Ethiopian, then, must have been at least a proselyte; and, indeed, the fact that he undertook so long a journey to worship at Jerusalem implies his close connexion with Judaism. But proselytes were already freely admitted even to Church office, vi. 5; and the mere admission of one other proselyte was not important enough to call for a detailed narrative of the circumstances in so highly compressed a history as Luke's.

Further, there seems a considerable probability that the Ethiopian was still more closely connected with Judaism, and that he was in fact a devout Jew of the Diaspora, like those Parthians and Elamites and others, who had listened to Peter at Pentecost and had come over in numbers to the new Faith. It is now a fact firmly established on the most indisputable evidence that there was a Jewish colony far up the Nile beside Assuan in the fifth century before Christ, and that this colony had already been settled there long before; and it is practically certain that they were sprung from the Jews who had migrated to Egypt in the time of Jeremiah. From this colony on the borders of Ethiopia it is perfectly natural and probable that Jewish influence and Jewish men would pass into Ethiopia; and there is no reason to think it strange that a Jew should be treasurer of Queen Candace. That is precisely the suitable and probable place for a Jew to fill.

Why, then, should Luke record this incident in his history, if it was merely the admission to the Church of a foreign Jew, or even of a proselyte? We start, of course, with the principle that there was a clear and sufficient reason for regarding this incident as important enough to deserve admission. The reason was partly that the Ethiopian Jew or proselyte, as a eunuch, was not permitted to have the

full privileges of the Jewish congregation (Deut. xxiii. 1). The full admission of the Ethiopian was an advance in the development of the Church because it involved the principle that no man, however maimed and humiliated by the accident of fortune or by the cruelty of man, was excluded from the mercy of God and the grace of Christ. It anticipated in a certain degree the revelation to Peter that he "should not call any man common or unclean." Although this principle was not enunciated expressly to or by Philip, yet it was in a way involved in his action. But the action remained an isolated one: it was not confirmed by the Church, and probably was unknown to it until a later time. It exercised no influence on public opinion or on the course of events in Palestine, for the Ethiopian "went on his way rejoicing," and passed out of the domain of Luke's history.

The only way in which a really important effect on the development of the Church can be assigned to this episode is on the theory that Luke regarded it as a step in the spread of the Church to the south; and, if so, one must proceed to the further supposition that he had this direction of church development before his mind, and, therefore, that the further stages in it formed a possible extension of his historical purpose in the sequel.

Yet even this supposition does not fully explain why the Ethiopian is left so much in the shadow, why his personality remains almost wholly unknown, why he is rather a figure in a chariot than a real man whose position and character stand out before us. In many other cases Luke makes even quite secondary actors in his drama live in their acts and words, though they fill less space in his pages than the eunuch. Moreover what we learn about him is through formal description, and quite an unusual space is occupied in describing his position in the world: his acts

and words reveal little, and are mentioned rather as being the occasion of Philip's action than as manifesting his own individuality.

In short, this figure finds a place in Luke's pages mainly for the purpose of bringing into relief the character and power and influence of Philip, and not as indicating an important direction in the growth of the new Faith towards the south. Such a story was not gathered from Philip himself, but from a warm admirer of Philip. Yet admiration does not affect the representation of the facts. The same limitations are observable here as at Samaria. Philip can only baptize; his influence does not carry with it the gift of the Spirit.

Our view, therefore, is that the Ethiopian episode was included by Luke rather with a view to showing the character of Philip than with the intention of describing a step in the growth of the Church. Luke appreciated the great men who had made the early Church, and was resolved that his readers should appreciate them also. He knew that no impressive view of history can be given or acquired, unless the dominating figures are set in their true light. He was writing for the congregations of the Graeco-Roman world; and one of his main objects was to move them, and to affect their life. To do this it was above all things necessary to put before them in their true colours the great figures Peter, Stephen, Philip and Paul. He had at the same time the Greek sense of historic truth and of proportion: he shows those figures to us in action, and never merely describes them. For example, the scene of the voyage and shipwreck in chapter xxvii. is not directly important in itself for the development of the Church; but it is highly important as illuminating the character of Paul and showing how even as a prisoner and a landsman at sea he became the dominating personage in a great

ship's company as soon as danger threatened; and it also draws the reader's attention to the central and critical importance of the scene towards which it leads up, viz., the trial of Paul in Rome. So, also, the Ethiopian episode places Philip before the reader in a new light. Henceforth we realize his character and his action in a very different way; Philip now rises from the level of a second-rate figure almost to the higher plane on which Peter and Paul move. Even the Samaritan episode assumes a different character, when it is read in the light of the Ethiopian incident.

Such seems to be the intention of Luke, when he gives the story of the Ethiopian eunuch a place in his history. He heard it, not from Philip himself, but from the prophetesses his daughters, one or all. It was they who imparted the spirit of the Old Testament to the story, regarding their father after the fashion of an old Hebrew prophet, who went forth into the wilderness, to whom the messenger of the Lord spoke, who was caught away by the Spirit when he had done what he was ordered to do. The narrative impressed the imagination of Luke, and has been recorded by him in the same tone in which he heard it. It shows us how Philip impressed those among whom he lived; and we recognize in him a person who was fitted to write the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹ He was a great admirer of Peter, and yet he had the freedom of mind that fitted him to appreciate Paul. The self-suppression that characterizes the part of the Acts in which Luke depends on him is also evident in the Epistle, where the writer never mentions himself, and where the first person singular appears only as a literary form.² The personality

¹ The writer's view on this subject is stated in a paper in *Luke the Physician*, pp. 301-328.

² See *Luke the Physician*, p. 324.

of this leader may yet be recovered in a much completer fashion by a careful comparison of the Epistle and the portions of the Acts that we have been discussing in a general way.

It has been stated that Luke has always a definite purpose in mentioning any individual—a purpose bearing on the plan of his history, and not a mere desire for literary effect. The case of the slave-girl Rhoda in chapter xii. may seem to be an exception. It may be thought that the incident in which she appears is recorded only for its picturesque and literary value. While Luke was certainly perfectly sensible of this value, he has another purpose in view. He knows the very inmost feelings in Rhoda's mind, her joy as she heard the voice of Peter, her fluttering eagerness which defeated her own desire by leaving Peter in the street in danger of discovery while she ran into the inner house to tell the news, her confidence that she was right while the others disbelieved her and thought she was mad. This is the way in which Luke intimates to us that he had himself talked to Rhoda, and had her own evidence to go upon. Only from her, or from some one who took a warm personal interest in her, could he have learned these details; and there was no one who was likely to have interested himself in the slave-girl and to have treasured up such information in his memory to retail to Luke. We have here personal recollection, narrated to Luke by the maid herself, and caught by his sympathetic and appreciative mind.

Incidentally, we notice here the close and friendly relation between the slave-girl and the family and family-friends. Rhoda knows Peter's voice, is full of joy at hearing it, forgets in her joy her duty as a servant, and runs in to impart the glad news to the family as a friend. She is in the most real sense a part of the household, fully sharing

in the anxieties and the joys of the family, knowing the family's friends as her own friends. As has been said above, it is impossible to judge ancient society and life from the proper point of view, unless this fact is fully appreciated.

The story of Peter's release from prison is palpitating with life. There is nothing quite so picturesque, after a certain fashion, in the whole of Luke's work as this scene : but the fashion is not exactly that of Luke's pictures generally. This scene stands apart by itself, just as the Ethiopian scene also stands alone. Some special authority was followed by Luke in each case for one scene and no more. The ultimate authority for the facts of Peter's escape was, necessarily, himself. No other had seen the facts. No other person could tell what thoughts, and what confusion, filled Peter's mind. No one heard his soliloquy, when the angel left him in the street. But the description of the scene was not got by Luke from Peter's lips ; it has all the character of a narrative by a spectator, who was present in Mary's house and listened with eager interest and retentive memory to his hurried account of his deliverance. The listener's attention, of course, was concentrated on Peter ; and the Apostle's narrative was brief and confined to the facts which were most important in his hearers' estimation and his own. He had already lost valuable minutes at the door, while Rhoda was talking with the incredulous people inside and maintaining that Peter himself was at the door. His escape might be noticed at any moment, an alarm raised, and strict search made for the fugitive. Hence neither does Peter tell, nor do the hearers ask, what the two soldiers watching in his cell were doing, what the two sets of sentinels on guard outside the cell—"the first and the second ward"—were doing, whether all were asleep. We gather later that the escape was not discovered until the

next morning. As Peter had been roused from sound sleep by a blow on his side, and was as in a dream throughout the whole escape, and only awoke to full consciousness after he was clear of the prison and the angel had left him, his account would naturally take little notice of surrounding circumstances, and be restricted to the facts that had most strongly impressed him ; he saw nothing else, and was conscious only of those urgent facts, and that in a dim and half-dreamy fashion. No questions were put to him by any of his hearers on those other circumstances, or, if put (which is extremely improbable), they were not answered :¹ although information about them might be useful in view of his escape from Jerusalem and the chances of immediate pursuit. It was sufficient for the little crowd of listeners to have a clear conception of the really important factors in the situation—the distress of the Church in the prospect of losing its most influential and guiding spirit :² the earnest prayers of its members : the wonderful deliverance by “ a messenger of the Lord ” at the very moment when those prayers were being made most insistently and distressfully in the last night before the execution. These are the features set clearly and strongly before the reader in the whole narrative, and only one of them belongs to Peter himself or could originate from him. His story is, in the strictest sense, only subsidiary to the greater story, that of the Church’s need ; and it is placed before us from that point of view. In short, as has been said, we have here the authority of a Christian who listened to Peter, and had

¹ Implying that Peter either had no information to give or no desire to give it. But, considering the character of the Oriental audience, I should feel very confident that no questions were asked, and that the description of the scene is perfect and complete in all essentials..

² James was now evidently regarded as the head of the Church in Jerusalem ; but that was probably due to the frequent absence of Peter on external duty (viii. 14, 25, ix. 32, Gal. ii.).

prayed for Peter. But the circumstances were such as to impress Peter's words indelibly on the memory of his hearers : we have the scene before us in all its intensity and anxiety, yet in every stage deliberate and unhurried. Even Peter's dressing is described point by point ; he and his guide move on in the light, but the light shines in darkness, and all that does not concern their acts from moment to moment is shrouded in the darkness.

The narrator was Rhoda. Luke had listened to her. He had doubtless heard the tale from others, e.g., from John Mark, perhaps, when they were together in Rome¹ or elsewhere. Probably he heard Rhoda tell the story in the house of Mary, and in the presence of other witnesses who could corroborate or correct her. But she needed no correction. It was the great event of her life, and she told it in that striking fashion in which we read it. Luke recognized that her narrative gave the true spirit of the scene ; and he used the narratives of others only as subsidiary.

If we be right in this interpretation of the source, the story of Peter's deliverance lies before us almost in his very words and certainly in the exact details of the facts, as they were described within an hour after they occurred by the one man who knew them. This has a most important bearing on the trustworthiness of the Acts. There is no room here for invention or for the growth of legend. People were too eager : the need was too great : no one could do anything except under the overpowering urgency of the danger. All the persons who played a part in the scene were compelled by the circumstances to be themselves for the moment, and to strip off all pretence and regard to outward appearance. *Eripitur persona : manet res.*

That this interpretation is the true one must be felt by

¹ Colossians iv. ; Philemon.

every one who has the literary and the historic sense for reality. Luke, according to his custom,¹ gives the story of his informants with an added touch of literary skill, but never such a touch as to disturb the simplicity and the vivid rush and hurry of the original ; and Rhoda is the main authority.

Now, given this tale, based on this supremely excellent testimony, related to Luke thirteen years after the event, and, doubtless, often related in the interval, what are we to make of it ? We have here a test case of the worth of the class of evidence on which (as I believe) ultimately the whole three Synoptic Gospels rest, as well as much of Acts : the evidence is that of eye-witnesses, and absolutely honest truthful witnesses. What is its value ? what are its defects ? It is obvious, on the surface, that we in one sense do not know exactly what happened in the prison, but that much is enveloped in obscurity, and observed almost in a dream ; and that in another sense we know on the very best evidence all the really important and critical facts of the case.

(To be continued.)

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ As demonstrated by Harnack ; see footnote above, p. 268.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.¹

XIII.

ἐνδείκνυμι.—With the construction of ἐ. in 2 Tim. iv. 14, πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνδείξατο (cf. Gen. i. 15, 17) cf. OP 494⁹ (ii/A.D.) πᾶσαν πίστιν μοι ἐνδεικνυμένη, a passage which also helps to confirm the meaning of “faithfulness” for πίστις in certain N.T. passages such as Matt. xxiii. 23, Gal. v. 22.

ἐνδιδύσκω.—The range of this somewhat rare word is extended by the dialect inscription *Syll.* 857¹³ (ii/B.C.), ἐνδυδισκόμενος, clearly a hewer’s error for ἐνδιδυσκόμενος (Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 51).

ἐνδόμησις.—The spelling ἐνδώμησις, which W.H. adopt in Rev. xxi. 18, is confirmed by *Syll.* 583³¹, τὴν ἐνδώμησιν τοῦ τεμένους, where the editor pronounces this orthography as “new.”

ἐνέδρα.—The derived meaning of “treachery,” “fraud,” is illustrated by OP 62⁹ ff. (iii/A.D.), ἵνα μὴ ἐκ τῆς σῆς ἀμελείας ἐνέδρα περὶ τὴν ἐμβολὴν γένηται, “in order that there may be no fraud in the lading through any neglect of yours” (G. and H.). For a similar use of the verb see *Notes* iii. p. 430, and add P Rein 7²⁵ ff. (ii/B.C.), δέομαι οὖν ὑμῶν τῶν μεγίστων θεῶν μὴ με ὑπεριδεῖν ἐνεδρευόμενον ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἀγνώμονος, “I beseech you therefore, most high gods, not to show yourselves indifferent to the trap laid for me by this unfeeling [man].” Cf. *Syll.* 324¹⁹ (i/B.C.), ἐνεδρεύσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν νύκτωρ ἐδο[λοφ]όνησαν.

ἐνειλέω.—TbP 24⁶² (B.C. 117), ἐνίων μὲν αὐτοὺς ἐνειληκότων οἰκονομ[ίαις] κ.τ.λ., “some have wormed themselves into positions of oeconomus,” etc.

ἐνειμι.—The interpretation of Luke xi. 41, πλὴν τὰ ἐνόνητα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, “the contents of your cup and platter

¹ For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) *EXPOSITOR*, pp. 170, 262.

give ye in alms," may be supported by TbP 414^{19f.} (ii/A.D.), τὸ σφυρίδιν μετὰ τῶν ἐνότων κάτω, "the little basket with its contents at the bottom" (G. and H.).

ἐέργεια.—With the limitation of this word in the N.T. to superhuman activity (see Robinson, *Eph.* p. 242) cf. *OGIS* 262⁴ (iii/A.D.), προσενεχθέντος μοι περὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας θεοῦ Διὸς Βαιτοκαίκης. The generally strong sense of the word comes out in a fragmentary letter from Cronion, a προφήτης, TbP 616, ἐκ π[ύσης?] ἐνεργείας καὶ σπουδῆς καὶ φιλείας. The adj. is used in BU 1067⁴ (A.D. 101–2) of a mill in working order, μύλαιον ἐνεργόν, while in *Syll.* 517¹⁷ it refers to "employed" capital, money which brings in a return.

ἐνέχω.—Numerous instances of the construction of this verb with the simple dative as in Gal. v. 1 (see *Proleg.* 61) are forthcoming, e.g. TbP 5⁵ (ii/B.C.) an amnesty granted by Euergetes II. and the two Cleopatras, the "sister" and the "wife" to all their subjects, πλὴν τ[ῶν φόν]ους ἐκουσίοις καὶ ἱεροσολίαις ἐνεχομ[ένων], "except to persons guilty of wilful murder or sacrilege," BU 1051³⁴ (time of Augustus), χωρὶς (=χωρὶς) τοῦ τὸν παραπαίνοντα (=παραβαίνοντα) ἐνέχεσθαι τῷ ὠρισμένῳ προστίμῳ, "apart from the transgressor's being involved in the appointed penalty." Cf. also *Syll.* 154²⁶ (end of iv/B.C.), ἐνεχέσθων τῶν ψηφίσματι.

ἐννομος.—Sir William Ramsay contends (*Pauline Studies*, p. 203 ff.) that Acts xix. 39, ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται, should be rendered "it shall be determined in the duly constituted assembly" ("lawful," A.V.) rather than "in the regular assembly" (R.V.). In connexion with other nouns the adj. means "legal," as in OP 247¹² (A.D. 90) of the registration of a man προστρέχοντι τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἡλικίᾳ, "who is approaching the legal age." In *Syll.* 922^{4f.} (iii/B.C.) we read of a decision come to in the city of Delphi, ἐν ἀγορᾷ τελείῳ σὺν ψάφοις ταῖς ἐννόμοις; cf. for the same phrase *OGIS* 241¹³ (ii/B.C.), etc.

ἐνόρκιζω.—See *Thess.* 80.

ἐνοχος.—Wellhausen's assertion (*Einl.* p. 33 f.) that ἔ. τῆ κρίσει in Matt. v. 22 is not Greek is sufficiently ruled out by Grimm's apt parallel, ἔ. γραφῆ, "liable to be indicted," from Xenophon: Blass (p. 106) makes the dative there "the commoner classical construction." The dat. of the crime, also classical, is found in Hellenistic, as EP 23¹⁹ f (iii/B.C.), ἔ. τῆ ἀσεβείαι τοῦ ὄρκου. The gen. in 1 Cor. xi. 27 is claimed by Deissmann as a Cilician provincialism of Paul (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 78, where ἐνοχος ἔστω πᾶσι θεοῖς is cited from an inscription in SW. Asia—a yet closer parallel for Matt. *l.c.*).

ἐνταφιάζω.—In OP 476 (ii/A.D.) we have the report of two ἐνταφιασταί, "mummifiers," who had been commissioned to examine a dead body. On the use of the same subst. in Gen. i. 2 f. to describe the Egyptian physicians who embalmed the body of Jacob, see Deissmann, *BS* 120 f.

ἐντευξις.—The usage of this word in 1 Tim. ii. 1, iv. 5 is readily explained by its constant recurrence in the papyri and inscriptions as a kind of "vox sollemnis" for a "petition" of any kind. Thus AP 33²¹ f. (ii/B.C., a petition addressed to Ptolemy Philometor and Cleopatra II), δεόμεθ' ἰμῶν τῶν μεγίστων θεῶν εἰ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ ἀποστεῖλαι ἡμῶν τὴν ἐντευξιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρηματιστάς. According to Dittenberger on *OGIS* 138⁴ the word signifies properly the act of approaching the king, and was thence transferred to the statement or petition presented to him at the time. For the more literal meaning of "congressus" see *OGIS* 5⁶ (end of iv/B.C.), τὴν ἐντευξιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου ἐποιοῦμεθα.

ἐνρέπομαι.—See *Notes* iii., *Thess.* on 2 Th. iii. 14; add Witkowski's note, p. 47.

ἐντυλίσσω.—In BM II. p. 11¹⁵, an inventory of ii/B.C., we find amongst other articles mention of an ἐρίᾱ (ἐρεᾶ) ἐντύλλη, by which the Editor understands a woollen wrapper or rug.

The verb is found in the magic papyrus BM I. p. 110⁸²⁶ (iii/A.D.), ἐντύλισσε τὰ φύλ(λα) ἐν σουδαρίῳ κενῶ (καινῶ?), a passage which strangely recalls its only occurrence in the N.T., John xx. 7, τὸ σουδάριον . . . ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἓνα τόπον.

ἐνύπνιον.—This common LXX word (cf. Acts ii. 17) may be illustrated by two passages from the Paris Papyri, both belonging to ii/B.C., 44^{5f.} (=Witk. 58), ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐνύπνια ὄρῳ πονηρά, 47^{27ff.}, ἀποπεπτωκαμεν πλανώμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν, καὶ πιστεύοντες τὰ ἐνύπνια.

ἐνώπιον.—See *Proleg.*³ p. 99.

ἐξαλείφω.—*Syll.* 439²⁰ (iv/B.C.), ὃς δ' ἂν δόξει μὴ ὦν φράτηρ ἐσαχθῆναι, ἐξαλειψάτω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτὸ ὁ ἱερεὺς. *OGIS* 218¹²⁹ (iii/B.C.), ἐξαλείψαντας τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐκείνου—passages which at once recall Rev. iii. 5, οὐ μὴ ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς.

ἐξαρτίζω.—As this word is “rare in prof. auth.” one or two citations may be of interest. OP 296⁷ (i/A.D.), πέμψον ἡμεῖν περὶ τῶν βιβλίον^{sic} ἢ ἐξήρτισας, “send me word about the documents, how you have completed them,” where the editors remark that ἐξήρτισας probably = ἐτελείωσας. In TbP 342^{16f.} (ii/A.D.) it is found in the sense of “furnish,” κεραμεῖον . . . ἐξηρτισμ(ένον) πᾶσι, and similarly in BM III. p. 164¹¹ (iii/A.D.) of a boat, σὺν κώποις δυσὶ ἐξηρτισμένον, “supplied with two oars.” For the subst. see Aristeas 144 (ed. Wendland), πρὸς . . . τρόπων ἐξαρτισμὸν δικαιοσύνης ἔνεκεν σεμνῶς ταῦτι ἀνατέτακται.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

THE RELIGION AND WORSHIP OF THE SYNAGOGUE.

An Introduction to the Study of Judaism from the New Testament Period, by W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box. Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1907.

A TRUSTWORTHY handbook to modern Judaism, written from the Christian standpoint, has long been a want felt acutely by scholars, and by others interested in the Jewish race. Those who desired to obtain information about the doctrines and practices of Jews in this twentieth century have been obliged to read either books written by Jews (as, for example, on the Orthodox side, Mr. Michael Friedländer's *Jewish Religion*, 1891, and on the Reformed side, Mr. Morris Joseph's *Judaism as Creed and Life*, 1903, both able books from their own standpoint), or to hunt up separate articles, whether in that storehouse of information, the Jewish Encyclopedia, or in magazines and reports issued by missionary societies. Mr. J. Allen's *Modern Judaism* (1830) and Dr. Moses Margoliouth's *Fundamental Principles of Modern Judaism Investigated* (1843), though valuable in their day, are not up to modern requirements; while Dr. McCaul's *Old Paths* (1st edition 1835) never pretended to do more than describe and refute the opinions of extremely Orthodox Jews in Poland.

In truth no book has been published of recent years that deals in a comprehensive and scholarly way with the beliefs and practices of this strange Semitic nation which is to be found in every civilized country, and is of growing influence in each, save, of course, those of times contained within the Canon of the Old Testament. We therefore heartily welcome this present attempt to satisfy a very legitimate demand.

The authors divide their work into three parts—Introductory, Dogmatic, and Practical. In the first they deal chiefly with the Sources of Judaism, by which they understand, of course, not only the Canonical books of the Old Testament, to which they only allude, but also later writings. Thus they describe briefly, with dates, the Apocrypha and the pseudepigraphic writings, and rightly, if, as it seems, these played an important part in the development both of Christianity and of Judaism. They give summary information about the Targums and the Talmudic

literature of various kinds, indicating the best editions, whether of the original texts or of translations. For their book is intended even more for ordinary readers than for Hebraists or Talmudists. They also state the various methods by which such books are usually quoted, conscious of the fact that there are many pitfalls here, into which, it may be remarked, most commentators of the Bible fall. We hope, by the bye, that in the second edition, which must, we should suppose, soon be demanded, the learned authors will note that the Palestinian Talmud is quoted at least as often by the pages and columns of the first edition (Venice, 1523), copied at Cracow (1609) and Krotoschin (1866), as by the chapters and Halachoth. A wise man, however, quotes by both methods, for he has learned by experience that thus the exact passage required can frequently be found more quickly. Then follows an excellent chapter on the Midrashim and the Prayer Book, the rationale of the latter finding a place in the Third Part. We observe with pleasure that the Authors have here added a few references to the great mediaeval Jewish thinkers and theologians, though the information given might well be amplified. Mention should have been made of the German translation of Bachya's *Duties of the Hearts*, for the advantage of those who are unable to read that remarkable and stimulating treatise in the Arabic or the Hebrew. This Part is fittingly closed with a brief account of the Jewish sects and parties, coming down to those of modern times, the Chassidim and the Reform Jews.

The Second Part, on Dogmatic Judaism, is bolder and more original, being an attempt in a hundred and thirty pages not only to state the chief doctrines of Judaism, but also to explain their origin and development. Naturally much use has been made of Weber's standard work on *Jüdische Theologie* for the later developments, and Bousset's *Religion des Judentums* (we wonder how many of his readers know how his name ought to be pronounced !) for the earlier. But nothing has been taken for granted, and almost every paragraph is marked by independent thought. At the same time it is the most tantalizing portion of the book ; for it suggests the need not only of describing a doctrine, but also of weighing it in relation to Christian truth. This is hardly attempted. We should greatly like to see an exhaustive study of Jewish doctrine from this point of view made by Dr. Oesterley and Mr. Box. They have an absolutely

clear field before them, for no one has yet attempted it, at least in a serious and fitting way. We hope that they will carry it out, working, we may add, very slowly at a task of such importance, and therefore very surely.

The Third Part is on Practical Religion, and describes the education and life of the Jew, the Synagogue and its Calendar, the Prayer Book looked at from within (and Mr. Box, as is well known, has made a special study of this), the Sabbath, the Festivals and Solemn Days, with a closing chapter on some religious rites and ceremonies. In this last chapter we again have an attempt to explain the origin and development of the subjects examined.

It is poor praise to say that the book is unique. It is equally true to say that it is an extraordinarily able arrangement of trustworthy information about modern Judaism, with a great deal of original suggestion. It is, we hope, an earnest of a still more finished and judicial study of the doctrinal relation of Church and Synagogue.

A. LUKYN WILLIAMS.

APOSTOLIC PREACHING AND EMPEROR WORSHIP.

THE aim of this discussion is to attempt, on the basis of researches made by scholars within recent years, a more or less definite estimate of certain aspects of the bearing of the Imperial cult on Christian teaching and influence in the first age of the Faith.

Certain facts, it may be held, have passed beyond the region of controversy. The best authorities, for example, are agreed that the real clue to the interpretation of the Apocalypse is to be found in the very enigmatic thirteenth chapter. There, the great Dragon, the embodiment of all that is evil and ungodly, makes over his power and authority to the Beast which comes up out of the sea. The Beast, upon whose horns are ten diadems, and upon his heads names of blasphemy, is worshipped by all who dwell on the earth, "every one whose name hath not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain" (Apoc. xiii. 8). The second Beast, which comes up out of the earth, exercises all the authority of the first Beast. He commands those who dwell on the earth to make an image to the first Beast. Those who refuse to worship that image, he causes to be killed. Recent interpreters are at one in holding that the first Beast symbolizes the Imperial Power of Rome.¹ That dominion is visualized for the inhabitants of Asia Minor in the temples erected, at first, to the Divine Augustus and the goddess Rome, subsequently, to the *Divi* (dead

¹ See, e.g., Bousset *ad loc.*

rulers) and the living Emperor.¹ The second Beast represents the provincial priesthood of the Imperial cult, which had attained enormous power in Asia Minor.

The provincial Diet, the yearly gathering of the municipal deputies of the province, had become so closely associated with the temple festival and games celebrated annually in honour of the deified Emperor, that soon the presidency of the assembly became a function, *ex officio*, of the high-priesthood of the provincial temples.² These provincial high-priests necessarily became links between the Imperial administration and the general religious life of the provinces. It would therefore be for them a matter of self-interest, as well as of patriotism and religion, to denounce to the ruling state-officials any disloyalty on the part of individuals to that worship which was the very emblem of Imperial unity and stability.

The difficult references to the mark of the Beast (Apoc. xiii. 16, 17) have had, at least, some light shed upon them by Professor Ramsay's brilliant investigation of the inscription of Gondane, belonging to the Imperial estates, near Pisidian Antioch, relating to a religious society known as the *ξένοι Τεκμορείοι* or Tekmoreian Guest-Friends. The Tekmor (*τέκμωρ*), from which they took their name, "was some solemn sign and pledge of the loyalty of the celebrant to the Emperor and his service. We can hardly be mistaken in connecting the institution of this solemn secret symbolic act with the greatest political fact of the third century, the war between the State and the Christian faith" (Ramsay, *Studies in the Eastern Roman Provinces*, p. 347). There is nothing rash

¹ See Kornemann, *Zur Geschichte d. antiken Herrscherkulte*, in *Klio*, ed. by Lehmann, i. p. 108.

² See Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, i. pp. 347, 348; Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 127; O. Hirschfeld, *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Akademie, 1888, p. 347 (notes).

in the hypothesis that similar usages must have been current at an earlier date.

It is plain that the writer of the Apocalypse, composed in all likelihood in the reign of Domitian, recognized a life and death struggle in the opposition between the Christian faith and the Imperial worship. This was precisely the attitude taken by the Emperor Domitian himself. No ruler more arrogantly asserted claims to divine adoration. In his own lifetime he had himself proclaimed as *dominus et deus*.¹ Refusal to acknowledge those claims must have appeared the highest form of treason. And such refusal adherents of the Christian faith were bound to make.

This negative aspect of the situation is thoroughly intelligible. But was there a positive aspect also? Apart from the general situation, were there definite elements in the Christian faith and in the Christian Gospel, as they were propagated throughout Asia, calculated to provoke bitter antagonism in the minds of loyal adherents of the Imperial cult? The central Figure of the new and rapidly spreading propaganda was the crucified and risen Jesus. In what character was Jesus set forth by the Christian missionaries as they journeyed through the provinces of the Roman Empire? We know that among their Jewish compatriots in Palestine the first followers of Jesus were designated Nazarenes. But soon, as the sphere of influence of the new religion expanded, this name, which probably had a more or less contemptuous *nuance*, was exchanged for that of *Χριστιανοί*. This, also, may have been at first a nickname (so Wetstein and others). In any case, it is a striking outside testimony to the fact, so fully established by the New Testament, that the Messiahship of Jesus stood in the forefront of apostolic preaching.

A larger view of the Messianic Hope of Judaism has shown

¹ See Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 275.

that the remarkable foreshadowings of the Old Testament cannot be compressed within the conception of the Anointed King. Yet this must not blind us to the significance of Jesus' own central idea of the Kingdom of God, and the continual quotation in a Messianic sense by New Testament writers of Old Testament passages dealing with the God-appointed King. Even in the Epistles of Paul, whose personal experience of Christ has largely shaped his Christian vocabulary, the term *βασιλεία*, in its Synoptic sense, occurs far oftener than is sometimes realized. In the Apocalypse, a typically Jewish book, and yet written in Asia Minor, *βασιλεία* and *βασιλεύειν* are found with noteworthy frequency. That this element was prominent in the Messianic status of Jesus comes out quite incidentally in all the accounts of His trial before Pilate. Luke describes the main accusation brought against Him as that of "perverting our nation and forbidding to pay tribute to Caesar and saying that he himself is Christ the King" (Luke xxiii. 2). Similarly the Fourth Gospel reports the Jews as shouting to Pilate: "If thou releasest this man, thou art no friend of Caesar's; every one that maketh himself a king, opposeth Caesar" (John xix. 12). At Thessalonica the mixed rabble describe the Christian missionaries Paul and Silas to the Politarchs as men who "act contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another King, one Jesus" (Acts xvii. 7). The Kingship and Kingdom of Jesus the Messiah must therefore have been powerfully emphasized in the apostolic preaching. And often the impression received by Hellenistic audiences would no doubt be exceedingly literalistic.¹

It need scarcely be said that no name was more expressive of the Christian attitude to Christ than that of *κύριος*,

¹ See an interesting note in Harnack, *Mission u. Ausbreitung d. Xtums.*, p. 191, note 2, in which he shows that the early Christians were accustomed to call Jesus *βασιλεύς* in the East, and in the West *imperator*.

Lord. Probably its full significance is exhibited in Philip-
 pians ii. 9, 10, where Paul, after describing the infinite
 condescension and lowliness of Jesus, declares that, as the
 result of this voluntary humiliation, "God highly exalted
 him, and gave him the name which is above every name,
 that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things
 heavenly and earthly and beneath the earth, and that every
 tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is *Lord*, to the
 glory of God the Father." The universal Lordship of
 Jesus means universal adoration. Hellenistic Jews recog-
 nized in the title *κύριος* the Septuagint translation of the
 Old Testament Jehovah. Again and again the apostolic
 writers adduce quotations in which it stands for God.
 This was the designation which adhered to Christ in the
 early Church, as Harnack notes,¹ above all others.

It is interesting to observe that the title "Saviour,"
σωτήρ, which has had such a wide currency in Christian
 usage, is almost confined to the latest books of the New
 Testament. This may be entirely accidental, as it must
 be recognized that *σωτηρία*, "salvation," has a wide range
 in the New Testament writings. In any case, towards
 the close of the Apostolic Age, *σωτήρ* became a favourite
 title for Christ. And its vogue so largely increased that
 "in some Christian circles the designation 'Saviour' was
 exclusively used of Jesus" (Harnack, *Mission*, etc., p. 74,
 note 3).²

No reference has as yet been made to the very important
 appellation "Son of God" (*υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*). Obviously,
 the phrase has its roots in the Messianic conceptions of
 the Old Testament (e.g., such passages as Ps. ii. 7, Ps.

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, i.² p. 153, note 1, in which he quotes a remark-
 able testimony from Novatian.

² Harnack points out that Irenaeus (I. i. 3) reproached the Valentinian
 Ptolemaeans for not consenting to call Jesus *κύριος*, but only *σωτήρ*.

lxxxix. 26, 27). But in the self-consciousness of Jesus, as disclosed by the Synoptic Gospels, and in the thought of writers like Paul, John, and the author of Hebrews, the idea has been infinitely deepened. Its significance for these writers is sufficiently elucidated by the fact that they all emphasize the pre-existence of Christ. The Sonship of Jesus means an altogether unique relationship to God. Its background stretches behind time. It postulates Divinity in the fullest sense.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the rarer designations of Jesus such as *ὁ ἀγαπητός*, *ὁ ἀρχηγός*, *ὁ εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, *ὁ πρωτότοκος*, and others, although all of these might be brought within the scope of our discussion.

The all-important fact to observe at the stage we have reached is that the chief names of reverence and adoration given to Him whom the Christian missionaries proclaimed on their journeyings as the sole Hope of humanity were precisely those accorded to the Emperors, dead and living, by the votaries of the Imperial cult. They also are worshipped under the appellations of *κύριος*, *σωτήρ*, *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, *θεὸς ἐπιφανής*, etc.

It may be well, before examining the facts more closely, to recall, in a few sentences, the historical process which led to this result. In oriental civilizations like those of Babylon, Persia, and Egypt, from an early time, the king was regarded as the son of a god. It may be impossible to determine all that was involved in the content of the conception. But the ideas associated with it became familiar to eastern peoples. In the Hellenic world probably the nearest approach to this cycle of thought was the super-human honour paid to those who, in their lifetime, had been pre-eminent among their fellows for bravery, patriotism, or some other impressive characteristic. Raised after death to the rank of "heroes," they had sacred rites

and festivals dedicated to them. A formula found in inscriptions is *θεοῖς ἠρώσι τε* (see Rohde, *Psyche*,² ii. p. 353, notes). These two currents of thought must inevitably mingle when the conquering genius of Alexander the Great brought East and West together in a common Hellenism. As a matter of fact, the deification of rulers takes very definite shape in the kingdoms of Alexander's successors. Thus in an inscription of Halicarnassus (perhaps about 306 B.C.) Ptolemaeus I. (Lagi) is named *σωτήρ καὶ θεός* (Dittenberger, O.G.I. xvi. 2, 3).¹ But not before 261 B.C. was he called *θεός* in Egypt (*ibid.* note 3). The various kings of Syria who bore the name of Antiochus receive the title *θεός* (see the very significant inscriptions in Dittenberger, O.G.I., 245, 264). The fourth, of notorious memory, is designated on his own coins *θεὸς ἐπιφανής*, the god who has appeared among men. Antiochus I. of Kommagene, at the opening of the famous inscription in which he recounts his own merits, names himself *θεὸς δίκαιος ἐπιφανής* (Dittenb., O.G.I., 383, 1). A step of immense significance for history was taken when titles of this description were given to Roman rulers. The custom seems to have begun in Asiatic communities, in the last century of the Republic, when temples, e.g., were erected to Roman proconsuls and generals.² This was partly due to the habit of cringing adulation, characteristic of Eastern races, which had become acclimatized in Asia Minor, and partly to genuine gratitude for the stability of Roman supremacy. Thus, an inscription of Ephesus (Dittenb. Syll.³ 347, 6) honours Julius Caesar in his lifetime as *τὸν ἀπὸ Ἄρεως καὶ Ἀφρο-*

¹ All our examples, unless otherwise cited, are from W. Dittenberger's splendid collection of Greek inscriptions, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, ed. 2, 3 vols., Leipz., 1898-1901, and its supplement, *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 2 vols., Leipz., 1903-1905.

² See Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 836.

³ See Kornemann, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

δείτης θεὸν ἐπιφανῆ καὶ κοινὸν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου βίου σωτήρα, "the god descended from Ares and Aphrodite, who has appeared in human form, and the universal Saviour of the life of men." In 42 B.C., apotheosis was officially decreed for the dead Julius under the title *Divus* (not *deus*). For a time, at least, Augustus restricted the worship of Roman citizens to the *Divus Julius*, but accepted divine honours for himself from his Graeco-Asiatic subjects. Apparently the first temple dedicated to his worship was one at Pergamon, erected to "Rome and Augustus." Connected with the temple was a guild of choristers, θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ καὶ θεᾶς Ρώμης.¹ A similar temple at Ancyra in Galatia soon followed (Dittenb., O.G.I., 533, note 2). From this time onwards divine honours were showered upon Augustus in his Eastern dominions. At a later period he accepted deification even from Italian communities, e.g., Beneventum (about 14 B.C.). The Imperial cult was now an elaborately organized institution. Professor Ramsay has shown with masterly ability that this organized worship was the real basis of Roman provincial unity, and that that unity was the most influential idea in Asia (e.g., *Letters to the Seven Churches*, pp. 115, 127).

We are now in a position to set side by side the earliest Christian designations of Christ, as proclaimed by the apostolic missionaries, and those of the deified emperors in the opening centuries of our era. It is scarcely necessary to call attention to so obvious a fact as the conflict between the Christian idea of βασιλεύς and βασιλεία, and that universal throughout the Graeco-Roman world. The former was central for the teaching of Jesus, and must have been prominent in early Christian preaching, even apart from its implication in the conception of the Messiah. Harnack refers (*Mission u. Ausbreitung*, p. 191, note 2) to an inter-

¹ See Kornemann, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

esting passage in Justin Martyr (*Apology*, i. 11): "You (i.e. the Pagans), having heard that we expect a kingdom (*βασιλείαν*), have, without discernment, supposed that we speak of a human kingdom." On this point, as we have hinted above, an issue must early have been raised by loyal subjects of the Emperor throughout the Hellenistic world, who gave their liege lord this very title of *βασιλεύς*. We shall have occasion to return to this subject in discussing the idea of the Christian and Pagan Messiah.

Still keener would be the controversy roused in Greek-speaking audiences by the constant description of Jesus Christ as *κύριος* on the part of the Christian missionaries. We know what the term meant for the Apostolic Church. It expressed the claim of the risen Christ to the sole worship of men. The title *ὁ κύριος* is sometimes given to the gods in the hieratic inscriptions, although it is not very common. Professor Ramsay (*Expos. Times*, x. 5, p. 209) is inclined to attribute it to Semitic influence, particularly to "the old Semitic spirit of early Anatolian religion."¹ Something of this flavour will have probably adhered to it when used of the emperors. In any case, for our purpose, the usage is highly significant. In a decree of the inhabitants of Acraephia in Bœotia, in honour of Nero, he is styled *ὁ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κύριος*, "Lord of the whole world" (Dittenb. Syll.² 376, 31). It is easy to realize the profoundness of the antagonism between the Imperial worship and the new faith when, over against such appellations we place utterances like Acts x. 36, *οὗτός (i.e. Christ) ἐστὶν πάντων κύριος*: 1 Cor. viii. 6, *εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*: and Apoc. xvii. 14, *κύριος κυρίων ἐστὶν καὶ βασιλεὺς βασιλέων*. The epithet *ὁ κύριος* is constantly found attached to the names of the emperors, and often in the interesting form

¹ Compare the extraordinary importance of the *Baalim* (Lords) in Semitic religions (W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 92 ff.).

ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, e.g. of Antoninus Pius (Dittenb., O.G.I., 706, 5), of Commodus (*ibid.* 708, 1), of Caracalla, and others. Asiatics, Greeks, and Romans had, therefore, already a very definite connotation for the phrase ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, a phrase which occurs on every second page of Paul's Epistles, and which must have been equally common in his preaching. How much was involved in the Imperial designation becomes clear from such noteworthy collocations as τῶν μεγίστων καὶ θειοτάτων κυρίων ἡμῶν αὐτοκρατόρων, "our absolute Lords, most mighty, most divine" (Dittenb., O.G.I., 515, 10-11). And it is worth while comparing with this the combination so frequent in the Apocalypse, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, "the Lord God omnipotent," a combination already found in the Septuagint. That, in turn, brings into bolder relief the full content of κύριος as applied to Jesus Christ.

In a few passages, belonging almost entirely to the latest books of the New Testament (Phil. iii. 20, Tit. i. 4? 2 Pet. i. 11, ii. 20, iii. 2, 18), κύριος is coupled with σωτήρ, usually in the phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος. The noun σωτήρ is curiously rare in the New Testament, with the exception of the Pastoral Epistles and Second Peter. This may be wholly accidental, as we have seen, for the cognate words σωτηρία and σώζειν are widely current among New Testament writers. And in the passages in which σωτήρ does occur it seems impossible to discover in it a shade of meaning different from that belonging to its kindred terms. This, in our judgment, has been established by W. Wagner in an exhaustive article (*Zeitschr. f. N. T. Wissenschaft*, vi. pp. 20 ff.), in which he comes to the conclusion that "σώζειν and its derivatives in the technical sense do not describe deliverance from any casual trouble, but deliverance from spiritual or eternal death to a new religio-ethical or eternal life" (p. 229). The conception

of salvation (*σωτηρία*) is, of course, the very core of New Testament Christianity. It is virtually identical with that of Eternal Life, the final goal of the Christian career. Its basis already appears in the redeeming mercy of God in the Old Testament, and Jesus deliberately describes His own mission as "to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke *xix.* 10).

At the same time it is possible that Harnack¹ and Wendland are not wholly mistaken in associating the appearance of the actual noun *σωτήρ* in the later New Testament writings with its prominent position in the Imperial cult. The subject has been so thoroughly discussed by Wendland (*Zeitschr. f. N.T. Wissensch.* v. pp. 335 ff.), that all we can do is to state concisely the salient positions of his article. It makes little difference to our discussion whether the early Christians were actually influenced in their application of *σωτήρ* to Christ by the Imperial worship or not. The fact that they used the title, a title which in any case lay close to their hands, reveals another sharp point of conflict between them and the State-religion.

The word *σωτήρ* constantly occurs in the LXX as a translation of the Hebrew *יְהוָה* or of *יְשׁוּעָה*, as applied to God. It has also had an important place in Greek religion. Zeus, Apollo, Asklepios, Hermes, etc., are all worshipped under the title of *σωτήρ*. Then it was applied to heroic men who received divine adoration, and particularly to the successors of Alexander, the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Finally, it was ascribed again and again to Augustus, as, e.g., in

¹ In his *Mission u. Ausbreitung*, etc., Harnack strongly emphasizes the missionary preaching of the early Church as the Gospel of the Physician and Saviour (*Heilandes, Healer*), and in this connexion most interestingly traces the enormous expansion of the cult of Asklepios, the god of medicine, into that of the *σωτήρ par excellence*, the Helper in every time of need, the friend of mankind. *φωσφωριστρες* (pp. 74, 76, 77). I have not been able to consult his *Reden u. Aufsätze*, i. pp. 301-311, which contains a paper, "Als die Zeit erfüllet war. Der Heiland."

an inscription of the island of Philae, which says of the Emperor: ὁ σωτὴρ Ζεὺς ἀνέτειλε μέγας, "who arose a Saviour, Zeus, most mighty" (Wendland, loc. cit., p. 343). Wendland shows that the designation emphasizes the clemency and grace of the Emperor, qualities peculiarly valued by his subjects in the Provinces, who call his birthday, probably not insincerely, "the beginning of existence and life" for them (inscription of Priene).¹ *Soter* is the helper in time of need, the bringer of deliverance and salvation. Thus Hadrian is described as σωτῆρι ῥυσαμένῳ καὶ θρέψαντι τὴν αὐτοῦ Ἑλλάδα, "the Saviour who rescued and nurtured his own Hellas" (Dittenb. Syll.² 383, 1). Wendland is disposed to think that expressions like ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου in John iv. 12, 1 John iv. 14, τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος in 2 Tim. i. 10, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος in Titus ii. 11, and a few others, suggest a more or less conscious adoption of ideas by Christian teachers from the Imperial cult. The question appears to us impossible of decision, although we cannot deny that there are good grounds for speaking of "the complete mosaic of ideas from the sphere of the Hellenistic Imperial worship revealed in these two passages, from the Pastorals" (Wendland, loc. cit. p. 349). Thus, for example, the phrase quoted above from 2 Timothy i. 10, τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος, receives a new significance when we remember that ἐπιφανής was the stereotyped epithet applied to the deified King or Emperor to express the idea of divinity made visible in him to humanity. And unquestionably the suggestion would wonderfully illuminate Paul's words in Philippians iii. 20, "For our citizenship (πολίτευμα) is in heaven, from whence we truly expect a Saviour (σωτῆρα), the Lord Jesus Christ." A supreme test of loyalty for citizens of the Empire was adherence to the worship of the Imperial ruler who was κύριος, σωτῆρ,

¹ See also Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 115.

and θεός. The Christian Commonwealth also has a κύριος and σωτήρ. But the commonwealth and its Lord belong in reality to the unseen world.

There remains the important New Testament designation of Christ as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. It is needless to give examples of its occurrence. As early as the famous inscription on the Rosetta Stone (B.C. 196), Ptolemaeus V. (Epiphanes) is called εἰκὼν ζώση τοῦ Διός, "the living image of Zeus."¹ In the Roman Empire, the living Ruler is regarded as the incarnation of *Sol Invictus*, the invincible Sun-God.² Domitian desired to be worshipped as Divine Providence in human shape.³ The inscriptions abound with the direct title θεοῦ υἱός. Thus, in an inscription of Olympia not later than 27 B.C., Augustus receives this designation (Dittenb. Syll.² 351, 1). A favourite appellation is αὐτοκράτωρ θεοῦ υἱὸς Σεβαστός (numerous examples in Dittenberger). An inscription of 31 A.D. denominates Tiberius as θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱός, θεοῦ Ιουλίου νιωνός (Dittenb. O.G.I. 471, 1). Deissmann, who believes that υἱὸς θεοῦ is a translation of $\frac{1}{2}$ *divi filius*, so common in Latin inscriptions, cites an interesting inscription in honour of Augustus, bearing this title, from the city of Tarsus, in which, he suggests, the youthful Paul may, for the first time, have come across the idea of the Son of God "long before the words for him were filled with a different content" (*Bibelstudien*, p. 167, note 2). In this case, of course, no hypothesis is admissible as to a possible derivation of the phrase from Hellenistic usage. But it is easy to picture the impression made on the inhabitants of the Roman Provinces, whether Greeks or Asiatics, as they listened to the humble yet ardent missionaries of the new faith heaping upon its

¹ See Kornemann, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

² See Wendland, *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, p. 97.

³ See Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 275.

Founder the highest titles which adorned the Imperial Ruler, that Ruler whose worship was the most important symbol of all that they valued in their political life. The effect must have been startling; and the result, either the creation of a bitter antagonism or the awakening of a mysterious interest in Christ and His religion.

For this latter aspect of the situation must not be left out of sight. Each fresh investigation of the life and thought of the Empire makes a new contribution to the significance of Paul's phrase, "the fulness of the time." It was not indeed mere flattery which led to the apotheosis of the Imperial Rulers, as the *foci*, so to speak, of Roman dominion. The *Pax Romana* was an inestimable boon to regions which had been for centuries the arena of bitter and deadly strife. There is rich significance in the words of an inscription of Halicarnassus: ¹ εἰρηνεύουσι . . . γῆ καὶ θάλαττα, "land and sea are at peace" (qu. by Wendland, loc. cit., p. 344). But this boon of material order and stability left unstilled the religious cravings of the people. Emperor-worship was at best a superficial expression of feeling, of feeling that was not religious at all. As Professor Ramsay has shown, in Asia the gods of Pergamon, Dionysus Kathegemon and Asklepios, and Artemis the goddess of Ephesus, were brought into prominence for the purpose of satisfying this need.² More remarkable still was the welcome given to all manner of Oriental cults, which had esoteric doctrines to impart and mystic sacraments to communicate to their devotees.³ The Christian faith came into the arena as one of those competing views of life. But it refused to compromise with the State-religion. It claimed for

¹ Brit. Museum Inscrr. 894.

² *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 230.

³ See an admirable brief statement in Heinrici, *Der litterarische Charakter d. N. T. Schriften*, pp. 6-17: fuller discussions in Cumont, *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme romain*: Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*.

its central Figure the highest prerogatives which had ever been assigned to the Emperor. Jesus also had been man, but finally had been "declared Son of God in power, according to the spirit of holiness, as the result of His resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4). Was it of no moment that these inhabitants of the Graeco-Roman world were accustomed to hear at all their national festivals the very names by which He was named? If the person who symbolized that power on which their national prosperity depended was greeted as Lord, Saviour, and Son of God, must it not have been easier for them, through the spiritualizing of these very terms, to rise to the understanding of Him in whom their souls could find the living God and be satisfied?

But over and above this strange parallelism between the Imperial Ruler and the risen Christ, we must note the fact that each was the centre of a new order. The Christian missionaries proclaimed that in Jesus the wonderful Messianic forecasts of the earlier revelation were perfectly realized. The moment for which the world had been waiting was come. There is a remarkable similarity in the thrill of joyful expectancy which greeted the accession of Augustus. The Roman people were sick of bloodshed and slaughter. The awful proscriptions were an indelible memory. Those who were most sensitive to the currents of history saw in the establishment of the Empire the opening of a new era, the advent of a Golden Age which should wipe out the stains of crime and cruelty. Many passages might be quoted from classical writers to exemplify this outlook. A most interesting conspectus is given in Wendland's brilliant work, *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, pp. 88-89, notes. Probably the most famous of these passages is the Fourth Eclogue of Vergil, which has been the subject of such keen controversy. We are not concerned here with the detailed interpretation of the so-called Messianic

idea of the poem, although we are persuaded that Professor R. S. Conway and others are right in holding that Vergil had in view the birth of a son to Octavius, which was expected in 40 B.C.¹ Of chief importance is the poet's reference to the boy "who shall put an end to the age of iron and cause the age of gold to arise for the whole world" (lines 8-9). That this expectation belongs to the hopes kindled by Octavian, as founder of the Empire, is plain from other passages in Vergil, e.g., *Aeneid*, vi. 791-794 :

This, this is he, so oft the theme
Of your prophetic fancy's dream,
Augustus Caesar, god by birth ;
Restorer of the age of gold
In lands where Saturn ruled of old (Conington).

With these lines may be compared *Aeneid*, i. 291-296. But this welcome of a better and brighter age echoes throughout the poetry of the time. Thus Horace in the *Carmen Seculare*, 57 ff., can sing : " Now Faith and Peace and Honour and ancient Modesty and neglected Virtue dare to return, and Plenty appears to view, rich in her full horn." The fifth ode of Horace's Fourth Book is a Hymn to Augustus, resounding with the same note of glad security, relief from the burden of lawlessness and vice, and the restoration of purity to the world. Numerous parallels might be quoted from the literature of the opening decades of the Empire.

It is, therefore, no exaggeration to call Augustus a Pagan Messiah, the inaugurator of a " Messianic " Age. Indeed, many passages occur in Vergil and Horace in which the imagery has a remarkable resemblance to the prophetic pictures of the Messianic era in the Old Testament. The parallelism, as we know, made so powerful an impression upon the Fathers of the Church that Vergil, at least, was ranked among the prophets. But apart from this, the

¹ See Conway in the *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1907, p. 318.

facts are surely full of significance. Must not this spirit of the time have worked powerfully in favour of the Christian missionaries who announced that the Messiah was indeed come, and this a King, whose pathway had not been prepared by force and bloodshed like that of Augustus, whose kingdom, on the contrary, was "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost"? This was the very ideal, as Conway admirably shows, which Vergil extolled, "the conception of peace by forgiveness, of conciliation instead of punishment,—in a word, the ideal of mercy" (loc. cit., p. 324). It corresponds to the *φιλανθρωπία*, "humane conduct" (*benignitas*), the *χάρις*, or "grace" (*clementia*) of the Emperor, so frequently lauded in inscriptions. And these are precisely the ideas emphasized in Titus iii. 4: "When the kindness (*χρηστότης*) of our Saviour God appeared (*ἐπεφάνη*, the word used of the visible deity of the Emperors, *ἐπιφανής*), and his love towards men (*φιλανθρωπία*)." Equally suggestive is Titus ii. 11: "For there has appeared (*ἐπεφάνη*) the grace (*χάρις*) of God, bringing salvation (*σωτήριος*)." In view of these facts it is not surprising that among Patristic writers we come upon statements like that of Origin *c. Celsum*, ii. 30, which estimates the situation from a kindred, while slightly varying, standpoint:¹ "In Jesus' days righteousness arose and abundance of peace: they began with His birth. God was preparing the peoples for His doctrine, and ordained that the Roman Emperor should rule the whole world. . . . It is well known that the birth of Jesus took place in the reign of Augustus, who had united most of the peoples into a single dominion. The presence of a number of kingdoms would have hindered the diffusion of Jesus' doctrine over the whole earth, not merely on account of the causes already named, but also because the peoples would then have been compelled to

¹ See Harnack, *Mission u. Ausbreitung*, etc., p. 13.

wage war and defend their fatherland. . . . How, in that case, could this peaceful doctrine, which does not for a moment permit revenge upon one's enemies, have penetrated and found a reception, if the circumstances of the world in every direction had not taken a more peaceful shape at the time when Jesus appeared?" We will not dwell on this most noteworthy feature of the situation which Professor Ramsay has made so familiar to students of early Christianity, the unity of the Empire, expressed in the Imperial cult, as a wonderful preparation for a universal religion and a universal Church.¹

Enough has been said to indicate some of the positive as well as negative bearings of Emperor worship upon the apostolic preaching and its influence. The antagonism between the Imperial cult and Christianity must have been enormously intensified by the very fact that Christ and the Emperor were worshipped under synonymous titles which established identical claims upon the adoration and devotion of the worshippers. But this identity must, in turn, have opened up avenues in the Hellenistic mind for the entrance of the highest Christian conceptions. Moreover, the quasi-Messianic significance of the new Imperial order, which ultimately led to Emperor worship, was the counterpart of the new dispensation of grace which was heralded by the Christian missionaries in the name of Jesus the Christ. And, finally, the unification of the Roman provinces, a process whose basis was the State-religion, was unconsciously preparing the way of the Lord. Even externally, although this consideration opens up a vista into another far-reaching branch of the subject, the intimate relationship of the two orders can be maintained. "It

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, pp. 29, 115, 127, etc.; *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 133, 192, 362, etc.; also, Wendland, *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, pp. 93 ff.; L. Hahn, *Rom und Romanismus*, pp. 99-104, 169-176.

is a remarkable testimony," says Hirschfeld,¹ "to the continuity of all human development, even when, to all appearance, it is accomplished in sharp contrast to its past, that the Christian Church in no small measure derived the outward forms, titles, and insignia for its councils and priests from that provincial Emperor worship which, for three centuries, had constituted the Pagan emblem of Roman Imperial unity in the East and in the West."

H. A. A. KENNEDY.

A FOURTH-CENTURY LYCAONIAN BISHOP.

II.

THE biography, in nineteen condensed lines, of a Roman country gentleman who served as a military officer in a Provincial governor's train under the Emperor Diocletian, who suffered many tortures under Maximin rather than be disloyal to the Christian faith, and who afterwards administered an important bishopric during a period of peculiar romance in the history of the early Christian Church—the period of the first Emperor who took up arms for Christianity, and of the last armed champion of paganism—is preserved to us in the Epitaph of Bishop Eugenius, found last summer at Laodiceia Combusta, and published in the EXPOSITOR for November of last year. The sketch given there of the career of Eugenius in its historical setting, and the attempt made to appraise the bearing of the evidence contained in his epitaph on our knowledge of the relations between Church and Empire was necessarily brief and inadequate. It is only with time, and with close study of the history of the period, that the full significance of a miniature autobiography from the hand of a man who lived through such an epoch of disruption and recon-

¹ Loc. cit. p. 862.

struction can be realised. A few further notes on the early career of Eugenius, suggested by a criticism of the article referred to above by a distinguished German epigraphist, may remove a possible cause of misconception as to the direction and aim of the new Edict of Maximin against the Christians in the Roman army, and help somewhat towards a clearer understanding of the position of a Roman provincial of good family in a Provincial governor's bureau in the years preceding the Nicene Council.

These notes must open with a correction and an acknowledgement. In the translation appended to the text of the Epitaph in the November EXPOSITOR, the word *τάξι* is rendered "detachment of troops" (on the analogy of a common use of the word in Greek writers of the early Empire ¹), and Eugenius is represented as having served with the body of troops under command of the Governor of Pisidia. This (possibly with the substitution of "attached to the train of" for "under command of") is, as we hope to show below, a perfectly accurate description of the facts, but full justice is not done to the rendering of the word *τάξις*. Professor Dessau, of Berlin, in a private criticism of my former paper, has pointed out to me that in texts of the later Empire the word *τάξις* occurs regularly, denoting the whole *officium* or bureau of a Provincial governor,² and this is quite clearly the meaning of the

¹ Philo, *in Flacc.* § 11, τῆς ὑπηρετοῦ τάξεως: § 13, μετὰ τῆς τάξεως τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἧς ἀφηγεῖτο (in both cases under a *centurio*). Aelian, *Tactic.* ch. 9.

² Professor Dessau writes Dec. 1908: ". . . Ich glaube Ihnen schon gesagt zu haben, dass nach meiner Meinung der spätere Bischof Eugenius nicht im Heer Kriegsdienste gethan, sondern im Bureau (Officium) des Statthalters von Pisidien eine Stelle bekleidet hat: ἡγεμονικὴ τάξις ist *officium praesidis*, *τάξις* das technische Wort für das Officium (die *apparitores*) des Statthalters. So kommt das Wort z. B. in Märtyrerakten vor, unter anderm in den Akten des Romanus and Calliopius, die Mommsen, *Festschr. f. O. Hirschfeld*, s. 6, und im *Martyrium SS. Theodorae et Didymi*, die Ducange s. v. *τάξις* anführt (Ducange ist überhaupt zu vergleichen), vornehmlich aber in zahlreichen griechischen Kaisererlassen, im Cod. Justinianus und anderswo: die meisten sind zwar aus der Zeit Justinians

word in Eugenius' Epitaph. The translation of the passage *στρατευσάμενος ἐν τῇ κατὰ Πισιδίαν ἡγεμονικῇ τάξει* should accordingly be "who served in the train of the Governor of Pisidia."

Under the Roman Empire, the body of civil "apparitores" and in certain cases the troops attached to the service of a Provincial governor, came to be known by the term *officium*, which occurs in this sense as early at least as the younger Pliny (Ep. i. 5, 11), and which gradually ousted the older word *cohors*.¹ Our information about the composition of the *officia* of the higher civil and military officials is chiefly derived from the *Notitia Dignitatum*, an incomplete list of the official hierarchy belonging to the beginning of the fifth century, the *Codices* of Theodosius and Justinian, and the *Digesta Justiniani*. The *Notitia Dignitatum* unfortunately omits the *officia* of the lower Provincial governors. It mentions the Praeses Pisidiae only as being under the "disposition"² of the Vicarius of the Asian Diocese; the officials in his *officium* are not enumerated. Our arguments as to the composition of this *officium* must therefore rest on analogy (a safe guide so far as Roman Provincial administration is concerned) and on such support as the epigraphic evidence affords.

It is well known that *militia* and *militare*, *στρατεία* and *selbst* (z. B. Cod. Just. 9, 4 (6), 9), aber einige auch älter (z. B. Cod. Just. 11, 41 (40), 7, *οἱ ἀρχοντες καὶ αἱ τάξεις αὐτῶν*). Daraus erklärt sich wohl auch, dass Eugenius nichts über den Rang sagt, den er innerhalb der *τάξεις* gehabt hat; 'Princeps officii' wird er übrigens nicht gerade gewesen sein. Die Zugehörigkeit zum Heere würde gewiss anders bezeichnet worden sein, als mit den Worten *στρατευσάμενος ἐν τῇ κατὰ Πισ. ἡγεμονικῇ τάξει*. Dass der Dienst in den Bureaus der Statthalter als 'Militia' *στρατεία* bezeichnet wurde, ist bekannt. . . ." Professor Kübler quotes Mitteis, *Papyri Lips.* 1906, No. 49, 15 and No. 51, 14 (which belong to the fourth century), and B.G.U.I. No. 306; III. No. 749 (which are later).

¹ In Byzantine times, members of the provincial *officia* were called *cohortalini*, civil servants in the higher bureaus *apparitores*. Cf. Bury. *Later Rom. Empire*, p. 45, n. 2.

² "Sub dispositione."

στρατεύεσθαι¹ were used under the later Empire in the sense of civil service, without any military connotation.² The question may therefore be raised whether in the Epitaph of Eugenius the words *στρατευσάμενος ἐν τῇ κατὰ Πισιδίαν ἡγεμονικῇ τάξει*, and *στρατευσάμενον* and *στρατείας* (bis) below, imply that Eugenius had been a soldier, or rather a civil official in the governor's *officium*. The latter view has been taken by such an authority as Professor Dessau,³ and will doubtless occur to others. It therefore seems worth while to discuss the evidence.

In the ensuing discussion, two points must be kept distinct. In the first place, we are able to show by incontrovertible evidence that there were soldiers attached to the *officium* of Provincial governors, and that these soldiers had officers of their own, apart from the civil governor, but also in his *officium*.⁴ In the second place, we must ask whether the evidence warrants us in believing that Eugenius was one of these soldiers. We must further bear in mind that while we are discussing a fourth-century career, yet the part of that career in dispute lay in the period before the sweeping reforms of Constantine, which made the cleavage between the civil and military administration of the Empire, which in the natural course of things was already declaring itself, final and complete.

The relation between civil and military administration in the years preceding Constantine's reforms is an obscure

¹ Also *militaris*, *στρατία*, *στράτευμα*.

² But see below, p. 315 ff. ³ See his letter quoted p. 308.

⁴ The governorship of certain provinces involved the command of legions, and in such cases the *officium* probably did not include soldiers, apart from the legionaries. Nor were the legionaries said to be *in officio proconsulis*. The *Notitia Dignitatum* in such cases mentions the *officium* apart from the legions, beginning with the words "officium autem . . . habet ita." The governor of Isauria is a *Praeses*; but, as he has the command of two legions, he holds the rank of a *Comes rei militaris*. In Pisidia, which bordered on Isauria, there were no legions; but obviously some troops were required.

and difficult subject,¹ but a few general principles can be laid down, and partly verified by the evidence of inscriptions.

The police-work of the Roman Empire was partly left to local authorities, partly committed to Imperial troops. In so far as civil administration was separated off from military, ordinary police measures were a department of civil administration. In so far as these police measures were carried out by Imperial soldiers, it is evidently implied that those soldiers were at the disposition of the governor of the Province, even in cases where the Province was under a civil governor, and did not involve the command of legions.² Such soldiers, of course, had officers of their own, but soldiers and officers alike must have been in the bureau of the governor. In the Latin language they would be said to be *in officio praesidis*, or *in officio proconsulis*.

The evidence which would enable us to say to what extent the Governor's *officium* in the various administrative areas consisted of soldiers has still to be collected: but that there were soldiers in the *officium* can be proved beyond question. An inscription of Eumeneia in Phrygia, copied by Professor Sterrett, and published by Professor Ramsay, first in *J.H.S.* 1883, p. 401, and afterwards in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, vol. i. part 2, p. 529, contains the epitaph of a certain "Aurelius Mannus, a soldier in the Mounted Archers serving with the Dragon standard, belonging to the *officium* of Castrius Constans, most renowned."³ It would be an important point gained if we

¹ See the remarks of Mommsen in *Hermes*, vol. xxiv. p. 195.

² The employment of soldiers for this purpose must be distinguished from their employment in civil functions in the Imperial household or in the bureaux of high officials. See below, p. 316.

³ . . . Αὐρ. Μάννος στρατιώτης ἰππέυς σαγιττάρι(ο)ς δρακωνάρι(ο)ς ἐξ ὀφικίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἡγεμόνος Καστρίου Κώνσταντος. ὁ λαμπρότατος corresponds to "vir

could determine the date of this inscription, which is unfortunately very doubtful. The inscription belongs to Phrygia Pacatiana, and it is probable (though not certain) that Castrius Constans was governor of that province. Supposing he was, the inscription must be later than the *Notitia Dignitatum*. The province of Phrygia Pacatiana is there said to be under a *Praeses*; and we know from another source¹ that the dignity of this governorship was subsequently raised; the inscription must be later than the date of the change, for it mentions the governor of Pacatiana as *vir clarissimus*, a man of consular rank. Professor Ramsay, was inclined originally (*J.H.S.* 1883, p. 434) to place the inscription between the date of the *Notitia Dignitatum* and the end of the fifth century; in *Cities and Bishopricks*, loc. cit., he decides for a date about 290-300.² If the inscription is post-Constantinian, it proves that even after his reforms an *officium* contained soldiers; *a fortiori* it contained soldiers before the civil and military spheres of administration were absolutely separated off. Our argument from this inscription to the case of the Province Pisidia is nowise invalidated by the fact that Pisidia was under a simple *Praeses*, while the governor in whose *officium* Mannus served was a *vir clarissimus*. The Romans were practical enough to send soldiers wherever they were needed to preserve order and uphold Government: the rank of the governor was a secondary consideration. The proximity of Pisidia to Isauria, one of the great centres of disturbance in the later Empire, necessitated the presence of a considerable body of troops

clarissimus," a man of consular rank. ἐξ ὀφικλου is a Latinism. Cf. the *centurio ex officio (praefecti) annonae* quoted from Orelli-Henzen by Kuhn, *Verfassung des röm. Reichs*, vol. i. p. 152.

¹ Hierocles, 664, Ἐπαρχία Φρυγ. Πακατ. ὑπὸ κοινυλάριον.

² "Taking Castrius Constans as consular governor of the undivided Province of the entire Phrygia." (Note by Sir William Ramsay.)

there. An example of the kind of duties which justifies us in assuming, even apart from such corroborative evidence as the above, that a civil governor had troops at his disposal, is given in *Codex Justinianus*, i. 40, 17, where a rescript of the first Emperor Leo runs: "The (Provincial) governors shall seize and condignly punish those who engage in brigandage and similar offences."¹ The fact that measures like these came under the competence of the civil governors evidently implies that they had a body of soldiers attached to their suite.

These soldiers must, of course, have had officers of their own, apart from the civil governors. The rank of the officers varied with the importance of the command, but in most cases the officer would be at least a *Tribunus*. The handful of soldiers required to guard the prisoners in a marble quarry in Pannonia in the time of Diocletian had a *Tribunus* in command.² Similarly, the corresponding soldiers in charge of a mine in Palaestina were under command of a *Tribunus*.³

It is certain that the Province of Pisidia, where a considerable unit of soldiers must always have been required,⁴ and where the epitaphs of soldiers abound, must have had officers of higher rank, and not mere *centuriones* or *decuriones* in command of the troops attached to the *officium praesidis*.

That the presence of soldiers in a governor's *officium*

¹ Τοὺς ληστεύοντας ἢ παραπλήσια πταλοντας συλλαμβανέτωσαν καὶ ἀρμοδίως οἱ ἄρχοντες τιμωρέτωσαν. The subject of both verbs is οἱ ἄρχοντες, the provincial governors. Cf. Digest. Just. I. 18, 3.

² *Passio Sanctorum IV, Coronatorum*.

³ Eusebius, *De Mart. Palaest*, 13, p. 335 (ed. Schwegler). See Büdinger, *Römischer Kaisergeschichte*, vol. iii. pp. 344-5.

⁴ Examples of the lawlessness and brigandage of Pisidia under the Empire are given by Sir W. M. Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 23 f. On the *centurio regionarius* at Antioch, see his *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 254, 445. Professor Sterrett, Ep. J., p. 122, wrongly reads (λ)εγεωνάριον,

involved the presence of officers there is self-evident. It is unnecessary to labour the point, but one circumstantial proof may be given. The word *ταξέωτης* occurs regularly in Byzantine texts in the sense of *officialis*, a civil servant in the *officium* or *τάξις*; but it also occurs meaning military officers, and perhaps even the soldiers under their command. For example, in Theophanes Continuatus, ii. 11, where a civil war in Asia Minor is described, we read: "Slaves armed the hand of murder against their masters, the soldier of the ranks against his *company officer*,¹ the captain against his general." Here the word *ταξέωτης* means a military officer, not of very high rank; it could obviously have acquired this meaning only if there was a military detachment in the *τάξις*. The same writer (iii. 28) uses the expression *Χαζάρων ταξεῶται*, where the word "quemdam militem gradum supra milites gregarios videtur denotare" (Ducange). The same body of *ταξεῶται* are mentioned by Constantinus Porphyrogenetus.² In another passage³ of Constantinus we read: *ἠθροίζετο οὖν ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν κάστρων τῆς Δελματίας στρατιῶται ἔφιπποι, καὶ ἀπεστέλλοντο ἀπὸ τῆς Σαλῶνος . . . ἐπεὶ οὖν κατὰ τὸ συνηθὲς αὐθις οἱ ταξεῶται ἀπεστάλησαν ἀπὸ Σαλῶνος*. Here the word *ταξεῶται* means either the mounted troops themselves, or the officers in charge of them. It is not, of course, implied that in Dalmatia these troops were in the governor's *officium*; for Dalmatia was a province where legions were required. But it is implied that in certain cases the *officium* was partly military—else how could the word *ταξέωτης* have come to mean both civil servant and military officer?⁴

¹ *στρατιώτης κατὰ ταξεῶτου.*

² *De Adm. Imp.*, ch. 45.

³ *Ibid.* ch. 30.

⁴ The word *ταξέωτης* as a military term does not appear to occur before Theophanes, late in the sixth century; therefore it cannot be derived from *τάξις* in the sense it has in the early Imperial writers (above p. 314).

We have accordingly shown that the *officium praesidis* included soldiers, and therefore officers. How far these officers were under the direct command of the civil governor it is impossible at present to say; but they, like the soldiers under them, were clearly *in officio praesidis* or ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος τάξει.

We now pass to our second question, whether Bishop Eugenius had been a soldier or not. This is an important question, for on our answer to it must depend our whole view of the significance of the new Edict of Maximin against the Christians, and of the other evidence on the period contained in the epitaph. We take the view that if the Christian who suffered under Maximin's Edict and "strove to leave the service" is held to have been a civil servant in the bureau of Valerius Diogenes, the history of the Persecution, instead of acquiring clearness and precision from the information contained in the Epitaph, becomes more confused than ever.

First, then, as to the phrase στρατευόμενος ἐν τῇ κατὰ Πισιδίαν ἡνεμονικῇ τάξει, it must be conceded at the outset that these words could at one period of the Roman Empire have meant "having been a civil official in the bureau of the governor of Pisidia,"¹ but it is at least doubtful whether the words could have had that meaning when Eugenius composed his Epitaph. We must at this point turn our attention to a chapter of Imperial history, which has a direct bearing on our subject—the transference of the

The officer in command of a τάξις in this sense was a ταξίαρχος (Aelianus, *loc. cit.*) or a ἑκατοντάρχη, Philo (*loc. cit.*); cf. Suidas, *Lexicon*, s.v. τάξις. It is true that the *Lexicon Cyrilli*, compiled by a monk of Palestine in the sixth century, contains the gloss τάξις τὸ στρατιωτικὸν σύνταγμα· ἐξ οὗ καὶ ταξεύεται καὶ ταξειδιον (a military expedition); but this must be a mistake. The regular meaning of the word ταξεύτης is *officialis*, and its military meaning must be derived from the presence of soldiers in the τάξις, in its later sense of *officium*.

¹ Examples of στρατεύεσθαι in this sense are given in Stephanus.

term *militia* from military to civil service. The transference of *militia* (with the verb *militare*) from its earlier meaning of military service in the Roman army to the meaning of "civil service" (by civilians) which it bears from the beginning of the fourth century onwards, must, of course, correspond to some real change in the status of the persons to whom the term was applied. It must be confessed that after a slight treatment of the subject by Mommsen, and a fuller discussion by Professor Otto Hirschfeld, a good deal of misapprehension exists as to the origin and meaning of the use of *militia* and *militare* as signifying civil service under the Empire. This use was investigated by Mommsen;¹ the earliest examples of *militia* in the sense of civil service known to him occur in an undated rescript of Diocletian, and a rescript of Constantine dated 314 A.D., and he regarded Diocletian as responsible for the innovation. Professor Otto Hirschfeld² quotes a passage in Tertullian³ as proving that *militia* was used in the sense of civil service as early as the time of Septimius Severus. But a fast distinction, according to our view, must be drawn between the use of *militia* in the sense of civil service in the time of Severus, and *militia* in the sense of civil service as used in Mommsen's instances from the time of Diocletian and Constantine. Mommsen and Professor Hirschfeld agree that the new use of *militia* must be closely connected with the substitution of free-born Roman citizens for Imperial slaves and freedmen in the service of the Imperial household. When this substitution took place is not clear, but by the end of the third century it had certainly been effected, and after that date the use of *militia* denoting civil service is common.

¹ *Hermes*, vol. xxxiv. p. 153.

² *Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten* (2 Auflage), p. 464.

³ *De Corona Militis* (ch. 12), "Est et alia militia regiarum familiarum."

But it is equally certain that at the time of Septimius Severus this substitution had not been effected; for as late as 258 A.D. we have a clear and unmistakable reference to the slaves and freedmen in the Imperial household. Cyprian gives a rescript of the Emperor Valerianus to the senate, belonging to that year, directed against the Christians in Rome which mentions in a separate category the "Caesariani," or Imperial slaves and freedmen.¹ Now, so long as the *personnel* of the civil service was composed of, or included slaves and freedmen, the use of the term *militia* as denoting civil service in general was clearly impossible, for those classes were rigorously excluded from military service throughout Roman history, and not even by a legal fiction would the Romans have used the term *militia* in speaking of slaves and freedmen. The term *militia* in the passage quoted from Tertullian must therefore be explained differently, and the true explanation is given by Professor Hirschfeld himself,² although he does not draw out the full conclusion contained in his premisses. He points out that from the time of Septimius Severus—we may add even earlier³—soldiers began to be employed in large numbers in civil functions alongside of the Imperial slaves and freedmen,⁴ and it is surely clear that, when Tertullian uses the words "Est et alia militia regiarum familiarum" he is thinking of those soldiers who perform their *militia*

¹ Cyprian, Ep. 80, "*Caesariani* autem . . . confiscantur et vincti in Caesarianas possessiones discripti mittantur." This passage (a reminiscence of the practice in the time of Plautus of sending slaves to the country 'Ergastula,' as a punishment) proves that the *Caesariani* were still in the service of the Household, and were not yet reduced to the condition of overseers or serfs on Imperial estates, in which position they are found in Byzantine times (e.g. in Cod. Just. iii. 26, 8, referred to by Mommsen, *Hermes*, xxiv. p. 151).

² Loc. cit.

³ Kuhn, *Verfassung*, vol. i. p. 152 (quoted by Hirschfeld).

⁴ Cf. p. 311, n. ²

in the Imperial household. The object of the tract *De Corona Militis* is to discuss the question whether a Christian can become a soldier, or a converted soldier remain in the ranks; and Tertullian must discuss every branch of the military service. A reference to persons who are not soldiers would be irrelevant here. For Tertullian's purpose, there was an obvious distinction between soldiers who served in civil posts and those who spilled human blood in war, though for a Christian he condemns all kinds of soldiering alike. But *militia* applied to civil functions performed by soldiers is a very different thing from *militia* as applied to civil service performed by civilians, although the former use shows the step by which the change to the latter use effected itself. We must therefore maintain, as against Professor Hirschfeld, that Mommsen was right in attributing the change to Diocletian, and rule the instance quoted from Tertullian out of court, however interesting it may be as showing how the way for Diocletian's innovation was prepared by his predecessors.¹

¹ The Digest. xlii. i. 6 quotes from Ulpian the expression: "miles qui sub armata militia stipendia meruit." As Mommsen knew no instance of *militia*=civil service of earlier date than the time of Diocletian, he regarded these words as an interpolation (*Hermes*, xxxiv. p. 153, n. 3). Hirschfeld, on the authority of the passage quoted from Tertullian, upholds the genuineness of the text (*Verwaltungsbeamten*, p. 464, n. 5). Hirschfeld is wrong in ascribing the fourth century meaning of *militia* to the passage in Tertullian; but our explanation of *militia* in Tertullian admits the possibility that the passage in the Digest ostracised by Mommsen, may be genuine. In opposition to the civil *militia* of the later time, the phrase *armata militia* (ἔνοπλος στρατεία) was regularly used for service in the army. This use implies *militia* firmly established in the sense of civil service; and of course an opposition between the two in *this* sense is foreign to the time of Ulpian. But it is conceivable that the phrase *armata militia* was used as early as Ulpian in the sense of the ordinary service of soldiers in the army—in the Praetorian Guard or on the frontiers—as opposed to the service of soldiers as civil officials in the state service—the opposition, in fact, hinted at by Tertullian (*est et alia militia*). This is put forward as a suggestion to be confirmed or rejected by further inquiry. It is interesting that in Middle-Age Latin *militia* returns to its original meaning, especially of the military service owed by a vassal to his feudal lord.

We conclude that *militia* in the sense of civil service by non-military persons began to be used in the time of Diocletian. This usage clearly belonged at first to the official terminology, and it would be some time before it passed into common use.¹ It may be argued that as soon as the usage established itself in Latin, it would be copied in the Greek equivalents *στρατεία* and *στρατεύεσθαι*; but no later scholar appears to have produced an instance of this use in Literature or Epigraphy of earlier date than those quoted in Stephanus' *Thesaurus*, all of which date from the fifth century and later.² Until a third- or early fourth-century instance of *στρατεία* or *στρατεύεσθαι* in the sense of civil service by civilians is produced, we may claim as highly probable that the usage was foreign to the Greek of the time of Eugenius.³ Inscriptions of Pisidia and the surrounding district contain examples of the word *στρατεύειν* or *στρατεύεσθαι*, always in the sense of military service. The word would almost certainly have been understood in that sense by the people of Laodiceia Combusta in the early fourth century, even if we admit that Eugenius, who would be acquainted with the new usage in Latin, might have copied a Latin usage in Greek. Had the epitaph been composed in the fifth century, we should have to concede that for the participle *στρατευσάμενος*, taken by itself, civil service was a possible meaning; but that this meaning was possible early in the fourth century requires the proof of illustration.

¹ The earliest literary references I have found are: Ammianus Marcellinus (late in the fourth century), xxviii. 4. 20: *militia principis*; another quotation from the same author in Ducange, *Lex. Tot. Graec.* s.v. *στρατεία* (without reference): *notarius militans inter primos*. St. Augustine (born 354), *De Civ. Dei*, v. 6: *ille in officio comitis militat (et alibi)*. Prudentius (born 348), *Proem. Cathemer.* 19, *tandem militiae gradu Eiectum pietas principis extulit*.

² No inference as to date can, of course, be drawn from *στρατεία σχολάζων* in Apost. Can. 83.

³ The Epitaph was composed about 340 A.D., or earlier. See Sir W. M. Ramsay, *Luke the Physician*, p. 351.

But even if we were to admit for the present that the words, when used by Eugenius, could have denoted a civil office, other considerations make it clear that Eugenius must have been a soldier, and in virtue of his social rank necessarily an officer.

In this connexion, as in others, stress must be laid on the social rank of Eugenius. That he was of high social rank is proved by his marriage into a Roman senatorial family. It was the regular practice under the Roman Empire for families of high social standing to send their sons into the higher ranks of the army as a preliminary step in either a civil or a military career, and there is no reason to believe that the practice had been given up at the end of the third century. On the other hand, it is certain that the social rank of the various subordinate civil officials enumerated in the *Notitia Dignitatum*—much more of those omitted by the *Notitia* as composing the *officia* of governors of lower standing—was not compatible with that of Eugenius. We know that the *cohortalini*, the officials in the train of Provincial governors, considered their position a hardship—they were not allowed to qualify for promotion even into the subordinate positions in the Palace service.¹ The social status of members of the *officia* can best be gauged by the fact that those who attained the rank of a *princeps*² in their bureau were called *primipilares*, the name given also to the highest class of common soldiers.³ That the son-in-law of a Roman

¹ See esp. Professor Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, vol. i. pp. 45-6 (on position of cohortalini), and p. 39 (on social rank of Senate).

² See *Not. Dign.* passim.

³ Cagnat's discussion in "Darembert et Saglio," s.v. "Primipilus," merely proves that *primipilares* sometimes rose by merit to high military rank. Their social standing as a class is quite unaffected by this well-known fact. We have an exact parallel in the British Army: the fact that common soldiers occasionally rise to the rank of general does not influence the social standing of sergeants and other non-commissioned officers. Nor do sergeants as a rule marry the daughters of peers.

senator could have been an ordinary *cohortalinus* is as unthinkable as that he could have been a *miles gregarius*.

The awkwardness of expression in the first four lines of the Epitaph can be readily explained on the supposition that Eugenius was an officer in the army; ¹ no explanation is obvious on the rival theory. Professor Dessau admits that the words are inapplicable even to the *princeps* of a bureau.²

A careful consideration of the phrases "should not be allowed to quit the service," ³ and "having striven to leave the service" ⁴ in relation to the known facts concerning the attitude of the authorities to the Christians in the army and outside of it during the Persecution, can leave no doubt in any mind that the reference is to military service. This subject has been discussed already; a short restatement of the main points will make it clear that civil service is out of the question in this Epitaph.

The Edict of Galerius in 303 ordained that recalcitrant civil officials should be scourged, while recalcitrant soldiers should be dismissed. A sharp line is drawn in his Edict between the military and the civil services, because he wished to have a pagan army, and the only way to secure this was to dismiss the Christian soldiers. The Edict of Maximinus, following closely on that of Galerius, must be understood as having direct reference to the effect produced by the latter; it is evidently designed to check the decrease in the army caused by Galerius' Edict. On the supposition that *στρατεία* in the inscription means civil service, we are at a loss to find a motive for the decree of Maximin. With reference to civil servants, Galerius decreed that

¹ See EXPOSITOR, Nov. 1908, pp. 394 ff. Ramsay, *Luke the Physician*, pp. 341-2.

² See his letter quoted p. 308.

³ καὶ μὴ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι τῆς στρατείας.

⁴ σπουδάσας τε ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς στρατείας.

they should be scourged, not dismissed ; why, then, should Maximinus decree that they should not be allowed to leave the service ? The most important factor in the history of the whole period was the proportion of Christians and Pagans in the army. The words "having striven to quit the service," are intelligible only of military service ; the whole point of the Edict of Maximinus, as of these words of Eugenius, is that the persons concerned were under military discipline. "*Μὴ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι τῆς στρατείας* in Maximinus' Edict is a clear echo of "ut . . . militia solverentur," in Galerius' Edict.

W. M. CALDER.

STUDIES IN CONVERSION.

II. CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

IN the thirty-third chapter of the Book of Job there is a lyric which can be lifted out of the surrounding context and enjoyed as a composition by itself. Its subject is conversion ; and it is interesting, both as proving that cases of conversion were numerous in the remote age of which the Book of Job is a monument¹ and as indicating the means through which they were brought about. These were three—dreams or visions,² bodily suffering³ and testimony.⁴

The last of the three is represented as prevailing in cases

¹ "Lo, all these things worketh God oftentimes with man" (v. 29).

² "In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed, then He openeth the ears of men and sealeth their instruction" (vv. 15, 16).

³ "He is chastened also with pain upon his bed, and the multitude of his bones with strong pain, so that his life abhorreth bread, and his soul dainty meat" (vv. 19, 20).

⁴ "If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man His uprightness, then He is gracious to him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom" (vv. 23, 24).

where the first two had failed ;¹ and this accords with the efficacy recognised in modern times as belonging to the testimony of those who have experienced the power of God themselves. In both ancient and modern times great virtue has belonged to the second means—namely, bodily suffering. But the first—dreams or visions—would probably, at the first glance, be relegated to ancient history and not supposed to play any part in modern times. Any, however, who may think so must be either ignorant or forgetful of facts ; for, indeed, dreams and visions still play a part in the religious life, as all are aware who have any considerable acquaintance with the details of personal experience. In any hundred cases of conversion in a modern revival a considerable proportion would be found to have been connected with incidents of the nature of dreams or visions. In ancient times, nevertheless, the proportion was undoubtedly greater. In Scripture such cases as those of Jacob, Samuel, Isaiah and St. Paul spring at once to memory ; and in the early Christian centuries the same element is everywhere conspicuous. No case is, however, more famous than that of the Emperor Constantine, whose date is 274 to 337.

The conversion of this man filled the world at one time with its rumour. No wonder : up to the very day when it took place the Roman emperors had, at intervals, for more than two hundred years, been persecuting the Christian religion and inflicting on its professors every slight, injury and torture which the wit of man could invent ; and now, in a moment, the immense influence of the Empire was transferred to the opposite side, and, like nursing-fathers and nursing-mothers, imperial personages embraced the cause which their predecessors had treated with contumely and cruelty.

¹ “ God speaketh once, yea, twice, yet man perceiveth it not ” (v. 14).

Since then, in the lapse of time, even this event has shared the oblivion which is ever creeping over human things. To the average man history, unless there be some particular motive for keeping it in memory, is a record which quickly fades. In this case the religious interest might have been sufficient to keep the obscuring mists at a distance ; and it has proved so in the Eastern Church, where to this day the Great Emperor is a figure as distinct as the Reformers are to Protestants ; but the same cannot be said of the West.

Another influence which has helped to displace Constantine from the position he might have held in the Christian mind is the dubiety which, in the course of time, has gathered over the good he did. As it is usually expressed, he was the first to establish the Church ; and the number is daily increasing of those who are not sure if this was ever a real advantage or are even certain that it was always the reverse. Many know little more about Constantine than that Dante said of him,

Ah, Constantine ! to how much ill gave birth,
Not thy conversion, but that plenteous dower
Which the first wealthy Father gained from thee.¹

But it ought to be noted that, while undervaluing the establishment of the Church, the poet does not speak lightly of the conversion, but the reverse. Constantine had to find out for himself how a convert to Christianity ought to act who occupied the very highest position in the world, and how such an one might best serve the cause he had embraced. It requires but little imagination to realise how difficult this must have been ; and, if he made mistakes, he erred with the best men of the age, which was by no means an age of little men. All his Christian contemporaries approved of what he did ; and, indeed, their own situation became so different from that of their predecessors that

¹ *Inferno*, xix.

it was no wonder if they seemed to themselves as men who dreamed and could find no fault with the conduct of their patron.

But, no doubt, the Christian mind has been prevented from dwelling with pleasure on this conversion chiefly by the backsliding of Constantine's later life. After he had done well for many years, there came a time when, for a little, he seemed to slip back into some of the worst practices by which the history of the Roman emperors has been made infamous, even a satirist of his own day suggesting a comparison with Nero. He caused his own eldest son, Crispus, to be put to death ; likewise his nephew, Licinius ; while the elder Licinius, his own brother-in-law, was dispatched in spite of a promise to spare his life ; and there is too much reason to fear that his own wife, Fausta, has to be added to this list. Of course it is possible that there may have been the best of reasons for all these executions, and very strong reasons indeed are whispered by antiquity in some of the cases ; but these incidents have, like the backsliding of another pious king, given great cause to the enemy to speak reproachfully and have, in the same degree, chilled the enthusiasm of Christians. Against him a great deal has, further, been made of certain conformities to the old religion of which after his conversion he is accused. But, in his position, these were to some extent inevitable ; while the reality of some of them is doubtful. The use, for example, on one side of coins of representations of the Sun-god, while Christian symbols adorned the other, is capable of the interpretation that his intention was to represent God as the Sun of the soul or Christ as the Light of the world. To make an objection out of the postponing of his baptism till the very end of his life is to betray ignorance of the time ; for this was then common in the Church and recommended by teachers of eminence. Even the darker stains mentioned

above did not destroy the belief or pride in him of the most Christian of his contemporaries. Eusebius, his biographer, does not even mention them. But this reticence was the worst of all services to his hero. To posterity a frank statement of the entire case from the contemporary Christian point of view would have been invaluable.¹

In spite, however, of some blemishes on the character of this man, his conversion cannot be omitted from any list of the historical conversions of the world, and its reality is not refuted by the record of the life that followed it, when this is judged fairly and as a whole.

The interest of the inhabitants of this country in Constantine used to be conciliated by the belief that he was born in our island; and, although this is no longer credited, it is certain that his father died at the city of York in the arms of his son, and that Constantine was proclaimed Emperor by the army there. How near he was to the age of the persecutions is shown by the fact that Diocletian, the author of the severest of all these outbreaks, was his father's colleague. In fact, he himself had, in his youth, been on the staff of Diocletian, and he was present in Nicomedia when the fire of persecution broke out against the Christians. In order to secure the protection of the Empire from danger, threatening from the Persians and the Germans, Diocletian had arranged that there should be four joint-emperors, stationed at different centres of the vast Roman dominion; and Constantine's father was one of these. The arrangement did not prove a lasting one; but, for a considerable time,

¹ Zahn's estimate in *Skizzen aus dem Leben der Alten Kirche* is so severe and unsympathetic as to raise a suspicion that some modern political motive may be behind, as in Strauss' treatise on Julian; and of what nature this is may perhaps be inferred from the note in the index after the name of the paper—" (Hanover, 1876)." At all events, with Zahn ought to be compared the sane and well-reasoned discussion by Dr. E. C. Richardson, which forms the introduction to the translation of Eusebius' *Life of Constantine* in *The Nicene and Postnicene Fathers*.

it was apt to recur when the rulers were weak, whereas a really strong ruler was apt to revert to the more natural plan of taking all the reins into his own hand. This Constantine did ; and it was in the process of fighting down his unworthy colleagues that he became a Christian. Apart from the persecution of the Christians in which some of them indulged, these were so profligate as men and so evil as rulers that it was a blessing to humanity to root them out, and the proceedings of Constantine assumed the character of a crusade against persecutors and evildoers.

In searching for the beginnings of Constantine's piety, we observe that Eusebius speaks of his father as having been a Christian. It would be probably more correct to say that he was a monotheist. Zahn conjectures that he may have been an adherent of Mithras, a Persian divinity, whose cult was at that time popular throughout the Roman Empire, and that this may account for the partiality of the son for sun-imagery in worship. At all events, the father kept entirely apart from the persecution practised by his colleagues, as well as from their other violent and oppressive proceedings, and was warmly loved by his subjects. As this was an age of good mothers, who won their sons to the faith, and as Helena, the mother of Constantine, is a saint in the calendar, it might be natural to look to her as the source of his religious impressions ; but the fact seems to be the other way : he seems to have been the source of hers.

Some have attempted to explain Constantine's change as a result of deep foresight and political calculation. The old religion was in the last stages of decrepitude ; its oracles were dumb ; its priests could only be impediments to any friend of progress ; but the new religion embraced the people of character ; its bishops held their adherents in the hollow of their hand ; to it the future belonged. Certainly this was

the actual situation ; and Constantine derived immense advantages as a statesman from his connexion with Christianity. But it does not follow that he foresaw these or chose his course with diplomatic skill with a view to them. On the contrary, the element of surprise, which always enters more or less into conversion, was conspicuous in his case. It was not he who sought Christ, but Christ who sought him. Indeed, so ignorant was he of Christ at the time when the signs of Him were presented to his apprehension that he had to go and ask who it was who had thus appeared to him. This he asked of the ministers of the Gospel, who thenceforward became his friends, and he asked it of the Word of God, of which he became for life a diligent student, often rising for its study while others were asleep. His biographer puts it as if, when setting out against Maxentius, the first of his colleagues who had become a foe, he had been in doubt under which divinity he should place his enterprise, when Christ appeared to him and offered His assistance. Others have represented the scene as taking place in the crisis of the battle at the Milvian Bridge, just outside Rome ; so it is depicted in the great picture by Raphael in the Vatican. An ancient authority places it two days before this battle. But the impression produced by Eusebius, who knew best, is that it took place earlier, at some place undetermined.

At all events, while his mind was bent on his enterprise and on the relation of Christianity to it, he saw at midday a great cross in the sky, with this motto, *Under this banner conquer* ; his men saw it too ; and that night he was commanded from the same quarter to adopt the cross as his motto and to put it on the shields of his army. But the incident is so important that it had better be given in the historian's own words : " A most marvellous sign appeared to him from heaven, the account of which it might have been hard to believe had it been related by any other person.

But, since the victorious emperor himself long afterwards declared it to the writer of this history, when he was honoured with his acquaintance and society, and confirmed his statement by an oath, who could hesitate to accredit the narration, especially since the testimony of aftertime has established its truth? He said that about noon, when the day was already beginning to decline, he saw with his own eyes the trophy of a cross of light in the heavens, above the sun and bearing the inscription, *Conquer by this*. At this sight he himself was struck with amazement, and his whole army also, which followed him on this expedition and witnessed the miracle. He said, moreover, that he doubted within himself what the import of this apparition could be. And, while he continued to ponder and reason on its meaning, night suddenly came on; then in his sleep the Christ of God appeared to him with the same sign which he had seen in the heavens, and commanded him to make a likeness of that sign which he had seen in the heavens and to use it as a safeguard in all engagements with his enemies.”¹

This is an arresting testimony; but it does not stand alone. It is certain that he caused the cross to be thenceforth impressed on the shields of his soldiers. He made it the standard, with the initial letters of the Saviour's name at the top, round which his bodyguard was clustered, and he testified to Eusebius with what effect it had often been carried into the hottest part of the battle where his adherents were giving way. The same sign was painted on the outside of his palace, with a dragon beneath, to betoken the defeat of the Old Serpent by the Saviour; and “so large a measure of the divine love possessed the Emperor's soul that, in the principal apartment of the imperial palace itself, on a vast tablet displayed in the centre of its gold-covered panelled ceiling, he caused the symbol of our Saviour's passion to

¹ *Life*, i. 28, 29.

be fixed, composed of a variety of precious stones richly in-wrought with gold. This symbol he seemed to have intended to be as it were the safeguard of the Empire itself.”¹

Of course, every conceivable explanation of the vision has been attempted, from the theory that it was a pure falsehood of the Emperor's invention, up through all kinds of subjective impressions, magnified by rumour and tradition. But these look very poor beside the statements quoted above. The vital question is, whether we can assume a divine agency. Was this the gracious self-manifestation of Christ to a human soul ?

Many considerations may have to enter into the answer to be given to this question ; but the principal surely is the testimony borne by his subsequent life to the reality of the change through which he had passed.

As might have been expected, he immediately put a stop to persecution ; and he got his principal colleague in the East to consent to an edict of toleration by which freedom of belief and worship was accorded to all religions. When his colleague subsequently contravened this engagement and resumed persecution, Constantine advanced against him, and the campaign, in which he was completely successful, assumed the character of a conflict between paganism and Christianity. He invited the exiled Christians to return to their homes and compensated them for the losses they had incurred on account of their testimony. Having an imperial passion for building, he now caused churches in immense numbers and of great splendour to rise in every part of his dominions, while the temples of the heathen divinities were transmuted into Christian sanctuaries. He conferred on the Church and its officials ample privileges, delighting to call himself a bishop for the external, while Christian

¹ *Life*, iii. 49.

ministers were the bishops of the internal affairs of the Church. Yet he did not fail to manifest an interest also in the Church's spiritual welfare, as was proved, in more cases than one, by his efforts to efface differences and restore concord, his greatest effort in this direction being the calling of the ever-memorable Council of Nice, at which he not only presided but did not a little personally to secure the decision which has ever since expressed the faith of the Church on the greatest of all her dogmas. He was a man of prayer, taking about with him on his campaigns a tent for his private devotions. "He pitched the tabernacle of the cross outside and at a distance from his camp, and there passed his time in a pure and holy manner, offering up prayers to God, following thus the example of His ancient prophet, of whom the sacred oracles testify, that he pitched the tabernacle without the camp. And, making earnest supplications to God, he was always honoured, after a little, with a manifestation of His presence. And then, as if moved by a divine impulse, he would rush from the tabernacle, and suddenly give orders to his army to move at once without delay, and on the instant to draw their swords. On this they would immediately commence the attack, fight vigorously, so as with incredible celerity to secure the victory, and raise trophies over their enemies."¹ It is a much more striking evidence of the strength of his new convictions that he tried without ceasing to impart to others the experiences through which he had passed himself. Thus he taught his soldiers a prayer for daily use. "On one occasion he thus personally addressed one of his courtiers, 'How far, my friend, are we to carry our inordinate desires?' Then, drawing the dimensions of a human figure with a lance, which he happened to have in his hand, he continued: 'Though thou couldst obtain the whole wealth of this world, yea, the whole world

¹ *Life*, ii. 12.

itself, thou wilt carry with thee at last no more than this little spot which I have marked out, if, indeed, even that be thine.' ”¹ He even went so far as to preach, thus anticipating the practice of the present Emperor of Germany ; and Eusebius gives an admirable account of the general scope of his doctrine on such occasions.² He has also preserved for us an actual specimen of the Emperor's sacred oratory. This is generally printed at the close of the *Life* under the title of *To the Assembly of the Saints*, and, although it cannot be recommended as a sample of the highest pulpit eloquence, it is very good preaching for an emperor.

As a ruler, Constantine is not only praised by Eusebius and other Christian panegyrists, but ranked among the very foremost in history, as one equally great in the arts of war and the achievements of peace, who shed happiness on his subjects and, after uniting the empire in his own hand, bequeathed it to his sons. In his own day this was not the only estimate ; for some, who disapproved of the favour shown by him to Christianity, accused him of extravagance ; and there is no doubt that he was often taken in by hypocrites. In modern times estimates have gone to opposite extremes ; for any one who makes such an outspoken religious profession is sure to excite partisanship of both a favourable and a hostile description. It does not, however, admit of question that he was superior in every respect to the competitors whom he displaced ; he was conspicuously free from the grosser vices by which, in the imperial period, the highest place in the state was so often disgraced ; and he devoted his energies of mind and body unweariedly to the service of the position in which Providence had placed him. Eusebius, who saw him in youth, describes him as having been at that time tall and handsome, excelling in all manly exercises, and he testifies that at the Council of Nice, where he sat by his side, he,

¹ *Life*, iv. 30.

² *Life*, iv. 29.

in his maturity, bewitched all present by the dignity and graciousness of his manner.

His baptism, as has been already mentioned, was delayed to the very close of his life, not because he hesitated to confess himself a Christian, but on account of a superstition, common at the time, that this ordinance could wash away sin and secure a straight passage to glory. After the act he refused to clothe himself with the purple any more, and, in a few days, amidst many expressions of happiness and faith, he passed away. He was buried in a church which he had caused to be erected in Constantinople, to be his mausoleum. It contained twelve pillars, to represent the twelve apostles; and he himself was interred, in an upright position, in a thirteenth pillar. This may explain the title given him in the calendar of the Eastern Church, "equal to the apostles," unless, indeed, the meaning of this title be "like to the Apostle"—that is, St. Paul—the reference being to the circumstances of his conversion, which bear not a little resemblance to the scene on the way to Damascus.

JAMES STALKER.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

V. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD.

(1) IN the last Study the Need of Salvation was shown to be due both to the guilt and to the power of sin. Man's conscience witnesses against him that in his sin he is estranged from, and opposed to God, and that he, therefore, needs the forgiveness of God. He is also conscious of his weakness to withstand temptation, and to discharge duty, and seeks deliverance from the bondage of sin from God. It was argued, in criticism of current theological tendencies, that the one need is as real as the other. The sense of guilt is not an illusion, and the feeling of weakness only an actual-

ity. For Paul even the first need seems to be greater than the second. But it is not at all necessary thus to compare them ; for the salvation which cancels guilt is conceived as also renewing strength. It is the one act of God in the death and rising again of His Son, which offers forgiveness and breaks the fetters of evil habit. This needs to be insisted on, as there has been a tendency in a good deal of theological speculation on the theory of the Atonement to dissever justification and sanctification, the forgiveness of sin, and the holiness of the forgiven. It is necessary to show, on the one hand, that both the divine grace which offers, and the human faith which receives pardon is pregnant with moral purpose and power ; and on the other, that Christian holiness has its roots in, and draws its nourishment from the forgiveness presented in Christ's Cross.

(2) Having recognized the close bond between the religious good and the moral task of the Christian salvation, we may venture, for clearness of statement, to treat them separately. The need which man feels of forgiveness because of the guilt of his sin is met in *the righteousness of God*, a characteristic Pauline phrase about which there has been much dispute. Luther's explanation is " the righteousness valid with God " ; while it is imparted to the sinner by God, it is the ground on which God receives him again to His fellowship. There can be no doubt that Paul was as much concerned as Luther about the sinner's acceptance with God ; and, therefore, we may be sure that this meaning is included in the term. But we want to go a little deeper than this : we want to know of what content is the righteousness which is valid with God.

Baur seems to take us a step further : he renders the phrase " a righteousness agreeable to the nature of God." That can be valid in God's judgment which is in accord with His nature. Over against theories of acceptation

which regard the death of Christ as the condition of man's forgiveness by an arbitrary appointment of God, it is necessary to emphasize that God in forgiving sinners is true to Himself. The view now generally held is that the righteousness of God is the state of pardon and acceptance before God, which is the gift of God's grace and is welcomed by man's faith, and which has been provided by God for mankind in the work of Christ in His Crucifixion and Resurrection. There is no doubt whatever that this view explains many of the passages in which the term is used.

(3) In Romans x. 5, 6, it is contrasted with "the righteousness which is of the law" as "the righteousness which is of faith." It is not a reward earned, but a gift bestowed. In x. 3 the Jews' failure is thus explained: "Being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their own, they did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God." It is not the result of man's efforts, but contrasted with them. Coming from God to man, it claims man's submission. In the exercise of the faith which receives God's gift there is obedience to God in turning from the path of establishing one's own righteousness to the way God commands of accepting what He bestows. In Philipians iii. 9 Paul seeks to put his meaning beyond all doubt. "Not having a righteousness of mine own, *even* that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." In Romans v. 17 "the gift of righteousness" is conjoined with "the abundance of grace," and in verse 21 grace is described as reigning "through righteousness unto eternal life." The grace of God, the desire and purpose of God to save mankind, is the ultimate cause; eternal life is the final result; the righteousness of God is the historical reality through which this cause effects this result. The difference between the grace of God and the righteousness of God is this, that in the right-

eousness of God this grace saves man, not in contradiction of, but in conformity with "the wrath of God which is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Rom. i. 18). The wrath of God against sin, and His love for the sinner are moments in the righteousness of God; in other words, God judges the sin He forgives. It is because Paul attached so great importance to God's condemnation of sin in His forgiveness of it, that he did not use the simpler term forgiveness for this gift of God's grace, as many who do not share, and cannot understand his moral seriousness would have preferred him to have done. The righteousness of God means forgiveness, but forgiveness coming in such a way as adequately to express God's condemnation of sin, and so fully to satisfy the conscience which in the sense of guilt echoed that condemnation.

(4) Our conception of the righteousness of God will be superficial, however, unless we connect immediately the gift to the Giver. What God does shows what God is. Hence it has been maintained that the phrase means, "God's attribute of righteousness." There are several considerations which can be advanced for this view. It is in accord with Old Testament teaching, as in Psalm xcvi. 2, "The Lord hath made known His salvation, His righteousness hath He openly shewed in the sight of the nations." Paul himself uses the term of God's character, "But if our unrighteousness commendeth the righteousness of God" (Rom. iii. 5). The contrast of the revelation of the righteousness and of the wrath of God (i. 17, 18) at least suggests a quality of God shown in His action. It may be objected, however, that God cannot in His grace confer His own perfection on man as a gift to be received in faith. But surely the phrase may be elastic enough to embrace both the divine cause and the human effect, even as grace means both God's favour and the state of man which that favour confers. As the forgiveness

of sins means the restoration to fellowship with God, participation in the divine life, God gives Himself in His gift. There is a moral continuity between God, Christ, and Man, God's whole attitude to sin and sinners finds its expression in Christ's experience in the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, and the believer as crucified and risen with Christ is put in the same attitude. The sinner is saved from God's wrath against sin in his sense of guilt, which expresses only one moment in God's disposition and dealing with sinful men, by coming to share God's righteousness, the full expression of God's will. If Paul does not himself clearly and fully state this view of the phrase, "the righteousness of God," it is implied in his conception of saving faith as such moral unity with Christ in the act in which this righteousness of God is revealed.

(5) Having thus connected the gift with the character of God we may press the further question, What is the content we must give to this attribute of God? Is it judicial, governmental and penal only or is it more? It has already been suggested that the wrath of God, the antagonism of God to sin and His infliction of penalty on sin, is included in it. This is proved by Romans iii 25, "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation (or propitiatory), through faith, by His blood, to shew His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God; for the shewing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season, that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." To this verse we must afterwards return; but the one point to be noted at this stage of the discussion is that Paul assumes here that God's revelation of His righteousness must include both the wrath and the grace of God; the term *propitiatory* cannot mean the one without the other, for the revelation must show adequate reason why God's punishment of sin did not always exactly corre-

spond with man's transgression. Judgment on sin is included in God's righteousness. But something more ; and that something more is suggested in the last clause, which, to bring out the close connexion with the term under discussion, would be better rendered, "righteous and reckoning righteous." This does not mean that God reckons righteous the believer in spite of His being righteous ; but rather that He reckons righteous just because He is righteous. His righteousness is not merely protective and punitive, but expansive and reproductive. As righteous God does not merely condemn and punish sinners ; it is His righteousness, His moral perfection, which prompts Him to seek their salvation, so that they too may become righteous even as He Himself is. This they cannot be unless they judge sin even as He Himself does, and, therefore, the penal is necessarily included in the redemptive energy of the character of God in the Cross of Christ. It may seem that we have read more into the phrase than Paul as a Pharisee could mean ; but (1) surely Paul's conception of God was one of the things made new in the conversion ? and (2) are we not entitled to put into the object of faith the fuller content which Paul himself suggests in Romans vi. in his revision of the conception of faith ?

(6) If we rightly conceive the gift offered to faith "the righteousness of God," we shall be in a better position to deal with another much disputed question : Does justification mean making righteous or reckoning righteous ? As regards the meaning of the term there is a growing agreement among scholars that it means *reckoning righteous*. For this view four reasons can be advanced. The whole class of Greek verbs formed in this way supports this meaning, and is opposed to the other. No instance of the other meaning has been yet cited from classical literature. This is the usual sense in the Septuagint, the extra-canonical

Jewish literature, and the New Testament, including the passages in Paul's writings where he is not dealing with this distinctive doctrine. Paul gives a definition in Romans iv. 5 which seems to be intended to put this sense beyond doubt, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness." His teaching on this point clearly is that the ungodly are reckoned or treated by God as righteous, because He reckons as their righteousness the faith which has Christ, especially His propitiatory death, as its object, and which grows to such a union with Christ as to become a being crucified and risen with Him. But can we leave the question at this stage? If Paul's doctrine is to be made "worthy of acceptance" to-day, it seems to the writer we must show that it is not merely forensic, and that antinomianism or even moral indifference in the slightest degree is not a justifiable conclusion from it. We must avoid handling merely Paul's abstract theological definition instead of getting into as close touch as we can with the concrete moral and spiritual reality of his experience, which he was trying to express and explain in his doctrine. It is the righteous God who forgives in judging sin in the Cross of Christ, with whom the sinner through faith in Christ is brought into personal contact and communion. To be received into fellowship in being forgiven by such a God, to be thus brought under the direct influence of moral perfection, is surely to be treated as righteous in such a way as cannot but make righteous. The religious good received is of such a kind as to produce the correspondent moral change. The conclusion which it is desired to reach at this stage of the discussion may be put in this way. Will a taskmaster who rewards only those who have properly done their tasks and punishes all others in strict proportion to their failure secure by inspiring the best service, or will a Father who while making plain to His

children the holiness which He Himself is, and which as His children He desires them to become, treats them as His children even when they fail and fall short? To reckon as righteous in the way in which the righteousness of God is offered to men in Jesus Christ is to make righteous far more effectively than to leave men to win the divine favour by their own deserts. What needs emphasis is, to vary the terms, the impulse to holiness which forgiveness brings with it. We may thus connect "the righteousness of God" which seems at first only a legal conception with moral character in God and in man.

(7) The righteousness of God is manifested in the Cross of Christ. It needs no elaborate demonstration that Paul's thoughts about Christ centred in the Cross (Gal. vi. 14; 1 Cor. i. 18, ii. 2). That death he closely connects with man's sin (*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*, 1 Cor. xv. 3; *περὶ τ. ἁ. ἡ.*, Gal. i. 4; *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, Rom. viii. 3; *διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν*, Rom. iv. 25; *περὶ ἡμῶν*, 1 Thess. v. 10; *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων*, Rom. viii. 32; *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, 2 Cor. v. 15). If we are not warranted in saying that Jesus died *instead of* us as well as *on our behalf*, in our interest, yet we may recall at this point the statement in a previous Study on the *Doctrine of Christ*, that Paul conceived Christ as assuming man's condition because of sin, as sent in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. viii. 3), born under the law (Gal. iv. 4), made sin (2 Cor. v. 21), and become a curse (Gal. iii. 13). While we must carefully avoid any attempt at estimating a quantitative equivalence between the suffering of Christ and the punishments of men, or even at describing His passion as qualitatively the same, that is, as penal, we do not interpret Paul's teaching adequately unless we lay due stress on this fact, that Christ took upon Himself the full consequences of human sin. It was not a legal substitution of one victim of divine judgment for another, but a voluntary

identification by Christ of Himself in love with the sinful race so as to share completely its condition. What purpose, we must ask, did this sacrifice serve? There can be no doubt that for Paul's thought Christ's sacrifice served the same end in God's moral order as the punishment of sinners, as well as effected their salvation.

(8) There are three words which must be examined more closely to justify this conclusion: *ἱλαστήριον* (Rom. iii. 25), *ἀπολύτρωσις* (Col. i. 13; 1 Cor. i. 30), *καταλλαγή* (Rom. v. 10, 11, and 2 Cor. v. 18, 20). As regards the first of these terms, it is not at all likely that Paul meant by *ἱλαστήριον*, the lid of the ark of the covenant, as the allusion would have been too obscure. More probable is the view that Paul meant the propitiatory victim, although no distinct evidence of such a use of the term has been produced. His allusions to the Old Testament ritual system are not so frequent as might have been expected, yet here he need not have been thinking of any of the Levitical sacrifices at all. He had mixed enough among Romans and Greeks to know about the human sacrifices offered to turn away the anger or to secure the blessing of the gods. This allusion, even if it were certain, would not help us in our interpretation of the passage. As there is some proof of the use of the word as an adjective, it is best to take the term in the widest sense possible. Paul does not directly affirm that the blood of Christ propitiates God; that would be an altogether pagan thought; but just as in Galatians iii. 13 he says that Christ became *a curse*, not accursed, so here he represents Christ's death as propitiatory in the sense that in it God reveals both His wrath against sin and His grace to the sinner, carries out judgment on sin as well as offers forgiveness to the sinner. The emphasis on the blood of Christ forbids our omitting this element of wrath or judgment, and the context absolutely demands it. The previous argument is intended to show

how the revelation of the wrath of God is superseded by the revelation of the righteousness of God. This is not effected merely by the cessation of the former revelation, but by the fulfilment of it in the latter revelation. Whatever necessity for the revelation of wrath there was is fully recognized in the revelation of righteousness which takes its place. Nay, even more than this. The revelation of wrath had not been in times past adequate to moral requirements. God had in His patience not exacted from men all the penalty they had brought upon themselves by their wrong-doing. Before forbearance could be changed into forgiveness, the passing over of sins into the blotting out, it was necessary that what the revelation of wrath had but imperfectly accomplished should be perfectly accomplished in the revelation of righteousness in the Cross. How does the Cross meet this demand? Possibly Paul did not ask himself the question. On the one hand, he was sure that sin ought to be punished; on the other, that God in Christ offered forgiveness: he solved the problem by assuming that in the Cross the moment of punishment is taken up into the moment of forgiveness. The Cross has a moral value for God and a moral efficacy for man far transcending all that punishment could effect for the expression and maintenance of God's moral order, as an act of moral obedience by Christ which more than compensates for the moral disobedience of Adam and of the human race [(Rom. v. 12-21). The obedience of Christ so transcends the disobedience of Adam that the grace which comes through Christ abounds more exceedingly than the sin brought in by Adam (*vs.* 19, 20). If we compare with this statement by Paul the others in which he describes Christ as entering into man's condition, we are warranted in affirming that the value for God and efficacy for man morally of the Cross of Christ lies in His voluntary acceptance as required by the divine will of, if not the punish-

ment, yet the consequences of sin which for mankind are penal. The grace of God which in Christ bestows forgiveness confirms, approves, vindicates the wrath of God against sin by enduring the conditions imposed on sinful mankind. May we not say that in the obedience of the Son of God in enduring these final consequences of sin God's moral order in the world which necessarily expresses His moral perfection is fulfilled, expressed with a completeness and finality that the continuance of mankind under these penal conditions cannot reach? If as the Psalmist believed the broken and the contrite heart is a more acceptable sacrifice to God than the sacrifices of burnt offerings (Ps. li. 16, 17), if penitence for sin is an element in the faith which claims God's forgiveness, then this judgment of sin may be fitly regarded as necessarily included in the act of forgiveness. Antagonism too, and condemnation of sin, is an essential feature of moral perfection, and of its manifestation in word and deed. If man's moral nature is that in him which has most affinity with God, our thought does not presume too far in the conclusion that for God in revealing Himself it is absolutely necessary that His attitude to sin should be adequately and conclusively expressed.

(9) What further light on the matter Paul's use of the idea of redemption throws we must next inquire. In the passage we have been discussing the term ἀπολύτρωσις is used, "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 24); but the idea is not made any clearer. In Colossians i. 13 "our redemption" is equivalent to "the forgiveness of our sins." In 1 Corinthians i. 30 it is conjoined with righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) and sanctification (ἁγιασμός), and we seem entitled to assume that it is used as combining both ideas. In Christ man is delivered from the guilt of sin by God's righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), and from its power by the

sanctification (*ἀγιασμός*) of His Spirit. Redemption is presented as deliverance from the law itself in Galatians iv. 4, "that he might redeem them which were under the law," and from its curse or penal consequences in death in iii. 13, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us." The last passage shows that Paul did think of a ransom paid for the redemption, and this is definitely stated in 1 Corinthians vi. 20, "Ye were bought with a price." Without committing ourselves to any judgment on the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles we may compare 1 Timothy ii. 6, "Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all," and Titus ii. 14, "Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works." What the ransom consisted in has been made plain already: it was Christ's endurance of man's lot, not only to deliver man from all consequences of sin as well as sin itself, but also by so doing, as the last three verses quoted state, to bring men under such obligation to Himself as to make them His absolute possession. The means of justification is the motive of sanctification.

(10) Christ having been set forth as propitiatory, and man having been redeemed from sin by the Cross, there is reconciliation between God and man. That the reconciliation is mutual, of God to man and man to God, is taught by the two passages in which the doctrine is most fully stated. In Romans v. 10, 11 the removal of the enmity between God and man is declared. "For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life; and not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation (*καταλλαγὴν*)." God is reconciled to man not in the sense that His disposition to man is changed from

an adverse to a favourable, but that the revelation of His wrath is, as we have already seen, taken up into the revelation of the righteousness in Christ as propitiatory. In 2 Corinthians v. 18, 20 the declaration of God's reconciliation to man is the reason for an appeal to man to become reconciled to God, that is, to lay aside his distrust, estrangement, and enmity to God. "But all things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." It is only a very superficial interpretation of Paul's teaching which can assume that the reconciliation is only of man to God. The reconciliation takes place first as an objective fact through Christ; Christ propitiatory declares God reconciled to man. To men who have in faith accepted this divine gift is committed its proclamation to their fellows. The reconciliation of God to man consists in His "not reckoning unto them their trespasses." Men are entreated to accept this objective fact so as to be changed in their subjective feelings to God. It is God's forgiveness, which does not exclude, but includes, as we have again and again shown, judgment on sin, which casts out fear or hate of God, and awakens trust and love. It is not necessary for the present purpose to discuss Paul's extension of this idea of reconciliation in Colossians i. 20, 22 to all things, and in Ephesians iii. 16 to the relation of Jew and Gentile. This conception of reconciliation forms the link between justification and sanctification: and we may here note how the means of the one is fitted to be the motive of the other. It is not only the love of God shown in the Cross which awakens man's love. If there were no more in this

reconciliation, it would be a sentimental, and not a moral relation which would be constituted between God and man. God's love has a *moral content* in the Cross inasmuch as sin is judged as well as forgiven, and therefore it exercises a *moral constraint*, human love responding to it is humble and contrite, as well as grateful and devoted. It is the objective fact of God's reconciliation that gives its character to the subjective feeling of man's reconciliation.

(11) This doctrine of an objective atonement, a righteousness of God revealed in Christ propitiatory for the redemption of man from sin and evil and the reconciliation of God and man, is to many Christian thinkers foolishness and a stumblingblock. To avoid intellectual and moral offence, it is necessary that it should be stated with the utmost care ; that the wrath of God and the propitiation in Christ should be kept free of pagan associations of anger changed to favour by the shedding of blood ; that the sacrifice of Christ should not be spoken of as the endurance of penalty to the confusion of the distinction between man's guilty and Christ's sinless consciousness : that the moral character of divine grace and human faith and the suffering of Christ should be made evident and certain ; that forgiveness should be conceived as the necessary commencement of holiness. In maintaining all these safeguards it is not necessary for us to depart from Paul's teaching ; for his was a vigorous moral conscience and an intense religious consciousness. This doctrine of the righteousness of God in the sacrifice of the Cross is not of the husk which the Christian faith can without loss strip off, but of the kernel itself ; for however theories of the Atonement may have varied, religious revival and consequent moral reformation have in the history of the Church ever had their source in Christ Crucified as the power and wisdom of God unto salvation.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

COVENANT OR TESTAMENT? A NOTE ON
HEBREWS IX. 16, 17.

No one who reads the passage cited at the head of this paper, whether in the Authorized Version or in the Revised Version, will fail to admit that the introduction of a fresh illustration at a critical point disturbs the argument, and seems out of place. On referring to the Greek text the reader will see that it is the English rendering, and not the Greek word employed in the passage, that necessarily brings in the fresh and disturbing illustration. He will see that the same Greek word, *διαθήκη* (*diatheké*) is used throughout, and that the change to the rendering "will" or "testament" is supposed to be necessitated by the context, and, to say the least, may not have been intended by the writer of the Epistle.

The question turns, in the first instance, on the usage of the word *διαθήκη* in the classics and the LXX and the New Testament, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In the Classics the meaning of disposition by will or testament stands almost without exception.¹ On the other hand, in the LXX and in the New Testament, with the doubtful exception of the passage under discussion, and the still more doubtful exception of Galatians iii. 15 (where see Lightfoot), the word is used to translate the Hebrew *berith* or "covenant"; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews the argument so largely depends on the contrast between the old and the new covenants that the use of the word in a different sense is *primâ facie* most improbable.²

¹ One instance only is cited from the Greek classical writers, where *διαθήκη* is used in the sense of a covenant or agreement, viz., Aristoph. *Aves*, 439.

² A writer in a recent number of the *EXPOSITOR* has spoken of *διαθήκη* as "not only a keyword in the Epistle but almost *the* keyword" (*EXPOSITOR*, vol. v., Seventh Series, p. 348).

It is also to be noted that not only is *διαθήκη* found in about 330 passages of the Greek Bible in this one sense of "covenant," but that the phrase itself here used, *διαθήκην διαθέσθαι*, is of very frequent occurrence and would undoubtedly be suggestive of a "covenant," and of a "covenant" only, to the Hebrew readers of this Epistle. Such a passage as : *ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο κύριος* (behold, the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made), Exodus xxiv. 8, is doubly suggestive.

An even stronger argument for the sense of "covenant" is derived from the position of the word in the text of the Epistle.

The writer has been treating of the sacrificial death of Christ and of the offering made by His own blood. He indicates the far greater efficacy and value of the blood of Christ as compared with the blood of bulls and goats. In this way Christ is the Mediator of a new covenant, "a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant" (v. 15). Then, without any break in the argument, he proceeds to say (*διαθήκη* being taken in the same sense as in the preceding verse), "For where a covenant is there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. For a covenant is of force (*βεβαία*) where there hath been death ; for doth it ever avail (*ἰσχύει*) while he that made it liveth ?" (vv. 16, 17). In the next verse again without any break in the argument, and with a connecting particle (*ὅθεν*), the writer continues : "Wherefore even the first *covenant* hath not been dedicated without blood."

Instead of this rendering of verses 16 and 17 the Revised Version, with which the Authorized Version is in substantial agreement, has : "For where a^s testament is there must of necessity be the death of him that made it" (the testator, A.V.). "For a testament is of force where there hath been death, etc."

First of all it may be noted that the changed rendering of *διαθήκη* in these verses can only be due, to a difficulty of the other rendering in relation to the context.

Accordingly it must be shown by any one who desires to carry on the meaning of "covenant" into verses 17 and 18, (a) that the difficulty indicated, though it exists, is not insuperable, and (b) secondly, that the rendering "testament" involves difficulties of its own not easily to be surmounted.

The difficulty in retaining the meaning of "covenant" lies chiefly in the two phrases, "the death of him that made it" (*τοῦ διαθεμένου*), and, "while he that made it liveth." But in interpreting these words it must be remembered that the covenant referred to differs from all other covenants in that "He who made it" is at once the Mediator, the Priest and the Victim whose blood ratified the covenant. In the mind of the writer the thought is of the personal Christ who made the covenant and ratified it by His death, and the difficulty of interpretation has arisen through overlooking the distinctive and unique character of the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. For once, in this one true sacrifice, the Victim is not, as in the typical sacrifices, a representative of the offerer, it is the offerer Himself. While generalizing the binding element of a covenant by a death the conception of this special covenant and this special Victim is to be expressed, and the masculine form *ὁ διαθέμενος* becomes the natural one to use.

In regard to the second phrase which seems to create a difficulty in the interpretation of "covenant," "Doth it ever avail (*ἰσχύει*) while he that made it liveth?" it may first be noted that these words are explanatory of the preceding clause, "For a testament is of force (*βεβαία*) where there hath been death," and are thought to point conclusively to the conception of a will or testament rather than to a "covenant." But here it may be observed that

while it is true to say of a covenant that it is not of force or ratified except on the condition of the victim's death (*ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*), it cannot be affirmed that a will is only of force on the death of the testator. A will properly drawn up and attested is valid or of force during the testator's lifetime, unless revoked, although it does not take effect or become operative until after his death.

This will be seen by a consideration of the terms used. *Βέβαιος* signifies "firm," "assured," "valid." It is applied to the divine promise (Rom. iv. 16), to a steadfast hope (2 Cor. i. 7), to the security of the Christian calling (2 Peter i. 10), and in four passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews in addition to its occurrence here. In all these instances the firmness or security is a quality inherent in that of which it is predicated. The promise, for instance (Rom. iv. 16), is sure at the time it is made, not at the time of its fulfilment. Similarly *ἰσχύει* is used of existing power or validity. See Matthew v. 13 : "Salt that has lost its savour is good for nothing" (*εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει*). It is often used of power or ability to do a thing—power which exists although it may be latent. Therefore, as used in this passage, both *βέβαιος* and *ἰσχύει* are more applicable to a covenant at the time of its ratification than to a will or testament after the death of the testator.

But, apart from the serious interruption to the argument involved in the generally accepted rendering of *διαθήκη* by "testament" in this passage, there are further difficulties to be considered.

It will be admitted that throughout the passage it is the sacrificial death of Christ upon the cross which is present to the writer, and which he compares with the sacrifices of the old covenant. But it is not so much death as the blood-shedding which was an accompaniment of the sacrificial death that is the prominent thought. The author of the

Epistle is leading up to the conclusion that "without shedding of blood is no remission" (v. 22). But in the case of the death of a testator this essential element is entirely absent. And yet the "death" (*θάνατος*) of verses 16 and 17 must be closely connected with the "death" of the preceding verse. For how else can we explain the *γάρ* (for) of verse 16? And the deduction made in verse 18 (introduced by *ὅθεν*) is only explicable on the supposition that the "death" named in the preceding verses is a death by blood-shedding.

Another weighty consideration is that this illustration of a will made operative by the death of a testator, and that testator Christ, introduces a new conception into the Christology of this Epistle, if not of the New Testament generally. And how vastly inferior is that conception to the inspiring thought in this Epistle of the risen and ascended Christ, "ever living to make intercession for us"; whereas one who makes a will and by his death brings it into operation necessarily ceases to act or exercise influence. He has bequeathed his life's work as well as his possessions to others.

It is sometimes stated in support of the current interpretation of this passage that in St. Luke xxii. 29, 30, Christ is described as making a bequest to His disciples. The words are: "I appoint (*διατίθεμαι*) unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me." But in that passage, as Dr. Plummer remarks, "the verb does not necessarily mean 'covenant to give' or 'assign by bequest,' which would not fit *διέθετο* here, but may be used of any formal arrangement or disposition." It is the gift of a living Christ to His disciples. There is no thought there of death.

In conclusion it may be said that the passage discussed must always remain one of some difficulty, but if the above explanation is of any weight, it will have helped to clear

away the difficulty already stated of an illustration introduced into the argument without elucidating it. It will have helped to vindicate the continuity and sustained reasoning of this great Epistle. ARTHUR CARR.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND THE LOWER CLASSES.

III.

BUT we should be giving a very one-sided picture if this were the one thing that we had to say on the subject of "Primitive Christianity and the Lower Classes." Primitive Christianity was a *religious* movement of the lower classes—that is the next point to be insisted on. It was not a speculative movement in support of some new theory of life and the universe, nor was it an emancipatory movement with a tendency to communism. The celebrated passage in the Acts of the Apostles about the community of goods in the church at Jerusalem (Acts iv. 32 ff.) has been greatly exaggerated in historical importance, because the moral emphasis with which it is formulated has been mistaken for the language of an official inquiry into social conditions. The Primitive Christian expectation of the kingdom of God was doubtless of decisive influence in worldly affairs in so far as it was the expectation of a renewal of this earth by God and His Anointed and the hope of a great adjustment of inequalities at the Last Judgment. But Primitive Christianity never sought to organize the proletariat and so bring about the ideal State by fighting for political power. All that was to come—and they expected much—was expected from God. Man's contribution towards the mighty revolution of things that should come with the kingdom of God consisted in fitting his own soul for it by inward reform, self-denial, and self-sacrifice for the brethren.

And here we have touched the second factor that is characteristic of the relation of Primitive Christianity to the lower classes. We can express it more precisely thus. Located *in* the masses, and sympathizing with the masses, Primitive Christianity discovered the individual in the masses, set an unprecedented value on the individual soul and assigned it tasks hitherto unheard of.

It is no mere accident without significance that we find the expression "souls," even in earliest Christian usage, when the masses were being numbered. "There were added unto them about three thousand souls," so we read in the Acts of the Apostles (ii. 41). This usage, for which other passages might be quoted, was not a Christian invention; it is found in the Old Testament, and there is a pre-Christian papyrus letter ¹ in which an Egyptian peasant begs for food to be sent "to save many souls." But the usage is very characteristic of Christianity. The masses are regarded as made up of souls, and it is the desire to save individual souls that urges on the Master and His apostles.

The same Jesus, whom we find standing before the crowd of five thousand, promises to be present to the twos and threes that gather together in His Name. The same Jesus whose grand consciousness of His mission sends Him forth to the "many" and even to "all," devotes the most special individual care to the souls of the lost, the fallen, and those in danger of falling whom their misery casts in His way. When prayer, the most intimate act of devotion, is concerned, He who Himself at times sought refuge from the thronging multitude in the night and in the desert, takes the individual out of the multitude and out of the street, and bids him flee into the closet. He even contrasts the many who are called with the few who are chosen, and He speaks of his "little" flock. The same Jesus who looks with warm

¹ The Tebtunis Papyri No. 56 (σῶσαι ψυχὰς πολλάς).

sympathy on the degenerate mass of the lower orders sees also the guardian angel of each one of them ; knows that not a hair falls from their head without God's will ; and ennobles the individual by showing him the possibility of joining the company of God's elect. Jesus places the whole world in one scale and the soul of man in the other, and the world is found to weigh lighter than the soul of man. Not a single one of these souls must be lost ; Jesus could identify Himself with the simplest and the poorest soul. At the same time it is clear throughout that He places exceptional confidence in the human soul which He prizes so extremely highly, for He makes exceptional demands upon it.

The same polarity of interest, here for the many, there for the individual, is found also in St. Paul. Driven up and down the world by a tempestuous missionary zeal, himself a debtor to the Jews and to the Greeks, he wants to convert a whole world to obey Christ, and at the same time he is an accomplished master of the finest arts in dealing with the individual soul. A typical example is the pastoral care he lavished on the runaway slave Onesimus and his master Philemon, of which we have precious testimony in the brief letter to Philemon. Doctrinaire prepossessions have caused some people to mistake entirely the peculiar character of that one priceless page. It is not, as they seem to think, a pamphlet on the attitude of Christianity to slavery : it is an instantaneous view of Primitive Christian pastorship. The pastor who could throw off such a letter had penetrated deeply on the intricate path of the inner life of man ; the intoxication of looking after the many had not destroyed his sober appreciation of the individual. No less typical is the treatment of another individual human soul in the second Epistle to the Corinthians—a Corinthian, otherwise unknown, who had deeply offended the apostle on the occasion

of the short visit to Corinth. And then St. Paul himself, the great pastor, represents—how could it be otherwise?—an altogether remarkable type of the individual soul, the like of which will not be seen again, alive to this day in the confessions contained in his Epistles, which witness that St. Paul had compassed all the heights and depths of man's spiritual nature with untrammelled freshness and vigour of experience. Like Jesus, St. Paul ennobled the individual soul by bringing it into connexion with the higher world. The individual is a temple of the Holy Ghost, a member of the Body of Christ, elect of God, a co-heir with Christ, a saint, i.e., one saved from the sinful world and brought into Christ's holy sphere. The individuals thus saved enter into organic union with the church of God, with the Body, or, as was said later under the after-influence of St. Paul, with the spiritual house in which they are living stones (1 Peter ii. 5), or with the brotherhood. By such deep conceptions as "saints," "body of Christ," "church of God," and "brotherhood" the apostles establish a line of division within the confused mass: here the saints, and there those that are without. And within the ranks of the faithful yet another organic classification of individuals, according to the gifts and powers given them by God; and all, from Jerusalem to Rome, from Galatia to Corinth, across land and sea, held together by the spirit of solidarity (especially clear in 2 Cor. viii. 13 ff.), each esteeming the other as his neighbour and brother, and himself as a slave for Christ's sake.

Our picture showing the Gospel united in the closest bonds with the lower classes of that age has now been enriched by one characteristic feature the more. Primitive Christianity, its stand taken among the masses of the ancient world, has discovered the individuals within the masses, sanctified them, and united them in a living organism.

The complete picture, then, beneath which we can write the title of this paper, is this :—

Far away in the East, on Galilæan soil, from out the serried ranks of the insignificant many, the weak and the lost, the babes, there rises the figure of a Redeemer. He towers above the inferior masses and above the handful of superior persons, and yet neither cuts Himself off from the masses nor despises them: He rather embraces the masses with His whole soul and bids them all to the Kingdom of God. But *in* the masses He seeks the individual, raises the individual from the masses, makes a soul of the individual, brings this soul into contact with the higher world, equips and sanctifies it for the great blessings which God will bestow on His own in the Kingdom.

A generation later a man is working among the lower orders of the populous cities of the Hellenistic world of the Mediterranean. It is Paul the missionary, himself a thorough man of the people, calmly contemptuous of the sham culture of the superior persons. He gathers together brotherhoods for the cult of that Redeemer, and though his thoughts are bent on the evangelization of the world he has the pastor's loving eye for each individual, so as to build up the house of saints out of single souls.

The polarity of the two interests—interest in the masses and interest in the individual—is one of the polarities on which the elastic force of Primitive Christianity depended.

Contact with the masses is the source of the continuous unaffected simplicity of its religious convictions. Contact with the masses is the foundation of that homely forcefulness which is prophetic of its triumphal progress from the people to the peoples. The delicacy and depth of its pastoral care for souls assure ethical energy to Primitive Christianity and safeguard it from selling its birthright and from degenerating into a mere cult.

With this polarity of interest in the masses and interest in the individual, Primitive Christianity set succeeding generations tasks that have remained immeasurably great and serious down to the present day. For us indeed they have become greater and more serious than ever before. Never has the individual soul been so threatened by the fact of its existence in the mass, and never has the menace to the soul reacted with such force upon the mass, as now in the machinery of modern mass-existence.

To enter into contact with the masses, to understand the masses as they are and as they have grown, what they can do and what they cannot do, to get to love the masses as we love our mother earth, the spreading cornfield, the wide forest, and the endless sea ;—then to discover the individual in the masses, to save the individual from the dangers with which he is threatened by existence in the mass, to raise the individual above the mass, and by thus raising the individual to improve the mass and thereby assure to our great social communities, the State, Society, and the Church, their natural foundation—that is the programme that has brought us together in the Evangelical-Social Congress. It is a programme of sentiment. It prescribes to the social politician the direction but not the exact path to be taken in his practical work. He must find the path himself. Others may smile at a programme of sentiment ; *we* feel ourselves strong in the certitude that with this programme we are representing the sentiment of the classical, the creative period of our faith.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

*LUKE'S AUTHORITIES IN ACTS I.-XII.*¹

III.

As we saw in the preceding part of this paper, Peter's escape is described to us by Luke in words closely approximating to those in which the fugitive narrated it to the group of the Saints at Mary's door within an hour after it occurred. It would be difficult to find any narrative of an escape from prison better authenticated, or related amid circumstances which exclude more absolutely the supposition either of falsification, or of the growth of legend. The description of the scene at the house must convince the unprejudiced judge, who examines the evidence critically, that Luke had listened to the story as it was related in the presence of several other witnesses of the scene by Rhoda herself, and that he intends to convey to his readers that he had been in the house and heard the story there.

In the story we hear not a word about the conduct of the guards, of whom three sets had to be passed. Were they hypnotized, or drugged, or bribed? Did Peter and the messenger pass among them without being visible? The supposition that they were asleep naturally cannot be entertained where so many were concerned, all bound by their duty to be vigilant and all responsible for their vigilance with their life. Under the head of hypnotism we may sum up any and every kind of supernatural influence which prevented the guards from observing what was going on. The Divine power, if we adopt the theory that the deliverance was accomplished in a supernatural manner, acts through natural means so far as possible; and there must

¹ In the list of recent writers to whom I have been specially indebted in studying the Acts, I omitted accidentally the name of Rev. R. B. Rackham. But, as I said, the present series of articles gives personal impressions, and is not founded on fresh study of modern commentators.

have been some reason evident to an observer why the guards did not take notice of what was going on, not even of the opening of the outer gate, until the morning.

Peter's story explains in part why he observed so little, and why the circumstances are left so obscure. He was wakened out of sleep—evidently a deep sleep—by a blow on the side; but he was still in such a confused, half-awakened state, that he believed all was a dream, until out in the street he found himself alone, after the “messenger of God” had disappeared. Then at last the cold night air and the continuous exercise restored his faculties, and he began to review the situation. He was a practical man, not an observer and student of psychical phenomena. He misses out what would interest the man of scientific temper: “when he was come to himself he said, ‘Now I know of a truth, that the Lord hath sent forth His messenger and delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and from all the expectation of the people of the Jews.’” He pictures to himself the scene on the morrow, the disappointment of the people, and the annoyance of the monarch whose hand and power had proved so feeble. He was conscious of this side of the situation first; and then later came the thought of escape, and of what immediate steps he should take to save himself. The order of his thoughts shows a calm and sane intellect, with a distinct sense of humour. A fussy or timid person would have thought at such a moment only of flight and safety. Peter, as we can gather from this scene, even if we know nothing else about him, was a man far above the common in respect of coolness, courage, and presence of mind. He resolved that the best thing to do was to retire to some obscure spot, after first relieving the anxiety of the brethren about his safety.

We observe that Peter had to think over the situation before he came to the conclusion that his deliverer was a

messenger of the Lord. He had not as yet been conscious of anything apparently supernatural in the circumstances, except that the gate "opened of its own accord."¹ He knew of no agent or instrument pushing it, but saw it open before him. Otherwise the accompaniments were all natural: the light was needed in the dark cell: he fastened his girdle round his tunic, and put on his thick upper garment and his sandals, before going out into the cold night. The chains had indeed dropped off from his hands; but this occurred first of all at the very moment that he was wakened, and he had no knowledge how the fastenings were unloosed. The "messenger" or "angel" appeared to him, therefore, in ordinary human form; and Peter only inferred his superhuman mission from subsequent reflexion about the circumstances. During the escape from the prison Peter was not in a condition to think; he simply obeyed and acted. When, standing alone in the street, he collected his thoughts and reviewed the situation, he concluded that the deliverance was the act of God.

Now, since previously the steps of the action had proceeded without his observing anything supernatural in the appearance or conduct of the deliverer, it is not necessary to understand from the conclusion which he stated, that the deliverer was a supernatural being. In the life of such people in modern times as Dr. Barnardo, who from small means have built up vast and beneficial organizations in reliance on the help of God, that help has come always in apparently natural ways. When a stranger in a

¹ This is a very vague thought in the mind of an Oriental, and is perfectly consistent with other explanations besides that of supernatural action. At the same time, I do not doubt that Luke understood it to imply supernatural agency. Luke was influenced insensibly by the western and scientific view, which sharply distinguishes the supernatural from the natural, and he often is placed in a difficulty by the idea of his oriental informants, who tended to identify the natural and the supernatural in a way that he did not fully understand or sympathize with.

hotel in Oxford, noticing Barnardo's name in the visitors' list, told him that he would make the first Village Home for girls, "we need not say that Dr. Barnardo and his friend received this as an answer to prayer, doubting not that the hand of God was in it." Was Peter, or were any of the early Christians at that time, less able or likely to recognize the hand of God in the affairs of the world than Dr. Barnardo and his friend? On the contrary, the Oriental mind is far more prone to see the hand of God in everything that goes on around us than the English mind is. To the Oriental God is always very close. The Oriental thinks and speaks of God far more frequently and familiarly than we do; and yet in his way of introducing the Divine name and supposing the Divine presence and action in the most common affairs of life, there is no irreverence. He does so, because he feels that God is always moving in all that goes on, great and small; that "not a sparrow falls to the ground without Him." We, on the other hand, tend to reserve the action of God for the big things, with the result that the logical mind, which cannot see any reasonable distinction between the small and the big things, fails, and must necessarily fail, to see that hand anywhere. Was not Barnardo more near the truth when he saw the hand of God in the bestowal of a needed subscription, and read in this act the fulfilment of his prayers?

Such is the Oriental view, at any rate; and there cannot be a doubt that, whether or not Peter actually knew his deliverer to be a real human being, he would equally confidently conclude that this was the angel of God. Peter's words should be judged from his own point of view, as they were meant. The Church was in the direst need, when its leader was on the eve of death. The Church engaged in earnest prayers. The prayers were answered. So much is certain; and we may safely assert that, whether the

deliverer was man or a supernatural being, he was equally "the messenger of God," in Oriental phrase.

Further, we may take it as certain that the escape occurred in the darkest part of the night, before the moon rose. The night following the last day of Unleavened Bread was the twenty-second of the moon, which therefore rose very late. The deliverance was doubtless timed, so that Peter should have a long period of darkness to place himself beyond the reach of pursuit. All the more remarkable is it that his escape was not observed until the next morning. The dawn-ing was not very early at that season of the year; and several hours must therefore have elapsed before the guards observed the facts and began to inquire what had become of Peter. It is not stated whether the outer gate closed behind the fugitive, or remained open. Peter observed only what bore on his immediate movements, and evidently never looked behind him, until he collected his thoughts in the street at some distance from the prison. But we cannot suppose it possible that the outer gate of the State prison remained open for hours, especially after the moon had risen, without some one perceiving it and giving the alarm. The gate, therefore, must certainly have been closed by the same agency which, unseen by Peter, had opened it, naturally or supernaturally, to let him go out.

Now there cannot be a doubt that the "messenger" who struck Peter on the side and guided him had human form, and had opened the door of the cell, for Peter, who described the other details so exactly, seems to assume that this door was open, and that only the outer iron gate at the top of the seven steps needed to be opened before them.¹ But, though the "messenger" had the form of a man (like "the messenger" who appeared to Cornelius),² he was

¹ The seven steps are mentioned only in the Western Text.

² Acts x. 30: when Cornelius tells the story he speaks only of "a man in bright apparel"; others speak of a "messenger," or "angel," of God.

to Peter merely an instrument used by the Divine power. God works through natural instruments and agents ; and Peter had none of the desire which we feel to investigate and state precisely the nature of each stage in his escape. The supernatural and the natural were not separated to his mind by any clear dividing line ; the one melted into the other, and he was not interested in placing the line between them.

Luke also was not interested to divide precisely the region of the natural from that of the supernatural. On the contrary, it would rather seem that he in many cases purposely leaves a debatable ground between the two. Those who, like the present writer, assume as the starting-point of their thought, that the Divine Power does continually exert itself in the affairs of the world, must recognize that at some point the Divine intervention (which is in its origin beyond our ken) becomes knowable to us, i.e., at some point it begins to act through means and in ways that are amenable to the ordinary laws of experience and reason. But where does that point lie ? To answer that question is always difficult. To answer it in the case of Peter's deliverance is impossible, because Luke intentionally or unintentionally—the present writer believes, intentionally—leaves the line of division in obscurity. Does the so-called natural action in this process begin only when Peter stood alone in the street, and was it previously all “supernatural” ? Or did it begin with the agent of the deliverance, in whose heart the thought was born and the means were carefully planned out ? We cannot say with certainty. But we can say with certainty that every one, whether he prefers to make the “supernatural” element larger or smaller, must acknowledge that at some point that element ceases and the ordinary and “natural” begins ; and we can feel great confidence that Luke, who

was generally disposed to enlarge the sphere of the supernatural, purposely leaves the transition obscure.

Now there is no doubt that at the court of the Herods, just as later at the court of many Roman Emperors, the Christians had friends, sympathizers, and even adherents. Slight references occur in the Gospels and the Acts, which may half reveal a considerable background of fact. The wife of Herod's steward was a follower of Jesus. The "foster-brother" of Herod,¹ Menahem, was one of the leading Christians, prophet or teacher, at Antioch. Others have observed and collected these indications; and it is not necessary here to enlarge on them. There is therefore nothing improbable in the supposition that some person influential in the *entourage* of Herod Agrippa I. had skilfully engineered the escape of Peter. The occasion was well chosen, as we have seen, in respect of darkness. Even if Peter had suspected or known who the deliverer was, he would not have mentioned the name at a street door; and he would equally have regarded his helper as "the messenger of God."

This case is typical of what can fairly be expected in the narrative of the New Testament, and of the limitations which must be allowed for. The essential facts and the spiritual truth are placed beyond doubt in this story, for they rest on evidence of the highest kind. But those who are bent on knowing the commonplace facts, those who regard it as the most important part of this historical scene to learn who managed the escape, and how the guards were evaded, will be disappointed: it is utterly impossible from the evidence

¹ I cannot wholly agree with Professor Deissmann's argument in his *Bible Studies*, p. 310 ff., that this term was merely a court title. I think that every one who comes into contact for a time with the life of the Levant lands, and knows how great a part in it is played by foster-mothers and foster-brothers, will be slow to accept some of the sentences in his argument.

to do more than make a vague conjecture, founded on general considerations and not on the special evidence, about these matters. The reason is that such things were indifferent both to Peter and to Luke : they are mere details, which do not in any way affect Peter's conceptions of real and spiritual truth, and the evidence does not even in the remotest way bear on matters of this class. The historian and the sociologist may long to know what was the relation of the royal court to the new Faith : it would be to such scientific inquirers a matter of real value to know whether some person who possessed influence at court managed the escape. Luke, however, did not write for them. Luke wrote for the Christian congregations of the Graeco-Roman world : and he told what was of permanent value for those whom he had in mind as readers. This principle must be applied in general throughout the New Testament narrative.

Turning now to the scene described at the assembly on the first Pentecost (in the second chapter), we observe that the speech of Peter pictures it after a different fashion from the narrative given in the preceding verses and especially in the words attributed to the bystanders. Although Peter at the outset of his speech quotes some of the words uttered by the onlookers, yet he does not mention that those who were now filled with the Spirit were speaking in foreign languages, nor is his tone consistent with the supposition that the use of foreign tongues was a characteristic and important part of the strange scene. He represents the facts which are occurring as a fulfilment of the saying of Joel, that in the last days the whole people, young and old, slave and free, male and female, shall have the gift of prophecy. What Peter heard around him, and mentions as the great feature of the scene, is prophetic utterance, and not the use of strange languages. On the other hand, while the preceding narrative does not exclude prophetic utterance

as part of the scene, it represents the use of foreign languages as being the most striking feature. According to this account, what impressed the onlookers was that strangers from remote lands heard the Christians speaking each in his own language. Those who harmonize everything by methods more or less Procrustean may find these two pictures in perfect agreement; but it seems to us more scientific and far more instructive to admit frankly their differences, and attempt to understand the origin and nature of the divergence between the two pictures.

We start from the belief that the speech of Peter is accurately and adequately reported. We have before us a précis of the actual words made by some of the audience (or by Peter himself), who possessed in a high degree the power of seizing and presenting in brief the essential topics of the discourse. There is nothing in the first half of Acts which more strongly impresses us with the historicity and early character of the record than the speeches in the Acts ii.-x.: these are original documents, in the truest sense, giving us faithfully the thought of that period, unaffected by later ideas.

We must, therefore, take Peter's speech in the second chapter as a thoroughly trustworthy account of the scene at Pentecost, so far as it goes. It was addressed at the moment to the spectators, and therein lie both the guarantee for its absolute trustworthiness and the cause of its deficiency. The speaker could not possibly address to such an audience a speech that was evidently out of keeping with the patent facts of the scene. But, on the other hand, he naturally and necessarily assumed as evident to the spectators, and therefore omitted from his speech, much that we should like to know. But, so far as it goes, and especially so far as it was intended by the speaker to go, it is perfect and conclusive evidence. Nothing that is directly contrary to it can be

accepted ; but much that is complementary to it may be correct, though not mentioned by Peter.

We have already stated the opinion that the report of Peter's speeches and of the scenes in which he appears ii.-x. comes, not from himself, but from Philip. Now, is it probable, or possible, that Philip, in addition to reporting exactly the gist of what Peter said, should also report to Luke his own impression of what he saw ? That such a theory is possible no one can hesitate to admit. That it would account for the divergence of the two accounts may also be at once admitted. The description given at the very moment by two spectators of such a scene, so strange and so confused, would certainly differ greatly. Peter, speaking to the crowd, and Philip, relating at a later time his own impressions, might very naturally and probably lay stress on different features ; and the two accounts are not fundamentally inconsistent with one another. The present writer feels no doubt that they both come from good authorities. Yet we must hesitate to attribute the narrative, verses 1-13, to Philip. It has not the character or spirit of those narratives that are most probably or certainly his, such as the scenes in Samaria and Caesareia. It is quite unlike the vivid and natural account of the healing of the lame man. It bears on its face the impression of being a later narrative, which attempts to describe to others by metaphors and elaborate similes a scene which they had not beheld, and to explain in this way not only the visual features of the scene but also the mental effects on those who were present. In verse 3 the remarkable words, " there were apparent to them as it were tongues of fire dividing themselves, and it sat upon each of them," present a vague and confused account and not the vivid picture of a spectator telling exactly what he sees. What sat upon each of them ? was it the fire as a whole, or a single tongue upon

each? Neither answer is satisfactory, either grammatically or rationally ; and yet there is no other possible. The truth is that the authority on whom Luke relies, though in himself good, was not clear on the point in his own mind, because he is mixing up two purposes, a description of what was seen and an account of the mental and spiritual process (which he is trying to make plain by aid of a comparison drawn from the language of the senses). The Divine influence occupied the mind of each individual ; and the manner in which it seized on each and divided itself so as to occupy the mind of each, is compared to the numerous jets of flame springing forth separately from a great fire : each jet divides itself from the mass of flame, and yet each is simply a part of the flame. The simile or allegory was, in a way, vivid and instructive to the simple minds of the ordinary Christians in Jerusalem, to whom the story was told frequently in the following years : but to the educated and scientific mind of modern students it is only confusing. It conceals the truth, instead of revealing it. But Luke was writing for the ordinary congregations, which contained " not many that had a philosophic and scientific education or administrative and official experience,"¹ and the comparison or simile was very suitable for his purpose and his audience. He had to convey a vague rough idea to minds which had

¹ It is strange that this phrase of St. Paul's is so often interpreted as if " not many " meant " none." Even Professor Deissmann adopts this misleading interpretation, *EXPOSITOR*, March, 1909, p. 221. His paper suffers from a fault which is probably due to the translator. It seems to move in a range of thought which assumes that there were in the Græco-Roman society only the aristocracy and " the lower classes," and it tries to demonstrate that Christianity was of the lower classes—an old idea. I have always maintained that, while early Christianity touched both the governing class and still more the lowest classes, its main power lay in its hold on the middle class. Professor Deissmann does not even mention or think of this aspect of the case. It is rather a characteristic of foreign theologians to ignore this class of the population, which, however, is the most thoughtful, the most energetic, and in the long run the strongest part of a nation.

not been trained to demand or to appreciate clear and definite ideas.

It must, as I think, be inferred that the account in verses 2-4 is that which formed itself in the earliest congregation at Jerusalem in the years following immediately after the event, and which was heard by Luke there in A.D. 57. Such allegory or simile is the beginning of legend: but in this case we find the process in such an early stage that its character and origin are clear. Had the process gone on for forty years longer, through a new generation, we should probably have had a legend in the fullest sense. As matters stand, we have the story still controlled by eye-witnesses, because it was repeated to Luke before the generation which beheld the scene had died out.

So far, the narrative seems to be only a naïve emblematic way of expressing the same fact that Peter describes in his speech, viz., the imparting of inspiration and power of prophecy to a number of persons. The following verses 5-11, however, are different in character, and undeniably describe a scene in which the inspired Christians are supposed to be speaking in various foreign languages. This is not necessarily inconsistent with the preceding and the following verses; but it certainly adds a new feature. The kind of prophetic utterance called "speaking with tongues" is never described elsewhere after that fashion; but it was certainly a feature of "speaking with tongues" that the expression was broken, hardly articulate, and not intelligible without an interpreter. It was the result of an ecstatic condition of the individual, and did not benefit others. Hence Paul regarded it with less respect, and classed it lower, than any other form of spiritual influence. Our view is that ii. 5-11 give a popular description of the first occasion on which this influence was manifested in the Church. That the description is not to be taken as literally correct, but

as the current descriptive tradition in the congregation at Jerusalem, follows from the following considerations.

In the first place, there is contained in it a speech which obviously was never actually made. The impression produced on the minds of the spectators is expressed emblematically in the form of a speech ; but none of the spectators literally said those words. This is the way in which the popular mind afterwards expressed and described the thoughts of the crowd, when the story was told and retold in the Church.

Secondly, the enumeration of peoples (really of languages) is evidently a rough enumeration such as occurs to one who was present, and who afterwards told the story, adding at the end two nations which he had omitted and which recurred too late to his memory. The understanding of this list has been obscured to the commentators because they take it as a list of countries where the Jews had settled ; it is a rough list of the languages spoken by or known to the Jews of the Diaspora (corresponding, of course, in some degree to the countries where they lived) ; and several are called by popular terms which cannot be specified with any certainty, Persian, Median, Chaldæan or Elamite, and North Aramaic¹ (Mesopotamia), Hebrew or South Aramaic, and Cappadocian, and some Pontic tongue² and Greek (Asia), Phrygian and the barbarous half-Greek of Pamphylia,³ two north-African languages, and Latin (spoken by both Jews and Roman proselytes), finally as an afterthought Cretan (a dialect of Greek so different from the Koine, as to seem a distinct language to the Jews) and Arabic. There is here no classification, but a popular statement, as the

¹ I use these terms in a rough unscientific fashion.

² We have no information as to the language in any of the various districts called Pontus.

³ It is known from inscriptions.

memory moves from east to west, with a supplement of two omitted languages. This is not Lukan ; it is what Luke was told, and it comes from the memory of some one who was present. But why is a list of languages given, when we may feel certain that almost all of those Jews knew Greek and that many also knew either Hebrew or South-Aramaic or both ? The whole passage merely emphasizes in popular fashion the strangeness of the phenomenon : the tongues were as intelligible in Persian as in Arabic : you needed only an interpreter in every case. The striving after emphasis, which is characteristic of the popular Oriental mind, is here carried to an extreme, and brings the narrative to the verge of legend : yet it is not legend, but an attempt to make uneducated people appreciate vividly a strange phenomenon.

In the third place the comparison of Divine inspiration to fire, which occurs in verses 2-4, was developed in verses 5-11 according to a popular Jewish superstition. That comparison is natural to the human mind, and was peculiarly characteristic of Hebrew thought and expression. Metaphors in which high mental excitation or spiritual enthusiasm is described by such terms as " burning," " flaming," " kindle," etc., are found in every language. But here the elaborate simile of verses 2-4 recalled to the popular Jewish mind the thought of a variety of languages, because a belief had grown up that on Mount Sinai the fire in which God spoke became a multitude of voices. Mr. Vernon Bartlet in his *Acts*, p. 384, rightly says that the analogy is sufficient " almost to prove the influence of this Jewish belief upon the present narrative." Such a development seems inconsistent with anything except a narrative current among the people and taking its colour and tone from their ideas.

Verses 12-13 describe other sides of the onlookers'

thoughts in briefer fashion, but quite in the same general style.

We have in this whole passage the popular account of the scene, as it was current in the Church at Jerusalem. We have not the description which Philip would give, if we judge him by the standard of those parts of the following chapters, where his hand is most apparent. But the picture is in its way a very striking one, and seemed to Luke worthy of preservation, in order to give full emphasis to the first episode in the growth of the new Church. He was certainly quite conscious that the incident contrasted strongly with the more orderly conduct that reigned in the Philippian Church, with its official bishops and deacons. He regarded the scene as an example of the Jewish and Eastern spirit, which even in the Church could not altogether disappear. His historical purpose was to describe the development of the Church; and he knew that Pauline views as to spiritual life were different from and higher than this. But that early scene also was the effect of the Divine Spirit, seizing on the young congregation for the first time and almost intoxicating them with its fervid enthusiasm. The Acts as a whole sets before us the picture of a Church growing, and not of a Church stationary.

We do not maintain that every part of these chapters can be assigned to some definite authority. Allowance must be made for the formative and guiding genius of Luke, and for his habit of using details taken from one authority to enrich and enliven a narrative taken from some other. But it seems in the highest degree probable that we can safely trace the varying origin of different parts of chapters i.-xii. Philip and his daughters, Rhoda and other persons in the household of Mary, may be confidently believed to have contributed by their personal narrative and trustworthiness to give greater individuality and vividness to

the account which was heard by Luke as current in the Palestinian Church about 57 A.D. Mere popular narrative tends to become vague, to lose grip of exact details, and finally to degenerate into legend. In the chapters we must acknowledge that some parts are more thoroughly historical and trustworthy than others; and we see the reason in the varied authorities on whom Luke depended.

The popular tradition was far more liable than single educated authorities like Philip to let its account be coloured by subsequent events; and it is therefore of the utmost importance that we have the tradition at such an early date. The arguments that Luke's history was composed and published about A.D. 60 or 70 rest on facts which really only imply that he had caught the tradition at that stage and reported it faithfully. In some cases it is of real value to have in the Acts a certain reference to subsequent history, because the history to which it refers is so early. The tradition even at its worst gives us the views entertained at an extremely early period. Perhaps the most important of those views is the conception of Church government which underlies the Acts. The administrative work of the Twelve, in which they subsequently needed the supplementary aid of the Seven, is repeatedly termed *diakonia*, and once *episkope*. It is logically necessary to infer that Luke, who was evidently keenly interested in the practical side of the history of the Church as an administrative institution, regarded the diaconate and the episcopate as both developing out of the apostolate in its capacity of a governing body. So long as there were any of the Twelve Apostles left, the government remained with them. But in their absence and after their death, other devices had to be introduced. In Syrian Antioch Barnabas and other "prophets and teachers" formed a governing body, not essentially dissimilar in character to the Twelve; Barnabas

in fact carried with him the prestige of commission from the Twelve, and of a rank close to theirs. We have still a semi-Oriental kind of governing authority, not unlike the colleges of priests at the great Asiatic and Anatolian hiera. But, when we come to the Hellenic cities of South Galatia, we find that Paul introduced the Greek system of popular election to Church office, Acts xiv. 23. This method suited the democratic spirit of Hellenic towns, and was wholly alien to Oriental ways. It was perpetuated, for in the *Didache* the rule occurs "elect for yourselves bishops and deacons": and it led to evils, as already is evident in Paul's letters, where allusions are made to the rivalry among the members of a congregation for distinction and office. Such rivalry, and the faults to which it is prone, was hardly avoidable in the Greek and Roman world. In the introduction of this method we recognize the Greek side of the mind and training of Paul. The pure Jew would never have instituted such a system of government.

In Galatia it was presbyters that were appointed. In Jerusalem the presbyters were merely "the elder brethren" (Acts xv. 23), viz., those members of the congregation whose experience and age fitted them for deliberation, while the younger members acted where vigour and physical work were needed (v. 6, 10): the distinction is a natural one, which comes about automatically. But in the Hellenic cities of South Galatia,¹ the presbyters were elected officials. The difference is profound. The one institution has no bearing on or inner connexion with the other. Very soon the "presbyters" were differentiated into "bishops" and "deacons," as we see at Philippi and in the *Didache*; and the two classes came to be regarded as respectively superior and preparatory. This development and systematization must have interested Luke keenly; and the fact that no

¹ Doubtless also in the Pauline Church at Ephesus.

word bearing on its initial stages is found in his history is one of the many reasons which convince me that his work was never completed, that a third book was in his mind, and that even the second book, the Acts, never received its finishing touches. In the year 57, when we leave Asia, there are only Presbyters. In the year 61 there are at Philippi bishops and deacons, as we see in the slight glimpse which Paul's letter to the Philippians permits. The development began in that interval, during which the Acts does not touch Asia or Galatia. A study of the Pastoral Epistles may throw some light on the subject.

W. M. RAMSAY.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.¹

XIV.

ἐξηλώω.—Dr. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 100) remarks on Justin's use of "the curious word ἀφηλωθείς" to denote that Christ was "unnailed" from the Cross (*Dial.* 108). The passage is noted by Sophocles (*Lexicon s.v.*), who also gives references for the corresponding verb ἐξηλώω. To these last may be added TbP 332^{14 f.} (A.D. 176) where complaint is made of robbers who τὰς θύρας ἐξηλώσαντες ἐβίασταξαν, "extracting the nails from the doors carried off" what was within, and PFi 69^{21, 24} (iii/A.D.) ἐξηλουῦσι σανίδες (accus.).

ἐξομολογέω.—For the ordinary Bibl. meaning of "admit," "acknowledge" cf. HbP 30¹⁸ (iii/B.C.), οὔτε τῶι πράκτορι ἠβούλου ἐξομο[λογήσ]ασθαι, "nor were willing to acknowledge the debt to the collector" (G. and H.). The derived sense of "agree," as in Luke xxii. 6, comes out in TbP 183 (ii/B.C.), τοῦ κω[μάρχ]ου ἐξομολογησαμένου ἕκαστα: cf. PFi 86¹¹ (i/A.D.) ἐξομολογουμένην τὴν πίστιν.

¹ For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) EXPOSITOR, pp. 170, 262.

ἐξορκίζω.—With Matt. xxvi. 63, ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα κ.τ.λ. may be compared the heathen amulet BU 956 (iii/A.D.), ἐξορκίζω ὑμᾶς κατὰ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματος θεραπεύσαι τὸν Διούσιον. The adjective is of constant occurrence in the magic papyri, e.g. BM I. p. 67⁷⁶ (iv/A.D.), p. 93²⁶⁹ (iii/A.D.).

ἐξουσία.—The phrase ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν in the general sense of exhibiting weight and authority (as Mark i. 22, ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων) may be paralleled from FP 125^{5f.} (ii/A.D.), ἀντιλαβὼν ἦν ἐξουσίαν ἔχεις, “using all the influence you have” (G. and H.). In an interesting note in his *Poimandres*, p. 48 n³, Reitzenstein claims that in the N. T. usage, as in the Hermes dialogue, the idea of “knowledge” is mingled with that of “power.” For the reference of the word to civil magistracy or rule (as Rom. xiii. 1) cf. BM III. p. 215 (ii/A.D.), δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας, the *tribunicia potestas* of Claudius.

ἐπαιτέω.—In BM I. p. 32⁴ (163 B.C.) a recluse at the Serapeum describes himself as living ἀφ’ ὧν ἐπαιτῶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, “from what I beg in the temple”: cf. Luke xvi. 3, ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι. That temples generally were a promising haunt for the profession St. Luke reminds us elsewhere. Ἐπητρία, the Greek for a “beggaress”—to translate it with an equal novelty—appears as a ἄπ. λεγ. in Witkowski, p. 52 (Par P 59), of ii/B.C.: see note.

ἐπακολουθέω.—The use of ἐπ. to denote those who “checked” or “verified” an account, e.g. the signatures to a series of tax receipts TbP 100^{20, 21} (ii/B.C.), Δρεῦος ἐπηκολούθηκα, Ἀκουσίλαος ἐπηκολούθηκα, throws light on [Mark] xvi. 20, τοῦ κυρίου . . . τὸν λόγον βεβαιούντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων: the signs “endorse” the Word. For an important discussion of the word see Wilcken *Ostr.* i. p. 76 f.

ἐπανόρθωσις.—With the metaph. usage in 2 Tim. iii. 16

cf. the verb in NP 1¹⁵ ff. (ii/A.D.), εἰ μάθοιμι παρὰ τὰ κεκελευσμένα πρᾶσσοντας, ἐπιστρεφέστερον ὑμᾶς ἐπανορθώ[σο]μαι.

ἐπάρατος.—For this N.T. ἄπ. λεγ. (John vii. 49) cf. *Syll.* 810, εἰ δέ τι ἐκὼν ἔξαμαρτ[ήσει], οὐκ ἐμὸν ἐπαράσ[ασθαι], δίκη δὲ ἐπικρέμαται τιμωρὸς ἀπελθόντι ἀπειθῆς Νεμέσεως—an inscription which recalls the teaching of Rom. xii. 19. The LXX compound ἐπικατάρατος (cf. Gal. iii. 10) is also amply attested from the inscriptions, e.g. *Syll.* 891² ff. (ii/A.D.), ἐπικατάρατος ὅστις μὴ φείδοιτο κατὰ τόνδε τὸν χώρον τοῦδε τοῦ ἔργου (a sepulchral monument).

ἐπεισαγωγή.—We have found no instance as yet of this interesting subst. (Heb. vii. 19, ἐπεισαγωγή δὲ κρείττους ἐλπίδος); but the verb is used as a *terminus technicus* in marriage contracts, forbidding a man to “bring in in addition” another woman to his house, EP 1⁸ (iv/B.C.), NP 21⁴ (ii/B.C.), BU 1050¹⁶. Ἐπίσακτος is found = “imported” in *Ostr.* 757 (106–5 B.C.): cf. the use of παρείσακτος in Gal. ii. 4.

ἐπέχω.—For ἐπέχω, “pay heed,” as in Acts iii. 5, 1 Tim. iv. 16, cf. FP 112¹¹ f. (A.D. 99), ἐπέχον τῷ δακτυλιστῇ Ζαίλωι. The sense of “delay,” “hinder” (as Acts xix. 22), is found in the legal phrase μηδενὸς ἐπεχομ(ένου), OP 488⁴³ (late ii/iii A.D.), TbP 327³⁷ (late ii/A.D.): cf. TbP 337² (ii/iii A.D.), ἐν ἐποχῇ, “in suspense,” with the editors’ note.

ἐπηρέάζω.—The verb is common = “insult,” “treat wrongfully,” e.g. FP 123⁷ (c. A.D. 100), διὰ τὸ ἐπηρεᾶσθαι, OGIS 484²⁶ (ii/A.D.), δι’ ὧν ἐπηρέαζον μάλιστα τοὺς τὸν ἰχθὺν πιπρᾶσκοντας. The middle is found in an interesting document in which a weaver petitions on grounds of poverty against his name being inserted in the list of those eligible for the office of πρεσβύτερος τῆς κώμης, or village elder, BM III. p. 131 A.D. 140), οἱ δὲ τῆς κώμης πρεσβύτεροι ἐπηρεάζοντ[ο μοι ὅπως] ἀναδώσω καί μου τὸ κτῆμα εἰς πρεσβυτερείαν τῆς κώμης ἀπ[όρου] μου ὄντος. For the subst. see

TbP 28⁴ (c. 114 B.C.), διὰ τὸν . . . ἐ[πληρ]εασμόν, “on account of the insolent conduct.”

ἐπιδείκνυμι.—For ἐ.—“prove,” as in Heb. vi. 17, see the old marriage contract already cited EP 1⁷ (iv/B.C.), ἐπιδειξάτω δὲ Ἡρακλείδης ὅτι ἂν ἐγκαλῆι Δημητρίαι ἐναντίον ἀνδρῶν τριῶν.

ἐπιδημέω.—The meaning of this word (see Acts ii. 10, xvii. 21) is well brought out in Par P 69 (iii/A.D.) extracts from the day-book of a strategus, where it is used of his arrival and temporary sojourn in a place, as ἀποδημέω is of his departure: see further Wilcken *Archiv* iv. p. 374. The subst. (e.g. *OGIS* 517^{6f}. (iii/A.D.), κατὰ τὴν . . . Αὐτοκράτορος Ἀντωνίνου ἐπιδημίαν) is thus practically synonymous with the more technical παρουσία, on which see *Thess.* 145 f.

ἐπιζητέω.—From OP 36 (ii/iii A.D.) we learn that if a tax-gatherer had any suspicion that a merchant had more goods on his ship than he had declared (ἀπεγράψατο), he had the right of requiring the cargo to be unloaded—ἐὰν δὲ τελώνης ἐκφορτισθῆναι τὸ πλοῖον ἐπιζητήσῃ, ὁ ἔμπορος ἐκφορτιζέτω. The directive rather than intensive force of the compound verb is well seen in such a passage as TbP 411^{5ff}. (ii/A.D.), ὁ γὰρ κράτιστος ἐπιστράτηγος ἰκανῶς σε ἐπεζήτησε, “has made several inquiries about you”: cf. Luke iv. 42, οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπεζήτουν αὐτόν. This has force as illustrating the meaning Dean Robinson gives to ἐπιγινώσκειν in his excursus in *Ephesians*.

ἐπιλανθάνομαι.—The construction with the acc. in Phil. iii. 13, while not unknown in classical, is amply attested in later Greek, e.g. Par P 32^{11ff}. (ii/B.C. = Witk. 43), ἐπιλελῆσθαι τὰ μέτρα τῶν ὀθονίων, OP 744¹² (B.C. 1), πῶς δύναμαί σε ἐπιλαθεῖν;

ἐπιλείχω.—A curious illustration of Luke xvi. 21, οἱ κύνες . . . ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ is afforded by *Syll.* 803³⁶

(iii/B.C.), where an inscription found in the Asclepieum of Epidaurus records how a dog healed a boy—*ταῖ γλώσσαι ἐθεράπευσε καὶ ὑγιῆ ἐπόησε*. Upon the presence of dogs in the Asclepieum see Dittenberger's note in *Syll.* 631⁴.

ἐπίλοιπος.—See *Notes* ii., *s.v.* ὀπίσω.

ἐπισκέπτομαι.—The verb is common="inspect," "examine," as when a tax-farmer describes how by means of a bribe he had obtained a view of (*ἐπεσκεψάμην*) the document containing his rival's offer, *TbP* 58 (B.C. 111). For the meaning "visit," as in *Acts* vii. 23, cf. *LIP* 6⁵ (iii/B.C.), *διαβάντος μου . . . ἐπισκέψασθαι τὴν ἀδελφὴν*, a sense which it retains in modern Greek.

ἐπίσκοπος.—To the examples of this important word as an official title given by Deissmann *BS* 230 f. may be added *PP* III. p. 75^{1 f.}, *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποδεδειγμένων ἐπισκόπων*, "in the presence of the appointed supervisors" (*Edd.*). See also *Notes* xi., *s.v.* *διάνοια*.

ἐπισπείρω.—With the usage in *Matt.* xiii. 25 cf. *TbP* 375^{13 f.} (A.D. 140), *εἰς σπορὰν καὶ ἐπισποράν*, "to be sown and resown." The sense is as old as *Hesiod*.

ἐπιστέλλω.—Laqueur in his *Quaestiones Epigraphicae et Papyrologicae Selectae*, p. 16 f., has shown that in letters written by Roman Emperors or Magistrates *ἐπιστέλλω* is always="write," rather than "send," e.g. *CIG* III. 3835, *ἐπέστειλα αὐτῷ δηλῶν τὸ πρᾶγμα ὅλον. ἐπέστειλα δὲ Ἐσπέρῳ τῷ ἐπιτρόπῳ*. With this the N.T. usage corresponds, *Acts* xv. 20, *Heb.* xiii. 22.

ἐπιταγή.—The use of this phrase in Paul to denote a *Divine* command (*Rom.* xvi. 26, *1 Tim.* i. 1, *Tit.* i. 3) suits its technical use in dedicatory inscriptions. Thus in *Syll.* 786 *Isias* dedicates an altar to the Mother of the Gods *κατ' ἐπιταγήν*, "by command" of *Cybele* herself conveyed in dream or oracle, as *Dittenberger* remarks. He compares other formulae like *κατὰ μαντείαν, κατ' ὄναρ, καθ' ὄραμα*. It

is at least possible that this connotation may be present in 1 Cor. vii. 6, 2 Cor. viii. 8. Add the Phrygian inscription Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ Σόλων ἱερός κατὰ ἐπιταγὴν Διὶ Δίῳ εὐχὴν καὶ ἑαυτῷ ζῶν, which Sir William Ramsay (*Stud. in the East. Rom. Prov.* p. 275) cites in illustration of the old Phrygian custom of consecrating any sacred place by a grave. "Here Solon, in service at an Anatolian hieron. was ordered by the god to fulfil a vow, and in the same act of dedication he made the grave for himself."

ἐπιφαίνω.—The verb is used of the "epiphany" of the goddess Artemis Leukophryene in a Magnesian inscription of 221–0 B.C., *Syll.* 256^b ἐπιφαινομένης αὐτοῖς Ἀρτέμιδος. For the corresponding use of the subst. to denote a conspicuous appearance or intervention of the higher powers on behalf of their worshippers, see *Thess.* 148 and cf. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* 271 ff. The fresh light thrown on the Pauline usage in 2 Thess. ii. 8, 1 Tim. vi. 14, etc., is obvious. To the note in *Proleg.* 102 on ἐπιφανής=Avatar, add a reference to Mr. E. R. Bevan's discussion of this title of Antiochus IV. in *Journ. Hell. Stud.* xx. 28 f. He shows that Seleucus I. had himself worshipped as Zeus Olympios: Antiochus replaced Zeus on his coins, the intervening kings having substituted Apollo. His title meant a claim to be worshipped as Zeus "incarnate."

ἐπιφώσκω.—A horoscope, BM I p. 132 ff., is dated ἔτους τρίτου θεοῦ Τίτου Φαρμουθι τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ ἕκτῃ, "the third year of the divus Titus, at the dawn of the 6th Pharmuthi," i.e. April 1, A.D. 81: cf. Matt. xxviii. 1, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων.

ἐπιχορηγέω.—Though the simple χορηγέω is more common, the compound verb is also well attested in the papyri: see e.g. OP 282^b ff. (A.D. 30–35), where a man states with regard to his wife ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἐπεχορήγησα αὐτῇ τὰ ἐξῆς καὶ ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, "I for my part provided for my wife

in a manner that exceeded my resources" (G. and H.). The passage may perhaps be taken as illustrating the "generous" connotation underlying the corresponding substantive, as in Phil. i. 19, ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (see Kennedy's note *ad l.* in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*).

ἐπιχρίω.—A very striking parallel to the healing of the blind man in John ix. 6 is afforded by an inscription probably from the temple of Asclepios at Rome of the date 138 A.D. : *Syll.* 807¹⁵ ff., Οὐαλερίῳ Ἄπρω στρατιώτῃ τυφλῷ ἐχρημάτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἐλθεῖν καὶ λαβεῖν αἷμα ἐξ ἀλεκτρυῶνος λευκοῦ μετὰ μέλιτος καὶ κολλυρίου συντριῖψαι καὶ ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐπιχρεῖσαι ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς· καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν καὶ ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ἠύχαριστήσεν δημοσίᾳ τῷ θεῷ, "To Valerius Aper, a blind soldier, the god gave commandment to come and take the blood of a white cock along with honey, and to mix together an eye-salve, and for three days to anoint it on the eyes. And he received his sight, and came, and gave thanks publicly to the god." (For the tense here note exact parallel in James i. 24, and note in *Proleg.*³ 144.).

ἐπόπτῃς.—With the application of ἐπόπτῃς to God in the Greek Bible (e.g. Esth. v. 1, τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτῃν θεόν, 2 Macc. vii. 35—cf. iii. 39—τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπόπτου θεοῦ) may be compared the corresponding use in the inscriptions. Thus an inscription from Cyzicus describes Pompey the Great as ἐπόπτῃς γῆς τε καὶ θαλάσσης (*JHS* xxvii. 64), and in *Perg.* 381 the Emperor Augustus is called [αὐτοκράτ]ορα Καίσαρα θεοῦ υἱὸν θεὸν Σεβαστὸν [πάσης] γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης [ἐ]π[όπ]-τ[ην]: cf. *OGIS* 666²⁵ (time of Nero), τὸν Ἥλιον Ἄρμαχιν ἐπόπτῃν καὶ σωτήρα with reference to an Egyptian Sun-god.

ἔτοιμος.—With the phrase ἐν ἐτοιμῷ ἔχω (2 Cor. x. 6) cf. *EP* 10⁷ (iii/B.C.), τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν ἐτοιμῷ ὄντων, and to Deissmann's examples of ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω (*BS* 252) add *AP* 32⁶ (ii/B.C.), ἐτοιμῶς ἐχόντων [ν χειρο]γραφεῖν τὸν βασιλικὸν ὄρκον,

“being ready to subscribe the royal oath,” which brings out very clearly the N.T. construction with the inf., Acts xxi. 13, 2 Cor. xii. 14.

εὐδοκέω.—See *Thess.* 22 f., 106, and add BU 1070⁶ (iii/A.D.), *εὐδοκοῦντα τῇ αἰρέσει τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς*.

εὐκαιρέω.—The idea of “favourable opportunity” underlying the word comes out well in Par P 46¹⁸ (ii/B.C.=Witk. 62), *αὐτὸς δέ, ὡς ἂν εὐκαιρήσω, παραχρήμα παρέσομαι πρὸς σέ*, where Witkowski also draws attention to *ὡς ἂν* of time with the conjunctive as frequently in the N.T., Rom. xv. 24, 1 Cor. xi. 34, Phil. ii. 23; cf. *Prolegg.*³ 167. The subst. (as Matt. xxvi. 16, Luke xxii. 6) is found in NP 55³ ff. (undated), *εὐκερίαν* (l. *εὐκαιρίαν*) *εὐρὼν . . . ἔσπευσα προσ-αγορεύσει* (l. *-σαι*) κ.τ.λ. It may be mentioned that Pallis *A Few Notes*, p. 11, regards Mark vi. 21, *γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαιροῦ*, as an “empty” day, a day without work, a festival; the meaning is supported from Byzantine (see Sophocles *s.v.*) and modern Greek.

εὐνοία.—An interesting illustration of Eph. vi. 7, *μετ’ εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες*, is afforded by the will of Acusilaus, OP 494⁶ (ii/A.D.), where, amongst other provisions, the testator sets free certain slaves *κατ’ εὐνοίαν καὶ φιλοστοργίαν*, “for their good-will and affection towards him.”

εὐσέβεια.—As emphasizing the place of this word and its cognates in religious phraseology (Deissmann *BS* 364, *Licht vom Osten* 231) see Par P 29¹⁰ (ii/B.C.), *δι’ ἣν ἔχετε πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβειαν*, and the payments made *ἐξ εὐσεβείας* to the Socnopaeus temple in TbP 298⁴⁵ (A.D. 107–8). The word occurs also in a very interesting letter of date A.D. 46 in which the Emperor Claudius thanks an athletic club for the golden crown which it had sent to him on the occasion of his victorious campaign in Britain—*ἐπὶ τῇ κατὰ Βρεταννῶν νικῆ χρυσοῦν στέφανον ἠδέως ἔλαβον σύμβολον περιέχοντα τῆς ὑμετέρας πρὸς με εὐσεβείας* (BM III. p. 216¹² ff.).

εὐσχήμων.—With 1 Cor. vii. 35, πρὸς τὸ εὐσχημον, to promote decorum, cf. the office of εὐσχήμων or guardian of public morals in Egypt, e.g. BU 147¹ (ii/iii A.D.), ἀρχεφόδοις καὶ εὐσχήμοσι κώμης. So TbP 594, Ostr. 1153 (Rom.), πέμψατε τοὺς εὐσχήμονας τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν παρολκην(άτων). The use found in Mark xv. 43, Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 12, is also well supported.

ἐφημερία.—A hitherto unknown derivative of this word is found in PP II. 10 (2)¹³, ἐν τῶι ἐφημερευτηριῶι with reference apparently to the “guardroom, where soldiers remain all day on duty” (Ed.).

ἔχω.—This word cannot be discussed at present, but we may note BM III. p. 210 (iii/A.D.), ἔχε αὐτὰς [τὰς δραχμὰς] εἰς κ.τ.λ.=“spend them on,” etc. This might give some support to the imperative (as R.V. mg.) in Matt. xxvii. 65, against which the durative tense is a serious objection. For the phrase γυναιῖκα ἔχειν (1 Cor. vii. 2, 12) cf. Syll. 794 περὶ γε(ι)νεῆς, ἣ ἔσται ἐκ τῆς γυναικὸς . . . τῆς νῦν ἔχει. “Ωραν ἔχειν in PFi 79 (i/A.D.) will illustrate ἡλικίαν ἔχειν in John ix. 21.

ζῶω.—With the phrase ἔτι ζῶν in Matt. xxvii. 63 ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος εἶπεν ἔτι ζῶν Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγειρόμαι, cf. such a monumental inscription as Ζώσιμος [τοῖς τ]έκνοις . . . καὶ ἐαυτῷ ἔτι ζῶν κατεσκευάσεν (Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, p. 660).

ζωγράφω.—For the thought of capture *for life* in Luke v. 10 ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωγράων (Beza, *vivos carpes homines*), cf. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* 841⁷ ζώγραε, δέσποτ’ ἀναξ, τὸν σὸν ναετήρα (cited in Herwerden *Lexicon*, p. 345).

ἡγεμών.—The breadth of this word and its derivatives, which in a single verse (Luke iii. 1) can be applied to the Emperor and to the *chargé d'affaires* of a tiny district like Judaea, is well seen in the papyri. Thus in LIP 4¹⁷ (iii/B.C.) the editor notes that it means “officier en général, et plus

particulièrement, dans certains cas, officier d'infanterie." He compares RL xxxvii³, where Prof. Grenfell notes that the hegemones are "subordinate to the strategi; nevertheless the Romans chose this title as an equivalent for the praefectus."

ἡγούμενος.—The participle has become stereotyped as a noun, like ἄρχων. We have various uses of this "ambiguous title," as the edd. note on FP 110 (p. 264): it may denote a president, as ἡγ. συνόδου in GH 67³ (iii/A.D.) etc., or a subordinate, as OP 294¹⁹ (22 A.D.), ὁ ἡγ. τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, "the marshal of the strategus" (G and H.). As an ecclesiastical title it passed into Arabic in later times: cf. *Studia Sinaitica* xii. p. 52. The verb in general is not very common. Its original sense of *leading* may still be seen, even as late as OP 128¹² (vi/vii A.D.) ἡγείσθω τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, "let it stand in the forefront of the letter." But the would-be literary taint is on this document: OP 55⁹ (283 A.D.), ἀπὸ ἡκουμένου πυλῶνος γυμνασίου ἐπὶ νότον, "leading southwards," is at least free from this reproach, as a glance at its spelling will prove. Since Grimm assumes that ἡγείσθαι is akin to ἄγω, it may be worth while to observe that the harmless necessary *h* really does matter in etymology. It would have been more to the point to compare the English *seek*.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

*THE POSITIVE ELEMENTS IN THE CONCEPTION
OF SIN.*

I.

IN this and a subsequent article I propose to attempt to determine, with as much precision as is possible, what are the elements essential to a concept of actual sin: a concept such as shall be based upon the knowledge of human nature that is available to us at the present day and such as shall at the same time satisfy the requirements of distinctively Christian theology and ethics. In thus endeavouring to define the nature of sin I shall aim at making my treatment of the subject before us as positive or constructive as may be. But I may as well explain at the outset of our inquiry that purely positive statements concerning the subject that is to occupy our attention would, in relation to present needs, be somewhat pointless. What we are to include in our concept can only be discussed with profit, at this stage in the course of Christian thought, if at the same time we insist upon the exclusion of certain disturbing elements which there is some tendency in our day to regard as comprehended under the term "sin." Allusion to an analogous case in the history of Christian doctrine will perhaps best serve to make my meaning clear. The language of the Nicene Confession, for instance, is wholly positive. But it was nevertheless largely determined by the Church's need to repudiate certain beliefs or theories which she could not assimilate; and it derives its meaning, to some extent, from the very necessity of ruling out heretical

or dangerous teaching. Exactly so, I believe, will an endeavour to present in our day a complete and exact definition of sin inevitably involve discrimination between sound and unsound doctrine, express repudiation of such current ideas as are incompatible with a consistent concept of sin or are not essential or relevant thereto.

If, then, I shall appear, especially in the earlier stages of my argument, to be as much concerned with negating and excluding as with asserting and constructing, and therein to be breaking the promise implied in the title of these articles, my apology must be that some negation is inevitable, and that no more shall be indulged in than is absolutely necessary to construct a concept at once positive and free from alloy. I may remark that I find myself, in undertaking my task of construction, much in the same position as the builders of the walls of Jerusalem under Nehemiah. They that builded on the wall, we are told, "every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon." I am afraid that my constructing hand will for a time be so impeded by adverse forces as to oblige me to call the weapon-hand sometimes into play.

To begin then. A logically perfect concept is one that is definite, or unambiguous, and constant; so that every one who uses it may be assured when he does so that his meaning is exactly the same as that of every one else who uses it. We can hardly say that a conception of sin possessing these characteristics has yet been acquired by Christian theology. Opinions indeed have differed, and still differ, amongst theologians, as to the exact content the concept ought to include. Now all human concepts are framed to some extent with arbitrariness. I do not mean by that that they are fashioned capriciously. I rather mean that our concepts are not generally dictated to us or forced upon us inevitably at

the outset, but are selected by us as serviceable to some one particular end rather than any other. Natural science, for instance, has come to use a certain number of concepts by which to classify objects and phenomena, not because these are thrust upon her with any logical necessity, as if there were just such and so many concepts whereby Nature can be made intelligible, and no others could be elaborated and used. Science has, by tentative efforts, found those which have hitherto best suited her particular purpose, viz., economy of thought and practical control of phenomena ; but there is nothing necessary or final about them, for, indeed, they are continually undergoing revision and replacement. It is this fact that concepts are artificially fashioned, and that their component elements are selected from amongst others, according to the purpose for which they are required, that constitutes what I have called the arbitrariness in their construction and that causes their content to be determined, in some degree, conventionally. The meaning of all words, indeed, has been fixed by consent. We are perfectly at liberty to put as much or as little content as we please into any word that we coin. But in order that our words, and the concepts they express, may be valuable, we are guided by various considerations, such as, for instance, that one term to cover a certain group of qualities is undesirable if, in virtue of essential differences amid the similarity of those qualities, two distinct terms are more conducive to exactness of description, brevity of language, and discrimination between things that differ.

This is exactly the case with the term "sin" and the concept of which it is the expression. I shall presently point out that it is very commonly used to cover a class of human actions, which, all externally alike in that they contravene an objective moral law, and all, so far, logically classifiable under one single concept, do nevertheless fall

into two sub-groups, distinguishable by a difference that is ethically far more significant than the point in which the actions all resemble one another ; and I shall plead for the replacement of the single term "sin," as thus commonly used to include two essentially different types of conduct, by two distinct terms : the one of which will be the word "sin," now restricted to one only of the two sub-classes it has often been used to embrace, and the other of which will remain to be selected. To speak more plainly, "sin" is frequently predicated of what it would be much better to call "imperfection" ; and an agreement that technical terminology should respect the essential difference between sin and imperfection is much to be desired. For until the difference between sin and imperfection is clearly recognized, it will inevitably happen that one theologian, who is inclined to emphasize it, will sometimes appear to another, whose tendency is to ignore it, to "call sin not-sin" or to hold views which "explain sin away." We cannot wish to see this state of affairs perpetuated, since the question involved is chiefly, if not entirely, one of words, or rather of appropriateness in terminology and consistent adherence to definitions once adopted.

As to the minimum of content that the concept of sin should possess, there is, of course, general agreement. Amongst Christians we can perhaps say that there is universal agreement. How much more we should include under the term "sin" is, subject to compatibility with other Christian ideas and doctrines, a matter of expediency, of convention, of common consent, of definition by selection and elimination. This, I hope, has been already made plain : though doubtless the point will become yet plainer as we proceed. I shall be contending, in what follows, that a usage of the term "sin" more restricted than that which is perhaps most common amongst Christian teachers, is

urgently called for in the interests of scientific terminology and of ethical valuation, and is at the same time more compatible with the presuppositions of Christian doctrine and more serviceable to Christian theology.

We can best approach the definition of sin with a view to introducing necessary refinements by setting out from the brief statement of St. John, that "sin is lawlessness." Or it will perhaps be better still to adopt for our starting point the less accurate rendering of the Apostle's words which we meet with in the Authorized Version: "sin is transgression of the law." For here we have a proposition which, while asserted of *ἀμαρτία*, is more immediately and obviously true of the particular act of sin, *a sin*, *παράβασις*. And to deal with the individual act of sin is preferable because it is always easier to be precise when discussing the concrete and the elementary, than when occupied with the general, the abstract, and the complex. But lest adoption of the individual sinful act as the most convenient and desirable point whence to begin our investigation should seem to any to savour of the Pelagian tendency to ignore sin as an inherent state, or to imply a legalistic idea of sinfulness, I would at the outset interpolate a few remarks on each of these two points.

As regards the former of them, I would merely say that any estimate of sin which ignores the fact that individual acts of sin leave their trace upon the will and tend to produce an inherent state of sin or a sinful disposition, is altogether inadequate. It contradicts experience and is inconsistent with Christian doctrine. In so far as a man's moral disposition is the consequence of repeated sins, of the abnormal exercise of his own will, that disposition renders him blameworthy or guilty. If he has thus become less able to do the things that he would, if his will has become fettered in its free activity, if his conscience has become seared so that he no longer condemns, as once he did, his misdeeds, his result-

ing powerlessness and ignorance do not excuse his easier transgression of the law ; they are marks of a degradation which he has brought upon himself by his own will ; he has acquired them by himself. Of elements in his natural temperament, as distinguished from this volitionally acquired disposition, I do not now speak : they are another matter. But all will agree that volitional acts engender habits, that habits of sin produce an inherent disposition of sinfulness, and that such a disposition involves the subject in guilt.

Again, to seek to base our conception of sin on the definition that a sin is a transgression of a law, need not bind us down to a merely legalistic doctrine of sin. For the law of which the Christian recognizes his sin to be a transgression is not a body of specific or particular prohibitions, not a decalogue multiplied thousandfold. The Christian's law is the living will of God, rather than a code of dead decrees. It extends, moreover, to his every inward intention as well as to his outward deeds. Sin is, for the Christian, evil regarded religiously. It may better be described, perhaps, as a sin against God than transgression of God's law ; and it is only in this extended sense that " law " can appear in the Christian definition of sin. Moreover to be sinless not only means to do what is pleasing to God, or even to anticipate, so to speak, His wishes, but also involves spontaneous delight in doing so. Love, and love only, is the " fulfilling " of the law. This is the peculiar characteristic of Christian ethic, determined as it is, and coloured all through, by an abiding consciousness of filial and loving relationship to a Personal God who would have us call Him " Father."

Thus safeguarded against possible misconstruction, we may proceed to analyse the provisional definition of a sin as a transgression of law, and to seek for the several qualifications and refinements which it will be needful to read into it

before that brief formula can stand for an exhaustive and accurate positive statement of the nature of sin.

We scarcely require reflection to detect that both the terms "transgression" and "law" are ambiguous. Each of them has what I may conveniently call a subjective and an objective meaning; and the question which first meets us is, which of the two possible meanings in each case, the subjective or the objective, is intended?

We may deal with the two possible ways of interpreting "law" first. That term in the formula we have cited from St. John may denote the whole ethical code implicitly contained in Christianity as a revelation of the perfect moral and religious life. This, as we have previously observed, will not consist in an elaborate system of tabulated precepts; it will be spirit rather than letter; it will consist in general principles to be applied to each particular element of conduct, to each single determination of the will, in any circumstances that may present themselves. It may require effort and patience to deduce from the principles underlying ideal Christian conduct, as illustrated for us by the life and teaching of our Lord, the particular adaptation to this or that concrete case before us; but we nevertheless believe that such an objective principle or law, wholly independent of ourselves and of our particular stage of moral development, exists, and that it is absolute. The Christian ideal, then, is the Christian's "law," in this, the objective sense of law. Over against this meaning of "law" we may now set the other, the subjective. It will be plain that the ideal of Christian perfectness is never more than approximately comprehended here by even the saintliest; that it is very imperfectly knowable to us in early life; that there was a time when each of us had no moral consciousness whatever. On the other hand, from the moment when moral consciousness dawned in us we have been in possession of some moral

sanction, some touchstone by which we might try or regulate a part of our conduct. With reference to the only ethical standards we could possibly know, at any given stage of our moral development, there may have been particular occasions when the determination of our will was not "lawless," though the act in which our volition issued may have fallen short of what we now perceive the Christian ideal to demand. Each of us, at each stage of moral growth, has had *his* law; that is to say, some fragment of *the* law, constituting all that it was then possible for him to know. Such is the subjective sense of "law." It is needless to remark that the concept of sin will be very different, according as we adopt the subjective or the objective interpretation of "law."

To turn now to the word "transgression." Objectively regarded in its outward manifestation alone, an act may contravene the letter of a moral law without being immoral. To cause another's death by pure accident contravenes the law, "Thou shalt not kill." But this is by no one accounted transgression. On the other hand, to kneel in prayer or to drop alms into the treasury is to comply with the letter of the law, while the act, if it be prompted by hypocrisy, love of praise or self-seeking, is the outward expression of sin. Obviously, then, transgression does not essentially consist in incompatibility between external deed and letter of precept; the external deed may be irrelevant to the question whether or not we have transgressed the law. But this literal interpretation it is perhaps hardly worth our while to have brushed away. Let us pass on to another objective sense "transgression" may bear, which it will be more profitable for us to consider.

A young child, we will suppose, has been allowed to pick up and to eat fruit which has fallen from a tree in his father's garden; and the parents have as yet had no occasion to lay down for the child the law concerning difference of

treatment to *meum* and *tuum*. On being taken into a neighbour's garden, in which there happens to lie about similar fallen fruit, the child, still unwarned, and at the same time unbidden, proceeds to gratify his desire. In so doing, he has plainly, by a volitional act, violated an elementary moral law. Here is a palpable "transgression of law" in the objective sense; and if the phrase "transgression of law" must, in our provisional definition, be interpreted thus objectively, we must say that the child has committed sin and laid the first foundation of a disposition to steal. If, on the other hand, we refuse to call an action of this kind a sin, as I expect we shall agree to do, we renounce the objective interpretation of "transgression" at the outset of our search for a concept of sin at once logically clear and ethically valuable; and having made the renunciation we must abide by it consistently throughout our whole doctrine of sin. In this case we shall fall back upon the subjective sense of "transgression," and only account an act to be sinful if it contravene such a part of the content of the absolute or objective ethical code as the agent can be, ought to be, and is, aware of, as constituting for him, at the moment of his act, a moral sanction binding his conscience and will. Again, we cannot fail to observe the extremely important nature of our choice between two alternative meanings of a word in connexion with our determination of the concept of sin.

Now at the present stage of our investigation, before consequences come in sight, it is open to us, not indeed as individuals, but collectively and with common consent, to choose, tentatively and provisionally, which of the two meanings I have endeavoured to distinguish shall be borne by the terms "transgression" and "law" respectively. At present some writers incline to the one and some to the other; and it is not infrequently the case that one and the same theologian consistently adheres to the subjective mean-

ing when treating of actual sin but unconsciously tends to adopt the other when what is called original sin presents itself for discussion.

As I have just said, it is open to us to choose which alternative we please. Let us now inquire what considerations should weigh with us in determining our choice. Firstly, we shall naturally desire to cause as little dislocation as possible in our inherited theological vocabulary. Secondly, we shall bear in mind that our doctrine of sin stands in a close relation of dependence to other Christian doctrines, such as our doctrine of God, which implies the impossibility of referring the moral evil of humanity ultimately back to Him as its cause. And lastly, we should surely endeavour so to shape our terminology, and so to fashion our guiding concept, that "sin" shall designate actions or modes of conduct which have in common some quality which is of paramount ethical significance; and we should deem it a small thing if in fixing upon this one quality as distinctive and determinative we were thereby to exclude from the comprehensiveness of our concept all actions or modes of conduct which, however similar in outward manifestation and as regards objective contravention of the letter of the law, do nevertheless lack the essential characteristic in question, and thereby differ from those which possess it *toto cælo* when regarded from an ethical point of view. Now there is such a quality which characterizes all acts and states which are transgressions of law in the *subjective* sense, viz., guilt. On the other hand, there are acts and states that may contravene objective law in an *objective* sense, but which, I assume, we cannot call guilty. If this assumption be correct, we have then a very strong—an overwhelmingly strong—reason for the choice of one of our alternatives rather than the other. We shall be led to define sin so that always and everywhere the term is strictly correlative with guilt; sin, in its simplest form, will

be the conscious intention to perform an act perceived by the subject to be contrary to a moral sanction of which he is aware, and which he recognizes as binding for his conscience.

I have made the assumption that acts contrary to the requirements of the moral law done unintentionally, or not known by their doer to transgress any moral sanction, such as the example from child-life that I gave just now, are not guilty actions ; that no moral blame for them is attributable to their doer by man or by God. That guilt is exactly co-extensive with accountability, accountability with responsibility, responsibility with sufficiency of moral insight to enable the subject to know, before committing a given act, that it would be morally wrong : these I take to be a series of immediate truths expressing matter of intuition alone : truths, therefore, at once unprovable and indestructible by any indirect and inferential argument whatever. Personally, I can no more doubt them than I can doubt the law of identity or any other fundamental and self-evident law of thought. And perhaps when they are thus plainly stated and isolated from all possible consequences and all relation to other supposed truths, no one will be found to challenge them. If they can be challenged by others, it only remains to say that we have come to an end of profitable discussion. There is left no common ground on which to erect objectively valid ethical propositions. A concept of sin is impossible unless all normally constituted persons perform these acts of intuition alike.

I believe that all such persons do share these intuitions, and that everybody who believes in moral accountability at all will be ready to assert that where accountability cannot be affirmed guilt cannot be imputed ; and when I come upon statements that appear to involve the contrary, I cannot but believe that there is faulty interpretation of intuitions somewhere.

I will not illustrate my meaning here by examining phrases which are obviously the outcome of mere thoughtlessness or of ignorance of the meaning of psychological terms ; I would rather choose as an example of apparent denial of the fundamental intuitive truth I have been mentioning a statement which occurs in the learned and able treatise of Professor Dorner on Christian Doctrine. In speaking of the moral experience of a supposed convert from heathenism to Christianity, Dorner asserts that such a person would rightly hold himself guilty for all such conduct, previous to his conversion, as he now would find his more enlightened conscience to condemn. The writer has not in view here the man's conduct which, in his heathen period, fell below the standard of such ethical sanctions as he then could know and act up to, but only that which the convert could possibly know to be imperfect after his instruction in Christian principles. Professor Dorner further appeals to the Christian consciousness to bear him out in his view that such a convert could rightly call such past conduct guilty. If he is correct in his own affirmation and justified through his appeal, there is an end of the assumption I just now proposed to make. And at first sight it seems difficult to get away from a Christian man's assertion as to his own feelings, his intuition of guiltiness for past actions. It appears to be final ; and indeed, if I mistake not, many persons are liable to be awed into unquestioning acceptance of statements that are alleged to embody the deliverances of Christian consciousness. But the Christian consciousness, like consciousness in general, is not entirely composed of immediate and self-evidencing intuitions ; indeed, highly complex mental processes are liable to be mistaken for simple intuitions by persons unused to performing psychological analysis of states of consciousness. And in these really complex processes, involving stages and inferences made so rapidly

that we are unconscious of making them, there is room for human fallibility to creep in and vitiate the supposed "immediate" deliverance. Bearing this in mind, we shall remember that such deliverances, however much they may be entitled to our respect and reverence, do not necessarily possess the finality and certainty that belongs to self-evident truth. And so we may sometimes venture to question the objective validity of an individual's assertion that he is guilty in respect of certain conduct in the past. A man may not always be guilty, even when he believes himself to be, and when he experiences all the feelings of shame and remorse which accompany the state of guilt. Let me give an instance from fiction which has perhaps often been paralleled in real life. An officer has been captured by the enemy and put to torture in order that information as to his general's plans may be divulged. This the torture has failed to elicit; but the desired information was simultaneously acquired from a traitor. The officer's friends are unable to imagine how the knowledge which led to their enemy's unexpected triumph came into the enemy's possession otherwise than through this man's confession, wrung from him by the rack; and he himself, though he cannot remember having revealed a secret during his sufferings, persuades himself that while faint and lapsing into unconsciousness through physical pain he must have betrayed his general. The good man feels all the shame and disgrace of cowardice and treachery; he can henceforth look no comrade in the face; he feels guilty of what he would rather have died than have done. There is no explaining away of his consciousness of guilt; he has it and he cannot be rid of it. And yet he has not only been absolutely innocent but heroically brave and true.

Now the case of the converted heathen condemning his heathen conduct, which only knew heathen morality and fully satisfied all its sanctions, because now that he has

acquired superior moral and religious enlightenment he sees it to be imperfect, and holding himself guilty of sin in respect of it, is in one point similar to that of the fictitious soldier. True, there is a difference. The soldier has a correct idea of accountability, but is mistaken in his belief that he has committed the deed to which he applies it. The convert has actually committed the deeds whose moral evaluation is in question, but he applies to them a false notion of what constitutes accountability. Thus, in a different way, he is equally led to accuse himself, and to experience the sense of guilt, without any objectively real or valid ground. I say the supposed convert has a false idea of accountability. Between his immediate feeling of guilt and the past conduct with which it is associated there intervenes a theory of moral accountability and an inference from it that he is accountable, both of which he overlooks altogether. The theory is false, and consequently the inference from it is also false. He is not guilty. Such a man should indeed feel *regret* for the past imperfection of his morality ; just as a devoted wife who by accident administers poison in place of medicine to her husband will ever regret her instrumentality in causing his death. But regret is not guilt ; and in neither case has guilt rightly any place. It is only in consequence of a confusion, of an illogical connexion of ideas, that the subjectively real feeling of guilt arises in a Christian's consciousness in relation to conduct whose incompatibility with the ethical standard was at the time unavoidable through ignorance for which he was wholly irresponsible.

I may then adhere to my assumption that only conduct for whose ethical imperfection we are accountable is rightly to be called guilty, and that this is a self-evident truth, a statement of immediate moral intuition. In other words, there are some acts ostensibly out of accord with the requirements of the moral law which do not deserve blame or render

their agent guilty. In making the positive assertion that a sin is a guilty act and sinfulness a guilty state, I desire most emphatically to insist at the same time that all imperfections, nay, all volitional acts which contravene Christian morality while their agent is unavoidably ignorant of the fact that they do so, must be rigidly excluded from the category of sin. The point is most important : it is determinative of our whole doctrine of sin ; and I therefore desire that the attention of Christian teachers should be focussed upon it. Hitherto I have pleaded for this distinction and exclusion mainly on the grounds of expediency from the point of view of terminology. If sin be exactly co-extensive with guilt, and guilt with accountability, we are able to isolate a class of actions or a kind of conduct which is so sharply marked off from other classes or kinds, however similar in outward manifestation, as to deserve a name for itself, and we arrive at a valuable and self-consistent concept of sin—or rather at one positive element in such a concept. On the other hand, if we are not thus careful at the outset to distinguish guilty from non-guilty imperfection and only to call the former kind sinful, we shall find ourselves driven to make the comprehensiveness of the term “ sin ” so wide that its grave ethical import will become evaporated and its theological and religious significance will be lost. This consequence remains to be drawn in our succeeding article, in which I shall also have to point out that more than terminological expediency is involved in the question I have raised. Here, however, we must conclude for the present. We have taken but our first step ; but it is the first step which costs.

F. R. TENNANT.

COMPETITION AND CO-OPERATION.

THE Competition which I am to discuss in this paper is that which has production and trade for its sphere. It may be convenient to look at this competition in a rudimentary form. Let us imagine a few pioneers in a new country. *A* has some corn to spare, and would like to have some wool; two other men, *B* and *C*, have some wool to spare, and would like to have some corn. *B* offers so much wool for so much corn; *C* offers more wool for the same quantity of corn. *B* has to consider whether it is worth his while to offer a little more wool than *C*, or to do without the corn and keep the wool. That is an illustration of what is often called the law of competition or the competitive system. I take the following words from a recent speech made by a Parliamentary representative¹ of the Labour Party: "I am firmly convinced that Christianity is impossible under the competitive system." The same speaker denounced "the inhuman law of competition," and insisted that the hunger of men and women and children would more or less speedily abolish it. That is, competition is treated as a system, as a plan or policy which has been adopted and which can be changed,—as we could abolish Free Trade, and bring back Protection. But competition, it must be evident, comes by nature; it is not an artificial system, it is not a law imposed by capitalists; it is what human beings tend to do everywhere as a matter of course.

That is a fact which it is important to realize. To abolish a natural instinct, an elementary and universal form of human activity, is a different thing from substituting one policy for another. To root out competition from the human world looks as if it would be quite impossible; in forming plans for restricting or partially superseding competition

¹ Mr. Pete Curran, Nottingham, Sept. 6.

it is well to bear in mind that we are dealing with what springs out of human nature. Competitive action is a form of that struggle for existence, of that endeavour to attain what is desired and to escape from what is disliked, to which philosophers trace the whole unconscious evolution of the created world ; it is an activity which may be kept within bounds by the charge " Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further ! " but which, though you may expel it with a fork, will persist in returning. The human race has in it a force or impulse which will be always seeking advantage with a natural appetite or hunger, and will therefore always desire to make advantageous exchanges.

But competition means, it may be urged, that one person gets an advantage which he hinders another from getting, whilst Christianity and human welfare bid men feel and act not as competitors, but as brothers and equals. A few thinkers, impelled by this opposition, and determined to hold a principle consistently, have exclaimed against the folly and madness of practices by which we stimulate, instead of doing our utmost to repress, the competitive impulse. They point to the educational methods at work everywhere ; they show how pupils are encouraged to strive against each other for places, and prizes are profusely offered for competition. " Here," they complain, " is an activity—call it a natural instinct if you please—which is opposed to Christianity and human welfare ; and you, who profess to be Christians and to desire the welfare of mankind, are setting yourselves to foster this instinct to the utmost of your power, and to bring up your boys and girls from their tenderest infancy as competitors ! " Here and there an attempt has been made to conduct education on a non-competitive plan, but with singularly little success in attracting imitation. In education, it is an eccentricity to contend that Christianity is impossible under the competitive system.

This is surely a remarkable fact, if those are right who say that competition must be expelled from trade and industry because it is essentially opposed to Christianity and human well-being. I do wonder, indeed, that we have not a party, at least as strong as that of the anti-vaccinationists, advocating the expulsion of competition from all studies and games. That there is no such party is due to the fact that studies and games and other enterprises, purged of the spice of competition, would be found very flat; supported by this other fact, that Christian or brotherly feelings, the most warm and sincere, are not only possible, but are known to be common and easy, between competitors. The closest friendships are continually growing up between rivals at school and college. If a master or tutor were asked, "Must not the mere contention between two youths who are striving against each other to obtain some prize have of necessity or naturally an unfavourable influence upon the mutual feelings of each towards the other?" what answer would he give? I think he would reply, that any imaginable or possible feeling of that kind, natural as it might appear to be, is overpowered by forces which hold it effectually in check; by a sense of what is honourable, by a spirit of the body, by a tradition of mutual duty and regard, by the Christian affections, by all the unnoticed impacts and influences of that Divine Providence which intends human beings to be joined together in a happy social order. He would add, I take it, that as a matter of experience education would not get on so well without competition; that the striving for success seems to have a place appointed for it in the course of things; that animation and progress depend at least in part upon it; that, if it were not recognized and brought into the open air and daylight, it would work in a covert and disorderly fashion; that it may be regarded as a force intended not to rule but to be harnessed,

and so to do good work. Look where we will throughout Christendom, we see prizes increasingly offered for the purpose of stimulating competition, without an audible protest or the faintest misgiving.

But in industry and trade, it will be urged by those who would abolish competition as an anti-Christian and inhuman law; freedom to bargain may result, and does actually to some extent result, in the starving of those who are worsted in the struggle. All arguments, it is insisted, must yield to this overwhelming consideration. Men and women and children must have food and clothing and shelter found for them as a right, and must be relieved from anxiety about these necessities of life. No traditions or laws must be allowed to stand in the way of this provision. Competition must be swept aside. Liberty must be given up, in order that fraternity and equality may prevail. The comforts of life must be distributed freely amongst all. Every genuine Christian ought to work for this revolution, and must insist that men shall labour, not against one another but in concert.

All English people are agreed that no one shall find starvation inevitable in this country. The only question which divides us is, on what conditions those who cannot support themselves should be supported. Not only should we all wish that every one should enjoy ease and comfort; we should be willing, I am sure, to make great changes for the sake of securing that end. But liberty, we cannot but feel, has its value. To abolish competition is to abolish freedom of exchange; and to abolish freedom of exchange is to abolish ownership. We cannot easily imagine ourselves not owning anything; we cannot easily imagine ourselves receiving our food and clothes and houses, and our appointed task of work, from the officials of the community. It is hardly worth while, it may well be thought, to talk of anything so extreme. I do so, because any attempt to abolish

the law or system of competition as inhuman and anti-Christian leads straight to that extremity of dependence and subjection.

Let us have—it is often said—Co-operation instead of Competition. Let us have—I would say—Co-operation, not in place of Competition, but to keep Competition in its place.

Co-operative Societies, for distribution and production, have proved themselves of great value. To belong to a store is advantageous to purchasers; it encourages carefulness and providence; it gives its members some experience and understanding of what trade is; it fosters a sense of responsibility. Productive co-operation is more ambitious, and has been found much more difficult, than distributive; and it also has a higher moral and social value. Both kinds secure that the interests of the workers shall at least be sympathetically considered. But co-operative societies do not abolish competition; they begin by adding to it; it is a charge often brought bitterly against them, that they compete unfairly with existing interests. When a co-operative society becomes a very large concern, it may claim to diminish competition by superseding a certain number of small competitors. But competition on a larger scale remains. Prices, including wages or the prices of labour, are still everywhere substantially determined by competition. An attempt to regulate prices arbitrarily cannot be carried through without abolishing possession or ownership. Modifications of prices, due to feelings other than the instinct of acquisition, are, it is true, quite possible: a wage-payer may choose and be able, for example, to pay rather higher wages than those of the market. But such modifications are delusive if they are taken as proving that by a further extension of the Co-operative system we could introduce an arbitrary arrangement of prices or exchanges which would

not destroy ownership. I admit that the State may do a great deal in the field of exchange. It has made letter-carrying a monopoly, with very arbitrary prices ; it might, if it pleased, carry letters for nothing. The State might obtain possession of all the railways, and make travelling free. But to do this, it would have to take the cost of doing it from public resources, and to pay prices fixed by competition. It might undertake to maintain all children, and to remunerate mothers ; but, similarly, the taxpayers or ratepayers would have to contribute the means, and their contributions would be spent in the markets of the world.

But, though no conceivable extension of co-operative societies would abolish competition, the co-operative spirit may modify competition and its effects in a most beneficial degree.

The competitive impulse may be likened, I would suggest, to the bodily appetites. The instinct of acquisition which is the competitive force, seems to rank with the cravings of the body. All sorts of opprobrious language may be applied to the desires of the flesh ; that has indeed been done, freely : but we do not see how the human world could go on without them. We do not exalt hunger to supremacy ; but we recognize it, and do not denounce it as anti-Christian. Our sense of the evil of drunkenness and gluttony and selfish love of pleasure does not set us upon attempting to abolish the natural appetites : nor, I may add, does it hurry us to the conclusion that men and women and children must indulge them only under the public doctor's supervision. We hold that, in Christians and civilized beings, the bodily desires are to be kept in subjection and governed. And we see that they can be. They are ruled and guided by self-restraint and wisdom of the most various degrees : but only the most abject members of civilized societies allow their appetites to exercise unbridled tyranny over them.

I have dwelt upon the similar assumption that is universally made with regard to the competitive impulse as it operates in a large part of human life. We are no more averse to this instinct, and have no more thought of abolishing it, in education, or recreation, or in the promotion of any sort of human attainment, than we set ourselves to eradicate hunger and thirst as noxious weeds from the human body. But we do take for granted that the competitive instinct is not to exercise authority over the action of competitors. They by nature desire to be before others and to win ; but they have higher principles of conduct than the impulses of nature ; and they know and confess that it is by these higher principles that their life is to be guided.

And may we not apply the same rule of judgment to all business dealings ? may we not assume that the competitive instinct, which is in this department the desire to exchange advantageously things which we produce or possess, will survive, and will have some useful work to do, and that the wheat of liberty is not to be pulled up with the tares of selfishness and inhumanity ; but that the spirit of humanity and co-operation is to keep the natural hunger of competition firmly under control, and to do its utmost, in the sphere of the mutual dealings of men, to bring about the general happiness which the Christian spirit cannot but desire ?

Already the divine principle of brotherhood has asserted itself decisively in the sphere of exchange, and with advantages which no one dreams of questioning. Through laws such as prevail in all civilized countries, and which are enforced by coercive penalties, that principle expresses what is defined as fraud. Laws which forbid fraudulent practices are a witness that human beings are not sent into the world to be at war with each other. Their nature may move them to compete with one another, but they must compete upon strict conditions. The desire to make advantageous ex-

changes is sternly warned that it must observe legal rules of fair dealing. Human societies are plainly justified in adding to these existing laws any others that they deem advisable for the protection of their interests from selfish greed.

Law and its penalties, as we all (unless we are Tolstoyans) believe, are of great strength and value ; we cannot imagine life going on without them. But law may also be pronounced weak through its being limited to outward and definite acts and to outward punishments. Law may prevent a man from stealing ; but it cannot make him brotherly in mind or loyal to the spirit of membership.

But the interests of society and the experience of life have always been pleading for the principle of membership ; and our Christian calling with simple directness makes this principle the rule of conduct for Christians. Our neighbours are to us fellow-members of the Divine Family, of the Body of Christ. And when are we to remember our calling and to be resolutely loyal to it, if not when there is a special risk of our being inconsiderate and selfish, and when the want of humanity may do grievous harm ; that is, when we are engaged in bargaining, and are going through the processes of production and trade ?

It would seem that in this department of human life Christian society has hitherto been rather specially slow to recognize the duty and the ideal which its calling sets before it. Selfishness makes everywhere a persistent fight against the spirit of membership ; and it has sought to persuade men that there is some intended separation between religion and the occupations of buying and selling. No doubt the subordinating of the whole industrial and trading world to the spirit of membership is a very difficult task ; it requires discernment and wisdom as well as disinterestedness. There is a mysterious law of Divine Providence which ordains that

the simplest impulses of human kindness shall be sternly bidden to restrain themselves, and insists that those who wish to relieve need shall pause and reflect. We are driven by experience into the wondering conviction that, if all Christians who have more were to resolve to share their possessions with those who have less, they would do harm rather than good. The ideal of a society thoroughly animated by the spirit of membership calls for a great deal of thinking and much readiness to listen to the voice of experience, which is the voice of God. The benevolent are bidden by a solemn monition to hold their benevolent impulses in check : but this Divine restraint does not mean that the impulses are to be killed out ; it means, on the contrary, that they are to be made more sturdy and stronger, and are to cherish and work for higher aims than that of appeasing the pain of sympathy.

In this age of ours Christendom is hearing a call from heaven, stirring it to a new and noble ambition, and pointing to fresh fields of conquest. It is evident that the conquest will involve some modifications of the existing industrial and commercial organism, and that loyal Christians are bound to take courage and not to be too afraid of change. A more prevailing spirit of membership will be aware of new dangers to be met, and will not be content to leave our present customs and regulations unaltered. But it is also pressed upon us that we must advance thoughtfully and cautiously in the path of economic reform, feeling our way tentatively when we cannot see it clearly ; and that we must keep the higher aims in view, and not assume that the one thing we have to do is to provide summarily for the bodily comfort of every human being. It seems likely enough, does it not ? that nations may have to learn a similar lesson to that which individuals, who have assumed that kindness required them to give to him that asked, have had to learn,

—that it is possible to lower those to whom you intend to be kind.

A high and living spirit of membership—that is what the Christian ought both to welcome into himself, and also to stimulate and cherish in his fellow-members.

This being our duty, we have to be on our guard against methods and proceedings which would weaken independence and the sense of responsibility. Those of us who are able to keep ourselves, and to look after wives and children and parents, may sometimes consider with advantage whether *we* should like to belong to a class dependent on public maintenance and management, and exempted from the anxieties of freedom. The flesh-pots of Egypt may at times be tempting ; but the worthy life of the true member seems to be bound up with duty, and striving, and the exercise of intelligence, and sacrifice. Man lives not by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God. And if some are to be independent and others dependent, will not the dependent constitute a lower—one might almost say, a servile—class ? and ought we not to have misgivings about creating a lower class, hopelessly inferior to our own ?

If we are to reverence the words of Christ, nothing can be more certain than that He sets, for His disciples, spiritual good above the bodily needs. The needs of the body He recognizes : “ Your heavenly Father knows that ye have need of all these things.” He gave those simple precepts of kindness and unworldliness which seem to bid us part with all that we have to feed the poor, and trust to be fed like the birds and clothed like the flowers. But He emphatically gave the first place to the kingdom of God, that is, the ideal spiritual society : “ Seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness ; and the things of the body, the things which the Gentiles seek, will be added to you.” Aim primarily at a brotherhood of spiritual members, of men with living wills

growing into conformity and fellow-work with the Divine Will ; and whatever is wanted by men who are made of bodies as well as souls will not be withheld. That is the teaching, that the promise, of Him whom we Christians own as Master and Lord.

It is possible, it has been found nobly possible, to produce, to trade, to compete, without forgetting that we are called by our heavenly calling to honour all men, to help each other, to control and repress self, to be slaves not to Mammon but to the heavenly Father of us all.

There are in this loud stunning tide
Of human care and crime
With whom the melodies abide
Of the everlasting chime ;
Who carry music in their heart
Through dusky lane and wrangling mart,
Plying their daily task with busier feet
Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat.

To seek to do by laws what laws can do to make life more regular and worthier for all is work upon which the best hearts and intellects may fitly employ themselves. But in all things and in all times the spirit is greater than law, and will do for those who honour it what law was not designed to do. We have bright hopes to encourage us : England is a much better place, town and country, for a poor man to live in than it was when I was young. There is not much more, I feel, to be desired than that the progress of the working people should in the next half century equal what it has been in the last.

J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.

SYNOPTIC STUDIES.

III. SOME CRITICISMS ON PROFESSOR HARNACK'S "SAYINGS OF JESUS."

CIRCUMSTANCES too strong for the best of good intentions have made it impossible to continue these occasional studies on any sort of plan; and I make no further apology for deserting the subject proposed at the end of my last paper (July, 1907). Professor Harnack's *Sprüche*¹ has raised afresh the most difficult of all Synoptic problems, and I propose to set down some of the questionings that have come up in the study of his book, as a small contribution towards settling the form of Q. What I have to say will be mainly confined to the earlier part of the book, in which Harnack reconstructs the text of Q. That such a reconstruction must be tentative at best is obvious, but we may get a little nearer to our goal by discussing principles.

Harnack's general method proceeds on the theory that Luke altered Q very freely on stylistic grounds, the alterations of "Matthew" being of a more material character though less frequent. There are one or two general criticisms that may be passed upon this theory before we take some definite examples. In deciding what is linguistically more primitive Harnack has made some assumptions which can no longer be taken for granted. One is that if either Matthew or Luke has a compound verb where the other has the simplex, we must assume that Q had the latter. No attempt is made to prove this, and we are ultimately shown what simple Greek the author of Q used because of the great predominance of uncompounded verbs in his vocabulary. But

¹ The quotations throughout are from the English edition. What a pity it is, by the way, that more care has not been taken with the proof-reading! The Greek accents are shocking; and a misprint like "casual" for "causal" (p. 306—original "begründend") might give trouble.

it does not seem to have been observed before that Mark, who writes the least cultured Greek to be found in the New Testament (outside the Apocalypse), has an extraordinary affection for compound verbs. In proportion to the length of his Gospel, he has exactly as many compound verbs as Luke, and he is only surpassed in this respect by the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Acts, the latter only by a small amount. Passing from the New Testament to the papyri, we find that the pre-Christian private letters in Witkowski's useful little collection¹ show a considerably higher proportion of compounds, and the letters there which are marked as illiterate have this characteristic nearly as strongly as the educated ones. There are other papyrus letters which dislike the compounds as much as the Fourth Gospel does; but this does not affect the point—the connexion between culture and compound verbs must go,² and with it a criterion on the strength of which Harnack decides for Matthew against Luke in dozens of places. Matthew's preference for the simplex is as likely to have ousted Q's compounds as Luke's preference for compounds is to have altered Q's simplicia: we must judge each case on its merits.

Another important note to make is that Harnack sometimes determines what is literary Greek (and therefore presumably an emendation of the rougher text of Q) by canons drawn from the literature alone. But here the papyri must have their say. *Ἐπιηραάζειν* looks literary enough, and Harnack assumes it to be Luke's emendation accordingly (p. 61); but it and its noun *ἐπήρεια* occur in papyrus petitions that owe nothing to the schoolmaster. This is not

¹ *Epistulae Privatae Graecae* (Teubner, 1906).

² Professor Burkitt remarks in a letter to me, after seeing my figures, that in English "Come with me" is literary, "Come along with me" is colloquial. This is, in fact, a thoroughly typical example.

the only word which takes a different literary complexion when the vernacular documents are compared. *Τματισμός* may or may not be original in Luke vii. 25, but it is a good popular word. So are *ἐνώπιον* and *ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι* (p. 84), *σουδάριον* (p. 125), *παραγίνεσθαι* (p. 86), and the phrase *ἐὰν γένηται*, c. inf. (p. 92—cf. my *Prolegomena*, p. 17); while *σιτομέτριον* occurs in the Petrie Papyri and the LXX, and the fact that its verb is censured by Phrynichus shows that it was good colloquial Greek. Whether *ψυχὴν ἀπολέσαι* appeared to Luke the Hellene “too paradoxical” (p. 114), we may question when we find *σῶσαι ψυχὰς πολλὰς* in a papyrus of pre-Christian date (TbP 45=Witkowski, p. 74).

There are, I believe, a fair number of places where we can demonstrate stylistic alteration on the part of the first Evangelist: the presence of these must naturally affect our judgement as to the principles of reconstruction. Matthew certainly dropped some vulgar forms which the literary Luke retained: that Luke *introduced* them is surely improbable in the extreme. Thus in Matthew vi. 30 the literary *ἀμφιέννυσι* is obviously, on Harnack's own principles, less original than the Lukan *ἀμφιάζει*, which, however, Harnack ignores (pp. 5, 140). In Matthew xxiii. 37 (p. 29) no one will suppose that the literary Hellene deliberately altered the correct *ἐπισυναγαγεῖν* of Q (so Harnack, p. 143) into the vulgar *ἐπισυνάξαι* (Luke xiii. 34), which is at home in the quite uneducated papyri. And this obvious consideration—which we may be quite sure Dr. Harnack would acknowledge when brought to his notice—suggests what seems to me a much more probable account of the relation between Matthew iii. 12 and Luke iii. 17 than that which is given on p. 2. In Luke *l.c.* \aleph^a reads *συνάξαι*, of which one can hardly doubt both *συναγαγεῖν* of \aleph^{*B} and *συνάξει* of Matthew are alternative and independent corrections. It accordingly stood in Q, with *διακαθᾶραι*; and

this construction was very simply mended by Matthew, to whom it seemed cumbrous. Harnack declares it to be an improvement on the two indicatives. This is clearly a matter of taste : the opposite conclusion seems more natural to me. Anyhow I must claim *συνάξαι* as self-evidencing, and this reading is only in Luke.

Difference of taste indeed rather frequently makes itself apparent in these questions ; and one has a natural shrinking from confession of a difference, where the opposite judgement comes from so consummate an authority as Harnack. One can only record the point and leave other students to choose. On p. 26 we read that *ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν* in Luke x. 24 "is an obvious stylistic improvement" on Matthew's *ἐπεθύμησαν*. I have tried hard to see the obviousness, but cannot resist the conclusion that "longed to see" is more forcible than "wished to see," which last I feel sure would never have been admitted by an artist like Luke, if it had not stood in his source. In Matthew iv. 6 we miss *ἐντεῦθεν* after *βάλε σεαυτὸν*, and we are told (p. 46) that is "a Lukan interpolation." What conceivable reason had Luke for inserting it ? "The word is found elsewhere in St. Luke." Yes, *once* ! Is it not more reasonable to say that Matthew dropped it as otiose, and Luke kept it because it was in Q ? There are other points in the restoration of Q in the Temptation story where I cannot feel confidence in the result. Would not Matthew xii. 40 justify us in claiming that "forty nights" is a Matthaean phrase and therefore interpolated ? Dr. Harnack himself declares that "the genuine text is the shortest" here ; and there are many places where one or two parallels are enough to make him claim a phrase as Lukan and therefore interpolated. Are we justified in crediting Q with the "exceeding high mountain," when the very vague *ἀναγαγών* so obviously demanded expansion ? That Matthew does thus interpret

is demonstrable in many passages. When Harnack asks (p. 45) why Matthew should have changed the one stone into "stones," it might fairly be replied that a single loaf would be absurdly insufficient to satisfy hunger, if the loaves were like those they make in Palestine to-day. A motive for Matthew's transposition of "the glory of them" into the introductory line (iv. 8) might be found in the fact that *αὐτῶν* refers back to *βασιλείας* in a very clumsy way: Luke left it as it stood in Q, but would never have introduced it. As to Luke's "extravagant" *οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν*, does not he use a similar phrase in just the same sense in Acts xxvii. 33? it would be absurd to suppose that the sailors had literally taken no food for a fortnight! I should seek further instances of Matthew's habit of abbreviating—which indeed is what he constantly does with the narrative of Mark—in iii. 11, where *βαστάσαι* "remove"¹ neatly concentrates the whole content of "stoop down and unloose"; and in xi. 27, where *ἐπιγινώσκει* exactly expresses the meaning of the longer phrase *γινώσκει τίς ἐστίν* found in Luke, and (as I am convinced) Q.² That Matthew paraphrases hard sayings when necessary I should show from x. 37, as one conspicuous example among many: the paradoxical *μισεῖν* is supported by the Fourth Gospel (in the parallel to ver. 39 and Luke xiv. 26), and would never have been introduced by a Gentile Evangelist. That Luke actually ousted the clear phrase of Matthew (cf. p. 87) in favour of one which he knew would make readers stumble, is a view which only conformity to a theory would suggest.

A few miscellaneous points may be collected. On p. 19 Harnack notes that *πᾶς* is "a favourite word" of Luke's.³

¹ A meaning recognized by R. V. in John xii. 6, and abundantly witnessed in papyri.

² This depends on the interpretation of *ἐπιγινώσκειν*, which I now think Dean Armitage Robinson has proved in his excursus in *Ephesians*. See my *Prolegomena*,³ p. 113.

³ Cf. Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 85.

This may be, though as a matter of fact $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ occurs 128 times in the W.H. text of Matthew and only 157 times in Luke: this is respectively 1.88 per page and 2.18—not a very striking disparity. But Harnack at least twice accepts $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (or $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$) for Q because it stands in Matthew (pp. 5 and 73), though Luke there does not use this pet word of his. We are told (pp. 20 and 274) that $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\ \tau\eta\ \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ “is a specifically Lukan expression,” on the strength of six¹ occurrences: “on the other hand, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ is only found in St. Matthew (twice again), and most probably comes from Q.” I cannot understand why the latter phrase is not on this showing “a specifically Matthaean expression.” When Luke uses “the finger of God” and Matthew “the spirit of God,” we find (p. 21) that the former “substitutes the Biblical expression”: why then are we “not certain” whether the same account should be given of Matthew’s “birds of the heaven” as against Luke’s “ravens” (p. 36)? Similarly (p. 49) Harnack rejects Luke’s $\kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ in the Beatitudes in favour of Matthew’s $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, which, however, strongly suggests assimilation to Isaiah lxi. 1.

In the well-known difficulty of Matthew v. 40=Luke vi. 29 Harnack takes for granted that the idea of judicial action is more primitive than that of the robber clutching at the garment that comes first. I am afraid I cannot regard this as self-evident, though I am not going to argue for the opposite view. I could quite imagine that Matthew has after his manner conformed the precept to the Old Testament, and made it refer to taking the poor man’s garment as a pledge. On the same page (60) we find Harnack’s treatment of the Lord’s Prayer. That the Prayer in Matthew’s form

¹ Harnack says seven on p. 274. Taking Luke’s two books together, the Lukan $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\ \tau\eta\ \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ (with or without $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$) occurs eight times, which would answer to 3.8 times in a book of the length of Matthew.

has been affected by liturgical use seems to me extremely probable.¹ I prefer this to the assumption that Matthew has made the additions himself. But if this is so, why not regard the *δίδου* as original, the *δός* as an assimilation to the other aorists, appropriate when the Prayer has passed into daily use? The isolation of this present imperative seems to me a strong plea for its originality.² In that case Luke has the Prayer very nearly as it stood in Q: that the reading "Let Thy Holy Spirit come on us and cleanse us" is the true text of Luke is a decision we must be allowed to doubt,³ and otherwise Luke's form approves itself in almost everything.

It seems fair to plead that Harnack is hardly consistent when he lays so much stress on Luke's stylistic alterations and then credits him with "a feeble word" which he was "fond of using" (*ἐγγιζειν*, p. 66). When this same word occurs in Matthew, it is original (p. 81). Now in this place (Matthew vi. 20) the phrase "dig through" may very well be repeated from xxiv. 43, where the verb occurs in a Q passage: Matthew is fond of repeating his phraseology. And with all deference to the instinct of a great scholar like Harnack, might I suggest a doubt as to the "feebleness" of the phrase in Luke xii. 33—"where thief never comes near it, nor does the moth destroy it"? We are told on p. 73 that "the falling was great" (Matt. vii. 27) is a "solecism," so that Luke's "great breach" is a correction. Possibly, but I demur to the "solecism." Perhaps in Germany they have no analogue to "Humpty Dumpty had a great fall," which in English at any rate is idiomatic enough.

¹ I may refer here to an excellent article by Mgr. A. S. Barnes in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1906.

² In *Prolegomena*, p. 119, I expressed a different opinion: it is altered in ed.³

³ Chase (*The Lord's Prayer*, pp. 25 ff.), after citing the scanty but widespread evidence for the clause, suggests a liturgical origin ultimately based on passages in *Acts*.

Turning a few pages, we have a criticism of the order of clauses in Matthew viii. 11, 12, and Luke xiii. 28, 29. It is said that the clause “ There (*ἐκεῖ*) shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth ” is out of place in Luke, because the *ἐκεῖ* is out of connexion. “ The change of order in St. Luke is due to the transposition of *ἐκεῖ* κ.τ.λ. to the beginning, for which the reason is not obvious.” Exactly—but is not the very fact that the transposition is *ex hypothesi* meaningless a sufficient reason why the literary Luke should not have ventured upon it ? That Matthew’s order is better is a reason against its being original, if we are to apply the reasoning by which Harnack is constantly refusing originality to Luke.

There are a great many points in which I cannot feel satisfied that Harnack has justly set aside Luke’s phraseology ; but it is not worth while to mention them where it is only a case of taste against taste. Two or three more instances might be given in which the case does not seem proven. Why on p. 83 is *μὴ φοβηθῆτε* in Luke xii. 4 said to be “ more elegant than *μὴ φοβεῖσθε* ” of Matthew x. 28 ? Because it is more appropriate—“ Do not be afraid (in the future) ” followed in verse 7 by “ Do not be afraid (as this prophecy prompts you to be) ” ? Is it not more likely that Matthew, with his love for uniformity, levelled a distinction that seemed otiose ? Later on in the same section there is an “ enigma ” which seems to me fairly easy—“ the existence of the variants, ‘ two sparrows for a farthing ’ and ‘ five sparrows for two farthings.’ ” I have always assumed the working of the ordinary commercial principle of reduction on taking a quantity. “ Had sparrows become cheaper ? ” is Harnack’s answer, on the strength of which, as usual, he votes for Matthew’s form. But surely if we are to choose between the complex price and the simpler one here, it is easier to assume that Matthew got rid of a superfluity than that Luke invented one for no apparent purpose ; for the two prices

must be regarded as equivalent to one another on ordinary rules. In the Woes on the Pharisees I find it hard to see "the cold, matter-of-fact tone of" Luke xi. 47, 48 (p. 102); while in assuming that Luke has introduced "greater precision" in writing *οἴκου* for *ναοῦ* Harnack appears to overlook the distinction between *ναός* and *ἱερόν*. As a matter of fact *ναός* is a better Greek equivalent of *οἶκος*, which was a piece of literalism that Luke would never have admitted had he not found it in his source. That Luke has avoided the word *παρουσία* (p. 107) as belonging "to the sphere of Jewish Messianic dogma," and "an unsuitable term for that Second Coming in which Christians believed," appears very strange in view of Paul's frequent use of the word. It has become clear that the word was a current vernacular term for a *royal visitation*,¹ and so a most suggestive and natural word on Paul's lips for the Return of the King of heaven. Why should a disciple of Paul avoid the word except because it was not in his source?

Nearly three years ago, in a paper on the Beatitudes (EXPOSITOR, August, 1906) I pleaded for the superior originality of Luke in this section, and I feel bound to maintain this still. In that connexion I called attention to the way in which Matthew is inclined to heighten parallelism: I compared the tendency of the Oxyrhynchus Logia, in which this is carried yet further. Now Professor Harnack notes (p. 18) that parallelism is frequent in Q, and that Matthew "has often destroyed it from a desire for brevity." If this is so, I am convinced that he has also not infrequently mended his source so as to show poetical symmetry. It is hard to understand how Luke, with his sense for literary form, should deliberately destroy such a perfectly balanced series of parallel clauses as we find in Matthew vii. 24-27. It is Harnack himself who has laid such stress on Luke's author-

¹ See Milligan's *Thessalonians*, pp. 145 f.

ship of the canticles in chapters i. and ii. The various motives which Harnack suggests (pp. 72-4) for Luke's marring of this passage seem to me beside the mark : it is much more probable that Matthew worked up a Q passage which Luke has retained with little alteration. I should, on the same ground, differ from Harnack's decision (p. 29) that Matthew xviii. 7*b* is better than Luke xvii. 1*b*, "because of the parallelism." We may cite Matthew vii. 9, 10 as another example : in Luke (and Q) we have Fish and Serpent, Egg and Scorpion—two *harmful* things given instead of necessary food ; while in Matthew the parallelism is heightened by prefixing Loaf and Stone, from which merely *useless* substitution there is a climactic rise to the harmful. (Matthew got it probably from the similar association in iv. 3, and of course he rejected the superfluous third clause in consequence.) In the same chapter we notice also verses 15-20 with their beautifully balanced sequence. Now the essence of this passage appears in xii. 33, which answers to Luke vi. 43, 44 ; the correspondence of verse 45 there with Matthew xii. 35 shows that Matthew's second presentation of the passage properly belongs to the Sermon, rather than the first. Matthew has apparently worked up the rough and disconnected saying of Q to fit its place in the Sermon, and has then repeated it in a later discourse, with a form less differing from Q : Luke has kept it nearly as he found it. Such an account harmonizes with all we find in the First Evangelist's setting of the Sermon. Recognizing the fragmentary character of the discourse as it stood in Q, he gathered together kindred matter from other sources and from other parts of Q and arranged them with wonderful skill round a connected sequence of thought. He found the pearls scattered, and he provided a string whereon to display them. Few would care to say that Luke found the necklace complete, but broke the string and let half of the pearls be scattered.

I should like to close with a note on Matthew xi. 16, 17= Luke vii. 31, 32. The key to the form of Q seems to be found in the reading *λέγοντες* for *ἂ λέγει* in Luke. This is attested by D and L, the Ferrar group, six Old Latin MSS. and the Bohairic: since *ἂ λέγει* can be immediately explained from assimilation to Matthew, this reading seems better, despite **NB**. Now this involves taking *προσφωνοῦσιν* as indicative—"and they call to one another, saying. . . ." In that case Matthew's *προσφωνοῦντα* may be based on a natural misunderstanding, which further caused the *λέγοντες* to be changed to *ἂ . . . λέγουσιν*. Probably also *τοῖς ἑτέροις* is a stylistic alteration for *ἀλλήλοις* of Q: strictly speaking, only *one* party said this to the other. Now note that with Luke's reading the parable comes out right, for the "generation" is represented by the sulky children to whom "they call." The subject is indefinite, and the *ἀλλήλοις* invites mending; but these are roughnesses due to Q, which Luke did not remove. Matthew did—but with the result that the parts in the parable are inverted. For the well-known crux which Matthew presents in the context of this passage (xi. 12)—Luke removes it to a distance, and it can hardly have been connected in Q—I venture to suggest that both Evangelists have tried to interpret by expansion a shorter ambiguous phrase. Suppose that Q had simply *οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος μέχρι (ἢ ἕως) Ἰωάννου ἀπὸ τότε ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βιάζεται*, "The prophets, and the law, were until John: from his time the kingdom is being eagerly entered," or "forced on." Matthew had to adapt this saying, which he took from a different context, and he gave his interpretation of the difficult *βιάζεται* by adding a clause. Luke in his turn paraphrases the word independently, using easier language for an idea not likely to be understood by Gentile readers, but makes a minimum of change in the words.

I do not like to close a paper devoted wholly to criticism without a word of whole-hearted appreciation of these "Studies" of the great master to whom theology owes so much. In doctrinal presuppositions he stands more with German scholarship than with British: even the less conservative among us would give much more extended holidays to the word "legend" than they are disposed to do beyond the Rhine! But for that very reason British liberals in theology welcome the more heartily the researches of one who cannot be suspected of bias, and one who writes with authority unequalled among all our living scholars. In this volume Professor Harnack gives us some declarations of high importance, which will be eagerly welcomed by men who try to defend on modern lines the central doctrine of Christianity. The high antiquity and trustworthiness of Q, the argument in favour of our Lord's having used words about Himself implying a unique relation to God, and the crushing condemnations of certain latter-day extravagances of criticism falsely so called, will serve as examples. Nor can one easily forget the excursus in his third volume (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 290-297) in which he states the "weighty considerations" in favour of dating Acts "as early as the beginning of the seventh decade of the first century." He does not adopt this date, as against "the time of Titus or the earlier years of Domitian"; but he leaves it open, and meanwhile gives the case for this astonishingly early date, with arguments greatly weakening the case for the later one. *Acts* in the early sixties and *Luke* of course to precede it—*Mark* therefore in the fifties and Q no one knows how much earlier still! And this comes to us as a recognized possibility not from an "apologist," bound hand and foot to a tradition which itself never pleaded for dates so early, but from the author of *What is Christianity?* and the most famous scholar in the greatest University in the world. It

fairly takes our breath away. Perhaps the "legends" about the Resurrection may yet be studied afresh on modern scientific lines—lines lying, one presumes, at more or less distance alike from Professor Lake's and Professor Orr's—and prove to have some truth in them after all!

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

*THE EXCAVATIONS AT GEZER AND RELIGION
IN ANCIENT PALESTINE.*¹

THE opening years of the present century have been marked by greatly increased activity in the excavation of the ancient sites of Palestine. Down to the close of the last century systematic excavation had been largely left to the English Palestine Exploration Society, and this Society had mainly confined its excavations to Jerusalem, and in the last years of the century to Tell el-Hesi (Lachish) and four other Tells in the Shephelah, which could not be certainly identified with particular places named in the ancient literature.

Since 1900, excavations have been undertaken on five sites of ancient fame—Gezer, Taanach, Megiddo, Samaria, Jericho. At Taanach Dr. Sellin carried through extensive and successful operations under the patronage of the Austrian government and the Vienna Academy of Sciences in 1902 and 1903; he is now superintending the excavations at Jericho, which have not yet gone far enough to produce results entirely commensurate with those of some sites that have been more fully worked over, but which, thanks to the greater fame of Jericho, have lately attracted the attention of our daily Press. The excavations at Samaria, under American direction, are also as yet in an early stage; no site perhaps promises more for our knowledge of Hebrew history in particular, if only the work is thoroughly and

¹ A lecture delivered to the Jews' Literary Society.

completely done. Prof. Steuernagel has just lately published the memoirs of the work which Dr. Schumacher directed on behalf of the German Palestine Society at Tell el-Mutesellim, the ancient Megiddo; and it is obvious that the fruits of this enterprise have not been less than those yielded by the neighbouring Tell Ta'annak.

I refer briefly to those other undertakings at the outset before I turn more especially to Gezer, because it is important to bear in mind that the meaning of facts yielded by one site is often only elicited, checked, or confirmed by results obtained elsewhere. I confine myself directly, though not also indirectly, to Gezer because it alone has yielded more of interest than it is possible to deal with on a single occasion; and for the same reason I do not propose to touch upon all the interesting matters illustrated or illuminated by the discoveries at Gezer, but merely on a single group of them—those, viz., which are associated with religion in ancient Palestine; even in the case of these it will be necessary to select, without attempting to exhaust.

The identity of the modern Tell Jezer, a few miles from Ramleh, with the ancient Gezer was definitely established by the distinguished French archaeologist, M. Clermont-Ganneau, who, having previously argued for the identification, had the good fortune to discover in the year 1872 a series of inscriptions around the Tell bearing the legend in Hebrew characters of about the Maccabean period, “Boundary of Gezer” (תחם גזר). The same savant in the year 1898 read a paper on a recently discovered addition to this series of boundary stones before the “Académie des Inscriptions des Belles Lettres,”¹ and concluded his discussion of Gezer with these words:—

“I will add, but without insisting for the present upon a

¹ A translation of this paper will be found in the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, 1899, pp. 118 ff.

scheme which I do not conceal from myself presents difficulties of every kind, that the *tell* of Gezer itself would seem to be one of the most likely spots in Palestine for methodical excavations. Digging would be carried on there with assurance of successful results, thanks to the certainty, unique of its kind, that we possess relative to the identity of the site. Everything there would be of interest, from the layer of the Crusades that covers the surface, to the deep layers in which are hidden the remains of a past anterior to the Exodus. Why should we attack, as is so frequently done, somewhat at haphazard, *tells* that are anonymous or of doubtful origin, and neglect this particular one (as has hitherto been the case), when it possesses the inestimable advantage of having a name that is known, a personality that is ascertained and a continuous history of its own, intimately connected with the general history of Palestine from the most distant times to the era of the Crusades ? ”

This was written at the time that excavations under the Palestine Exploration Society were being carried out at the “ *tells* that are anonymous or of doubtful origin ” of Eş-Şafi, Sandaḥannah, Ej-Judeideh and Zakariya, not very remote from Gezer. Four years later the same Society obtained a firman for the excavation of Gezer ; and now (Feb. 1909) at the end of seven years the work is approaching its completion. The difficulties which M. Clermont-Ganneau foresaw have been overcome by the skill and untiring zeal of Mr. Macalister ; the successful results of which he felt assured have been obtained.

No site in Palestine has ever been so completely laid bare as Gezer, or made to yield the full tale of its secrets. A mere glance at the 300 illustrations in the text of the memoir, or at the 50 plates of the atlas that accompanies it, will show how rich were the results of Dr. Schumacher’s work at Tell el-Mutesellim ; but a study of the plan indicating what

parts of the *tell* were actually excavated will also show how much less complete was the excavation than that of Gezer. In the hope, justified by events, that further search might recover more Assyrian tablets Dr. Sellin re-opened the mound of Ta'annak after he had published his memoir ; and his later work yielded a valuable "Nachlese." The Palestine Exploration Society finding at the end of the period of the firman that less than half the surface of the *tell* had been excavated, decided to apply for a further firman. Now at the close of the second period, and after over five years of active operations, the work, is nearly complete. The value of such completeness should be evident ; it increases the data for the solution of the problems that all excavation raises ; it diminishes the risk that important objects should escape discovery. At the end of the first period of excavation Mr. Macalister discovered tombs of a new and remarkable character : at the beginning of the second period he discovered others of the same type : the further evidence thus obtained reduced the extent of the problem created by the first discovery.

Let me now briefly remind you of the chief characteristics of the site of Gezer and of the chief points in its history as known to us prior to the excavations. Riding north from Ashdod one passes, after some three or four hours, on the right the site of another of the five Philistine cities—Ekron : at this point Tell Gezer is in sight as a long and conspicuous elevation ; in another hour or two one reaches the *tell* itself, and mounts somewhat steeply to admire the fine view seawards which commands also the line of march by which the armies of the Pharaohs marched northwards towards Syria, or the armies of Esarhaddon or Ashurbanipal southwards on Egypt. In a word Gezer borders on the Philistine country and is a natural stronghold close to an important military and trade-route. Jerusalem lies barely twenty

miles in a direct line westward, or let us say, at seven or eight hours' distance.

In the fifteenth century B.C. Gezer is mentioned among the towns conquered by Thothmes III. and among the Tell el-Amarna Tablets (14th cent. B.C.) is one in which Yapahi, its ruler, protests his fidelity to Pharaoh. Later it was captured by Merenptah (c. 1230 B.C.). After the Hebrew conquest it fell to the tribe of Ephraim, but, as the book of Judges informs us, the Canaanites were not expelled, but continued to dwell among the Ephraimites. According to 1 Kings ix. 16, Pharaoh king of Egypt captured Gezer, burned it with fire, slew the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and gave it to his daughter as her marriage portion when she wedded Solomon. Solomon then rebuilt the city. Thereafter we hear no more of Gezer till the time of the Maccabees, when Simon took it, and built for himself a palace there.

Two points come out clearly: Gezer was a town to be captured if possible, and from an early period it was subject to Egyptian influence. As to the last point the meaning of the inscriptions of Thothmes and Merenptah and the Tell el-Amarna Tablets is clear, even if we were to grant the contention of some scholars that an Egyptian Pharaoh would not have married his daughter to Solomon and that the original text of Kings recorded the capture of Gezer by Piru king of Musri, and Solomon's marriage not to an Egyptian princess, but to a lady from North Arabia.

Both these points are of importance in considering the significance of the excavations at Gezer for the history of Religion. Because Gezer was a border town and because the extent and duration of the effective Hebrew occupation of it is uncertain, it is necessary to proceed with caution in drawing conclusions as to Hebrew or Jewish Religion in particular. I have preferred therefore for the present and

in general to speak of Religion in Palestine rather than Hebrew Religion in particular. I shall point out specifically, where it seems well to do so, the bearing of the more general conclusions on the question of Jewish Religion. Much certainly that the excavations reveal with reference to religion in Gezer belongs to periods long prior to the settlement of the Hebrews in Palestine, much of it to periods when the population consisted only very partially of Jews.

As to the influence of Egypt I will merely say at this point that the excavations entirely confirm the impression that is given by the literary data: they enable us to trace that influence further back, to nearly a thousand years before the time of Thothmes III., whose mention of the city is the earliest reference to it in literature; they furnish evidence also of the nature and extent of Egyptian influence at various times between that remote period and the fall of the Jewish monarchy.

There is one general characteristic of all excavations in Palestine that has its bearing on our special point of view. This is the paucity of written material that they have brought to light, the still greater paucity of Hebrew inscriptions that have been recovered, and again the almost entire absence of inscriptions in Hebrew directly bearing on religion. Nothing has been thus discovered comparable with the Moabite inscriptions of Mesha, the Zinjerli inscriptions, the inscription of Zakir, which have shed so much light not only on the history of their times, but on the religion of those in whose midst they were erected.

The longest of Hebrew inscriptions—the Siloam—was discovered by accident and has no religious significance, being in this respect like the longest of the Hebrew inscriptions recovered at Gezer, which consists of some twenty words recording the months of the agricultural year.¹

¹ Palestine Exploration Fund *Quarterly Statement*, 1909, pp. 26-34

A sufficiently comprehensive list of all the inscribed matter recovered through the recent excavations can be quickly given. The inscribed handle jars were the chief yield of the Shephelah *tells* excavated in the nineties of the last century. Richest in inscriptions of the excavations of this century have been those at Tell Ta'annak, where Dr. Sellin recovered a series of letters written in Assyrian, and belonging to what may be roughly defined as the Tell el-Amarna period. Historically interesting and valuable, these letters raised one question of great religious interest. Among the persons named in them is a certain Ahijami. Is this name identical with the Hebrew Ahijah? If so, was the Hebrew name of God current among the Canaanites? I do not propose to re-discuss this much discussed question—a question of perennial interest and of great obscurity. It has, as you are well aware, been recently and thoroughly examined by Dr. Daiches.¹ Gezer has also yielded Assyrian inscriptions—two² in number, and both of the seventh century, and not without a bearing on the history of religion. To these I will return later. Gezer has also yielded one or two Egyptian inscriptions of some interest, but of no great length.

But of Hebrew inscriptions what have Gezer, Tell el-Mutesellim and Tell Ta'annak together got to show? The Calendar inscription already mentioned, some inscribed weights and some inscribed seals—the weights of no religious interest, the seals of some by reason of the proper names which they bear. Of these the seal of Shama' the servant of Jeroboam has attracted most attention.

This absence of written material leaves much obscure

(also published separately under the title *An old Hebrew Calendar-Inscription from Gezer*).

¹ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1908, vol. xxii, pp. 125-136.

² Since this was written, a third Assyrian (Neo-Babylonian) inscription has been found and published (*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, April 1909).

that might otherwise have been clear. The tombs, of which so many, and of so many varieties, have been discovered at Gezer, bear testimony to that important group of religious beliefs which gather around death and the dead; but there are no sepulchral inscriptions to interpret the frequent ambiguity of these remains.

In turning now to some of the points in Palestinian Religion on which these excavations have cast light we may well start with this question of the Dead—"the mighty nations of the dead," in the words of the author of *Urn-Burial*, who would assuredly have taken a deep interest in the skeletons of Gezer, numerous in themselves and yet how puny a remnant of those who died in Gezer during the two or three thousand years that the history of the city can be archaeologically traced.

One of the first and one of the most important of Mr. Macalister's discoveries was a burial cave which told of two successive periods in the history of the site. In the first period the cave was used as a crematorium, in the second for inhumation. Its use as a crematorium, so the indications seem to prove, was not singular; cremation at the period was not something unusual, but a *custom*; the cave was skilfully adapted by the use of vents to secure the strong draught requisite to reduce the human body to ashes; the mass of ashes, the thickness of the layer, pointed to successive incinerations.

The period of inhumation began about 2500 B.C.; the period of incineration may extend 1,000 or 1,500 years behind that date—say to about 4000 B.C. The striking difference in the customary treatment of the dead suggests, though by itself it might not prove, difference of race. But this suggestion was confirmed by an examination of the human remains: sufficient bones remained even in the incinerated stratum to permit of conclusions. The early

population which practised cremation were a people of slender build and small, but not dwarfish stature, with skull bones thick and heavy. These, together with other characteristics, appeared to Professor Macalister to indicate a pre-Semitic stock. The people who substituted inhumation for cremation were a stronger, larger-boned people, with skulls larger in size and of thinner bones, with longer faces, fairly prominent noses and rounded chins, characteristics that point to a Semitic stock.¹

There is an interesting parallel to the transition from cremation to inhumation, probably corresponding to a change in the racial character of a population, in Babylon, particularly at Nippur. Though archaeological synchronisms in distant countries must be accepted with reserve, yet these transitions may have been roughly contemporary; it is even more probable that in both countries they were due to a common cause—the substitution of a Semitic for a non-Semitic people.² For Palestine the conclusion is of far-reaching interest: so far as Gezer is typical of the country as a whole, we may conclude that the Hebrews after the Exodus settled in a country that had for 1,000 or 1,500 years been in the occupation of men of kindred race.

How far customs of that ancient pre-Semitic race influenced directly, or by way of re-action through aversion,³ the later population is an interesting speculation. Did the horror of burning the corpse linger through long centuries, and is the penalty of burning inflicted in certain gross cases on offenders such as Achan and his family (Josh. vii.), or the man who contracts marriage with a woman and her mother, a direct survival of the customs of an alien and abominated race?

¹ Palestine Exploration Fund *Quarterly Statement*, 1902, pp. 353-356.

² Cp. the careful statement and cautious inference of Father Vincent in *Canaan d'après l'Exploration récente*, pp. 260-267.

³ Cp. the pig-bones in the neo-lithic, i.e. pre-Semitic stratum.

But while we are thus brought face to face with two such distinct treatments of the dead as cremation and inhumation in different periods and probably by different races, the beliefs concerning the dead do not appear in some respects to have differed so widely. There is one custom, eloquent of the belief of those who practised it, common to both periods : this is the custom of depositing with the dead vessels suitable for holding food and drink. The meaning of this becomes particularly plain in certain cases where the corpse was so arranged that one hand of the skeleton was placed, and as placed was found by the excavators, in one of these food vessels. More instructive than any verbal description are the drawings given by Mr. Macalister, or by Dr. Schumacher in the memoir of Tell el-Mutesellim. Enough here to claim attention for the main point that in the earliest period of society in Palestine the belief was current that the dead lived ; for their dead they set apart caves much like their own cave dwellings.

Let us pass to a more special treatment of the dead, suspected before the excavations, and now proved more particularly by the discoveries at Gezer, Tell Ta'annak and Tell el-Mutesellim. I refer to certain special forms of human sacrifice and the extent to which the custom was practised. Of the existence of human sacrifice among the Canaanites, of the practice of some of the Hebrews themselves, such as King Ahaz and many in the days of Manasseh, the Hebrew scriptures leave us in no doubt. Both at Gezer and at Tell Ta'annak and also at Tell el-Mutesellim, the practically unambiguous remains of human sacrifices have been discovered, and they are such moreover as to suggest that the inhabitants of these places followed two customs : (1) Of foundation-sacrifice ; (2) Of the sacrifice of new-born infants. An allusion to foundation-sacrifice has often been suspected in the curse on the man who should rebuild Jericho—" at

the price of his firstborn (בבכר) shall he lay the foundation thereof, and at the price of his youngest shall he set up the gates thereof" (Josh. vi. 26; cp. 1 Kings xvi. 25). In the Hebrew practice of the redemption of all male firstborn some scholars have detected the transformation of an earlier custom of sacrificing the firstborn.

Of the foundation-sacrifices little need be said—the case seems clear enough. Mere burial *under* a house need prove little, but the frequent cases in which a single skeleton has been found buried at the base of a wall, under a *threshold*, or carefully set in the foundation masonry of a building yield no uncertain testimony that the custom of foundation-sacrifice which has left its marks in many countries and in folklore and legend, was practised also by the early Canaanites. One further point, however, of great interest has been made clear; the rite gradually degenerated in response, as we may safely infer, to the demands of a growth in moral ideas and humane sentiment. The early foundation-sacrifices, like the ordinary cases of sepulture, were accompanied by offerings of pottery. From the fifteenth century B.C. these vessels, formerly the *accompaniments* of foundation-sacrifices, begin to appear under foundations *without* the skeleton. Gradually the accompaniment, which now became the symbol, drove out the reality. Buildings, whether important or unimportant, were inaugurated with a rite as harmless as those which sometimes accompany a foundation stone laying in our country. But the original rite was practised long. Mr. Macalister reports cases from the period of the latter half of the Jewish monarchy (P.E.F. *Quarterly Statement*, 1903, 224).

The human beings chosen for foundation-sacrifices were often, but not exclusively, infants.

The question of the sacrifice of infants not connected with foundations is more difficult. Not indeed that there need

be much doubt that new-born infants were sacrificed ; the uncertainty begins when we ask how generally and why ? In any case it is the last point only that I now care to leave in the form of a question.

The skeletons of infants which first raised the question of general infant sacrifice were found by Mr. Macalister in close proximity to the ancient sacred place of Gezer, of which the most striking features were the eight great monoliths, two of which topped out above the unexcavated soil, but the rest of which were first brought to light by excavation. The *place* then in which these skeletons were found is significant ; but so also was the manner of sepulture. The skeletons were found in large jars ; the bodies had generally been inserted head first and with two or three smaller vessels such as bowls and jugs ; finally, the large vessel was filled up with earth.

As to the " why " of these sacrifices let me quote Mr. Macalister's suggestions with the above facts freshly and strongly pressing for explanation before him. " The infants were all newly born—certainly none were over a week old. This shows that the sacrifices were not offered under stress of any special calamity, or at the rites attaching to any special season of the year, for assuredly *some* occasion would arise when a new-born child was not to be found, and an older child would be sacrificed, whose remains would then be found with the rest. The special circumstances which led to the selection of these infants must have something inherent in the victims themselves, which devoted them to sacrifice from the moment of birth. Among the Semites the one cause most likely to have been effective was the sacrosanct character attributed to primogeniture : and it is, therefore, most probable that the infants found buried in jars in the temple of Gezer were sacrificed firstborn children."¹

¹ Palestine Exploration Fund *Quarterly Statement*, 1903, p. 33.

The force of this argument was partly destroyed by new facts reported by Mr. Macalister a few months later. "The uniformity with which the child-sacrifices have been found to be infants of less than a week old, has been broken by two cases of children aged about six."¹

Nevertheless Mr. Macalister stands by his theory of the sacrifice of the firstborn, and with him Father Vincent,² with the later as well as the earlier facts before him, agrees. Certainly if the *necessary* conclusion from the Hebrew law of the *redemption* of all firstborn *males* is that they had previously sacrificed every firstborn child, the most natural and probable explanation of the infant-burials before the temple of Gezer is that the god in whose honour the temple was erected demanded [that the firstborn of each family should be sacrificed to him, and within eight days from birth, if we infer again from Hebrew law, and the age of the great majority of the sacrificed infants at Gezer. But the conclusion from ancient Hebrew law to which I have referred is not admitted by certain distinguished scholars, and the argument on which it rests is obviously not rigorous. On the whole I am for my own part inclined to think that the discoveries at Gezer, though they establish the custom of sacrifice of infants, preferably of newly born infants, do not carry the case for a primitive Canaanite custom of the sacrifice of *every firstborn child* much further. And unless they prove that *every* firstborn child was sacrificed they obviously by themselves prove nothing at all about firstborn children: the remains of firstborn children differ in no way from those of the later born. In his discussion of this important question Dr. Frazer scarcely draws a sufficiently sharp line between the custom of offering up *some* and sacrificing *all* firstborn children. He remarks³ very per-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 223. ² *Canaan*, p. 190 f.

³ *The Golden Bough*², ii. 43.

tinently: "A people who burned all their children indiscriminately would soon extinguish themselves, and such an excess of piety is probably rare, if not unknown"; but the somewhat smaller degree of inhuman piety which could sacrifice the firstborn child of every mother seems to him very probable. He remarks again, "The conclusion that the Hebrew custom of redeeming the firstborn is a modification of an older custom of sacrificing them has been mentioned by some very distinguished scholars only to be rejected on the ground apparently of its extreme improbability. To me the converging lines of evidence which point to this conclusion seem too numerous and too distinct to be thus lightly brushed aside, and the argument from improbability can easily be rebutted by pointing to other peoples who are known to have practised or to be still practising a custom of the same sort." He then proceeds to give instances of "customs of the same sort": but in many of these cases we find sacrifice not of all but of *some* firstborn. Thus, "*Certain* families" among the Senjero of East Africa are obliged to sacrifice their firstborn sons; among some tribes of South-East Africa a woman who loses her husband in battle and marries again, sacrifices the first child of the second marriage; "the heathen Russians *often* sacrificed their firstborn to the god Perun," and so forth.¹

That the ancient Canaanites selected firstborn children by preference for sacrifices is probable; that they sacrificed every firstborn child is at best a matter of speculation: it is not a datum either of literary records or archaeological discovery.

There are many objects of unmistakable religious significance and also of high antiquity brought to light at Gezer with corresponding objects at other sites that I must not attempt to discuss, though they are of the highest interest.

¹ *Ib.* 51, 52 (*italics mine*).

I cannot, for example, attempt to bring out the importance of the temple at Gezer with its striking monoliths above ground and with its elaborate subterranean chambers. Nor must I discuss the altars that have been found: ancient rock altars with cup-marks, roughly hewn altars with steps, altars with horns, and so forth. Nor, again, the numerous objects of worship; most interesting among these are the frequently recurring female figures suggestive of fecundity which have been identified with Ashtoreth and of which, Dr. Sellin seems to have shown, each city possessed its dominating type. Nor, again, the remains of other than human sacrifice.

What further I can say I will consider from the general standpoint of the external influences to which the excavations have shown that the several sites excavated were open.

Ever since the discovery of the Tell el-Amarna Tablets it has become a commonplace to remark that before the fourteenth century B.C. the influence of Babylon had been strong. With the use of the Babylonian script, which these tablets proved to have been in use in Canaan in the fourteenth century, an undefined but possibly enough a large amount of Babylonian thought and civilization must have passed into Canaan. It was not difficult to believe that the ancient Babylonian myths of creation, which the Hebrews adopted to transform and ennoble, were current at this time in Canaan and influencing the religious conceptions of the people. It was, however, possible to hold that the diplomatic use of the Babylonian script did not necessarily imply a wide popular diffusion of Babylonian thought.

Recent excavation has carried the history of the use of the Babylonian script in Palestine a little further. The Assyrian letters found at Tell Ta'annak were not, as those of Tell el-Amarna, correspondence between Canaanite princelings and a foreign court, but between an overlord and his

vassal, both Canaanite, at least both confined, so far as the letters indicate, to neighbouring Canaanite districts. These letters go a considerable way towards showing that what writing was done in Canaan before about 1000 B.C. was in the Assyrian script.

Gezer, too, has yielded its Assyrian documents, but of a later date : the two deeds of sale discovered there are dated in the years 649 and 647 (B.C.). Are we to infer that for certain purposes Assyrian was in continuous use from 1400 B.C. to later than 650 ?¹ Another interpretation of the Gezer deeds of sale seems to be more probable, and to make them a vivid illustration of what we previously knew to be a characteristic feature of religion in the seventh century, I mean its strongly syncretistic character with special prevalence of the cult of the host of heaven. The Assyrian hold on Syria was maintained far down into Ashurbanipal's reign, below the year 647. Gezer, as we have seen, was a natural stronghold of which ancient as well as mediaeval conquerors appreciated the importance. What more probable than that an Assyrian garrison was resident there, and that Assyrian parties to the deed of sale employed an Assyrian notary ? Certain it is that some of the signatures bear pure Assyrian names, certain also that one of them bears a name that is Jewish—Nethaniah. These documents seem to give us evidence of that close intercourse between Assyrians and Canaanites, and in particular Hebrews, that facilitated the pursuit of peculiarly Assyrian cults.

What is really conspicuous about Gezer as revealed by excavation is the paucity of material signs of Babylonian influence. Beyond these documents in Assyrian of the seventh century, there are few Assyrio-Babylonian objects, though there are two other tablets which may no doubt in themselves be interpreted so as to possess particular significance.

¹ Cp. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*,² 176.

These are two tablets containing animal and other signs to the number of about sixteen, which have been supposed to represent the signs of the Zodiac; the second to be discovered was found in a stratum that Mr. Macalister assigns to the second or the third thousand B.C.

Mr. Johns, writing on the first discovered, sums up judiciously: "What seems most significant is the occurrence on Palestinian soil of such a striking example of the kind of object which elsewhere is taken as evidence for the astral religion of Babylonia. This is evidence that whatever the exact nature and purpose of the emblems, they are common to Babylonia and Palestine. There is, of course, the alternative to be considered whether this tablet was not sent or brought direct from Babylonia."¹

Even if we attribute the greatest possible significance to these interesting finds we shall no longer confine ourselves to sober interpretation but launch out on the wild sea of speculation on which the modern astral mythologists travel with such enviable ease and comfort, if we follow Dr. Benzinger in explaining the eight standing stones of Gezer as representing the twelve signs of the Zodiac and the double row of five monoliths at Ta'annak as a double representation of the five planets.² There is really not the slightest evidence that the eight monoliths of Gezer were once twelve: there is at least as much for Mr. Macalister's opposite theory that they gradually increased from two; and it is certain that one of the stones is of different provenance from the rest—a fact which at least calls for some explanation and receives none if each stone stands for one sign of the Zodiac.

The paucity of Assyrian objects is enhanced by the extraordinary abundance of Egyptian objects from about 2500

¹ Palestine Exploration Fund *Quarterly Statement*, 1908, p. 28.

² *Heb. Arch.* p. 320.

B.C., to which time Mr. Macalister attributes the first group, to far beyond the end of the Jewish monarchy.

There is, of course, nothing surprising in these evidences of intercourse with Egypt and Egyptian influence; a large amount of what was known of Gezer associated it with Egypt. Unfortunately we cannot very exactly determine how deep the influence of Egyptian religion sank: if we judge from religion in the not far distant city of Jerusalem, it was not very deep. One detail I may refer to that has a special interest in connexion with a passage in Isaiah, for which Lagarde proposed an interpretation of the consonantal text, strikingly different from the Massoretic, that has fascinated a number of later interpreters. According to him Isaiah (x. 4) threatened the unjust and oppressive rulers of Judah or Israel that in the day of visitation the gods whom they trusted would prove useless.

Beltis croucheth, Osiris is broken in pieces,
And under the slain they fall.

The assumption underlying this interpretation is that when the words were written by Isaiah, or as some have thought, by a later writer, Beltis and Osiris were favourite deities, and the difficulty has been that there is no independent evidence that they were. It cannot be said that the excavations make good this lack of evidence. Images of the Egyptian god Bes have been found, but the traces of Osiris, though not wholly absent, are not conspicuous, and do not occur in strata that come within the period of the age of Isaiah. In a stratum of about B.C. 1000 there was discovered a fine bronze statuette of Osiris, and in much the same stratum a stele with a dedication to Osiris. Yet the conditions which might have made Osiris a general object of worship in Israel or Judah in the eighth century or later should have applied to Gezer also, and we might, if such

worship really was prevalent, have expected to find statues or other traces of the god in strata of this period.

On one question of external influence—real or hypothetical—the excavations are of merely negative value. We are all of us aware how one distinguished scholar, who has devoted a lifetime to the study of the Hebrew Scriptures, and laid students under obligations it is difficult to over-estimate, has increasingly found the really dominant external influence over Israel, particularly in matters religious, to have been neither Assyria nor Egypt, but North Arabia. It was part of Mr. Macalister's ambition to settle by excavation the vexed question of the supposed North Arabian Muşri. We can certainly claim that the influence of Egypt attested by the records of Thothmes and Merenptah, whom the hardiest Muşrite will scarcely deny to have been lords of the Nile Valley and not merely or not even kings of Muşri, is reflected in the continuity of Egyptian objects throughout the strata of Gezer. He can claim too that there are no specific traces of North Arabian influence, or challenge the defenders of the theory to prove them. But this will scarcely convince them that a great Muşrite kingdom independent of Egypt in North Arabia is merely a mirage.

In these last remarks I have carefully abstained from drawing any very precise conclusions. I have been more concerned to indicate the wide range and importance of the questions that are touched by such systematic excavations as have recently been undertaken. The moral of the whole is, as it appears to me, that precise conclusions on many of the most important matters can only be wisely drawn when far more excavation has been carried out; and conclusions suggested by the results in one place can thus be checked by those obtained at a multiplicity of other places. The field for excavation is wide; the results already obtained have done much to vitalize the study of ancient Canaan

and of its greatest inhabitants—the Hebrews ; but these results are but firstfruits of the rich harvest which continued excavation should yield.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

*HOW THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVES
EXPLAIN ONE ANOTHER.*

IT is proposed to bring together here some of the instances in which the Resurrection Narratives help to explain one another : and these are specially interesting as the various accounts (by the four Evangelists and St. Paul) are so obviously independent that not one of them can be considered the source of any of the others. And of course it is immaterial for this argument whether the closing verses of the Second Gospel were written by St. Mark or any one else. Mere agreements will not be included, or even undesigned coincidences as they are called, such as St. Paul and St. Luke both placing the appearance to St. Peter before that to the Apostles ; but only points in which what is said in one narrative explains some obscurity, omission, or improbability in another. Many of them are, no doubt, well known, and some I have quoted in my *Truth of Christianity*, but it has been thought better to repeat them here, so as to make the list as complete as possible.

(1) To begin with, St. John records Mary Magdalene as visiting the empty tomb, and finding the stone rolled away (though St. Matthew alone says who rolled it away), and then telling the disciples, *we know not where they have laid Him*. But to whom does the *we* refer, as she was apparently alone all the time ? St. John does not explain matters, but the other Evangelists do ; for they say that though Mary Magdalene was the leader of the party, and is always named first, yet as a matter of fact there were other women

with her ; and this of course accounts for the *we*. Later on, no doubt, she was alone ; but then she uses the words *I know not*.¹

(2) Again, St. Luke says that *Peter* was the disciple who ran to the tomb on hearing of the angel's message, without, however, giving any reason why he should have been the one to go. But St. Mark, though he does not mention the visit of Peter, records that the message had been specially addressed to him ; and St. John says that Mary Magdalene had specially informed him, and this of course explains his going.²

(3) St. Luke then says that when Peter arrived at the tomb, he saw the linen cloths *by themselves*, and went home *wondering*. This seems only a trifle, but what does it mean ? St. Luke does not explain matters, but St. John does, for he describes how the clothes were arranged. They were not all in a heap, or scattered about anyhow : but were carefully placed. Those that had gone round the body were lying flat by themselves in one place, apparently as if the body had disappeared without disturbing them ; while the napkin that was about the head was rolled up by itself in another place. And this showed that the body could not have been hurriedly stolen. It seems to have convinced St. John that the disappearance was supernatural, and would quite account for St. Peter's wondering.³

(4) Again, St. Matthew narrates that when Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, He was at once recognized, held by the feet, and worshipped ; and they do not seem to have been at all surprised at meeting Him near the tomb, in spite of the angel's message that they should go to Galilee to see Him. Evidently something must have occurred between, making a break in the narrative after

¹ John xx. 2, 13. ² Luke xxiv. 12 ; Mark xvi. 7 ; John xx. 2.

³ Luke xxiv. 12 ; John xx. 6-8.

verse 8 (see R.V.). And this is quite possible, for the words *And behold* do not always imply a close connexion. Indeed, St. Matthew can scarcely mean that the women were sent by an angel to tell the disciples that Christ was alive, and that then, before they had any possibility of doing so, they were met by Christ Himself. And from the other Evangelists we learn what this was. For St. John describes an appearance to Mary Magdalene *alone*, when she was rebuked for wishing to touch Him, apparently in the old familiar way, as a mere human Rabbi, and without any act of reverence; and St. Mark says this was the *first* appearance. If, then, a few minutes later, she, in company with the other Mary, saw Christ again, it would quite account for their absence of surprise at meeting Him, and also for their altered behaviour in prostrating themselves to the ground, and being in consequence permitted to hold Him by the *feet*, and worship Him.⁴

(5) Again, we read in St. Luke that Cleopas and his friend, after referring to the death of Christ, continued, *Yea, and beside all this, it is now the third day*, as if the Stranger would have known the importance of this, and that something or other might possibly happen then. And yet St. Luke, though he records Christ's prophecy on the subject, never hints that it was known to any one except His own followers. But St. Matthew explains matters, for he says that it was known to others as well, and that the chief priests had in consequence obtained a guard from Pilate; so persons staying in Jerusalem would probably have heard of it.⁵

(6) We then read that Cleopas and his friend, after saying that the disciples (as well as the women) had found the tomb empty, added *but Him they saw not*. This seems to

⁴ Matthew xxviii. 9; John xx. 14; Mark xvi. 9. Compare Matthew ii. 1; xv. 22; xix. 16.

⁵ Luke xxiv. 21; Matthew xxvii. 63.

imply that they thought others had seen Him, and yet if so, how are we to account for their not mentioning it? St. Luke gives us no help in the matter, but St. Mark does; for he says that on a subsequent visit one of the women (Mary Magdalene) did see Christ, only when she told the Apostles, she was *disbelieved*. Obviously, then, if this appearance was generally disbelieved, Cleopas and his friends are not likely to have mentioned it to a stranger, though they no doubt kept thinking about it themselves, and it thus, almost unconsciously, influenced their language.⁶

(7) Once more, St. Luke says that when Christ appeared to the Apostles in the evening, He was mistaken for a *spirit*; but he gives no reason for this, and it was apparently the only occasion on which it occurred. St. John, however, though he does not mention the incident, fully explains it; for he says that *the doors were shut* for fear of the Jews; and obviously if Christ suddenly appeared within closed doors, it would account for their thinking that He must be a spirit.⁷

(8) On the other hand, St. John speaks of Christ's showing them His hands (and side), though without giving any reason for this; but St. Luke's statement that they at first took Him for a spirit, and that He did this to convince them of His identity, quite accounts for it; so each of the narratives helps to explain the other.⁸

(9) St. Luke then adds that as they still disbelieved, Christ asked if they had anything to eat (i.e., if they would give Him something to eat), and they at once offered Him a piece of a broiled fish. But he gives no hint as to why they happened to have any fish ready. St. Mark, however, though he does not mention either the request or its response, fully explains both, for he says they were *sitting at*

⁶ Luke xxiv. 24; Mark xvi. 11.

⁷ Luke xxiv. 37; John xx. 19.

⁸ John xx. 20; Luke xxiv. 37.

meat at the time, probably just concluding their evening meal.⁹

(10) And all this still further explains St. John's narrative; for we are told that Christ said to them *again*, the second time, *Peace be unto you*, which would be much more natural if something had occurred between, than if (as St. John implies) it followed only a few seconds after the first time.¹⁰

(11) Once more, St. Luke records a speech of St. Peter in which he says that he and the other Apostles ate and drank *with* Christ after His Resurrection. This certainly implies that they had a meal together, and is therefore scarcely suitable for the meeting just referred to, when Christ apparently only took a piece of fish by Himself, and drank nothing. And yet St. Luke gives us no other occasion for it, since St. Peter was not present at Emmaus. But St. John does; for he records the appearance in Galilee by the Lake, when it is distinctly implied that Christ, and most of His Apostles, including St. Peter, had a meal together.¹¹

(12) Again, St. Matthew speaks of the Eleven going to the mountain in Galilee *where Jesus had appointed them*. And yet he does not seem to allow any opportunity for making the appointment. It could scarcely have been done before the Crucifixion, and the messages to the women did not fix either the time or place. But St. John removes the difficulty, for he records the appearance by the Lake (just referred to), when, of course, Christ may have pointed out the mountain where He would appear, and have told His disciples when to collect the five hundred brethren, if (as is probable) they were then present.¹²

(13) Again, St. Mark records Christ as saying, after His

⁹ Luke xxiv. 41; Mark xvi. 14.

¹⁰ John xx. 21.

¹¹ Acts x. 41; John xxi. 13.

¹² Matthew xxviii. 16, 7, 10.

command to preach the Gospel to all the world, "He that believeth *and is baptized* shall be saved," though without any previous reference to baptism. But St. Matthew says the command was not only to make disciples of all nations, but to *baptize* them as well, and this of course explains the other passage, though, curiously enough, St. Matthew himself does not refer to it. Neither of these Evangelists, it may be added, in spite of the importance thus attached to baptism, says anything about the Apostles themselves being baptized, or how the omission would be made good. But St. Luke does, for he records Christ's promise that they should be *baptized with the Holy Ghost* in a few days.¹³

(14) And then as to the appearance to the five hundred brethren recorded by St. Paul. None of the Evangelists mention this, but it explains a good deal that they do mention. Thus St. John alludes to the Apostles being in *Galilee*, instead of (as we should have expected) staying in Jerusalem, but he gives no hint as to why they went there. Nor do St. Matthew and St. Mark, who say Christ told them to go there, give any hint as to why He told them; but this Appearance to the five hundred, who had to be collected in Galilee, explains everything.¹⁴

(15) It also accounts for another point. St. Luke, it will be remembered, omits Galilee among the places where the Apostles themselves had to preach the Resurrection; and yet one would think, considering the number of friends Christ had there, it would have been specially included. But of course the fact of there being five hundred witnesses there already made this unnecessary.¹⁵

(16) And it probably explains a curious remark in St. Matthew that when the Eleven saw Christ in Galilee *they*

¹³ Mark xvi. 16; Matthew xxviii. 19; Acts i. 5.

¹⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 6; John xxi. 1; Matthew xxviii. 10; Mark xvi. 7.

¹⁵ Acts i. 8.

worshipped Him, but some doubted. This *some* can scarcely mean some of the Eleven who had just worshipped, and yet St. Matthew says nothing about others being present. But if we assume that the five hundred were there too, it explains matters at once, as some of them may well have doubted at first whether it was really Christ, as He was some way off, and it was before He *came* to them.¹⁶

(17) Once more, St. Luke says that soon after the Resurrection, Christ's *brethren* were with the other disciples, and evidently believed on Him. And yet it is clear that they did not do so shortly before. Obviously something must have occurred between. And though neither St. Luke nor any of the Evangelists tell us what this was, St. Paul does, for he says that Christ appeared to one of them (St. James), and this would of course account for their changed belief.¹⁷

(18) Again, St. John relates that on Christ's first appearance He used the words, *I ascend unto my Father*, and on a previous occasion it was implied that this would be a visible ascent, and that the Apostles were to see it. And yet he never gives us a hint as to whether it ever took place. Two of the other Evangelists, however, though they do not mention either of these sayings, tell us that it did take place, and that the Apostles saw it. Probably in this particular case St. John had the other Gospels before him, and did not think it necessary to repeat what was well known.¹⁸

Now, of course, too much stress must not be laid on small details like these, but still the fact that such short and independent accounts should explain one another in so many ways is a distinct evidence of truthfulness. Legendary accounts of fictitious events would not be likely to do so.

¹⁶ Matthew xxviii. 17, 18.

¹⁷ Acts i. 14; John vii. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 7.

¹⁸ John xx. 17, vi. 62; Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxiv. 51.

THE PREVIOUS INSTANCES IN A TABULAR FORM.

O = a difficulty of some kind. X = by whom explained.

Matt. Mark. Luke. John. Paul.

1	We know not	X	X	X	O	—
2	St. Peter went to the tomb	—	X	O	X	—
3	The cloths by themselves	—	—	O	X	—
4	Their absence of surprise	O	X	—	X	—
5	It is now the third day .	X	—	O	—	—
6	Him they saw not . . .	—	X	O	—	—
7	Mistook Him for a spirit	—	—	O	X	—
8	Showed them His hands and side	—	—	X	O	—
9	The broiled fish	—	X	O	—	—
10	Again, Peace be unto you	—	—	X	O	—
11	They ate and drank with Christ	—	—	O	X	—
12	The place appointed . .	O	—	—	X	—
13	And is baptized	X	O	—	—	—
14	The disciples being in Galilee	O	O	—	O	X
15	No occasion to preach there	—	—	O	—	X
16	But some doubted . . .	O	—	—	—	X
17	His brethren believed on Him	—	—	O	—	X
18	I ascend unto My Father	—	X	X	O	—

LT.-COL. W. H. TURTON.

*LUKE'S AUTHORITIES IN THE ACTS, CHAPTERS
I.-XII.*

THERE is among many modern people a strong inclination to doubt such general statements as those in Acts v. 12, "by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people," or viii. 7, "from many of those which had unclean spirits they came out; and many that were palsied and that were lame were healed." Along with this doubt follows a general tendency to rate low the credibility of the book in which such statements occur, and the intelligence of the author who admits them. But let us take into consideration the character of an Oriental population, where physicians and medical attendance are unknown (except in some small degree among the wealthier classes), where ignorance and a low standard of living and of thought are prevalent, and where that peculiar class of trouble or disease called in the New Testament "possession by devils" is rife. I feel convinced that those who can appreciate from experience the actual situation and conditions of such a state of society will be the slowest to doubt the credibility of statements like those which have just been quoted. It is true "that the Hebrew nation was at that time the most highly educated people in the world—in the true meaning of the word education."¹ Yet the description given in the preceding sentences was quite fairly applicable to the very mixed population, and especially to the mass of the inhabitants of cities like Jerusalem and Samaria. Now imagine that amid this Oriental population, keenly susceptible to religious emotions and strongly influenced already by many superstitious ideas and customs, a great religious idea is introduced and propagated widely through the degraded masses by one extraordinary per-

¹ *The Education of Christ*, p. 67.

sonality and by a devoted enthusiastic group of followers, all themselves men and women of eminent power and magnetic influence. Take into consideration the strange and yet indubitable facts of faith-healing and "Christian Science." No one who weighs the conditions of this question can regard these general statements in the Acts as improbable in themselves or as detracting from the credibility of the book as a whole. The present writer can only assert his own conviction that those statements express just what must have occurred.

At the same time it must be frankly acknowledged that the general prevalence of such conditions must always lead to the too ready acceptance without investigation of particular instances; and that many of the individual cases would not stand rigorous scientific examination. Contributory causes would be traced in many such cases by a medical expert. Imposture and trading on pretended diseases would be detected in other cases. Yet none the less do even these examples of common delusion attest the reality of the curative influence. The public mind and body have as a whole been diseased, and they undergo a health-giving renovation. The impostor, who deludes the world with his pretended disease of body, is really diseased in soul; and it is no small thing that his mind should be cured and his life transformed into a healthy one. But most of the so-called impostors are physically diseased to some extent as well as morally diseased in their whole nature. All these cases furnish real proofs of the power which the new religious idea exerts on those whom it seizes. The medical expert would not label the disease and the cure exactly as the popular opinion does; but there is in each case a disease and a cure.

There is little, therefore, to gain by attempting to investigate each case. There is no proper evidence, and no sufficient

material to work on. We can lay no stress on many of the actual instances ; we must simply state them as vouched for by popular belief : the evidence is not such as to satisfy the critical judgment. Nor will modern judgment be convinced that, because a person who believes is cured, therefore his belief is truth. Belief in a delusion may sometimes produce a curative effect, though only in exceptional cases.

But a strong and general popular belief is a great power. The new idea as preached by the apostles had this great power supporting it and pushing it forward. And there was no pretence on the side of the apostles and of the Church. They felt and knew what a revolution they were making in the world. They saw with their own eyes that the souls and bodies of men were growing healthier around them ; and they knew that the cause was simply and solely belief in the Jesus whom they were preaching. Their own faith was made stronger by those cures, as well as the faith and character of the people that were cured.

Since the preceding and following paragraphs were written, I have read Dr. Schofield's remarkable article on "Spiritual Healing" in the *Contemporary Review*, March, 1909. While he differs in some matters from what I have said, and especially in admitting (and attesting from his own experience in a way that seems to me for the present to be conclusive) the existence of a healing power in some people which acts quite independently of any faith felt by the patient,¹ and also in setting apart from his discussion the whole range of the phenomena described in

¹ Some of my views as expressed recently on the necessity of faith in the patient would require to be revised on the ground of Dr. Schofield's evidence. But still there remains no doubt, even on his showing, that faith in the patient is an enormously potent influence, and by far the most common. Cure by the simple power of the healer must be always rare and exceptional. The record of a cure is more credible when it lays stress on the faith of the person cured.

the Acts as being cases of miraculous healing, yet any one who reads the article must, I think, conclude that in the essential point it confirms what I am contending for: viz. that those statements which are made in the Acts about wide and general healing produced by the apostles should not be set aside as incredible or as casting any doubt upon the trustworthiness of the history and the intelligence of the historian. With regard to "faith-healing" he strongly corroborates the view, which has been stated in the preceding pages of this article, that cure by faith affords in itself no direct proof of the truth of the thing believed in; but the indirect proof afforded by it, for which I contend, is, I think, entirely in the spirit of his remarks. Although I have made no change in what I have written, and leave the two different expositions to stand in their own form, I need hardly say that I bow humbly to Dr. Schofield's superior knowledge and more scientific way of stating the facts—with the solitary exception that I do not recognize the need or propriety of putting the narrative in the Acts out of discussion as recording a series of examples of a separate class, called "miraculous cures."

As we read the case of the lame man in chapter iii. 1-10, 12, 16; iv. 9-10, 14, 16, 21-22, we cannot but feel that we are reading the narrative related to Luke by an eye-witness¹ and recorded by Luke without any essential change. That eye-witness had seen the man holding Peter and John, unable to let them depart from him. He knew the popular belief that the man had been a cripple from his birth, forty years previously. He had not investigated evidence for that belief: no such evidence existed, and none was then needed. The people knew what they saw, and the apostles knew. The supreme Council of the Jews

¹ As already stated, I think that this eye-witness, evidently a man of education and intellectual power, was Philip the Evangelist.

regarded the facts as undeniable without accepting the inference that the teaching of Peter and John was true. A modern scientific man would investigate the facts before believing them; and even if his investigation justified the popular opinion fully, he would not, any more than the Council did, accept the inference that Peter and John were teaching the truth: he would probably say that the cure was effected by the belief which the people entertained, and not by the truth of the thing in which they believed. That opinion would be the diametrical opposite of the ancient opinion, which regarded the cure as the final and complete proof that the belief was true. Which opinion is nearest to the truth?

It must be admitted that the evidence in the case of Aeneas, ix. 32-34, is weaker than in the case of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful. The story does not so vividly convey the impression of being narrated by an eye-witness. It is far slighter and vaguer. There is no reference to what was after all the fundamental fact in this kind of cure, viz. faith. In this case we are brought nearer to the mere popular story, passing from mouth to mouth amid the congregations of Palestine; and such stories can never be ranked high as regards accuracy of detail. They only prove what were the general feeling and belief among the congregations.

If we knew who was Luke's authority, the story would at once acquire a more convincing character, even though it would still rank below the other. The speculation may be hazarded that Mnason was the authority. I believe that Luke has a historical purpose, when he names obscure individuals like Rhoda and Mnason; and in both these cases the reason is probably the same. They had been the sources of information to the historian. The common idea that Mnason was Paul's host in Jerusalem must be

abandoned; Paul and his company had a two days' journey at least to make between Caesareia and Jerusalem, 64 M.P., even with the help of horses; and they lodged for the night with Mnason. The journey is more fully described, and the details of the narrative analysed, elsewhere.¹ The place where they stayed was naturally Lydda; and the brethren from Caesareia who convoyed them so far, brought them to the house of Mnason.² Luke describes him as one of the early disciples, suggesting that he had been settled there for some time, perhaps one of those who had been scattered from Jerusalem after Stephen's death. He lived in Luke's memory and narrative as one of the authorities on whom the historian relied.

The episode of Tabitha-Dorcas is inferior in historicity to that of Aeneas. The authority is probably the same for both. The two towns were not far from one another, and the stories are connected. There is no reason to doubt that Peter was called to Joppa by Tabitha's relatives and neighbours. The uncertainty is with regard to her being really dead. No one can venture to claim that there is good evidence for that. The people believed her to be dead, and prepared her body for the grave. But how often is that done to persons who after all recover! And how often is premature burial suspected or proved to have occurred! In the Levant countries, where burial takes place with a celerity that seems to us revolting, there is far more opportunity for such errors to occur than with

¹ *Pauline and other Studies*, p. 266 f.

² The Western Text makes this quite clear; but even the Accepted Text is inconsistent with the vulgar translation. The order of events is: they began to make the upward journey to Jerusalem: they were entertained by Mnason: they reached Jerusalem. It is sheer mistranslation to put Mnason in Jerusalem; but those who do so quote Acts xxviii. 14-16 as an illustration, mistranslating it likewise. The meaning in the latter passage is: we came to the city-state Rome (whose bounds were in Southern Latium): we reached Forum Appii: we reached Three Taverns: we entered the city Rome (by the Porta Capena).

us.¹ Tabitha seems to have remained unburied for an unusually long time, in order that Peter might be sent for and have time to arrive. It is as absurd as it is unreasonable to stake the truth of Christian history on the correct judgment of Tabitha's friends as to her death. It is notoriously difficult for even the most experienced physicians to be quite certain that death has occurred. In the rustic East any person who falls and continues motionless for a time is assumed to be dead. That Luke heard the story as he relates it is quite sure. That Mnason and the world of Lydda and Joppa believed it is equally sure. Beyond this we cannot attain any certainty; and the right way is to confess that assurance is unattainable.

Closely connected with this topic of faith-cure and wide-spreading curative influence is a subject of very obscure character. The "laying on of hands" was an act to which evidently great importance was attached in the early Church and by the Apostle Paul or his circle.² It is sometimes curative (especially in the Gospels), sometimes ecclesiastical. The question must arise whether this act, as a part of ecclesiastical ritual, was regarded as purely symbolical, or as conveying with it some kind of authority or even of personal power. In the Gospels the Saviour often lays His hands on those to whom He gives power or imparts curative influence. It cannot be doubted that here the touch is regarded as really efficacious and not merely symbolical. When we read that sick people were laid where even Peter's shadow might fall on them (v. 15), and that Paul's hand-

¹ I have seen a case in which a man who fainted or died in the field was brought into the village, washed, mourned over, carried out, and buried within three hours; and I have never been able to shake off the feeling that he had merely fainted on a hot day: the feeling often returns to me by night.

² The act is mentioned by St. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles (which many would consider as originating from the circle of the Apostle rather than from himself), also by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

kerchiefs and aprons carried with them to a distance curative power (xix. 12), it is equally clear that the populace in Jerusalem and Ephesus believed in the efficacy of actual touch even in the second degree; and the probability is that Luke (and the circle of Paul's coadjutors along with him) were also believers.¹ Are we to suppose that Paul stood apart from the belief of his age and his circle? I cannot think so. They thought as he thought: the belief was common to the early Church as a whole. This subject, so far as it is ecclesiastical, will be more suitably treated in connexion with the Pastoral Epistles; and at present we restrict ourselves to remarking that the Acts in this respect approximates more closely to the Pastoral than to the other Pauline Epistles. The Pastoral Epistles are here nearer to the plane of feeling which characterized the circle of Paul, than that on which he himself stood; or shall we say that they form the transition from the pure and lofty Pauline teaching to the level of his associates?

In the episode of Ananias and Sapphira the intention to point a moral is so obvious as to force itself on the reader. This excites justifiable suspicion. In real history—and especially in the book of the Acts generally—the moral does not lie so openly on the surface. But here the purpose to bring out the contrast between honest real charity and dishonest pretence at charity is undeniable. The story is recorded, not for the sake of the importance of the facts in themselves, nor for the outstanding character of the

¹ It is to be noted that Dr. Schofield, in the article quoted above, mentions from his own experience similar examples which he considers indubitable. Very similar conduct may be seen at the present day in Asiatic Turkey. At Scutari, opposite Constantinople, the chief of the Dervishes treads on the sick to cure them; but, if the sick are very young children, he merely touches them with his hands and breathes upon them; and, if the invalids are unable to come, their garments are brought that he may touch them.

persons, nor as a stage in the growth of the Church or in the development of its organization, nor even from the simple desire to exemplify the power of the Spirit in the early congregation, but mainly for the sake of the moral which it teaches. Now this is the class of story which is most exposed to suffer as it lives on in Oriental tradition. There is an unavoidable tendency to drop out the points which do not serve the special purpose, and thereby to heighten the effect of the points which help to bring out the didactic purpose.¹ The story becomes a moral apologue, not because it is invented to bear the moral, but because it has lived through the moral which it bore and it was remembered only in so far as it was suited to impress this moral on the hearers of the story.

We are assuming that in certain real facts which occurred there lay a very evident moral, and that the early Church tradition preserved the memory of these facts for the sake of the moral, emphasizing it by selection and perhaps by slight modification. But the question requires to be investigated whether this moral may not have been observed and emphasized by Luke himself: in that case the fixing of the story belongs to a distinctly later period, and its historicity is proportionately diminished. On our assumption the story was fixed in the early Church, and recorded by Luke as he heard it about 57-59 A.D. A story whose type was fixed in that way stands on a much surer and firmer basis than one to which form was given by Luke himself at a period about A.D. 80 in a distant country and amid seriously altered circumstances.

That the form was given to it by Luke may be (and has been) maintained on the ground that the moral of the

¹ How often among ourselves, especially perhaps in University circles, do we observe the tendency in retailers of anecdotes, which are on the whole true, to avoid spoiling the effect of a story by injudicious adherence to exactness in the details.

story is very characteristic of that writer. It is true that he was specially interested in the poor, in charity, and in everything that seemed to teach the doctrine of the duty of the richer to share their possessions with the poorer. But the whole history of the Church in the early centuries shows that charity was much practised and was regulated as a Christian duty; and there is not the slightest reason to doubt Luke's authoritative account of the organization which was gradually created in the primitive Church for helping the poor.

There existed much poverty in Jerusalem, which was a city devoid of almost all opportunity of creating out of natural resources sufficient means of maintenance for the population which for various reasons tended to congregate there. In this city the attention of all must have been much directed to charitable efforts and charitable system. Luke found in the current ideas of the Church abundant matter which was akin to his own strong sympathy for the relief of poverty and distress. The whole story of the development of Church organization as primarily charitable was a natural memory in the congregation at Jerusalem; and this story was taken by Luke as he heard it. The fact was that, as the Church grew in numbers, some organization was necessary for efficiency and even for existence. There could not be an effective Church, unless it was well administered. The congregation, as it existed about 57-59 A.D., believed that the needs of the poor, and the desire of the Twelve to satisfy those needs well, had produced the first steps in organization, viz., the appointment of the Seven and the formation of a regular Church fund for charitable purposes. Luke accepted this belief and the account which was given him of the circumstances. He did not require to alter the account. The tone and belief of the Church in Jerusalem were in harmony with his own

ideas, but they were not invented by him in accordance with his ideas. No one could even suggest that the idea of binding close the new Church of Antioch, or later the new Churches of Asia, Macedonia and Galatia, to the old Church of Jerusalem, was invented by Luke. Yet there we see that the charitable motive supplies the strongest force to weld the whole Church together and to promote its organization.

The account of the facts, therefore, was given to Luke and not invented by him. It may be accepted as trustworthy. Some doubt might be felt whether there may not have been certain other causes, which co-operated to drive on the young congregation towards the gradual formation of a government within its own borders; but on consideration of the case we must reject such a supposition. The organization did not arise through conscious desire to institute a system of government, or through any aiming at an ideal form in the future. It sprang from the pressing needs of the moment, and each step in forming it was taken to suit the immediate occasion. Moreover in each step we trace the imitation of models existing in the world around, and the first steps did not lead in the direction which was ultimately taken. The appointment of the Seven was an experiment that caused no permanent custom. It was too Oriental: it resembled a college of priests, such as managed one of the Asiatic temples.¹ The forms in which the organization finally took shape were closer to the Græco-Roman type. Now as the organization grew in obedience to the dictates of occasion and need, there cannot be any doubt that the most pressing need was the one on which the record insists. The memory of the Church was not wrong in regarding charity and the feeding of the poor as the most urgent duty after the preaching

¹ *Cities and Bishops of Phrygia*, i. p. 293.

of the Gospel. As soon as the conversion of the world had begun, the first step in the young Church was to ensure that all its members were properly fed and cared for. Pity for want and suffering was the most fundamental, the oldest, the deepest, and the strongest feeling in the Christian mind; it sprang from the mind and life of Jesus; on it the Church is founded; and this motive forced the first steps in the creation of an administrative system.

So far as these considerations go, Luke's history stands on a firm basis as a record of what was remembered and thought about A.D. 57 in Jerusalem regarding the primitive Church; and the time that had elapsed since the events was too short to permit memory to grow very dim or facts to be invented. But, while we must regard Ananias and Sapphira as real persons, who suffered a sudden and terrible penalty, and who were remembered as a warning, their story was exposed to suffer from the cause which kept it fresh in the memory of the Church. No one cared to remember such obscure persons for their own sake. Everything about them sank into oblivion except the fact that they had combined to deceive the Church and had been punished for their act. Hence it is not easy to make out the exact facts about their fault. They had a property. They sold it. They brought part of the price as a donation to the Church fund. This property can hardly have been at Jerusalem, for in the publicity of Oriental life the price would in that case have been matter of common knowledge, whereas Luke was evidently under the impression that Peter's knowledge about the price was gained through Divine information—though he does not exactly say this. Moreover, if the price had been known generally, there would have been no deception and no crime; for Peter says that it was quite open to Ananias to retain the property as his own, and afterwards to keep the money as his own,

if he chose to do so. Ananias therefore seems to have appeared before the public assembly and to have pretended that he was, like Barnabas, giving to the Church fund the entire price of his property. This is not stated precisely, and it looks very much as if Luke was not quite free from the idea that it was a crime to retain any part of the price and that it was an imperative duty to give the whole. That would be an intrusion of personal Lukan feeling into the story ; but it is at least very slight, and not clear or certain. The words of Sapphira and of Peter, which are faithfully recorded, supply the corrective, and show what the facts were.

Incidentally, we notice that words and speeches in this part of the Acts are our best authority. They are most correctly remembered and recorded. Statements of fact are more liable to modification. This is an extremely important point in the critical study of the Acts.

We must also notice that in several other places Luke's personal opinions, i.e. the ideas of the period when the book of the Acts was actually composed (i.e. about A.D. 80), can be traced in the work, although as a whole it reflects most accurately the views and thoughts of the original authorities about A.D. 57-9. Among these later and personal ideas I would reckon, for example, the insistence on community of goods in the early Church, Acts ii. 45, iv. 32. These expressions are so strong that taken alone they would be counted, and have often been counted, sufficient to prove that the principle of absolute community of property was accepted in the primitive Church. But they are contradicted by the narrative generally ; and they must be regarded as too emphatic statements by Luke of his own impression and opinion. If the principle had been universally held as fundamental in the Church, it would be useless to record Barnabas's individual act of

charitable sacrifice, iv. 36-37, as deserving special note or praise. And Peter expressly contradicts that principle in his words of rebuke to Ananias. It was open to all to treat their own property as their own, only remembering always that the poor had a strong claim upon them.

One must also think that the celerity and secrecy of the burial of Ananias have been over-coloured. It is so repugnant to custom and feeling in the East to bury any person without letting his own family attend to the corpse and mourn over it, that one can hardly accept the record as literally accurate. True Christianity never tramples on the deep-seated and justifiable feelings of human nature; it strengthens and encourages them. The tradition in the Church, like all Oriental popular tradition, here sacrifices exactitude in striving for emphasis.

But such slight modifications do not interfere with the credibility of the narrative as a whole. This was the first example of punishment for sin in the congregation, the first occasion on which the baser feelings of human nature intruded themselves publicly into congregational work, and the difficulties of managing ordinary men and keeping them up to a uniformly high level of conduct were brought strongly before the notice of the people. And it occurred within less than two years after the Resurrection.

Another place in which we may recognize the hand and the point of view of Luke is xiv. 22, "exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God." Some scholars have inferred from this that Luke was one of those who were listening to Paul's exhortations in the Galatian cities. This opinion is based on the "We-Passages" in the later chapters, where indubitably the first personal plural pronoun is used to intimate the personal presence of Luke in the scenes described. But in those later passages the "We" has a

different character: it is evidently part of a narrative recording the travel and personal experiences of a small number of persons. Here the word means "we Christians" as a body. The author of the book feels the truth of this so strongly that he associates himself with the speaker and the audience and the whole body of the Church. We must gather that at the time when he was writing this truth was strongly impressed on him by the position of the Christians: in other words, he was writing during a period of persecution. Now in one way or another persecution, milder or graver, was the lot of the Christians continuously from 64 A.D. onwards, and before that intermittently but always in some part or another of the Church. The reason for this unusual touch of personal sympathy in the teaching doubtless lies in the fact that at the time the general state of persecution was specially accentuated by the Roman State.¹ But it is quite unjustifiable to place this use of "we Christians" on a level with the other use of "we," where it is found denoting "our little company of travellers and missionaries" in the sequel of the book.²

This passage has tempted the Bezan Reviser to make his remarkable addition in xi. 27-28, where Luke is made to speak as one of the congregation present at Syrian Antioch. It is evident that the Reviser (who was probably at work as early as the second century) understood xiv. 22 in the way which we have rejected. He regarded Luke as having been Paul's constant companion from the day when he

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 123.

² Mr. Bartlet in his *Commentary on the Acts* accepts my interpretation of "we" in this passage as "we Christians," and "as expressing a maxim of the Christian life which he himself strongly realized and to which he had special reason for wishing to direct attention in his own day." It is therefore, strange that he should quote it on his p. 21 and elsewhere as a proof that Luke speaks as one who was listening to Paul in the Galatian audiences. You must choose one meaning or the other. You cannot have both.

was brought by Barnabas to Antioch onwards. This opinion we can only regard as erroneous; it is contrary to the evidence that can be gathered from Luke's own words; but evidently it was widely spread in ancient times, and isolated manifestations of it have often been quoted by modern scholars as authority for various details in the life of Luke.

The apostles are mentioned in viii. 1 as remaining in Jerusalem through the storm of persecution, although the rest of the congregation was scattered abroad. This statement has been often understood as implying that the whole Twelve remained there; but that seems to be a false understanding of the words. The author of the Acts had a strong interest in the method of administration and government of the early Church: had he not possessed this interest, he would not have been such a good historian. He fully recognized that "the Apostles" were the original governing body of the central Church, and that subsequently in Jerusalem, and from the first in other places, the governing body of the local Church and of the Universal Church came to be different in constitution: there could never be any new apostles in the higher sense of the word after those who "have companied with us from the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us" had died out. We have inferred from the language put in Peter's mouth i. 17, 20, that Luke understood the bishops and deacons (as found in his own Philippian Church) to be the substitutes who had succeeded there to the authority of the apostles.

There are several passages in which this use of "the apostles," indicating merely "the supreme governing body in so far as its members were present in Jerusalem," gives the key to understand rightly the general sense. For example, in Acts ix. 27, Barnabas took Saul "and brought

him to the apostles." All that Luke intends here to say is that Barnabas introduced Saul to the heads of the Church (so far as they were present at the time in Jerusalem), and guaranteed his good faith. Accordingly the narrative proceeds that Saul "was with them going in and going out." This does not imply that the Twelve were always together and Saul with them during his visit ; but merely that Saul was in perfectly friendly and confidential relations with the leaders of the Church, communicating with them as occasion required. Paul himself tells us that he saw none of the apostles on this occasion except Peter and James (Gal. i. 18-20) ; and there is no inconsistency between the two statements and no reason even to infer that Luke was ignorant of the exact facts, which he had doubtless often heard from Paul himself. The apostles were probably much absent from Jerusalem ; and Acts ix. 32 is typical of a general fact among them.

From this frequent absence arose the headship of one of the great apostles, viz. James, whose sphere of action lay specially in Jerusalem. The new condition of government had evidently come into force before A.D. 44, when " James and the Brethren " are mentioned. It would be as fallacious to infer from this that none of the other apostles were in Jerusalem in the spring of 44, as it would be to argue from viii. 1 that the whole Twelve continued stationary in Jerusalem after the death of Stephen. The same state of things certainly ruled in the Church at Jerusalem about A.D. 49-50, as we may gather from xv. 19 : though " the apostles and elders " are usually mentioned as acting on that occasion. The same was the case in A.D. 57 (Acts xxi. 17-18).

In general, the governing body of the local Church acted for the Church ; and in xiii. 2-3 it is assuredly the governing body which chooses out two of its own number and lays

hands on them.¹ Mr. Bartlet says well that "the whole Church, in a meeting at which the dismissal took place, was conceived to act in the prayer and acts of its most gifted members, 'the prophets and teachers' (compare xiv. 27, the report to the Church)."

A modern scholar contrasts the great amount of attention devoted to Syrian Antioch in the Acts with the scanty references to that city in the Pauline Epistles, and draws some inferences from it. I have mentioned elsewhere that this argument cannot stand examination.² But it may be added to what is said there that, considering the epoch-making importance of Antioch in the development of the Church as the first Gentile congregation and the mother of all the Churches of Galatia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia, the remarkable feature in the book is that so little space is devoted to the foundation and development of this Church. Compare the space given to the beginning of the Church in Samaria, or to the episode of Cornelius, with the space assigned to Syrian Antioch!

I may take this opportunity of drawing attention to a new piece of evidence bearing on the chronology of the Acts and of St. Paul's life, which has strangely escaped general notice, though it was published so long ago as 1905. It was only in the winter of 1906-7 that I learned that M. Emil Bourguet had published³ the long-desired inscription which gives the date when Gallio governed the Province of Achaia. The text is unfortunately much mutilated, and the full meaning cannot be recovered; but the most important points for Pauline chronology are practically certain, (1) the document was a letter sent by the Emperor Claudius when he bore the title Imperator XXVI., i.e. A.D.

¹ I rather think that I once erred in this matter; but I at present am without the means of verifying.

² *Luke the Physician*, i.

³ *De Rebus Delphicis Imperatoris Aetatis*, 1905, p. 63.

52, to the city of Delphi, (2) he mentions Junius Gallio his friend and proconsul of Achaia.¹

The date depends on the time when the twenty-sixth salutation as Emperor was accorded to Claudius.² This is not known exactly ; but according to M. Cagnat's tables, that Emperor was still only Emperor XXIV. at the beginning of A.D. 52, and was Emperor XXVII. before the end of the same year.³ Therefore the date must be some time during that year, and presumably not too early (for victories in war causing successive salutations xxv., xxvi., xxvii., would naturally take place in the time of summer). Gallio therefore governed Achaia in the year 52-3, entering on office according to the usual custom in the spring of the year.

In my paper on Pauline Chronology,⁴ the residence of the apostle in Corinth is placed October A.D. 51 to February 53. This suits exactly the evidence of the inscription. The trial before Gallio occurred some considerable time before Paul left Corinth (Acts xviii. 18). On the other hand it is equally evident that Paul had resided some considerable time in Corinth before the trial occurred. We may fairly presume that it took place in the summer or autumn of A.D. 52. Further, Paul found that Aquila and Priscilla had arrived in Corinth not long before he came there, after their expulsion from Rome by Claudius. The expulsion, according to Orosius, occurred in A.D. 50:⁵ if

¹ The words "friend," "of Achaia," and the "Ju" of "Junius," are all restorations.

² Claudius was Imp. XXVII. on December 11, 52 (C.I.L. III. *Dipl.* I.), and he was Imp. XXV. in that year (C.I.L. III. 13880): the latter date depends on Mommsen's restoration of the number of the Tribunician authority, but can hardly be doubted.

³ The number of his Tribunician authority is lost.

⁴ *Pauline and other Studies*, pp. 361, 365, making more precise the chronology stated in *St. Paul the Traveller*.

⁵ The principle of Orosius's dating by years of Nero is often misunderstood, and wrong dates assigned as his.

we suppose that it occurred late in the year, this would suit their arrival in spring 51. We do not know that Aquila came direct to Corinth from Rome, without visiting any other city, but it is evident from Luke's words that any such visit must have been brief.

The inscription is irreconcilable with Mr. C. H. Turner's chronology. He places the residence of Paul in Corinth from late in 50 to the spring of 52. It is still more completely irreconcilable with Professor Harnack's system, according to which Paul was in Corinth A.D. 48-50. It is reconcilable with Lightfoot's view that the residence in Corinth was A.D. 52-54; but the adherents of Lightfoot have to reject Orosius's date as valueless, and they must suppose that the trial before Gallio took place rather soon after Paul's arrival. Gallio's year of office would naturally run from April 52 to April 53; and there is great probability that it was cut short by his illness and voyage to Egypt for health: while Paul on this system only arrived in Corinth in the late autumn of 52.

There remains for Mr. Turner's chronology always the supposition that Gallio governed the Province Achaia for more than one year, and that the letter of Claudius was sent in the second year of the Proconsul's tenure of office. The ordinary tenure of Provinces (especially Senatorial or proconsular Provinces) was one year; but there are occasional instances of tenure for a second year. But the safe plan in chronological reasoning is to follow the general rule, and refuse to have recourse to exceptions without clear evidence in their favour. Here, however, as in almost all chronological questions in ancient history, the reasoning falls short of certainty; and those who are bent on supporting any view can always constrain the evidence to suit themselves by a liberal allowance of exceptions to the general practice.

W. M. RAMSAY.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.*

XV.

ἡλικία.—Luke xix. 3 is the only N.T. passage where this word *must* mean “ stature ”; apart from it (and the rather different Eph. iv. 13) the N.T. represents the general *usus loquendi* of our vernacular sources. We are indeed unable to quote any example from these in which “ stature ” is the natural meaning, and hardly any in which it is possible; while for “ age ” we can present a long list. No one who had read the papyri could question what meaning the word bore in ordinary parlance. We must not yield to the temptation of discussing its meaning in “ Q ”; but we cannot resist expressing amazement that anyone could call it ἐλάχιστον (Luke xii. 26) to add half a yard to one’s height! The *Twentieth Century* translators boldly render “ Which of you, by being anxious, can prolong his life a moment ? ”—and we cannot but applaud them. That worry *shortens* life is the fact which adds point to the irony. The desire to turn a six-footer into a Goliath is rather a bizarre ambition.†—One inscriptional quotation should be given, as a most interesting parallel to Luke ii. 52: *Syll.* 325¹⁸ (i/B.C.) ὑπεστήσατό τε ἡλικία προκόπτων καὶ προαγόμενος εἰς τὸ θεοσεβεῖν ὡς ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ πρῶτον μὲν ἐτείμησεν τοὺς θεοὺς κ.τ.λ. The inscription—in honour of a wealthy young citizen of Istropolis, near the mouth of the Danube—has many words interesting to N.T. students.

ἡμέρα.—The phrase πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας (Matt. xxviii. 20) may be illustrated from an important Ephesian inscription of ii/A.D., *Syll.* 656⁴⁹, διὸ [δεδόχθαι ἱερ]ὸν τὸν μῆνα τὸν

* For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) ΕΧΡΟΙΣΤΟΒ, pp. 170, 262.

† Is it superfluous to refer to Wetstein’s admirable argument and his citations ?

Ἀρτεμισιῶνα εἶ[ναι πάσας τ]ὰς ἡμέρας. It is accordingly a vernacular Greek expression—"perpetually"; though one does not willingly drop the suggestiveness of the literal translation in the Great Commission, the daily Bread from heaven given day by day.

ἡρεμος.—Lest Paul should be credited with a literary word in 1 Tim. ii. 2, we may quote BU 1019² (ii/A.D.) . . . σω]φροσύνη(?) ἱκανὸν χρόνον ἡρεμίας μετῆλθεν.

θανάσιμος.—The phrase in [Mark] xvi. 18 may be paralleled by one from a *defixio* from Cnidus, *Syll.* 815², where a woman devotes to Demeter and Kore τὸν κατ' ἐμοῦ εἶπαντα ὅτι ἐγὼ τῶι ἐμῶι ἄνδρι φάρμακα ποιῶ θανά[σιμα]—if the restoration is sound.

θείος.—With θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως in 2 Pet. i. 4 may be compared the very remarkable inscription *Syll.* 757 (not later than Augustus). It is in honour of Αἰών, and strongly suggests Mithraism, though Dittenberger dissents from the connexion. VV. 7^{-end} must be quoted entire: Αἰὼν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς αἰεὶ φύσει θεῖαι μένων κόσμος τε εἰς κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, ὁποῖος ἔστι καὶ ἦν καὶ ἔσται, ἀρχὴν μεσότητα τέλος οὐκ ἔχων, μεταβολῆς ἀμέτοχος, θείας φύσεως ἐργάτης αἰωνίου <κατὰ (?)> πάντα. Cf. *Notes* v., pp. 173 f. On the "imperial" connotation of the word (=Latin *divinus*) see Deissmann, *Licht v. Osten* p. 252; also cf. BU 473¹⁵ τῶν θείων διατάξεων, referring to an immediately preceding re-script of the Emperor Septimius Severus. See *Archiv* i. 162.

θειότης.—*Syll.* 656³¹ (ii/A.D.—see above under ἡμέρα) declares that Artemis has made Ephesus ἀ[πασῶν τῶν πόλεων] ἐνδοξοτέραν διὰ τῆς ἰδίας θειότητος. The context is an expansion of the last clause in Acts xix. 27. In *Syll.* 420²³ we read of the θειότης of Jovius Maximinus Daza (305–313 A.D.), one of the last Caesars to claim this empty and blasphemous title. Dittenberger's Index (p. 196) gives a good many instances of the abstract neuter τὸ θεῖον (Acts xvii. 29).

θεόπνευστος.—*Syll.* 552¹² (ii/B.C.) opens a decree in connexion with the Parthenon at Magnesia with the words *θείας ἐπιπνοίας καὶ παραστάσεως γενομένης τῷ σύνπαντι πλήθει τοῦ πολιτεύματος εἰς τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τοῦ ναοῦ*—a divine “inspiration and desire” which has impelled the people to arise and build to the glory of Artemis.

θεραπεύω.—The most effective point which Harnack (*Luke the Physician*, pp. 15 f.) has gleaned after Hobart is his proof that Luke practised in Melita (Acts xxviii. 10 “honoured us with many honours”). To this Sir W. M. Ramsay (*Exp.* VII. ii. p. 493) has added the note that *θεραπεύειν* means precisely “to treat” rather than “to heal.” A good example of this occurs at the end of the great inscription from the Asclepieum at Epidaurus, *Syll.* 802 (iii/B.C.), where of a *παῖς αἰδής* it is said *οὗτος ὑπαρ ὑπὸ κυνὸς τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν θεραπεύόμενος τοὺς ὀπτίλλους ὑγιῆς ἀπῆλθε*. Four or five centuries later a similar inscription from the same place (*Syll.* 804²⁰) has *τεθεράπευσαι, χρὴ δὲ ἀποδιδόναι τὰ ἴατρα*, “you have been treated, and you must pay the physician’s fee”; the actual healing is to follow.

Θευδάς.—This name occurs in a sepulchral inscription from Hierapolis, *Syll.* 872, where Flavius Zeuxis, *ἐργαστής*,* has two sons, Flavius Theodorus and Flavius Theudas. On the ordinary assumption (Lightfoot on Col. iv. 15) this would be like having a Theodore and a Teddy as baptismal names of brothers. Are we to infer that Theudas is short for something else, say Theodotus? To judge without an exhaustive study, the abbreviated names were used together with the full forms much as they are with us: thus Acusilaus in TbP 409 (5 A.D.) is Acūs on the back of the letter, and in OP 119 (ii/iii A.D.) young Theon calls himself Theonas in the address.

* Query a *frumentarius*: he speaks of his seventy-two voyages past Cape Malea to Italy. His name suggests a late date in i/A.D., or not far on in ii/.

θηρσκειά.—The already quoted *Syll.* 656 describes as *θηρσκειά* the keeping of the month Artemision as sacred to the tutelary goddess. This fits the characteristic meaning of a word which denotes the *externals* of religion; hence its special appropriateness in James i. 26—no other “ritual” counts with God!

θριαμβεύω.—A cognate verb appears in BU 1061¹⁹ (14 B.C.) *περὶ ὧν καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Σιναρὺ παρεδόθησαν καὶ πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐκθριαμβισθῆναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀπε[λύθησαν]*, “for which crimes they were delivered up [to the authorities—cf. Mark i. 14] in Sinary itself, and were released in order that the affair should not be noised abroad.” (So Dr. A. S. Hunt, who kindly notes for us Basil, *De Spir. Sanct.* c. xxvii., *ἐκθριαμβεύειν*, and Photius, who glosses *θριαμβεύσας* with *δημοσιεύσας*.) This meaning is obviously allied to that in 2 Cor. ii. 14, “to make a show of,” and contributes additional evidence against the impossible rendering of the A.V. (*cf. Field in loc.*).

θυματήριον.—Some quotations may be given from *Syll.* In the context quoted above, 804¹⁹, the patient in the Asclepieum sees *παιδάριον ἡγείσθαι θ. ἔχον ἀτμίζον*: it is *censer* here, obviously. The same seems to be the case in 583¹² (i/A.D.)—so Dittenberger—and 588²⁸ (ii/B.C.), though there is nothing decisive: naturally in many contexts we cannot say whether the *censer* was fixed or movable. So also 734¹²⁴. The Arcadian 939¹⁶ has the noun *θυμίαμα*, in plural.

Ίάειρος.—It may be noted that the name occurs in one of Wilcken’s ostraka, no. 1231, of Ptolemaic age.

ιατρός.—*Syll.* 857, a dialect inscription from Delphi, of the middle of ii/B.C., is a deed of sale to Apollo Pythius—cf. the striking section on this usage in Deissmann’s *Licht vom Osten*. Dionysius by this form manumits Damon, a slave physician, who has apparently been practising in

partnership with his master. So at least we should judge from the concluding provision: *εἰ δὲ χρεῖαν ἔχοι Διονύσιος, συνιατρευέτω Δάμων μετ' αὐτοῦ ἔτη πέντε*, receiving board, and lodging and clothes. The early papyrus HbP 102 (248 B.C.) indicates that there was under the Ptolemies a tax (*ἰατρικόν*) for the maintenance of public physicians: in this case the payment (in money or kind) is made direct to the doctor. These two citations show that the profession practised in antiquity with a wide variety in status.

ιδιώτης.—In *Syll.* 847¹⁶ (Delphi, 185 B.C.) the witnesses to a manumission (form as above) are the priest, two representatives of the *ἄρχοντες*, and five *ιδιώται*, private citizens. The adjective *ιδιωτικός* similarly is used for “private” as opposed to *δημόσιος* (private debts, G.M. iii. p. 149⁸, of 211 A.D.—a private bank, *ib.* p. 137²¹, i/A.D.).

ίματίζω.—“Found neither in LXX nor in prof. auth.,” says Grimm. TbP 385¹⁵ (117 A.D.), *Ἡρωνος ίματίζοντος τὸν παῖδα*, and BM iii. p. 149 *bis* (211 A.D.) with same use of active “to provide clothing for,” will dispel any idea that Mark coined this word. The derivative *ίματισμός* is common.

ίος.—*Syll.* 587³¹⁰ (329 B.C.), *σίδηρος καταβεβρωμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰοῦ*, illustrates the special sense of *rust*, found in Jas. v. 3 etc. Grimm’s astonishing statement that this obvious cognate of Latin *virus* (Zend *vaeḍa*) has “very uncert. deriv.,” is a good example of the ways of the old etymologists, who strained out gnats, but could stomach any number of camels.

ίστορέω.—The only N.T. sense of this word (Gal. i. 18) is paralleled in the interesting scrap of a (i/A.D.) traveller’s letter, B.M. iii. p. 206, where it is twice used of sight-seeing—*ίνα τὰς χε[ι]ροπ[οι]ή[τους τέ]χνας ίστορήσωσι*, and again with an object that is not quite clear. It is used often thus in Letronne’s Egyptian inscriptions (as 201), once being translated *inspexi*.

ἰσχύω.—The special use in Heb. ix. 17, Gal. v. 6, occurs in TbP 286⁷ (ii/A.D.) *νομὴ ἄδικος [οὐ]δὲν εἰσχύει*, “unjust possession is invalid.” Its ordinary meaning “to be able,” without the idea of *strength* coming in, may be seen early in EP 17²³ (223 B.C.) *διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰσχύειν αὐτοὺς καταβαλεῖν τὰς λοιπὰς ἀναφοράς*, “to pay the remaining imposts.”

ἴχνος.—*Syll.* 325⁶ (i/B.C.)—the interesting inscription cited above under *ἡλικία*—has a good parallel for Rom. iv. 12 and 1 Pet. ii. 21: the excellent young man who is the hero of the laudation comes of a patriotic and pious stock, *καὶ αὐτὸς στοιχεῖν βουλόμενος καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων ἴχνεσιν ἐπιβαίνειν*. The agreement with the N.T. use of *στοιχεῖν* may be noted in advance: its nearness to *περιπατεῖν* helps to reduce the Semitism so confidently claimed for the latter, and provisionally conceded in *Proleg.* 11. The literal use of *ἴχνος* may be illustrated by the tax *ἴχνους ἐρημοφυλακία*, for maintaining the desert “police” who protected caravans: see introd. to FP 67.

Ἴωνάθας.—This name, found in the exceedingly plausible reading of D at Acts iv. 6, occurs in PP iii. 7¹⁵ with reference to a certain Apollonios, *ὃς καὶ Συριστὶ Ἴωνάθας καλεῖται*.

καθαρός.—The word and its derivatives have a wide range of use, being applied physically to land, grain, bread, etc., and metaphorically to “freedom” from disadvantages of various kinds. The old idea that *καθαρός ἀπό* is “Hebraistic” has been sufficiently exploded; but HbP 84⁶ (301 B.C.) *σίτον καθαρὸν ἀπὸ πάντων* is a peculiarly satisfactory new quotation, coming as it does from one of the oldest Greek papyri known.* In BM III. p. 110¹⁷ (iii/A.D.) there seems to be a similar use with *ψιλός*. On the higher pagan developments of “purity” cf. *Notes* iv. p. 56; and add the inter-

* Cf. also LIP 13³ (244 B.C.) *τοῦ σίτου καθαροῦ ἔντος*, and the editor's explanation of *κάθαρσις*.

esting inscription *Syll.* 567 (ii/A.D.) prescribing the conditions of entrance to a temple : *πρῶτον μὲν καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, χεῖρας καὶ γνώμην καθαρὸς καὶ ὑγιεῖς ὑπάρχοντας καὶ μηδὲν αὐτοῖς δεινὸν συνειδότας.* There follow *τὰ ἐκτός*—one thinks of Matt. xxiii. 26 : after eating pease-pudding (*ἀπὸ φακῆς*) an interval of three days is prescribed, after goat's flesh three, after cheese one, after practising abortion forty, after the death of a relation forty, after lawful sexual intercourse they may come the same day when sprinkled and anointed with oil. The tariff is curious, and the mixture on the same lines of ritual impurity and foul crime : it is an illustration of the four prohibitions in the Apostolic Decree.

καινός.—Papyrus usage hardly tends to sharpen the distinction between *καινός* and *νέος*. In PP III 80 a town named Ptolemais is *Πτ. ἡ καινή*, while in *ib.* 72 it is *Πτ. ἡ νέα*. PP III. 22 has *χῶμα καινόν* contrasted with *χ. παλαιόν* : *ii.* 14 has *πρὸς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς καινῆς καταλύσεως*, “new quarters.” *Ostr.* 1142 gives us *οἶνος καινός* to contrast with *οἶνος νέος* in Mark ii. 22. TbP 342¹⁶ (ii/A.D.) *τὸ κατασκευασθὲν ἐκ καινῆς ἐν Σομολῶ κεραμεῖον*, “the newly fitted potters at Somolo.” Two inventories of iii/A.D., TbP 405⁸, 406¹⁷, mention “a new basket” and “a new linen kerchief” : it may be doubted whether stress is to be laid on their being hitherto unused, though perhaps of ancient manufacture. The “New Testament” in Pallis’ edition is *ἡ νέα διαθήκη*, which suggests that the other word progressively yielded its territory to its rival.

κακία.—For the meaning “trouble,” as in Matt. vi. 34 (Aquila in Ps. xci. 10), cf. Rein P 7¹⁵ (ii/B.C.) *τῶι μηδεμίαν ἔννοιαν κακίας ἔχειν*, “because I had no suspicion of mischief.”

κακόω.—TbP 407⁹ (199 A.D.) [*εὖ ποιήσεις*] *μὴ κακώσασα*, “you will do well not to interfere” (edd.), shows this word in vernacular use in rather a different sense (intransitive).

κακῶς.—The combination κακὸς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτοῦς in Matt. xxi. 41 sounds rather literary to us. But cf. ὁ τούτων τι ποιῶν κακὸς κακῇ ἐξωλεία ἀπόλοιτο in *Syll.* 584, which Michel doubtfully assigns to i/B.C. The inscription is from Smyrna, apparently from a temple of Atergatis, whose sacred fishes are protected by this portentous curse: he who injures them is to die, ἰχθυόβρωτος γενόμενος. (Cf. the formation of the adj. σκωληκόβρωτος, Acts xii. 23). It seems clear that the collocation κακὸς κακῶς ἀπολέσθαι, starting as a literary phrase, had been perpetuated in common parlance, like our stock quotations from Shakespeare.

κανών.—One or two citations for this difficult word may be useful. Par. P 63 (Ptolemaic) ἐπαγαγόντα τὸ δισταζόμενον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκκείμενον κανόνα, is rendered by Mahaffy (PP vol. iii. p. 22) "if he applied the doubtful cases to the rule provided for him." Wilcken (*Ostr.* i. 378) says that after Diocletian κανών means ordinary taxes. *Syll.* 540¹⁰³ (175/1 B.C.) ποιῶν ὀρθὰ πάντα πρὸς κανόνα διηνεκῆ shows κ. in its original use as a straight rod. Dr. Rouse tells us he attended a sale of some leases of church property in the island of Astypalaea in 1905. "Bills of sale describing each plot were on the wall; and when I asked what these were, I was told, εἶνε ὁ κανονισμός." He suggests that κανών may have meant the "official description" of anything: he would apply this in 2 Cor. x. 13.

καταδυναστεύω.—The rather generalised use of this verb in Acts x. 38 is illustrated by PP III 36 verso καταδεδυνάστεύμαι (*sic*—the writer wished to change the tense) ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ λιμῶι παραπολλύμενος, "I am being harshly treated in the prison, perishing from hunger": though the agent in Acts *l.c.* is the devil, the reference is to the physical sufferings attributed to possession.

κατάκριμα.—See Deissmann *B.S.* 264 f, and *Notes* i. p. 275. Add TbP 298⁶⁵ (107 A.D.), where the edd. remark that

κατακρίματα = fines, comparing *ib.* 363¹⁵ (ii/A.D.), AP 114⁸, (*do.*), FP 66¹ (ii/iii A.D.), BU 471⁹ (ii/A.D.—*ὑπὸ κριμάτων*, clearly in same sense): these fines were collected by *πράκτορες* normally (cf. Luke xii. 58). We may add BU 1048¹³ (time of Nero)—the passage is fragmentary, but the context suggests the same meaning. It follows that this word does not mean *condemnation* but the punishment following sentence, so that the “earlier lexicographers” mentioned by Deissmann were right. This not only suits Rom. viii. 1 excellently, as Deissmann notes, but it materially helps the exegesis of Rom. v. 16, 18. There is no adequate antithesis between *κρίμα* and *κατάκριμα*, for the former never suggests a trial ending in acquittal. If *κατάκριμα* means the *result* of the *κρίμα*, the “penal servitude” from which *οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* are delivered (viii. 1), *δικαίωμα* represents the “restoration” of the criminal, the fresh chance given him. The antithesis is seen better in ver. 18, for *δικαίωσις* is “a process of absolution, carrying with it life” (SH), which exactly answers to *κατάκριμα*, the permanent imprisonment for a debt we cannot pay: Matt. xviii. 34 is the picture of this hopeless state.

καταλαμβάνω.—Many of the N.T. meanings of this common verb can be paralleled from our sources. *Syll.* 933^{aa} (iv/B.C.), [οἶδε] *κατέλαβον τὴν χώραν καὶ ἐτείχιξάν τὴν πόλιν*—the names follow of colonists who “appropriated” the land: this is Paul’s regular use of the verb in active and passive. “To overtake,” of evils, as in John xii. 35 and assuredly (we think) in i. 5, is the meaning in *Syll.* 214¹⁴ (iii/B.C.) *καὶ νῦν δὲ καιρῶν (crises) καθειληφότων ὁμοίων τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν*. 1 Thess. v. 4 may be illustrated by *Syll.* 803¹⁴ (Epidaurus, iii/B.C.) *μεταξὺ δὲ ἡμέρα ἐπικαταλαμβάνει*. For “catching” in a crime (as [John] viii. 3) cf. BU 1024 iii¹¹ (iv/v A.D.) *γυναῖκα καταλημφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐδικημένος (i.e. ἡδικημένου) μετὰ μούχου*, also LIP 3⁵⁸ (iii/B.C.) of oil-sellers caught selling at an illegal price.

καταπονοῦμαι.—BU 1060²⁴ (14 B.C.) ὄθεν καταπεπονημένοι προήγμεθα πρὸς ἀπειλαῖς (*sc.* -άς) seems to mean definite ill-treatment of which the petitioners complain. This is the meaning in Acts vii. 24. Can we not recognize it in 2 Pet. ii. 7? It is not mental distress that is referred to here—that comes in ver. 8—but the threatened violence of Gen. xix. 9. The conative present shows that the angels' rescue (ἐρύσατο) was in time.

καταφρονέω.—In *Notes* iii. it was shown that the verb regularly denotes scorn acted upon, not merely kept within the mind. Add *Syll.* 930³⁶ (112 B.C.) καταφρονήσαντες, the decree of the Senate and the Praetor and the congress of craftsmen (τεχνῖται, as in Acts xix. 24), they went off to Pella and entered into negotiations, etc.

κατέχω.—See *Thess.* pp. 155-7.

κατοπτρίζω.—*Syll.* 802⁶⁴ (ii/B.C.), ἀπονίφασθαι τὸ πρόσωπον ἀπὸ τᾶς κρίνας καὶ ἐγκατοπτρίξασθαι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ means of course "to look at his reflection in the water." It would perhaps be too fanciful to apply this prevailing sense of the middle in 2 Cor. iii. 18, making the glory of the Lord the mirror which reveals our own darkness and then floods that darkness with light.

κῆνσος.—An earlier example of this Latin word in Greek (Mark xii. 14 *al.*) occurs in an inscription from Bizye, which Mr. Hasluck who publishes it (*Annual of British School at Athens*, xii. 178) dates in i/B.C.

κλίβανος.—PP III 140 (*d*), ξύλα κλιβάνωι, a furnace fed with logs of wood, the κλιβάνωι being inserted above the line.

κλίνη.—See *Notes* i. (p. 279) and iii. In *Syll.* 877²² (about 420 B.C.) the word occurs (*ex suppl.*) meaning *bier*: so in Thucydides and Plato. Had we later authority, it would be tempting to apply this in Rev. ii. 22.

κοιμάω.—In *Mélanges Nicole* p. 181 Professor Goodspeed

gives a wooden tablet "probably for school use," in which this distich is repeated several times:—

ὧ μὴ δέδωκεν ἡ τύχη κοιμωμένῳ
μάτην δραμεῖται κὰν ὑπὲρ Λάδαν δράμη.

The thought is parallel with that of Psalm cxxvii. 2, when read, as R.V. *margin*, "So he giveth to his beloved *in sleep*."

κοινωνία.—It is worth noting that the word is used specially of the closest of all human fellowships: BU 1051⁹ (Augustus' reign, a marriage contract) *συνεληλυθέναι ἀλλήλοις πρὸς βίου κοινωνίαν*, and so the coeval 1052⁷. So the verb, PFi 36 (iv/A.D.), *ἑτέρα γυναικὶ κοινωνήσαντος*. We have the phrase *κατὰ κοινωνίαν* with gen., "belonging in common to," as PFi 41 (140 A.D.) *al.* In *Syll.* 300⁵⁴ (170 B.C.) *κοινωνία* denotes a commercial partnership: see note there. Dittenberger's index (p. 347) gives several examples of *κοινωνεῖν* with temples, mysteries or rites as the object. The N.T. usage is fully discussed by Dean Armitage Robinson in Hastings' *DB.* i. p. 460 ff.

κομφῶς.—See the new note in *Proleg.*³ 248.

κόσμος.—Nero's speech to the Greeks, *Syll.* 376³¹, *τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κύριος*, is an early example of the meaning "earth" or "world." For "adornment" there are several instances.

κράβατος.—See *Notes* i. p. 276. It is interesting to note that TbP 406¹⁹ (266 A.D.) has the spelling *κράβακτος*, characteristic of *κ*. So the late GH 111³², *κραβάκτιον*, with the editor's note. In *Mélanges Nicole* p. 184 a probably Ptolemaic ostrakon shows *κράβατος*.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

*HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE FIRST
EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.*

SECTION I. PURPOSE OF THE LETTER.

THE suppressed clause in the beginning of the letter (i. 3) contains and conceals (so to say) the purpose which the writer had in mind. The most familiar fact to those who have to study the intimate correspondence of ancient writers possessed of literary power, such as Cicero and his friends, is the frequency of such suppression of an important verb or half sentence. The correspondent to whom the letter was addressed knew what was meant; and the suppression was due to the fact that comprehension on the part of the reader could be counted on with perfect confidence. The meaning of all such passages depends on the proper supplying of the suppressed part. He who cannot supply it has not penetrated to the point of view from which the letter was written; and the intention of the whole letter may be distorted, if the wrong thought is supplied. That is a difficulty which must be reckoned with: we have to go through the process of bringing ourselves into sympathy with the ancient writer by thinking out afresh the thought and intention of the letter as a whole, and thus gathering what it was that the writer expected the original recipient to be familiar with, and what that first reader was expected to have in his mind as he was reading the letter.

Such a suppressed thought is a proof that the document in which it occurs is genuinely a letter, i.e. the expression and product of one human soul communicating with another, sympathizing with that other, and expecting sympathetic

response and comprehension. The more serious the suppression is, and the more difficult it is to supply the omitted words, the stronger is the proof that we have a real letter and not a pretended one. A forger does not express himself in this way, for he does not and cannot count on sympathetic comprehension: the forger is writing to be read by many persons, and not to be read by one alone.

It would not be easy to find a stronger example than the suppressed conclusion of the sentence in the third verse of this chapter—"as I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus" for certain purposes which are then enumerated—what is it that Paul was going to put as the conclusion of this sentence? Timothy understood what Paul had in his mind, and the rest of the letter must show indirectly what this was; but the sentence breaks off, while the writer wanders away into a description of the situation in which Timothy and the whole Church at Ephesus were involved, and is then led on to point after point; and he never returns to take up the thread of the sentence. What, then, can be the conclusion of this sentence except the main purpose of the letter as a whole? Now in the letter, though the treatment of the topics is much mixed up, so that very frequently the writer touches upon some topic, diverges to another, and then returns to the former one, yet on the whole there is one guiding thought and purpose: Paul is eagerly desirous and anxious that Timothy may rightly discharge the serious duty imposed upon him, and may perfectly comprehend the difficulties that lie before him, and may know the best means of meeting them.

That this charge and duty have been committed to Timothy is emphasized repeatedly in such words as "this charge I commit unto thee" (i. 18), "command and teach" (iv. 11, v. 7), "teach and exhort" (vi. 2): compare also i. 3, iv. 6, v. 20-21, vi. 17, 20, where the same idea recurs. This

charge is only temporary, to take Paul's place in his absence ; but it may last a long time (iii. 15). The personal conduct on Timothy's part that will enable him to discharge the duty well is described in various details, especially in iv. 7-8, 12-16, v. 1-4, v. 22-23, vi. 11-13, 17, 20. Advice as to his personal conduct often passes by an easy transition into advice as to the kind of teaching which he should give : see, for example, vi. 17-20.

The method by which Timothy will best discharge the duty imposed on him is, first, the regulation of the order and manner of public worship, ii. 1-2, 8-12 ; and, secondly, the right organization of the Church and of the Christian society which makes up the Church on earth, iii. 1-13, v. 5, 9-11, 14, 16-20, 22, 24-25, vi. 1-2.

The duty and charge have been imposed on Timothy by the Holy Spirit and by Paul. Prophecy marked him out and bestowed on him the gift which made him qualified for the charge, and the laying on of the hands of the presbyters had formally completed the selection and appointment (i. 18, iv. 14, vi. 12). But the apostolic authority of Paul had also co-operated ; or rather this was another aspect of the process of selection. The Spirit marked him out both through prophecy and through the apostolic power of Paul, whose apostleship made his act an expression of the Spirit's choice. Three times Paul emphasizes his authority as an apostle and herald of Jesus Christ (i. 1, 12, ii. 7).

This combination of the Spirit and the human authority in the same action places the thought on the same plane as that on which the book of the Acts moves (compare, e.g., Acts xiii. 2-3, xv. 28). The point of view and outlook in the Pastoral Epistles is strikingly similar to that which we observe in the Acts. This is due to the fact that although the Acts was composed as a single book finally about A.D. 80, yet in those parts where Luke writes on the authority of

others and not on his own, it presents to us as a whole the views and needs of A.D. 57-59, when he gathered the information which he faithfully reports.¹

The difficulties with which Timothy would have to contend in the execution of his charge are often touched upon, and evidently were constantly in the writer's mind. They will be briefly described in general terms in the following Section IV. For the present our purpose is to show that the charge imposed on Timothy is the guiding thought of the whole letter. Paul found that this thought was constantly weighing on his heart. Timothy was to take his place and was trusted to do the work which he himself did, when present, as founder and director of the Church in Ephesus. It is true that Timothy had been selected because he was the suitable man for the duty; he was marked out by the Holy Spirit; he was filled with the gift and the grace of the Spirit (iv. 14); he had been much with Paul, and had seen Paul's manner of confirming the Churches and guarding against evil and degeneration. I do not doubt for a moment that the advice given in this letter represents just the course which Paul himself had taken often in the practical difficulties of Church work, and with which Timothy had become familiar during years of companionship. It has, therefore, seemed strange and incredible to some scholars that Paul should write to urge on Timothy's attention ideas and methods which he knew so well, and his acquaintance with which was the real cause of his selection. But such scholars forget what human nature is. Paul could not

¹ Many prefer to take the view that, because the Pastoral Epistles approximate markedly to the point of view and standard of thought which are found in the Acts, therefore the Epistles must have been written at the same time as the book of the Acts was finally composed. Especially those who regarded the Acts as a second-century book must necessarily take this view. The present writer's reasons will appear in the sequel, and have partly been stated in the *EXPOSITOR*, February to May, 1909.

shake off the thought and the anxiety about Ephesus, merely because another, however much beloved and trusted, was charged with the duty. The thought of Ephesus was always with him, by day and by night. The hope that Timothy would keep all the important points in his memory, and the wish that Timothy should bear everything constantly in mind, led Paul to dictate from time to time instructions, warnings and advice. The letter has not the appearance of having been composed at one effort, like Galatians: it is more like Corinthians (though so much shorter), having apparently been dictated in parts, according as various anxieties occurred and recurred to Paul's mind from time to time.

This vague anxiety, which was the cause of the letter, also makes it discursive. Paul's thought moves back and forwards. One topic suggests another in an undetermined and casual way. He knew that it was not necessary to write an elaborate series of instructions to Timothy, and that to compose such a formal treatise would seem almost like an intimation of distrust. Yet the anxiety always drove him on to write, to mention various details, and to intermingle with them expressions of his own trust in the perfection of Christ (vi. 14-16), of his own unworthiness of the mercy which he had found and of the authority which had been bestowed upon him (i. 12-17), and other thoughts which presented themselves to his mind.

The guiding thought of the whole letter constitutes the unexpressed conclusion of the sentence, i. 3, from which we started. The protasis of that sentence has for its apodosis the letter as a whole: "As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus, when I was going into Macedonia, therefore I send this letter to express what I would have thee bear in mind, and to give suggestions from my Divinely granted authority—authority bestowed upon one who was utterly

unworthy of it, but still authority given fully and freely by Christ Jesus Himself of His own perfect grace.

One consideration may be added to these introductory remarks regarding the purpose of this letter. Apart from Paul's natural anxiety for Timothy's success in his charge, an anxiety which prompted him to make suggestions from time to time, it was not without its advantages that Timothy should be able to refer to Paul's written word of instruction, especially if he had to differ from a member of the Church older than himself. Such a person he must not rebuke, but exhort as a father (v. 1). If the exhortation could be supported by quotation from a written letter bearing on Timothy's charge, it would be all the more courteous and respectful from a young man to an old man. Not that this letter has in any respect the character of a communication intended for the whole congregation under the guise of a letter to Timothy. It is the direct communication of Paul's heart with Timothy's; in it soul speaks to soul; but therein lies its effectiveness and its permanent value for the Christian world; that is what makes it so natural, so living, and so eternal in its truth.

SECTION II. THE AUTHOR OF THE LETTER.

Such a letter as this could not be a forgery. It adds wonderfully to our conception of the width of Paul's mind and nature. It is quite true that, if we shut out the Pastoral Epistles, we can frame for ourselves from his other letters a picture of the remarkable and extraordinary personality from whom they emanated, and that these Pastoral Epistles stand outside of, and are not in perfect harmony with that picture. But it is not right method to assume that the narrower conception, broad and deep as it is, represents the entire breadth of Paul's nature and mind. There is revealed in the Pastoral Epistles a practical sense of the

possibilities of work among common human beings, which is necessary in order to complete our comprehension of Paul's life and work. He was not merely the man who could think out the lofty theology of Romans and Ephesians, or write the exquisite panegyric on the virtue and power of "love" to the Corinthians, after condemning so strongly the fault and the lovelessness of individuals among them, or rebuke in such a tremendous indictment the error of the Galatian congregations. In all those letters we feel that there stands out before us a personality almost too great and too lofty for the common world of humble, low-class, immoral, vulgar paganism: we can only with difficulty understand how a Paul of that kind could ever make himself intelligible to such a world: not merely the letters, but also the speech of such a man, must have contained "things hard to be understood"¹ by the men and women of the pagan world. It is the Pastoral Letters which, beyond all others, show us how Paul could understand the common man, and bring himself down to the level of his needs, and how the marvellous and instantaneous effect described in the Acts and briefly mentioned in Galatians was produced by his first appearance in the Galatian cities.

Those scholars who reject the Pastoral Epistles as un-Pauline are shutting themselves off from a most valuable help to the understanding of Paul. They must, in the construction of history, suppose that there existed some such other side of Paul's nature in addition to what is shown in the greater letters. Why not accept the side as it is shown in the Pastoral Epistles?

Finally, we must take into account that the transition is easy from the one Paul to the other. There are many passages in both letters to Timothy which are conceived in the spirit and expressed in the tone of the earlier Pauline

¹ 2 Peter iii. 15.

letters. There is no other writer in the New Testament to whom the two letters could for a moment be attributed ; they have practically nothing in common with the other books except the one common Christian faith and practice ; but they have much in common with the other Pauline letters, both in thought and in word. In the post-Apostolic works there is nothing which resembles them or throws any light on them.

While one must not underrate the difficulties involved in the theory of Pauline authorship, one must also remember that true scholarship is a process of triumphing over difficulties ; and that the widening of knowledge means the union in one view of facts which at first sight seemed unconnected and barely consistent with each other. It is far more difficult to frame any rational theory how these letters came into existence, if they are not the work of Paul, than it is to understand them as composed by him and as completing our conception of his character.

SECTION III. WORDS PECULIAR TO THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The totally different purpose and character of these letters from those to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians and other Churches furnishes a partial explanation of the marked change of language and the number of new words. In all his writings Paul shows himself an innovator and a creator linguistically. To express a new system of thought he created a new method. In the Pastoral Epistles he is attempting to create a terminology that shall correspond to the practical facts of an early Church society in one of those rather amorphous and unorganized original congregations, which were redeemed from paganism, but not habituated to a higher plane of action and life. Many of his new words are the brief expression of something which in his earlier

letters he describes as a process, but which now had become so common a phenomenon in the practical management of a congregation that it demanded a special name. Take, for example, the very first word in this letter that is peculiar to the Pastorals. It occurs in i. 3: "I exhorted thee to tarry¹ at Ephesus that thou mightest charge certain men not to teach a different doctrine," *ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*. This fact that there were in every congregation persons, coming from without or springing up from within, who taught doctrines which Paul did not regard as healthy or right, is a fact that he, in his earlier letters, mentions more than once. In Galatians i. 6-9 he alludes to such teachers, as preaching among the Galatian Churches, and says that he had warned the Galatians against them on his previous visit, i.e., as early as 51 A.D. He describes the teaching in that case as the announcing of another gospel. Again, in 2 Corinthians xi. 4, he describes the same thing as actually occurring in Corinth a few years later: there are persons who preach there another Jesus, and a different Gospel and another Spirit. That kind of un-Pauline teaching was therefore a continual danger in the Pauline Churches; and in 1 Timothy i. 3, vi. 3, it is briefly described by the single verb "to be a teacher of some different teaching." That a fact which was so frequently met with in Church management should force Paul to create a single word for it is not only not un-Pauline, but is thoroughly true to Paul's mind and character.

It is not within my purpose or my power to discuss every

¹ It is a curious example of pedantry that the word for "tarry" (*προσμεῖναι*) is reckoned by some among the words peculiar to the Pastorals and therefore un-Pauline. The sense of verbal propriety is defective in a scholar who finds any difficulty in understanding that any writer may occasionally, or even only once, use some compound of a Greek verb, which he often employs in the simple form. Moreover the word occurs about Paul in Acts xviii. 18.

“ un-Pauline ” word in the Epistle ; but on the whole one must feel strongly that those who label these new words as “ un-Pauline ” are missing a very instructive side of Paul’s life and character. This single case may serve as an example of the way in which the language of Paul developed (or varied, as some may prefer to express it) with his purpose and his subject.

SECTION IV. DIFFICULTIES WHICH TIMOTHY ENCOUNTERED IN HIS CHARGE AT EPHESUS.

The difficulties which Paul specially feared and which kept him always in anxiety for his son Timothy were of two kinds : in the first place, a false conception of Christian belief and teaching ; in the second place, a wrong type of conduct and morality among the congregations.¹

The principal passages which allude to the false conceptions of belief and thought and teaching in Ephesus and Asia generally are i. 3-8, 19, iv. 1-5, vi. 3-5. Naturally, this idea of the danger caused by false teaching easily turns into emphatic statement of the importance of right teaching : the latter idea is always close to the surface of Paul’s mind as he writes : his greatest anxiety is that Timothy should always give the right teaching and pronounce the right judgment in all the difficult situations and cases that come before him : this idea is very clearly stated in i. 5, iii. 16, vi. 6-7, 14-16, 17. Right rule and order in the society of the Church is the best preservative of truth in doctrine. Good government keeps the Church active and pure.

Owing to the overwhelming importance of right teaching, and the prevalence of wrong teaching, a word was coined by

¹ It would, doubtless, be better to speak of “ congregations ” in the plural. As being in charge for Paul at Ephesus, Timothy was to exercise surveillance over all the congregations and Churches of the Province Asia. Ephesus was the central point and heart of the whole Church organization of the Province.

Paul to express in brief the process of false teaching : the thing demanded a name and a verb, as has been stated in Section III.

One of the errors in teaching which Paul mentions most frequently, and which he evidently hated most strongly, was the love of abstract discussions on abstruse points, verbal quibbling and logomachy, and the attention to mere words rather than the realities of life. This was the vice of education at that period : it set words and form above realities and matter. Even physical science was not experimental and practical, but consisted almost wholly in abstract theories and words. Explanations of physical and moral phenomena were frequently couched in the form of genealogies. Even the explanation of changes of name in cities or rivers, which, so far as they were real changes and did not merely rest on misapprehension, were usually due to changes in population, language and nationality, were expressed in pseudo-historical fashion by genealogical fictions. Many examples of this way of putting history in the form of genealogical fictions may be found in the treatise attributed (falsely) to Plutarch on Rivers ; but the custom was not merely a late one. It was quite early, and it springs naturally from the vice of imagining that, when one has expressed a phenomenon in some new form of words, one has given an explanation of it. The subject might be traced throughout Greek thought, and even earlier than Greek thought. The genealogical fiction as a substitute for history is extremely old, and is an almost universal characteristic of primitive thought.¹

In the very ancient document incorporated in the Pentateuch as the Tenth Chapter of Genesis we find a history and geography of the known world expressed in that form.

¹ See e.g. *Luke the Physician*, in the essay on Dr. Sanday's Modern Criticism of the Life of Christ.

In a choral ode of the *Agamemnon* Aeschylus expresses the moral process of degeneration through arrogant pride, and the destruction in which this degeneration inevitably ends, in the form of a genealogy.

It is, therefore, unnecessary to see in Paul's mention of "fables and endless genealogies," or in his warning against teachers of a different doctrine, any allusion to elaborate Gnostic theories and systems of teaching that belong to the second century. The faults against which he cautioned Timothy were rife in his own time. They sprang up naturally and quickly in the hot-bed of mixed Gentile and Jewish thought, which existed in every Pauline congregation throughout the Aegean lands.

Paul regarded the tendency to quibbling and logomachy as almost the most dangerous enemy in the Greek cities like Corinth. His first letter to the Corinthians is in its first part largely prompted by the desire to combat this evil, to ridicule and to extirpate it. He perceived that the Corinthians, as they were learning a little, tended to pride themselves on their philosophic acumen; and he pointedly contrasts the simplicity of true teaching with the pretentious verbal discussion of false philosophy. Their philosophic discussions were empty and mere words: the truth was reality and power.

The "profane and old wives' fables" of iv. 7, the "questionings and disputes of words" mentioned in vi. 4, "the profane babblings and the antitheses of the falsely-so-called knowledge," to which he so sarcastically alludes in vi. 20, all bring before us what is fundamentally the same evil. That evil was rife in Corinth and in the cities of Asia. It had to be satirized and stamped out.

The words which Paul uses in his sarcastic descriptions of this evil are often peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; but almost every time that he mentions the subject he intro-

duces some new term ; and probably, if he spoke about it fifty times, he would add a great many other terms not elsewhere employed in the New Testament. Such is the wealth of language that is characteristic of him ; but the variety of his terminology is due to the intensity of his feeling on this matter.

The other class of difficulties against which Timothy would have always to contend was false morality and wrong conduct. The pagan converts had been from infancy habituated to an extremely low standard of living and speaking. It was not so difficult to stir them up on some great occasion to lofty action and noble effort, in other words, to convert them to the truth ; but the real difficulty lay in keeping them up to that higher standard permanently in their every-day life. That difficulty was, for the time, insuperable. People could not suddenly throw off their earlier character and habits, and rise to a continuous new life. The old habits would constantly tend to recur. The same difficulty faces every missionary in a pagan land : conversion of individuals does not raise them in their ordinary conduct to the level of people who have behind them generations and centuries of Christian education and life (except in the case of rare and remarkable personalities). All that can be done is to raise men a little, and to trust to the effect of time and the growth of better habits in the new generations. Throughout chapter v. and the first half of chapter vi., especially, Paul recurs often to these faults of life, small and great, which mark the society of the Asian cities. Some of them are the faults of human nature generally, as the love of money (vi. 9-10), and the tendency of young widows, desiring to be married again, to gad about from house to house, and to become tattlers and busybodies (v. 11-13). Others (as in i. 9-10) are of a darker kind. It is to be noticed that the faults into which the women were

prone to fall are on the whole of a much slighter kind than those which were a danger to men: the standard of life was higher, apparently, among the women than among the men.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DATE OF Q.

Now that the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke (or of a document so nearly identical with it as to be practically indistinguishable) is accepted as an almost certain result of criticism, attention is gradually being fixed more and more intently on the non-Marcian sections of the First and Third Gospels. No excuse, therefore, is needed for an attempt to suggest reasons for fixing the date of the document underlying these sections.

It is generally agreed that the use of a common source written in Greek ¹ is the necessary explanation of the great agreement between these Gospels in sections containing matter not found in Mark. To this document the name of Q is usually given, and among recent attempts to discuss it those of Wellhausen (*Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*) and Harnack (*Rede und Sprüche Jesu*) are the best known and the most generally useful. Harnack, indeed, has gone so far as to reconstruct the probable text of Q, on the basis of a comparison of Matthew and Luke, and the elimination of features likely to be due to their idiosyncrasies.

Although these attempts are certainly on the right lines, and are likely to yield profitable results to those who follow them up, it is perhaps not out of place to utter a preliminary word of caution to those who seem inclined to speak of Harnack's

¹ Many think that this Greek document was a translation of an Aramaic or Hebrew original, and some that the latter was known to Matthew and Luke and occasionally consulted by them. But this, though perhaps probable, does not alter the fact that Q, as directly used by them, was a Greek document.

reconstruction of Q as if it were an extant document. The unwisdom of such a course can be seen if we consider what we should know of Mark if our Second Gospel did not exist. The methods of literary comparison between Matthew and Luke would, in the absence of Mark, only result in the identification of a common source containing all that is now put into Q, together with the greater part, but not all, of Mark. It is exceedingly doubtful if literary criticism could get any further than this. That is to say, instead of at least two sources we should only think of one. The lesson to be learnt from this fact is the desirability of remembering that Q may just as well stand for several sources, all known both to Matthew and Luke, as for one single document; that it is practically certain that Q contained passages which are now found only in one Gospel, and that the probability is almost equally great that it contained some, though probably not many, passages which were not used by the redactors of either of the present Gospels. It is, of course, by no means difficult to make a tolerably good guess at some of the passages found in only one Gospel, yet nevertheless probably taken from Q, but it is obviously impossible to reconstruct sections which are not found in either Matthew or Luke, though that such existed is exceedingly probable.

At the same time, although a consideration of the history of the discovery of the Marcan source suggests caution in speaking of Q as a single document, it also inspires us with some degree of confidence in the general results of research. If we look at their treatment of Mark, we can see that Matthew and Luke both used it with a considerable degree of fidelity, except in small points of diction, such as altering the characteristic historic present of Mark to the more literary past tense. It is unusual for them both to alter Mark at the same place in the same way, and the number of places where they seem to do so ought probably

to be considerably reduced by textual criticism.¹ Therefore we have good reason for believing that as a rule the original Q is preserved either in Matthew or Luke, and an intelligent criticism ought to enable us generally to be right in our discrimination between the two.

Moreover we know that neither Matthew nor Luke omitted very much from Mark. We have therefore an *à priori* reason for thinking that we have probably got the greater part of Q in the two Gospels, even though there is a margin of doubt as to the number of passages belonging to Q which are only preserved in one Gospel.

We have some additional reason for thinking that Q was treated by Matthew and Luke in much the same way as they treated Mark in the fact that they have both followed, in the main, the same order (presumably that of their source in the Q passages, just as they have done in the Marcan ones. That is to say, if we divide up into sections the matter which probably came from Q, these sections as a rule follow each other in the same order in both Matthew and Luke. It is perhaps worth while to show this by a short table. We find the same order in the following passages :

(1)	Matt.	iii.	1-12	=	Luke,	iii.	1-17.
(2)	„	iv.	1-11	=	„	iv.	1-15.
(3)	„	v.	1-12	=	„	vi.	20-23.
(4)	„	v.	38-48	=	„	vi.	27-36.
(5)	„	vii.	1-6	=	„	vi.	37-42.
(6)	„	vii.	15-27	=	„	vi.	43-49.
(7)	„	viii.	5-13	=	„	vii.	1-10.
(8)	„	xi.	1-19	=	„	vii.	18-35.
(9)	„	xi.	20-24	=	„	x.	13-15.
(10)	„	xi.	25-30	=	„	x.	21-24.
(11)	„	xii.	22-37	=	„	xi.	14-23.
(12)	„	xii.	38-42	=	„	xi.	29-32.

¹ The main point in favour of this contention is that in early times the text of Matthew was on the whole the norm to which the others were adapted, and that on the whole Luke has suffered more from this cause than Mark, which often escaped, because it was the least widely used. The result is that when Luke was corrected so as to agree with Matthew it often produced a false appearance of an agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark.

Moreover the passages in which the same order is not preserved are mostly susceptible of easy explanation : for instance, in Matthew xxiv. 26-28, 37-41 and 29 correspond to Luke xvii. 20-35 and Matthew xxiv. 43-51 correspond to Luke xii. 39-46 ; it is fairly plain that Matthew has combined these eschatological sections with the similar narrative of Mark xiii. and thus disarranged the order.

Thus if we remember that the symbol Q may possibly represent more than one document and that this document is not extant, there is no reason to be unduly sceptical as to the correctness of Harnack and Wellhausen's views as to the contents of Q.

To establish the date of the document two methods suggest themselves. The first is to compare Mark with Q, assuming—what is indeed not improbable—that the former may be roughly dated as about 70 A.D.¹—earlier rather than later. By this means it would be possible to say whether it was earlier or later than Mark, i.e. than 70. This method has been more or less followed both by Wellhausen and Harnack ; but whereas the former thinks that in every case where comparison is possible Mark is seen to be earlier than Q, the latter holds a precisely opposite opinion. Those who have read both these treatises will probably agree that the impression made upon the mind of an impartial critic is that neither has decidedly the better of the argument. The passages in question are susceptible of either interpretation, and there is nothing in any of them to prove definitely the relative date of Mark and Q.

¹ This is certainly a popular hypothesis. Personally, I have never been able to see anything in Mark which points to one date much more than another except that before the fall of Jerusalem seems more likely than after it ; and if we could trust the tradition that St. Mark wrote after the death of St. Peter in Rome, that would leave the six years from 64 to 70 open. But this is very dangerous reasoning on which to build any heavy superstructure of conclusions.

It is perhaps, therefore, desirable to try the other possible method, that is, to consider the probable dates of the conditions of Christian thought which could have produced such a document as Q.

The outstanding features of Q are: (1) it began by an account of John the Baptist, and represented Jesus as first realizing his divine commission to be Messiah at his baptism. (2) It shows no sign of polemical motives, but has a purely Christian character; it seems to have been written by a Christian for Christians. (3) It is strongly eschatological, and expects the immediate coming of the Messiah. (4) It has no narrative of the death or resurrection of Jesus.

Of these four characteristics the first is unimportant for the present purpose, because it is equally true of Mark, and we have no means of saying at what time the point of view it implies was changed in favour of that found in the Gospels, while the second is in itself obviously useless for chronological purposes. The other two remain, and are not essentially changed if we admit the possibility (I do not believe that it is a probability) that Q had once a short account of the Passion and Resurrection of such a kind that it was useless for Matthew and Luke, in the light of the fuller treatment given in Mark and in the Jerusalem tradition peculiar to Luke. It might perhaps be argued that this Jerusalem tradition is identical with Q, but so far as I know this view has never been taken and seems exceedingly improbable; for myself the balance of probability is certainly that Q ended with the eschatological discourse and never had any Passion or Resurrection narratives at all.

The main chronological problem, therefore, is to define the date and circumstances under which a gospel, intended not for missionary purposes but for the use of Christians, can conceivably have ended, not with an account of the Passion and Resurrection, but with an eschatological discourse. In

other words, we need to ask, at what time is it possible that the Passion and Resurrection had no personal importance for Christians? It is necessary to emphasize that the question is not concerned with the importance of the Resurrection for missionary work, or for polemical purposes, but merely with the position which it took in the personal religion of convinced Christians. No one would suggest that there ever was a time when the fact that Christ was risen from the dead¹ was not used by Christians as a proof in controversy that Jesus, in spite of his death, was nevertheless the Messiah; but the question is whether there ever was a time when the Resurrection had no personal importance for converts after they had become Christians, because their whole interest was centred in the speedy coming of the Messiah? Or, to put the question in still another form, can we find a chronological importance in the fact that the characteristic Christian greeting was at one time not—as it is to-day in the East—“Christ is risen,” but “Maranatha, the Lord is at hand”? The suggestion is that the writer of Q belongs to the “Maranatha” period, while the canonical Gospels belong to that of “Christ is risen.”

To answer this question we do best to try to reconstruct the general point of view of the first Christians, and to notice the way in which it came to change.

The first stage in the history of Christian thought comes immediately after the death and resurrection of Jesus. The dominant feature of this period was the expectation of the

¹ It should, however, be noted that the speeches in the early chapters of Acts show that the *gravamen* of the Christian argument was not that Jesus had been resuscitated, but that he had been *raised and glorified*. Mere resuscitation was no argument that any one was Messiah: glorification was. This is why the emphasis is at the beginning all on the glorification of the risen Lord—on the change in him. Only later, for other purposes, was the emphasis shifted on to the identity of the risen body, and the idea of glorification united to the Ascension, regarded as a different event from the Resurrection.

coming of the Messiah, his establishment of the kingdom of God, and the eschatological drama of judgment of the heathen. We are accustomed to speak of the return of the Messiah, but the first generation of Christians spoke of his Parousia, or coming, because, although it seems certain that they identified Jesus as the Messiah even during his life, and that he accepted their identification, this view meant rather, if accurately expressed, that Jesus was he who was destined to be the Messiah. From the point of view of personality he was Messiah, and could properly be spoken of as such, but from the point of view of function he was *going to be* Messiah, and his Parousia had not yet taken place. He was "Son of God," but not yet Messiah in more than a proleptic sense of the word.

At this stage of development what was the importance of the Resurrection of Jesus to Christian thought? It was primarily the means whereby Jesus had become a heavenly being, so that he would soon be seen descending in the clouds to take up the functions of the Messiah.

This point of view seems to be that of the Petrine speeches¹ in Acts (chap. ii. 14-36; iii. 12-26; v. 29-32; x. 34-43). In all these passages the main argument is that through the Resurrection Jesus has been glorified and proved to be the expected Messiah. From the point of view of polemic against the Jews the Resurrection was evidence of the true character of Jesus; but for the Christian, who required no instruction on that point, it was merely the method by which he was glorified: the attention of the Christian was fixed not on what Jesus had done, but on what he was going to

¹ It is of course obvious that many of the words of those speeches, and some of the sentiments are Lucan and not Petrine. Still, when all possible allowance has been made for these facts, there remains over a very considerable and important amount which is *not* Lucan, and belongs to the source, whether written or oral, used by St. Luke, and this source seems to have so good a knowledge of the doings of St. Peter that the speeches have a real claim to be regarded as Petrine.

do. There is in these speeches no clear distinction made between the Resurrection, Ascension and Glorification, which are rather different ways of describing the same fact from various points of view. For instance, chap. ii. 33, St. Peter says, "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore exalted by the right hand of God, having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear." Here it is clear that the Ascension and Resurrection are regarded as two ways of looking at the same fact—the glorification of Jesus to a heavenly being—on which all the emphasis is laid. Moreover this glorification is, when looked at from the point of view of function, described in chap. ii. 36 as "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified"; or in chap. v. 31, "Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a prince and a saviour"; or still more plainly in chap. x. 42, "He charged us to preach unto the people and to testify that this is he which is ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead."

All this implies that for Christians of that period the very centre of their belief was that Jesus, who had been exalted to the position of a heavenly being, was about to come in order to establish the kingdom of his followers and to judge the world outside according to its deeds. The method of the exaltation was in itself less important, and had no personal bearing on Christians, in so far as they had no expectation of going through any experience at all parallel. They had themselves no thought of Resurrection,¹

¹ Nor did they look for judgment in the same sense as they expected it for the Heathen. The Parable of the Sheep and Goats is the most striking instance of the primitive point of view. It describes a judgment, not on Christians but on Heathen, τὰ ἔθνη, who do not know the Messiah for good or evil, and they are judged in accordance with their behaviour to the ἀδελφοί—the Christians, who are clearly pictured as standing round the throne of the King, as his followers, not among those who are being arraigned.

because they had no thought of death. If, therefore, they had written out during this period a gospel for their own benefit, not for polemical, and not for missionary purposes, they would have put the emphasis on the expectation of the coming of the Messiah and on his teaching concerning it and concerning their behaviour until he came.

So long, therefore, as this period lasted it is intelligible that Christians should have written just such a document as Q. In it we have no definite statement of the death of Jesus, but the fact as implied. For instance, in Luke xvii. 25, which almost certainly belongs to Q, though it is omitted by Matthew, we read, "but he (the Son of Man) must first suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation." Or, again, the wording of the saying, that he who does not "take up his cross" is unworthy of discipleship (Matt. x. 38, corresponding to Luke xiv. 27) must imply a knowledge of the Crucifixion, while the fact that the Son of Man is expected to come from heaven implies a knowledge of his Glorification, or, in other words, of the Resurrection.¹ No emphasis is laid on the fact, which is only mentioned in passing, but great stress is laid on the coming of the Son of Man in power, and this is clearly expected before the passing away of that generation. The exact time of the coming of the Messiah is unknown, and the disciples are warned not to listen to those who say, "Lo here, or lo there," because the coming of the Son of Man will be as a flash of lightning which leaves no room for doubt or question; but with this margin of uncertainty the idea that the Parousia would not

¹ These passages, added to the general improbability that a Gospel was written before the Passion, are, I believe, the adequate proof that Sir William Ramsay's hypothesis that Q was written during the life of Jesus is unsatisfactory. The following arguments are similarly the proof that he is wrong in thinking that it was only before the Passion and Resurrection that a Gospel could have been written without describing these events.

take place at all in that generation is as foreign to Q as it is to Mark.

Thus the general background of thought implied by Q is an expectance of the coming of the Messiah within a very short time, so short that it made the question of a resurrection of no importance for Christians, and an identification of Jesus with the Messiah. It is equally certain that this background of thought is that of the earliest Christianity, and so far as the contents of Q are concerned no date after the Passion seems impossibly early. It might theoretically have been written on the day of the Resurrection. So far, therefore, as fixing the *terminus a quo* of Q is concerned we have to rely upon other arguments of a rather vague nature, such as the general probability as to the time when Christians began to write books and as to the probability or otherwise that Q is a translation from an Aramaic original. But at present it is probably more important to try to fix the *terminus ad quem* of Q. To do this we need to ask, how long did the background described thus continue to exist unchanged? Obviously it is not likely to have endured beyond the limits of the first generation, and the Gospels, with their great interest in the death and resurrection, as distinct from the glorification of Christ, are a proof that the attitude of mind implied by Q did not last long. But the date of the Gospels is not easy to determine, and fortunately we have better indications in the Acts, and in the Pauline Epistles in passages the chronology of which is fairly certain, to show us the date at which the background of thought implied by Q was gradually giving place to one more familiar to us.

In the Acts the most instructive incident for the present purpose is that of Apollos. It has often been misunderstood because commentators have had too little feeling for the atmosphere of the first century and have tried to force into it ideas foreign to the time to which it refers.

Apollos was an Alexandrian Jew who had been attracted by the teaching of the Forerunner, whose baptism he knew. That is to say, he was acquainted with the baptism of cleansing and repentance as preliminary to membership of the Messianic kingdom, but he did not know who the Messiah was to be. On this basis he expounded the Messianic teaching of the Old Testament which St. Luke, speaking from the standpoint of Christian knowledge, describes as "the passages concerning Jesus." He then came into contact with Aquila, who explained to him the Christian standpoint, and the result was that he added to his teaching "that the Messiah," whom he had already preached "was Jesus," (τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι Ἰησοῦν,¹ It should be noted that the meaning usually read into this passage, "that Jesus was the Christ," is a bad piece of translation, into which even the revisers fell, untrue to the Greek, and obscuring the sense. The whole point is that there was Messianic teaching before there was Christianity, and that what Aquila did was to persuade Apollos to recognize Jesus as that Messiah whose existence² he had long known (that is what is meant by saying that he was "instructed in the way of the Lord") without being aware of his identity.

Such teaching as Apollos must have given after his intercourse with Aquila would have been probably very like that of Q, so long as he was not engaged in directly polemical

¹ After I had formulated this view, I happened to mention it in conversation to Mr. J. H. Hart, who told me that it was also his own, and had been published in 1904 in the *Journal of Theological Studies*: I ought to have known this, but Mr. Hart's very interesting article, which gives detailed arguments for each step of the reasoning, was published at a time when I was mostly occupied in learning Dutch, and I never read it. I venture to mention this, as Mr. Hart and I are thus independent witnesses, and, as he would express it, "It is written again, out of the mouth of two witnesses, etc."

² It is scarcely necessary to say that the Book of Enoch is the absolute proof that a "Messianically-minded" Jew would certainly have thought of the Messiah as already existing.

work. The Resurrection would be for him merely another name for the Glorification of Jesus. The details of its accomplishment would be immaterial in comparison with the expected Parousia, and the death of the Messiah had probably obtained no special significance: just as there is nothing in Q to suggest that redemption—entry into the Messianic kingdom—depended on the death of the Messiah, so in the opening chapters of Acts it is “the name” of Messiah, not his death, which brings salvation.

In the earliest Pauline epistles we also catch a glimpse of the same state of things, but it is beginning to change, and the Resurrection of Jesus is obtaining a personal importance for Christians, in the light of the fact that the first generation was beginning to see that their ranks were not immune from the attacks of death. In 1 Thessalonians the new converts are expecting the Parousia so momentarily that it is necessary to urge them to attend to their ordinary work; but some of them were distressed at the death of friends, apparently doubting whether they would not be prevented by death from entering into the Messianic kingdom which the Parousia would inaugurate. They are then comforted by St. Paul, who teaches that there will be a Resurrection at the Parousia, so that those who remain will not have any advantage over those who sleep. It is especially noteworthy that he clearly regards those who remain as representing the normal event—he speaks of them as “we”—and that whereas in speaking of the Parousia he assumes that it is well known—“It is not necessary that I should write to you,”—in dealing with the resurrection of those who sleep he treats it as a new subject,—“I would not have you ignorant.”

Here we certainly see the beginnings of that change in Christian thought which ultimately made the Parousia be regarded as the resurrection and judgment of all,—including

Christians—rather than the joyful coming of the Messiah to join and comfort his own followers and to judge not Christians, who stand by the side of the judge rather than by those to be judged, but the heathen world, and to destroy the powers of evil. But the change has not yet come. The resurrection of those who sleep is in 1 Thessalonians not a judgment, but merely the means of restoring Christians who had died before the Parousia to fellowship with their surviving friends.

It is obvious that as soon as this—in a certain sense—new doctrine of a resurrection for Christians became well known, it gave rise to discussion, and the Resurrection of Christ must have been used as an analogy for the resurrection of Christians. That is exactly what we find in 1 Cor. xv. ; for the first time this analogy is put forward, and put forward so elaborately as to have a tendency to deceive us as to its position in the development of Christian teaching. St. Paul's Epistles are for us scripture, and it is difficult for us to make the effort to recollect that they were originally letters written on special occasions to discuss special points, as to which there was either some difference of opinion, or a danger of forgetfulness on the part of Christians. Yet it is most important to make this effort, for without it we are apt to try to construct systems of Paulinism out of the Epistles by treating as most important the things on which he says most. It would only be a somewhat paradoxical way of expressing the truth to say that the reverse method is the better. In letters no one discusses the things at the centre, on which he is perfectly agreed with his correspondent, but rather the things at the periphery of thought, where agreement and difference meet. There is no reason to think that St. Paul was an exception to this rule ; his Epistles may be taken to deal most fully with points on which there was a difference of opinion among Christians, or which had

not previously been emphasized in teaching. Among these points was the personal importance of the resurrection of Christ as an analogy for the resurrection of Christians.

To many people this is a central—or even the central—feature of their Christianity, but there was a time when it was unknown, when, as 1 Thessalonians shows, Christians had no hope of resurrection because they had no expectation of death. 1 Corinthians xv. marks the appearance of the doctrine of a resurrection for Christians and its connexion with the resurrection of Christ at the periphery of Christian thought.

The importance of this argument for the dating of Q is obvious, for Q clearly belongs to the world of thought earlier than 1 Corinthians xv., to which probably Apollos at Ephesus and certainly the Church at Thessalonica belonged, at least until they received 1 Thessalonians.

To translate this result into a definite date is of course impossible, but it is probably not too much to say that every year after 50 A.D. is increasingly improbable for the production of Q.

At the same time we have no right to dogmatize too much on this point or to say that a date later than 50 is impossible : there may have been circles of Christian thought in which it would not have been impossible. It would be impossible in the directly Pauline circle after the date mentioned, but we do not know what was the rate of the progress of thought in non-Pauline communities, nor do we know whether Q belongs to a Pauline or non-Pauline circle.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

VI. THE SANCTIFICATION OF MAN.

(1) THE Christian salvation is from the *guilt* and the *power* of sin. The guilt is removed, as was shown in the previous Study, by the righteousness of God. How the power of *sin* is broken in the sanctification of man we have now to consider. Although we may for convenience distinguish these two aspects of the deliverance in Christ, they are not to be separated. As has been already shown, the righteousness of God is so revealed in the Cross of Christ that the means of forgiveness is also the motive of holiness. The cancelling of the guilt of sin is the first step towards the breaking of its power. A burdened conscience goes with a baffled will. Until the burden of distrust of, and estrangement from, God in the expectation of His judgment is lifted off, the bondage of evil habit cannot be broken. The sense of guilt paralyzes moral effort. The pardon of sin conveys the assurance, inspires the anticipation of the conquest of sin. The man who knows himself forgiven can say, If God is for me, sin cannot at last overcome me. The forgiveness of sin brings peace with God (Luke vii. 47, 50); and this reconciliation with God is promise and pledge of complete emancipation. Paul has clearly stated the soul's assurance, "If, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life" (Rom. v. 10). Without at this point considering the new power that enters into the life in fellowship with God through Christ, we may here note that the removal of the sense of helplessness, and consequent hopelessness, is already the beginning of deliverance from the oppression of sin. There is moral reinforcement in the spirit of adoption. "Ye are all sons of God,

through faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 26). "Because ye are sons, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. iv. 6). Although the phrase "the righteousness of God" may suggest the law-court, the reality that it expresses is the restoration by the forgiveness of sin of the fellowship of God as Father with man as son. This sonship as it gains certainly gives courage and confidence in the moral struggle. The despairing cry, "O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" (Rom. vii. 24) has already found its answer in the man, who, as justified by faith, is gaining peace with God (v. 1). As fear weakens and hope strengthens, pardon is the beginning of power.

(2) But the worth of this gift of forgiveness, and even more the cost to God of its bestowal in the Cross of Christ, brings a new motive into the life, and a motive which in its persistence and efficiency excels any other motive. "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again" (2 Cor. v. 14-15). The love, and especially the sacrifice endured, gives Christ an absolute claim. "Ye are not your own; for ye were brought with a price" (1 Cor. vi. 20). Compare 1 Peter i. 18: "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things . . . but with the precious blood of Christ." If we compare one passage with another, it will become evident that it is no legal right that the apostle thinks of, but the constraint of love, a claim more absolute than any legal right could be, the generosity of Christ's love, or of God's love in Christ, calls forth the love of gratitude in man. It is not necessary to give proofs of Paul's dominant mood of thankfulness to God. It runs like a golden thread through all the varied pattern of his writings. He answers his own despair-

ing cry with his triumphant thanksgiving, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vii. 25). He faces sin, law, and death with the song on his lips, "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. xv. 57). Such gratitude has a moral potency. Appetites, ambitions, tastes, interests, pursuits which would enter into rivalry or conflict with such a motive are consumed in its glowing fervour: "Far be it from me to glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. vi. 14). To this motive Paul appeals in exhorting the Corinthian believers to generosity: "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich" (2 Cor. viii. 9). Gratitude for grace, that is the new motive of the Christian life. Can we doubt its efficiency? Although it was not the new motive alone which made Paul a new creature in Christ Jesus, yet it was a potent factor in his moral transformation. There are not a few to-day who find it difficult to understand what are often called his more *mystical* doctrines, the fellowship of the living Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; but surely all Christians can understand this gratitude for grace as the dominating motive for the new life. It is true that a popular revivalism has often been accompanied by moral superficiality if not laxity; but that is surely due to the fact that the grace of God in Christ has not been adequately presented in its essentially moral character. A plan of salvation for man's safety and happiness here and hereafter may be so presented as, even when accepted, to prove morally impotent; but the historical reality of Christ on His Cross in its moral significance and value as the revelation of the righteousness of God, when apprehended and appreciated, cannot but evoke a love which, as its object is holy, will inspire the desire for,

and sustain the effort after holiness in the subject. Even in the Epistle to the Romans the danger of an abstract statement of the way of salvation is illustrated. The question with which Paul passes from his treatment of the doctrine of justification to that of sanctification, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" shows the danger of any theory of atonement that is not charged with moral content. That in the Cross sin is judged as well as forgiven by holy love is the presentation of the grace of God necessary if the response of gratitude in man is to prove a potent moral motive.

(3) It has seemed desirable to place in the forefront in regard to the Christian salvation to prove its moral efficacy, these two considerations, which make the widest appeal; but it is scarcely necessary to say that here we do not get the characteristically Pauline doctrine. The gratitude for grace is not for Paul the most potent factor of the new creation he experienced. Not an event of the past, however pregnant with promise for man's deliverance, was the source of the new life in him. It was in a constant and intimate personal communion with Christ that he experienced the sufficiency of the grace of [God, the perfecting of God's strength in his weakness. If in Galatians ii. 20 he expresses this living union with the living Lord in an individual form as his own personal experience, he does not claim it as a spiritual monopoly, for in Romans vi. 3, 4 he makes a general statement on the assumption that this experience is common to all Christians. "Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death? We were buried, therefore, with Him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." In discussing this passage it is necessary to make a concession and a distinction.

We must admit that this union with Christ is not realized in the common Christian experience in the same degree as in Paul. His moral passion and his spiritual vision combined to make the Christ of faith a reality to him as He is but to a comparatively few souls. But even where there is no such certain and vivid consciousness of Christ's presence there may be such trust in His promise, fulfilled in the experience of such as Paul, as will enable the moral struggle to be waged with courage and confidence due to the assurance that the human strength is not left unaided, but is sustained by the divine power of the Saviour whose working is not limited by the soul's consciousness of His presence. It is indeed a blessing to be greatly desired that now and again, if not always, that presence may be felt; but what is to be remembered is that the power worketh even where the presence is not recognized. Down in the valley there is help even for those who have not beheld the glory of the mountain-top. Christian experience both in its moral endeavours and its spiritual visions, confirms the truth that the soul's deliverance from the power of sin is not accomplished by the impression made or even the motive awakened in man by Christ and His Cross, as an event of past history, but by a constant and potent living and saving presence. It is a personal influence which is being universally and permanently exercised, and exercised even when its reality is not fully recognized. Nevertheless, as intimate communion increases the efficacy of personal influence, so the practice of the presence of Christ is a condition of moral progress. It is a pity that this phase of Paul's teaching has so often been called *mystical*, as the term seems to warn off those who are most concerned about the moral issues of Christian faith. It is spiritual in character, because independent of sense, but is also moral in content, because man's holiness is its end.

(4) We may make a distinction between the general fact of this personal union with Christ and the particular content which Paul gives to it. It is not the historical Jesus as He is represented for us in the Synoptic Gospels on whom Paul meditates and with whom he communes. His attention is almost exclusively concentrated on the Crucifixion and the Resurrection ; and to enter into personal union with Christ is to be crucified and risen with Him. Although he claims "visions and revelations of the Lord," a rapture into Paradise, a hearing of "unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter" (2 Cor. xii. 1, 4), yet his moral progress did not depend on these ecstatic experiences. It was his meditation on the death and rising again that was the condition of, and gave content to, his personal communion with Christ. The thought of many devout and earnest believers is to-day withdrawn from the Cross and the Grave. It is in the words and works of Jesus in His earthly ministry that they find that "inner life" which is to them the revelation of the grace of God. Jesus' absolute devotion to God on the one hand and His intense compassion for sinners on the other present to them that blending of mercy and judgment, that "righteousness of God" which Paul saw in the Cross of Christ. If the "inner life" of Jesus so conceived does convey to them the condemnation as well as the pardon of sin, and so the salvation from sin, we have no right to forbid them this way of approach to the grace of God. Nevertheless, we may still believe that it is in the sacrifice of Jesus that the moral energy of God in bringing men to repentance as well as assuring them of pardon is most effectively exercised. It is not necessary, however, to consider these as alternative courses. The death and rising again need not be detached from the earthly ministry. As we become familiar with the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels the moral conscience and the religious consciousness of the

Christ Crucified and Risen become more intelligible to us. His attitude to God as Son and His attitude to man as Brother are made plain and sure to us in His words and works. We can thus penetrate a little further into His "inner life," and so interpret His experience in the Crucifixion and Resurrection to give to it a fuller spiritual and ethical content. How far Paul did thus give meaning to the death and rising again by such contemplation of the concrete reality of the historical Jesus we cannot now tell; but there can be no doubt that for us his teaching of personal union with Christ as crucifixion and resurrection with Him gains in significance and value in the measure in which the historical Jesus is concrete reality to us, and not a theological abstraction. We must not, however, ignore what such an experience as Paul's teaches, that it is in the Cross that the moral purpose of Christ has its fulfilment. His revelation both of the compassion and the severity of God, of God's love as holy, is not complete until we see sin judged as well as forgiven in the revelation of the righteousness of God in Christ propitiatory in His blood. Here is focussed the light and the warmth of the grace of God.

(5) The content of the personal union with Christ is for Paul crucifixion and resurrection with Christ. But how shall we understand this experience? Shall we interpret it in terms of the substitution of Christ for man, or of the identification of man with Christ, or are the two conceptions but complementary? In the previous Study it was shown that what Christ suffered or did was on behalf of man; He took man's lot that He might give man His life. Doubtless Paul's thought was this, He was crucified for me, and so I was crucified with Him; He endured on my behalf what He saves me from enduring, God's judgment on my sin. He rose again for me, and I rose with Him; what He achieved was for my gain that I might live in fellowship with God

through Him. "One died for all, therefore all died." While we must carefully guard our statement against misconception, it seems to the writer impossible to explain Paul's experience or Christian experience generally without the recognition of such a *substitution*; Christ's suffering on our behalf, to rescue us from the suffering that our sin would have brought upon us. Are not Mrs. Browning's words in her poem "Cowper's Grave" true?—

Yea, once Immanuel's orphaned cry His universe hath shaken;
It went up single, echoless, "My God, I am forsaken!"
It went up from the Holy's lips amid His lost creation,
That, of the lost no son should use those words of desolation.

Hermann regards this truth as the necessary confession of Christian experience. "The believer then says to himself, spontaneously looking back on the work of Christ, what we should have suffered, He suffers" (*Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*, p. 107). That is not all that Paul means. This statement regarding Crucifixion and Resurrection is made by Paul to define clearly the moral attitude of the Christian; and so our crucifixion and resurrection with Christ mean our conscious, voluntary identification of ourselves with Christ in the moral purpose of His work for us. Christ offers Himself to us as our *substitute*, that we may choose Him as our *representative*. He identifies Himself with us that we may identify ourselves with Him. Paul did mean that we made our own Christ's condemnation of sin on the Cross, and His consecration of Himself to God in His Resurrection. "Our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin; for he that hath died is justified from sin" (Rom. vi. 6-7). There is an absolute separation from sin freely willed by the man who in Christ accepts the pardon of his sin. He condemns and executes it in himself as it was judged in the Cross of Christ. Repentance is not only *change of mind*

in regard to sin, but a new direction of the will, consent becomes antagonism. Although there are difficulties in speaking of Christ's death as the offering of a perfect penitence for humanity to God, yet the penitence of the believer is his crucifixion with Christ, and the more fully he realizes what the death of Christ involved for Him, and lets the mind of Christ concerning sin be reproduced in himself, the more adequate will his repentance become. Thus the faith that accepts the grace of God in the Cross accepts also the judgment of sin the Cross involves, and accordingly it has an essential moral influence in severing men from sin. This crucifixion with Christ is not a single act at the beginning of the Christian life, but needs in face of constant temptations to sin to be continuously maintained. It is the negative phase of moral progress, the reproduction and expulsion of moral evil from the renewed life. The Resurrection of Christ too has a moral meaning which can be reproduced in the believer: "The death that he died, he died unto sin once; but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus" (vers. 10, 11). Until His death on the Cross Christ Himself, though sinless, stood in relation to sin. He was liable to temptation, subject to the contradiction of sinners, submitted Himself in His vicarious sacrifice to the consequences of sin. By His death He was once for all released from His relation to sin. He, who had found His meat and His drink in doing His Father's will, at His resurrection entered into a life so free of all the conditions that had on earth opposed His sense of God, that He could henceforth live unto God, and God alone. The believer who is united to Christ in Him enters on a life of such complete dedication unto God. Of course Paul knew well that neither he himself, nor any other believer, was so entirely dead to sin and alive to God as cruci-

fixion and resurrection with Christ indicated. It was in this, however, that he saw the aim set before himself and others, and an aim, the attainment of which was not hopeless because of the sufficiency of the grace of Christ which the faith of man could ever claim. Faith was for him the condition of perfectness.

(6) We do not recognize all that Paul means when he so describes the Christian experience unless we lay the emphasis on the divine grace and the human faith. While faith calls into exercise, and free and full exercise, the whole personality of man, it is not understood as Paul understood it, if it is regarded as a task to be done by man's strenuous effort. If faith were this, salvation would be of works, and grace would not be grace. The stress in Paul's doctrine is on the objective facts of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, the subjective states of being crucified and risen with Christ are the necessary effects of these facts, where a man submits himself to Christ. Faith is not a productive, but a receptive energy. It is the greater personality of Christ which inspires and sustains that dependence on, communion with, and submission to Him which results in a man's moral transformation. In these days, when on the one hand the Jesus of history is receding into the distant past, and the Christ of faith is being sublimated into a moral and religious ideal, the identity of both needs to be insisted on to make the one present, and the other real. It is the real presence of the personal Saviour and Lord which alone explains Paul's own experience, and the experience which he assumed to be common to all believers. The moral passion and power of the apostle can be recovered by the Christian Church to-day only as it recognizes the moral meaning of the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ, and reproduces that moral content in personal union with Him.

(7) This is not, however, all that Paul has to teach us in

regard to the sanctification of man. We find in his writings what may at first sight appear an alternative explanation of the Christian life, but what may on closer scrutiny prove but a complementary representation. Paul speaks of salvation through sanctification of the Spirit (2 Thess. ii. 13). The work of making holy (*ἁγιασμός*) cannot but belong to the Holy Spirit (*πνεῦμα ἅγιον*). It is not intended in this Study to discuss the doctrine of the Spirit generally, for that subject must be reserved for subsequent discussion; only the function of the Spirit in the deliverance of man from the power of sin. One feature of Paul's teaching must, however, be mentioned. What may be called the popular view of the Spirit's presence and power in the Apostolic Church was closely connected with the Old Testament conception. In the earlier portions of the Book of Acts dealing with the primitive Church the work of the Spirit is generally recognized in the miraculous and the marvellous. The ecstatic *charismata*, such as speaking with tongues and prophesying, are especially regarded as the gift of the Spirit. Paul shared the popular view, for in such a matter he was a man of his own age and surroundings, but only in admitting the supernatural character of these manifestations. In two important particulars he rose above it. In the first place he formed a much more moderate estimate of the value of these exceptional phenomena than was current, and he not only demanded that the exercise of these gifts should be subordinated to the edification of the Christian community, but even gave a higher place to the three graces of faith, hope, love (1 Cor. xii. and xiii.). Secondly, for him the Spirit's work was seen in man's moral purification and elevation. The Spirit was for him the antithesis of the flesh. As the flesh was the seat and vehicle of sin, so in the Spirit was the source of holiness. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest . . . but the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-

suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 19-23). The Christian lives, is led, walks by the Spirit (vers. 18, 25) and thus crucifies the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof (ver. 24). The being crucified and risen with Christ is the same as living, being led, walking by the Spirit. The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, and no man is Christ's who has not His Spirit (Rom. viii. 9). Even although Paul speaks of the Lord the Spirit, and expressly says the Lord is the Spirit (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18) we should solve the problem too easily were we simply to identify Christ and the Spirit. The work of Christ and of the Spirit is one; there is no union with Christ that is not possession and habitation by the Spirit; and yet there can be no doubt that Paul distinguishes the Spirit and Christ in the Apostolic benediction 2 Cor. xiii. 14: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." (Compare 1 Cor. xii. 4-6, and Ephesians iv. 4-6). The love of God is revealed in the grace of Christ, and this grace is realized in the communion of the Spirit; but while there is one divine work in men the Spirit is no more the same as Christ than Christ is the same as the Father.

(8) How shall we relate the working of the Spirit to the work of Christ? It seems to the writer that in so far as Paul was not conscious of the personal presence of Christ in his experience, and yet had evidence of divine activity in his religious certainty and moral progress, he described that action of God as the indwelling (Rom. viii. 9), working (1 Cor. xii. 11), leading (Rom. viii. 14), bearing witness (v. 16), help (v. 26) and teaching (1 Cor. ii. 13) of the Spirit. The whole of his "inner life" was not covered by his consciousness of personal communion with Christ. These were experiences which he could not assign to the exercise of his own personality alone, but for which he must find a divine

cause. To discuss the question whether Paul conceived the Spirit as a power or a person is quite beside the mark. For him the Spirit did indeed mean power, an enthusiasm and an energy which human personality could not account for ; but as the power of the personal God it was necessarily conceived and described as personal. Yet we seem warranted in affirming that he could not so distinctly distinguish the operations of the Spirit from the exercise of his own personality as he could distinguish himself from Christ even in the most intimate personal communion. The demand sometimes made that the Spirit is to be conceived as a person is self-contradictory, for the Spirit is God in His most intimate working within the soul of man, least distinguishable from human aspiration and effort. This working of the Spirit, while it may be distinguished from the personal communion with Christ, is not to be detached from the revelation of God or the redemption of man in Him. We must avoid, however, representing the working of the Spirit as only the subjective effects of the objective facts of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ as the means of man's salvation. Only where the grace of Christ is received in faith is the fellowship of the Spirit enjoyed, and yet the fellowship of the Spirit is more than the impression and influence of His grace. We do justice to Christian experience only as we recognize that God as Spirit Himself becomes progressively immanent in those to whom He reveals Himself and whom He redeems in His Son. The God who is in all, and through all, and over all does in measure conceal His presence ; but in the spiritual life that presence in the thoughts, feelings, desires, deeds of the spiritual man, is known and felt. The connexion between justification and sanctification is not merely human gratitude for divine grace as the motive of a new life ; it is not only a conscious personal communion with a Divine Saviour and Lord, a communion that must be

potent in conforming man to His moral perfection ; but it is, even when there is no consciousness of the personal presence of Christ, so long as faith claims grace, a habitation and operation in man of God by His Spirit, the very life of God become the life of man.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

STUDIES IN CONVERSION.

III. ST. AUGUSTINE.

IF the conversion of the Emperor Constantine is an instance of the power of dreams and visions, that of Augustine is a no less striking illustration of how another means of conversion mentioned in the thirty-third chapter of Job—namely, testimony—may take effect.

Augustine's life covers the second half of the fourth century and the first quarter of the fifth, his date being 354 to 430. He was a native of Thagaste, a town of Numidia in North Africa ; and most of his life was spent in that province. Soon after this time Numidia was blotted from the map of civilisation by the incursions of barbarians ; but, in his day, not only did it form part of the Roman Empire, but its capital, Carthage, was one of the leading cities of the world. The town of Hippo, where his mature life was spent, has been restored in recent times by the French, under the name of Bona, and, at the present day, is a busy seaport, containing 25,000 inhabitants.

Augustine was of good family. His father was a government official and, though far from being a wealthy man, made great efforts for the education of his gifted son, who was trained first at home, then in the neighbouring town of Madaura, and finally at the university of Carthage. The profession for which he was intended was that of a rhetorician or, as we should say, a professor of literature,

his pupils being those who meant to practise in the courts of law. This profession he exercised both at Thagaste, his native place, and at Carthage, as well as subsequently at Rome and Milan. But, after his conversion and baptism, which took place in his thirty-third year, he abandoned this calling and entered the Church, where he soon became a bishop and was settled for life in the town of Hippo, not far from the place of his birth. In this new position the full force of his genius unfolded itself, and he became one of the best known men of his age. But his fame in subsequent centuries has far exceeded even that of his lifetime. In the Middle Ages his influence was equally great in the intellectual life of the Church, which we call Scholasticism, and in the spiritual movements which we comprehend under the name of Mysticism; and at the Reformation the leading Reformers learnt more from him than from all other teachers, outside the Bible, put together. In fact, since the Apostle Paul there has arisen no greater teacher in the Christian Church.¹

From his own hand we have received an account of his early life and of his conversion which certainly holds a leading place among the religious classics of the world, and perhaps the foremost place of all among personal accounts of conversion. In literary form it is singular; for from beginning to end—and it extends to about three hundred pages—it is a continuous prayer. It abounds in sublime and ardent addresses to God such as we should call prayers. But, besides, the author recounts minutely—still in the form of prayer—the incidents of his life. And not only so; but he pauses at every opportunity to recapitulate the reflections occasioned

¹ Zwischen Paulus, dem Apostel, und Luther, dem Reformator, hat die christliche Kirche niemanden besessen, der sich mit Augustin messen könnte, und an umfassender Wirkung kommt ihm kein anderer gleich."—Harnack, *Reden und Aufsätze*, i. 53.

by these incidents in his highly trained and speculative mind, and still he keeps up the form of prayer. Hence the book is the most extraordinary *mélange* not only of self-analysis but of descriptions of the state of society, character-studies of his friends and acquaintances, shrewd remarks on human life, psychological observations and glances into the deepest mysteries of the soul. It ought to be read in its native Latin; because the epigrammatic sayings—some of them the deepest ever uttered—and the sublime invocations of the Deity have an extraordinary impressiveness in that language. The book was penned when the author was forty-three years of age; and the whole may be called an account of his conversion; for all the influences both which retarded and which led up to this event are carefully traced out; and, very soon after it takes place, the narrative portion comes to a close.

Although, in the half-century preceding St. Augustine's birth, Christianity had become the state-religion and had closed the idol temples all over the Empire, yet the old religions were still far from being overcome; and the heathenism of Numidia, which had been of a singularly dark and intense type, had not by any means entirely lost its hold, Carthage especially being a notoriously profligate city. St. Augustine's father was not a Christian, and he lived with the freedom of a pagan. His mother, Monica, however, was not only a professor of the new faith, but one in whom Christianity had accomplished its most perfect work. She was a woman of rare excellence—wise, affectionate and benevolent—and she proved the good angel of her son, the God whose servant she was giving her, before her own life ended, the supreme satisfaction of seeing both her husband and her son converted and baptized. The husband, however, died in the son's seventeenth year, leaving her a widow, to watch over the

development of the young man, who was still far from God and righteousness ; and she remains to all the Christian centuries the type of what a mother so circumstanced should be and do.

St. Augustine calls his autobiography *Confessions*—a name which suggests a penitential account of sins. This is not, indeed, exactly what he means by the word : his book is a confession of the divine mercies no less than of his own transgressions ; and its object is the praise of God. Still, the penitential element is predominant, and the author tells with frankness, but never with the slightest tone of boasting, at what points and by what influences he was led away from the path of virtue.

He goes very far back, confessing even the sins of his childhood, which he does not remember ; because, he argues, the anger, jealousy and other vices which he observes in other children must have existed in him also, when he was a child. In the account of his boyhood he charges himself with such sins as lying and petty thefts ; and, in the whole course of his education, he was possessed with the spirit of rivalry and vanity—a spirit which, he says, his father and his teachers encouraged rather than checked. At an incredibly early age he fell under the power of the sin which especially became his chain : it is sad and painful to have to mention—but the conversion of St. Augustine could hardly be made intelligible without mentioning the fact—that, before he had reached his eighteenth year, he had become the father of a son, with whose mother he had entered into a connexion in which heathen morality saw nothing to blame, but which Christianity inexorably condemns, and his conscience also condemned, though he was faithful to her. He was entangled also in the company of young men who plunged far more more deeply into vice than himself ; and he confesses that, when they were boasting of

their disgraceful acts, he made himself out worse than he was, lest he should be jeered at as an innocent. "O friendship," he exclaims, "too unfriendly! thou mysterious seducer of the soul; for, when they say 'Let us go: let us do it,' we are ashamed not to be shameless."¹

Meantime his education was being completed, and his mind was unfolding its remarkable talents. On the intellectual side of his nature too, however, he fell into error, in which he was long held captive, through becoming connected with the Manichaeans—a sect in whose tenets there was a strange combination of Oriental mysticism with some elements of Christianity. Its fundamental notion was that there exists in the universe an eternal dualism: in both nature and human nature two principles—the one good and the other evil—are forever at war with each other, being incapable of reconciliation. Its adherents made great pretensions to superior intellectuality and even to sanctity, but they ridiculed the Scriptures, and their doctrines destroyed the sense of responsibility for such sins as those to which Augustine had yielded. "It seemed to me," says he, "that it was not we that sinned, but I know not what other nature sinned in us. And it gratified my pride to be free from blame and, after I had committed a fault, not to acknowledge that I had done wrong."

Thus, by the time he had reached his majority, he was held fast by the cords on both sides of his nature—both the side of the senses and the side of the intellect. Yet influences of an opposite kind were never wanting; and—to use the words of John Owen—in the ashes there gleamed up from time to time sparks of celestial fire.²

There was always his mother's influence. She had imbued

¹ *Confessions*, Bk. ii. ch. 9.

² Owen has a chapter on the Conversion of St. Augustine in his work on the Holy Spirit.

his mind with Gospel truth ; he well knew that she prayed for him incessantly ; and he had constantly her example before his eyes. When he began to be wild and to distress her with his conduct, she had a dream of his conversion, by which she was greatly cheered. On another occasion she requested a bishop to converse with him and refute his Manichæan errors ; “ but he refused,” says Augustine, “ very prudently, as I afterwards came to see ; for he answered that I was still unteachable, being inflated with the novelty of that heresy, and that I had already perplexed divers inexperienced persons with vexatious questions, as she had informed him, ‘ But leave him alone for a while,’ saith he, ‘ only pray God for him ; he will of himself, through reading, discover what the error is, and how great is its impiety.’ He then disclosed to her that he had himself in his youth been given over to the Manichæans, but had come to see, without argument from anyone, how much that sect was to be shunned, and had shunned it. Which, when he had said and she would not be satisfied, but repeated more earnestly her entreaty, shedding copious tears, he, a little vexed at her importunity, exclaimed, ‘ Go thy way, and God bless thee, for it is not possible that the son of these tears should perish.’ Which answer, as she often mentioned in her conversations with me, she accepted as though it were a voice from heaven.”¹

In his boyhood Augustine had often been visited with the strivings of the Spirit of God. He mentions one time in particular when, being in extreme bodily pain and apparently at the point of death, he passionately begged to be baptized. His mother was at a loss ; but she distrusted the depth of his impressions ; though he himself, when writing of the circumstance, is not sure if she took the right course in refusing his request.

¹ iii. 12.

At a more mature stage of his youth he experienced another moral crisis in a somewhat singular way—through the reading of the *Hortensius*, a moral treatise of Cicero. In this work the author presented the claims of wisdom, as against the service of the flesh, with such persuasiveness that Augustine was almost persuaded to cast off his bonds. “This book,” he says, “changed my affections and turned my prayers to Thyself, O Lord, and made me have other hopes and desires. Worthless suddenly became every vain hope to me; and with an incredible warmth of heart I yearned for an immortality of wisdom”; and he adds the remarkable statement, “This alone checked me thus ardent, that the name of Christ was not in Cicero’s book. For this name according to Thy mercy, O Lord, this name of my Saviour Thy Son, had my tender heart piously drunk in even with my mother’s milk; and whatever was without that name, though never so erudite, polished and truthful, took not complete hold of me.”¹

In fact, although he was entangled both in vice and in doctrinal error, his was still in many respects a noble nature. Thus he tells that on one occasion, having offered himself as a competitor for a rhetorical prize, he was accosted by a soothsayer, who proposed, by sacrificing certain creatures in accordance with his art, to secure his triumph, but he indignantly replied: “If the garland were of imperishable gold, I would not suffer a fly to be destroyed to secure it for me.”²

He had a heart full of affection, and in his youth—as, indeed, all his life long—he was surrounded by troops of friends, to the choicer of whom he displayed a rare devotion. No one has ever spoken more glowingly of the delight of intercourse with friends—“to discourse and jest with them; to indulge in an interchange of kindness; to read together pleasant books; together to trifle and together to be earnest;

¹ iii. 4.

² iv. 2.

to differ at times without ill humour, as a man would do with his own self ; and even by the infrequency of these differences to give zest to our more frequent consentings ; sometimes teaching ; sometimes being taught ; longing for the absent with impatience and welcoming the coming with joy.”¹ By the death of one dearly loved friend he was so immoderately affected that he could no longer live in his native town, where he had begun to practise his profession, but removed to Carthage. “ Mine eyes sought him everywhere,” he writes, “ but he was not granted them ; and I hated all places because he was not in them ; I was astonished that other mortals lived, since he whom I loved was dead ; and I wondered still more that I, who was to him a second self, could live without him.”² Sentences like these betray what manner of man Augustine was—a deep, passionate nature, with an inappeasable thirst for the infinite.

The oft-quoted saying, which occurs in the first paragraph of the Confessions, is the keynote of his entire life, “ Thou hast formed us, O Lord, for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee.” He tried every substitute for God, but always in vain. He tried sensual pleasure ; but he confesses that he was “ scourged with burning rods of jealousy, suspicion, fear, anger and strife.” He tried ambition and honours. He tried learning and philosophy. He tried friendship. But an attraction far more divine was ever drawing him, though he was shy of yielding to it. “ So,” says he, “ I fretted, sighed, wept, tormented myself, and took neither rest nor advice. For I bore about with me a rent and polluted soul, and where to repose it I found not. Not in pleasure groves, not in sport or song, not in fragrant spots, not in magnificent banquetings, not in the pleasures of the bed and the couch, not, finally, in books or songs did

¹ iv. 5.

² iv. 5.

I find repose. To Thee, O Lord, should my soul have been raised. This I knew, but was neither willing nor able.”

It turned out that the bondage of the intellect to error was the one from which he was to be first delivered. He gradually lost faith in Manichaeism. This change of mind was partly brought about by a growing acquaintance with science; for the sect had woven into its creed certain unscientific tenets on scientific subjects; and, when Augustine discovered that these were mistaken, the whole system crumbled away in his mind. The process of disenchantment was completed by his coming in contact with a famous high-priest of the sect, whom he expected to find able to solve all his difficulties, but whom he discovered, on close acquaintance, to be a mere orator with no depth of speculative power. “And,” says he, “what profit to me was the elegance of my cupbearer, since he offered me not the more precious draught for which I thirsted?”¹ At this stage he was like to fall into univereal scepticism, for he had dropped the false faith but had not yet adopted the true, and, indeed, was to a large extent ignorant of it, as he had not yet attached himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures. Certain Platonic books, however, which fell into his hands at this time, fortified him with a few elementary convictions. Augustine is one of those, of whom there have been not a few, to whom philosophy has served as a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ; and he used to compare those who came into Christianity out of heathenism enriched with the doctrines of the philosophers to the children of Israel who came into Canaan laden with the spoil of the Egyptians.

About the time of his emergence from Manichaeism he transferred his abode from Carthage to Rome. So opposed was this to the wishes of his mother, who feared for him the temptations of the capital, that it was only by practising

¹ v. 7.

on her a cruel deception that he was able to get away. She prayed against his going, yet, by not answering this prayer, as Augustine characteristically observes, God was answering all the prayers of her lifetime ; for, when her son directed his course towards Italy, he was unawares on the way to meet the redeeming influence of his life. He was not long in Rome before he received an enviable appointment in Milan, then the second capital of Italy and an imperial residence. The Bishop of Milan, at the time, was St. Ambrose—one who is now reckoned, along with St. Augustine, among the four greatest teachers of the Latin Church. He is best remembered perhaps for his eminent service to the praise of the Church ; but he was, besides, an eloquent preacher and a solid teacher. Augustine was introduced to him and at once fell under his fascination. At first, indeed, he confesses, he went to hear him preach on account of the eloquence of his delivery and the elegance of his Latinity ; but soon he was enthralled with the truth itself. From Ambrose he obtained a view of Christianity and an interpretation of the Scriptures with which his intellect was satisfied ; and in no long time he was thoroughly convinced that the teaching of the Church was the truth of God.

Thus the half of his conversion may be said to have been accomplished. Yet the decisive step had still to be taken. His intellect was satisfied, but the bondage of his senses to lust was as unbroken as ever. His mother had joined him at Milan, and she started a project of marriage, to which he assented, and he sent back to Africa the woman who had been the companion of his guilty life. The marriage, however, could not take place for two years on account of the youth of the bride ; and in the interval he miserably fell into a connexion of the same kind as that from which he had escaped.

This is the darkest blot on the record of St. Augustine ;

and to us the astonishing thing, betraying how undeveloped was the morality of the age, is that he seems to have had no idea what he owed to the mother of his son. Now he experienced in all its violence the struggle, described in the seventh of Romans, between the law in the members and the law of the mind, and felt all the bitterness and shame of knowing to do right and yet doing it not. His conversion became, in short, a stand-up fight between a 'deep-seated, besetting sin on the one hand and the law of God and the attraction of Christ on the other.

The final passages in the struggle are of absorbing interest. Milan, full of Ambrose's influence, was a place where remarkable religious decisions were taking place, and Augustine could not but hear of them. His soul was shaken and he burned to imitate them; yet he could not make up his mind. His miserable prayer, he says, was, "Grant me chastity and continency—but not yet." "To Thee," he says again, "showing me on every side that what thou saidst was true, I, convicted by the truth, had nothing to reply but, 'Presently, lo, presently; oh, leave me a little while; but 'presently, presently' had no present, and my 'leave me a little while' went on for a long while."

One day a friend, who held high office in the Emperor's court, was calling on him and expressed surprise at seeing a volume of St. Paul's Epistles lying on the table. When Augustine confessed that he was now a reader of such literature, the man, who was a Christian, began to testify to his Saviour, and especially to describe the case of two fellow-officials, who had recently, in very trying circumstances, given up all for Christ. As he listened, Augustine was overwhelmed with shame, remembering in how many ways the Spirit of God had striven with him, and with what trivial pleas he had stifled his convictions. When the visitor had departed, he threw himself in a tumult of emotion on

Alypius, a friend who lived with him and who had been passing through an experience not unlike his own, crying : “ What is wrong with us ? What is this ? Didst thou hear what he said ? The unlearned are taking heaven by force, and we, with our learning, but wanting heart—see where we wallow in flesh and blood.”¹

There was a garden behind the house into which he rushed, followed by Alypius, and there, casting himself down, he resigned himself to the tumult of emotion. The hour had come ; and it was as if the powers of heaven and hell were contending for his soul. “ Lo,” he says, “ I said mentally, Let it be done now. And, as I spoke, I all but came to a resolve. I all but did it, yet I did it not. Yet fell I not back into my old condition, but took up my position hard by and drew breath. And I tried again, and wanted but very little of reaching it, and somewhat less, and then all but touched and grasped it ; and yet came not at it, hesitating to die unto death and live unto life. And the very moment that I was to become another man, the nearer it approached me, the greater horror did it strike into me ; but it did not strike me back nor turn me aside, but kept me in suspense.”²

At length, feeling himself about to give way to a rush of tears, he rose from Alypius’ side and moved away to a remote part of the garden ; but, as he went, he heard, from a neighbouring house the voice of a boy or girl, saying, perhaps in some game, “ Take up and read, take up and read ” ! In his excitement it sounded to him as a divine command to take up and read the Epistle of St Paul, with which he had been occupied. Returning at once, he took up the roll, when the first words on which his eyes fell were these : “ Let us walk honestly as in the day ; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying ; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision

¹ viii. 8.

² viii. 11.

for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof.”¹ This Scripture, it will be observed, struck straight at his besetting sin : and, as has happened so often in other cases, the sword of the Spirit proved to be the weapon needed to cut the cords asunder ; they fell at his feet, and he stepped out of his bonds forever. Not only did he at once feel release, but the peace of God which passeth all understanding flowed into his soul ; and he returned to the house, to make his mother happy with the news.

Fortunately the autumn holidays of the institution in which he was a lecturer were at hand, and he retired to a country-house, at the foot of the Alps, placed at his disposal by an acquaintance, accompanied by a number of young men, who had apparently been swept into the kingdom in his wake ; and there he stayed for six months in heavenly communion, occupied with the study of Scripture and literary composition ; for he had resolved to give up the rhetorician’s trade.

At the end of this delightful interval, he was baptized by Ambrose, along with his son Adeodatus and his friend Alypius ; and immediately thereafter, he set out with them and his mother for his native Africa. But at Ostia, the port at which they were to embark, he lost his beloved mother. She had obtained the desire of her heart, and had nothing left to live for. Her son tells of a conversation they had at Ostia, before she was seized with the fever of which she died. Leaning out of the window of the house of entertainment at which they were lodged, they spoke long and pleasantly about the past and the wonderful goodness of God. Augustine began to confess how he had tried her, but she would not allow that he had ever been anything but kind. Then their thoughts took a higher flight, and they spoke so intimately of the enjoyments and glories of heaven that they

¹ Rom. xiii. 13, 14.

could scarcely believe they were not in that place of bliss. Within a week she had actually passed to the better country, and Augustine had to set forth alone to face the great future that lay before him.

JAMES STALKER.

PAULINISM AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS.

THE true criterion of any religion or system of thought is the effect it produces upon its followers. And in the case of the Religion of Jesus this line of evidence is all the more essential because it is the evidence to which He Himself trusted. Jesus Himself wrote no book. He never, so far as we learn from the Gospel narratives, made any attempt to present His teaching in systematized form. He was content to implant certain seed-thoughts and truths in the minds and hearts of his immediate followers, and leave them to germinate and develop there. The disciples of Jesus thus became in a very special sense His witnesses, to whom the future proclamation and propagation of His religion were intrusted, and any attempt to estimate in what the real significance of Jesus' Religion lay must necessarily start from their testimony.

Amongst these witnesses, the Apostle Paul occupies an outstanding, if not the outstanding place. True, it may at once be said that St. Paul was not himself one of the original Twelve, nor even a personal companion of Jesus. But this, so far from being an objection, rather tells the other way. Historical personages and events are as a rule best understood not by those who stand immediately under their shadow, but by those who, while furnished with adequate knowledge, are able to look at them as it were from the outside, and under circumstances favourable to an impartial judgment. And from this point of view where

can we find a better witness than St. Paul? His conversion took place at most within a very few years after the death of Jesus, and he consequently had the opportunity of free intercourse with those who had been Jesus' own contemporaries; while, on the other hand, the whole course of his previous training and mode of life made it imperative for him to ascertain in what the secret of Jesus really lay.

Nor is this all, but we are in possession of altogether unexampled means of discovering what the views of St. Paul regarding the religion of His Master were. If, as Goethe puts it somewhere, the best memorial a man can leave behind him is a letter, in the letters of St. Paul we have memorials of the most trustworthy and convincing kind regarding his influence and thought. The day has happily gone by when the authenticity of by far the greater part of the Pauline Epistles can be seriously attacked. With the exception of the Pastorals, which stand on a somewhat different footing, practically all are accepted by such outstanding critics as Professor Harnack in Germany and Sir William Ramsay amongst ourselves. And we are also now able—largely through the labours of the same scholars—to accept as genuine historical documents the corresponding and supplementary narratives of the Book of Acts. And the general result is, that not only is St. Paul himself “the most luminous personality in the history of primitive Christianity” (Harnack), but that what for convenience we are accustomed to describe as Paulinism—Christianity seen through St. Paul's eyes, and interpreted by St. Paul's thought—is better known to us than any other type of teaching in the apostolic age.

On the corresponding influence that Paulinism has exerted—on the impress that it made not only on the Apostle's own times, but on the whole succeeding life and thought of the Church—it is unnecessary to dwell. It is

reflected in our creeds. It has been the inspiring cause of our principal religious movements and reformations. Men like St. Augustine or like Luther have been "unable to find a religion in Christ until they have entered by Paul's door." And we have only to trace to their source the language, the expressions, of which we make use in giving utterance to our own deepest religious convictions to discover how largely St. Paul is responsible for them.

This very fact, however, that St. Paul has exerted such a commanding influence in the past history of Christendom inevitably raises the question as to how far this influence is justified. And the question is all the more urgent, because of the attitude that is so frequently taken up at the present time with reference to it.

Thus we are all familiar with the contention that the Religion of Jesus, instead of being helped, has rather been hindered by this close association with St. Paul, and that not till it shakes itself free from the "burden of Paul" can it make its true power felt. "Back to Jesus" is the cry—"Back from the subtleties and dogmas of the disciple to the simple and direct teaching of the Master."

Or, conversely, we are asked to see in St. Paul, and not in Jesus, the real founder of Christianity. The "gospel" on which the Apostle so prided himself, and which even in his own days was regarded as "another," has, so we are told, no real roots in the Person or Words of the historic Jesus: its "kernel" lies "elsewhere." And as the latest and most outspoken exponent of this view, Professor Wrede, does not hesitate even to say, as compared with Jesus, St. Paul has "exercised beyond all doubt the stronger—not the better—influence . . . He has thrust that greater Person whom he meant only to serve, utterly into the background" (*Paul*, Eng. Tr. p. 180).

An attitude such as this, so fearless, so incisive, and at

the same time so utterly subversive of what we have been accustomed to regard as the true relation between Jesus and His foremost follower, has naturally called forth a number of replies. And writers of the more "advanced or "liberal" school in Germany—such as Kölbing,¹ A. Meyer,² and Jülicher³—have hastened to join hands with the veteran Professor Kaftan⁴ and others in repudiating the existence of any such deep and impassable gulf between Jesus and Paul as Wrede thinks he has discovered.

Upon the different arguments they have advanced, or the different methods in which, while admitting real and important differences, they have sought to establish essential agreement between Paulinism and the Religion of Jesus, it is impossible to enter just now. It would involve us in endless technicalities, and after all perhaps not carry us very far, for it is obvious that a full solution of the problem can only be reached after agreement has been arrived at as to what is really involved in the teaching of Jesus on the one hand, and in the teaching of Paul on the other, and then a detailed examination of the points of likeness and unlikeness that have thus emerged. But it may perhaps help you to put yourselves at the proper point of view for approaching the study and discussion of this question, which after all is a question not merely of great historic and literary interest, but of immense practical significance, if I try to bring before you one or two considerations of a general kind that have an important bearing upon it.

1. In itself there is nothing unreasonable in the fact that out of the fundamental truths of the Religion of Jesus—truths, remember, in which His Life as well as His Words

¹ *Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu auf Paulus* (1906).

² *Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus?* (1907).

³ *Paulus und Jesus* (1907), one of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher* like Wrede's *Paulus* (1905).

⁴ *Jesus und Paulus* (1906).

have a place—St. Paul constructed a definite and systematic exposition of thought.

On the contrary, such an exposition was from the nature of the case inevitable. Men must think out—interpret—the varied bearings of the religious truths on which their faith rests, if that faith is to continue to have any real hold over them. And not until they have tried to understand so far as is possible the nature of the relation in which Jesus stands to God on the one hand and to mankind on the other, can they hope to realize the full character of the work He has accomplished. Or, to express this in the language of Theology, no sooner have we grasped the meaning and extent of Jesus' claims on our allegiance, than a theory of His Person, a Christology, entitling Him to make such claims, must follow. And this Christology carries with it in its turn a Soteriology, or doctrine of the redemption, which by His Death and Resurrection He has effected.

The fact, then, that St. Paul, in a sense which I shall define more exactly directly, is a theologian cannot in itself be made any real ground of complaint against him. It may be that his early Rabbinical training shows itself at times in a style of argument which we have great difficulty in following; and that, at other times, the controversies in which he was engaged, and which are so clearly reflected in his Epistles, have led to a certain sharpness of definition which would otherwise have been wanting. But the broad fact remains, that in placing the Religion of Jesus on a reasoned basis, he has given us a constructive scheme of Christian thought, without which that Religion could not have continued to assert its supremacy over the mind as well as over the heart of man.

Nor in this connexion is it without significance to notice that in so doing St. Paul was only carrying out and developing a tendency of which we have already traces in

the teaching of the original Apostles. The sermons and speeches, for example, of the first half of the Book of Acts are by no means so untheological as many would have us to believe. And it is surely a pertinent inquiry to ask those who are so fond of magnifying the peculiarities of St. Paul's doctrinal system to explain how it was that, after undoubted difficulty and much discussion, his teaching in the main was ultimately accepted and approved by the "pillars" of the Church at Jerusalem.

"There is no historical fact," says so great a master of historical inquiry as Professor Harnack, "more certain than that the Apostle Paul was not, as we might perhaps expect, the first to emphasize so prominently the significance of Christ's death and resurrection, but that in recognising their meaning he stood exactly on the same ground as the primitive community" (*What is Christianity?* p. 153). And again—"It was, indeed, no insignificant circumstance that men in whose ears every word of their master's was still ringing, and in whose recollection the concrete features of his personality were still a vivid memory—that these faithful disciples should recognise a pronouncement to be true which in important points seemed to depart from the original message and portended the downfall of the religion of Israel" (*ibid.* p. 179).

2. We must not, however, in approaching the study of St. Paul's teaching think of him only or even principally as a theologian. Though he was Paul the thinker, he was and remained Paul the man. And only as we regard the truths he taught in the light of his own personal religious experience can we hope to understand either him or them.

The point, self-obvious as it seems, is too often forgotten. Wrede, for example, in the book to which I have already referred, while rightly denying that we can describe Paul as a theologian in the modern sense of the word, insists

emphatically that “*the religion of the apostle is theological through and through : his theology is his religion*” (p. 76). And we all know how frequently in the ordinary text-books on Paul and Paulinism the man himself—the eager, passionate, living man, whose whole self throbs in every word he writes—is apt to be lost sight of in endless discussions on the exact meaning or bearing of this or that doctrine; whereas, nowhere more than in St. Paul’s case does the old maxim hold true: “*pectus facit theologum.*” Only as we get at the heart of the man can we hope to get at the heart of his teaching. Or, to invert Wrede’s phrase: “his religion is his theology.”

The central fact in St. Paul’s religion, and consequently in the future development of his religious thought, is of course the outstanding event in his life, which we commonly call his conversion, as caused by the appearance to him of the Risen Lord on the Damascus road. And whatever view is taken of that appearance, whether it is regarded as subjective or as objective, or better, as both subjective and objective—subjective when viewed in its effect upon St. Paul’s own mind, and objective because that effect was caused by no hallucination but by a real manifestation of Jesus in what the Apostle afterwards calls “the body of His glory” (Phil. iii. 21)—I say whatever the exact view taken of that appearance, as a simple matter of historical fact it changed St. Paul. Henceforth he was literally a “new man”—influenced by new feelings, dominated by new impulses, looking at all truth from a new point of view, so that it is not going too far to say with Holtzmann, that St. Paul’s entire system of doctrine or teaching—his *Lehrbegriff*—“simply means the exposition of the content of his conversion.”¹ Or, in the words of a recent English writer, Mr.

¹ Holtzmann’s words are: “Sein ganzer Lehrbegriff . . . bedeutet einfach die Explication des Inhalts der Bekehrung, die Systematisierung

Bernard Lucas, which I gladly quote, if only for the sake of recommending to you his fresh and suggestive study of Paulinism published under the title of *The Fifth Gospel*: "The Gospel of Paul is an interpretation of the life and work of Jesus, based upon the revelation to him of Jesus as the risen Christ . . . It cannot be too strongly emphasised that it was a fact and not a theory, experience and not argument, which revolutionised his thought" (pp. 15, 63).

3. But if so, we see how inevitable it was that St. Paul's main interest should centre in this Risen, this Glorified Christ, who had appeared to him, and in union with whom he was conscious that his own life was henceforth lived. He began, in fact, first where the older Apostles ended. They, starting from their experience, saw in the Death and Resurrection of Jesus the crowning of the whole of the earthly life they themselves had been privileged to witness. But St. Paul, to whom no such earthly acquaintance had been granted, starting in his turn from his experience, saw in Jesus first and foremost a Heavenly Being, the "image" (2 Cor. iv. 4, Col. i. 15) of God, who had come down from heaven to suffer and to die.

The problem that St. Paul had to face—and this alone makes his experience so important for ourselves—was What could this Risen Christ do for one who had never seen Him upon earth, or at any rate who had never been one of His personal followers during His earthly ministry? And his answer was that He could do all and more than all that the historic Jesus had done. "He was still a living Personal Power, still the source of healing, righteousness, and life to all who would trust Him; that is the truth of which the doctrine of justification by faith is the theological expres-

der Christophanie. Das ist die Grösse und das ist die Schwäche der Sache" (*Neutest. Theologie*, ii. p. 205).

sion.”¹ For, just as while He was upon earth Jesus extended His saving ministry to all who showed “faith” in Him, even so a corresponding faith was still rewarded by the assurance that the believer was “in Christ,” and consequently, as the result of this union, and not as leading up to it, placed within the sphere of God’s forgiveness and justifying love.

It would have been interesting to try and show how the other great Pauline doctrines of adoption, of sanctification, of future salvation, are but varying theological expressions of this great personal experience looked at from different points of view. But that would carry us too far from our immediate purpose. And it must be sufficient to emphasise that it was the consciousness of the change that had been wrought in his own life, and that affected his whole life, that afterwards made it so impossible for St. Paul in his teaching to dissociate the objective redemption in which his gospel centred from the new life in which that redemption found expression. The crude divorce between religion and morality with which we are so familiar nowadays, and for which Paulinism is sometimes held responsible, was certainly unknown to its author. Not less strenuously than his Master does he insist that it is not the mere “word of hearing” that constitutes “the believer,” but the word “doing its work,” or better “through its Divine inherent power being made to work” (ὅς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται, 1 Thess. ii. 13) within the heart. And so far, therefore, from faith being with him “at bottom belief in a dogma,” as Wrede asserts (p. 164), Jülicher is nearer the mark, when he finds in it a convenient contraction to describe the whole life as it is lived in Christ with the consequent victory over the lusts of the flesh, or, in a word, a convertible term with holiness (cf. *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 21).

¹ Lock, *St. Paul, the Master-BUILDER*, p. 69f., a discussion to which the whole of this section is much indebted.

4. While, however, in virtue of the nature of his own experience—an experience, I repeat, which is also in its own degree ours—the Risen and Glorified Christ is the centre of the whole of the Apostle's theological and ethical teaching, this is very far indeed from saying that the Jesus of history has no interest for him.

It is perfectly true that the references in the Pauline Epistles to the facts of the earthly life and ministry of Jesus are by no means so numerous as we might naturally perhaps have expected. But this arises not only from the Apostle's overwhelming interest in the living Lord, to which reference has already been made so often, but to the fact that these Epistles were addressed to Christian communities and individuals whose knowledge of the more elementary truths could be taken for granted, and who consequently were in need not so much of instruction as of confirmation and edification in the faith.

Nor is this all, but the references that do exist are of such a nature as to show us that St. Paul could have told us a great deal more had it lain within his immediate purpose to do so. When, for example, he refers to Jesus' being born of a human mother, to His Jewish origin, to His Davidic descent, to His circumcision, to His brethren, of whom one was James, to the poverty of His early surroundings, it is obvious that he had more than a vague knowledge of what these early surroundings were. And consequently when we pass to the closing scenes, which from their still deeper significance bulked so largely in his thoughts, it is not surprising to find that, even if other sources of information were no longer available, we could still gather from the Pauline writings alone a wonderfully clear impression of how the Saviour's last hours on earth were spent—His betrayal, His Crucifixion, His Death and His Burial. While, as regards the Resurrection, it is to the same source that we owe not

only the earliest, but in a sense the completest record of the appearances of the Risen Lord, before He finally ascended from the earth (1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.).

Other evidence that points in the same direction are the references—few but unmistakable—which St. Paul makes to the words or teaching of Jesus, and, more important still, the striking manner in which the whole portraiture of the meek, the sinless, the loving Christ of the Epistles presupposes and rests upon just such a personality as is brought before us in the Gospels. These Gospels in their present form were of course not available for St. Paul. But he may well have had in his possession certain written records of the words and deeds of Jesus, such as are pointed to in St. Luke's preface, while his knowledge was undoubtedly supplemented by personal intercourse with the original Apostles.¹

Attempts indeed have been made by Wrede and others to explain St. Paul's picture of Jesus as due not to the impression made upon his mind by the account of Jesus' actual character and words, as to certain Jewish conceptions regarding the Messiah which had been familiar to him in his pre-Christian days, and were afterwards transferred by him to the Christ of his faith. But the evidence appealed to in support of these alleged parallels is utterly inadequate to bear the weight laid upon it. And while I am, of course,

¹ Resch in his elaborate work *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu* (Leipzig, 1904) is of opinion that immediately after his conversion Paul came into possession, perhaps at the hands of Ananias, of a primitive Gospel, the Hebrew *Logia* of Jesus, and that this was his constant companion during the three years' solitude in Arabia (p. 533 f.). The conjecture is more interesting than convincing, as is the case also with many of the parallels that its author seeks to establish between the language of the Pauline writings and the discourses of Jesus. The whole question of the *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ* may be most conveniently studied in Canon Knowling's judicious Boyle Lectures published under that title (1905), with their wealth of bibliographical references. See also the valuable monographs by P. Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus* (Leipzig, 1902), and M. Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 1904).

very far indeed from denying that St. Paul frequently clothed his teaching in forms suggested to him by his old Jewish training, for the essential contents of his thought we must look, not to any dead system of ideas, but to an historic personality—the Jesus of Nazareth, of whom His opponents said that He was “dead,” but “whom Paul affirmed to be alive” (Acts xxv. 19).

“Jesus is Lord”—that is the central, the dominant note of all St. Paul’s life and thought. As the Risen Lord, who appeared to him on the Damascus road, appeared under the human name of Jesus (an interesting confirmation of the historical character of the whole narrative), so with all his after-sense of dependence upon the Christ of experience, the Apostle saw ever behind that glorified and heavenly Being the Christ of history, the religious significance of whose life and death His resurrection had first made clear. And it is further highly significant of this need that St. Paul himself felt of an historical basis to his creed, that in the most spiritual of all his Epistles he reminds his readers that thus only can they truly “learn Christ,” according as they have been taught “even as the truth is in Jesus” (Eph. iv. 20 f.).

In his *Saint Paul*, in which he analyses with such marvellous insight the feelings and longings of the great Apostle, Frederic Myers goes too far when he represents Paul as regretting that an actual companionship with Jesus upon earth had been denied to him—

Oh to have watched thee through the vineyards wander,
Pluck the ripe ears, and into evening roam!—
Followed, and known that in the twilight yonder
Legions of angels shone about thy home!

Of any such desire the Apostle himself never gives the slightest trace. On the contrary, whatever the exact meaning of the much disputed words, all such outward

knowledge of Christ "after the flesh" seems to him a very small thing indeed as compared with the new knowledge "in Christ," which is his chiefest glory and hope (cf. 2 Cor. v. 16 f.). But this is very far indeed from saying that St. Paul did not constantly look towards the historic Jesus, or that his faith was of the vague, subjective character that it is sometimes represented to have been. The indwelling Christ was for him no empty abstraction, but a real Person, freed from all those limitations by which He had been encompassed during His sojourn "in the flesh," and able to make His Divine power universally felt. And it is just "from this intimate blending of history and faith, of the subjective and objective in his mind" that St. Paul's theology resulted: "in this combination lies its distinguishing feature."¹

We need not, then—to come back to the point from which we started—have any fear that, in approaching the study of Paulinism, we run the risk of being influenced by one who substituted for the religion of Jesus an unauthorised gospel of his own. St. Paul was not, in Deissmann's happy phrase, "the second after Jesus, but the first 'in Christ'"; and if, in certain respects, his gospel differs from the gospel of the other Apostles, it is only because he has entered more fully into the mind, the whole mind of Christ. To him "Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11). And so far from glorying in "persuasive words of wisdom" (1 Cor. ii. 4), his one ambition is to interpret to the world the Incarnate and Risen Lord, whom first of all he has discovered for himself.

Therefore, not "Away from Paul and back to Jesus," but rather, as one of his recent apologists puts it, "Back through Paul to Jesus and to God."²

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

¹ Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. Tr. p. 85.

² A. Meyer, *Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus* p. 104.

THE CAREFULNESS OF LUKE THE PROPHET.

PROFESSOR HARNACK, whose candour and straightforwardness of mind in the best sense of those words have always been the admiration of his readers, says of St. Luke that "there is scarcely another writer in the New Testament who is so careless a historian as he.¹ He must indeed be called an artist in language, but in regard to his subject-matter, in chapter after chapter, where he is not an eye-witness, he affords gross instances of carelessness, and often of complete confusion in the narrative." He then proceeds to give instances.

I propose to submit some passages in the Acts, whether describing scenes of which he was an eye-witness or not (and on this question my sure conviction that St. Luke was Silas prevents me just now from agreeing with him), which to the patient examiner exhibit signs of a most unusual and careful elaboration. The formulated results of this examination, which was made long before Professor Harnack's work appeared, have not a little to do with the question of whether Luke was "a careful historian" in the sense of Professor Harnack's statement, which, taken apart from the context to which I refer the reader, might appear to be a much more sweeping statement than he probably intends it to be. Most readers would be disposed to group the instances quoted by him as minor discrepancies, slight omissions, iterations, anticipations, abbreviations in detail. But the present point is whether the "carelessness" of the historian is to be strictly limited to his statements of detailed occurrence in particular scenes and so amounts to nothing more than incomplete description, or, on the other hand, extends to a carelessness of writing, apart from the artistic merit that the critic has rightly attributed to St. Luke.

¹ *Luke the Physician*, p. 112.

It will appear that there is a balance of carefulness against the carelessness that has to be taken into account, and that moreover throws a light upon the innermost mind of St. Luke which can only lead us to further results of great importance bearing on the question of the authorship of "Acts."

Let us first take the three accounts of the "Conversion" of St. Paul, which happen to be the first of the instances mentioned by Professor Harnack, who adds: "Here the narrator alone is to blame, for he possessed only one account." It must be remembered that the "conversion" of Saul is a term which has no scriptural authority as applied to the great occurrence on the road to Damascus. St. Paul so far from applying it to himself gives no account of the event in his Epistles. And in one way it is an objectionable term, in that it implies that St. Paul was once converted from a sinful life. What St. Paul is reported as saying is that he "was exceedingly mad against" the saints, when "I lived according to the strictest sect of our religion, a Pharisee," "being zealous for God, even as ye all are this day." His persecution of the saints is a proof of zeal, not of sinfulness. His own consciousness of sin is quite apart from his having been a persecutor before baptism. He "is not fit to be called an Apostle because he persecuted the Church of God" (1 Cor. xv. 9), not however because that was "sin" at the time, but because it was madness or misdirected zeal, "being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers" (Gal. i. 14). The amazing contrast was indeed a complete turning round (Gal. i. 23) or conversion, but it was not so much a confession of previous sin as of previous insanity or error. The Apostle's self-reproaches of sinfulness in Romans vii. have no particular relation to his life before the occurrence.

However, it must next be observed that whatever fitness belongs to the term "conversion" in St. Paul's case, the same

is held by St. Luke to belong to the term in St. Peter's case. St. Paul was "converted" in Acts ix. because St. Peter was to be "converted" in Acts x. Let this not be misunderstood. Both events were historical and both, I believe, have been truly described by St. Luke. There was a parallelism in fact, and St. Luke has set forth this parallelism in history. Neither the description in Acts ix. nor that in Acts x. has been composed in order to make history; neither of them is a fiction for purposes other than the diffusion of the truth. The parallelism of the Acts is a fact and not a fancy,¹—a fact of critical importance,—but the reasons of it and the consequences of it generally do not now concern us more closely than the particular observation that Acts ix. is parallel to Acts x. It must suffice here to say that the predisposition of St. Luke's mind exhibited in the parallelism which he has drawn between St. Peter and St. Paul is abundantly illustrated in the pages of the New Testament. It is illustrated in the resemblance of events in one apostle's life and events in another's: in the resemblance of events in the life of the Master and that of the disciple (for instance, "Talitha, arise," Luke viii. 54, and "Tabitha, arise," Acts ix. 40; and the words on the Cross compared with those of Stephen at his death); in the resemblance of the historic occurrence and the prophetic prediction; in the resemblance of the New Testament chain of events and the Old Testament chain of events.

The latter is the most wonderful of all these kinds. If I were asked what was the most marvellous thing, apart from the Beauty of Holiness, in the whole Bible, I should have no hesitation in saying that it was the coincidence between the names in Joshua in the Greek Old Testament and the names in the map of Macedonia.² This coincidence,

¹ *St. Luke the Prophet*, p. 319.

² See EXPOSITOR, 1901; *St. Luke the Prophet*, ch. ii.

which is gathered from the pages of "Acts," but only remotely indicated by St. Luke, is marvellous, undeniable, unique, antecedently incredible, unaccountable except on the supposition of the accuracy of the travel-document, and at the same time altogether consistent with the other features of St. Luke's writing.

It is time that we came to close quarters with St. Luke's report of the "conversion" of Saul. It is written, not only with a sense of parallelism with the Old Testament, but upon the framework of a certain chapter of Daniel.

St. Peter's conversion is directly stated to have been due to an ecstasy or state of trance, superinduced, physically speaking, by fasting (Acts x. 10). The question naturally arises whether the physical state of Saul on the road to Damascus was not equally one of ecstasy.¹ To some persons it may appear incredible that the persecuting Pharisee, however faint and weary with the heat of the midday sun and the fatigue of travel, could have fallen into a trance. Such persons would assuredly be disposed to say, as the men of old time "said one to another, Is Saul also among the prophets? Therefore it became a proverb" (1 Sam. x. 11, 12). But is it so unlikely that a state of trance which was habitual with the prophets—of this there is no doubt whatever—would not befall one who at that time was not himself a prophet? Does any student of the physiology of trance venture to say that a condition would not in the circumstances given in this particular case account for St. Luke's language, which we, for convenience, may fairly sum up in the statement that a trance or ecstasy fell upon Saul as it fell upon Peter at Joppa? The Greek Bible was known at that time to Saul, and he would be especially versed in the history of his namesake, Saul, son of Kish.

¹ This question is partly discussed in *St. Luke the Prophet*, p. 343 ff., but the following parallelism with Daniel had not been noticed by me then.

The words in 1 Samuel x. 2 would be present to his mind, "The Lord hath anointed thee for his inheritance to be a ruler": he was in fact charged with a High Commission to deal with certain sectaries accused of blasphemy. Acts xxvi. 11 implies this, which, however, is proved on other grounds. His destined "inheritance" seemed then to him to be "Israel after the flesh" (1 Cor. x. 18; Eph. ii. 11; Rom. ix. 3). How little did he dream then of its fulfilment in the "inheritance of the saints in light" (Eph. i. 18; Col. i. 12)! Then, further, he knew that it had been foretold of Saul, the son of Kish, that "the Spirit of the Lord shall *leap upon* thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man." It is a common way of speaking that prophecies tend to their own fulfilment, and it seems to be credible that this prophecy so tended in this case of the second Saul of the tribe of Benjamin. I do not find more than two traces of the narrative of 1 Samuel x. underlying the narrative of Acts, but these are worth noting. "It shall come to pass, when these signs shall have come upon thee, do all things that thy hand findeth to do, for God is with thee . . . and I *will tell thee what thou shalt do*" (1 Sam. x. 7, 8). In Acts ix. 6 Jesus says to Saul, "Enter into the city, and it *shall be told thee what thou must do*" (ix. 16), "for I *will shew him how many things he must suffer* (compare Acts xxii. 10). And the other trace is in the single but volume-speaking word, also of Jesus, to him (Acts xxvi. 18), "that they should receive remission of sins and an *inheritance* among the saints by faith that is in me."

This, however, is only by the way, except that it illustrates the profound permeation of St. Luke's mind with the phraseology of the Old Testament, such as no Gentile could ever have obtained. It is, I respectfully think, an omission of Professor Harnack's, that he has passed so very lightly over the question of St. Luke's (alleged) Gentile origin.

We come now to the passage of Daniel x., which underlies Acts ix., xxii., and xxvi., and it will appear to be a plain conclusion from the comparison of Acts with its original that the writer of Acts believed that a trance "leapt upon" Saul on the way to Damascus. The account in Daniel is abridged here.

LXX. of Daniel x.

(2) In those days I Daniel was mourning *three* weeks.

(3) I ate no pleasant food, and meat and wine entered not into my mouth.

(4) I was at the brink of the great river Tigris.

(5) And I lifted up my eyes and saw, and, behold, a man . . . and from his waist was *light*.

(6) Like brass *lightening* forth (ἐξαστραπτῶν).

(7) And I saw this great *vision* (ὄρασιν LXX, ὀπτασίαν Theodotion), and the men that were with me saw not this vision, and great *fear* fell upon them.

(8) And I was left *alone* and . . . there was not left *in me any strength*.

(9) And I heard not the *voice* of his *speaking* (τὴν φωνὴν λαλιᾶς αὐτοῦ): for I had fallen on my face upon the earth. (So LXX, but Theodotion has, "and I heard the voice of his words, and in my hearing of him (αὐτοῦ) I was dumfounded . . ." (κατανευυγμένος.)

(10) And, behold, he led forth a *hand* to me (χεῖρα προσήγαγέ μοι) and raised me upon my knees (ἤγειρέ με ἐπὶ τῶν γονάτων)

Acts ix. 3 foll., xxii. 6 foll., xxvi. 12 foll.

ix. He was *three* days without sight, and he ate not nor drank.

ix. As he drew near to Damascus there *lightened* round him (περιήστραψεν φῶς) (also xxii.) a *light* from heaven.

xxvi. the heavenly *vision* (ὀπτασίᾳ).

ix. and the men that journeyed with him stood speechless hearing (part) of the voice but seeing no man (ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες).

ix. And when his eyes had been opened he saw nothing.

xxvi. We all fell down to the earth, I heard . . .

xxvi.14 β. Because of the *fear*, I alone heard a voice (φωνήν).

xxii. Saw the light, but heard not the voice (φωνήν) of him that spake to me (λαλοῦντος).

ix. And he fell upon the earth and heard a voice (ἤκουσεν φωνήν).

ix. leading him by the hand they led him into Damascus (χειραγωγούντες, so xxii.).

xxvi. But stand up, and stand

on to the soles of my feet (ἐπὶ τὰ ἴχνη τῶν ποδῶν μου).

(11) And he said unto me, Daniel, thou art a miserable man : understand the *commands* (προστάγμασι) that I speak unto thee, and *stand* (στῆθι) upon thy place (but τῆ στάσει, Theodotion), for now I am *sent as an apostle* (ἀπεστάλην) unto thee.

(12) From the first day thou didst . . . humble thyself before the Lord thy God, thy word was heard, and I entered at (?) thy word (εἰσηλθὼν τῷ ῥήματί σου).

(14) I came to *show* thee (ὑποδείξαι σοι) what shall befall.

(15) And the general of the *king* of the Persians. . . .

(16) And, behold, as it were the likeness of a man's hand touched me on the lips, and I opened my mouth and spake, and said to him that stood before me, *Lord*.

(19) And as he spake with me, I became *strong* (ἰσχυσα) and said, Let my Lord speak ; for he *strengthened* me (ἐνίσχυσεν με).

upon thy feet (ἀνάστηθι καὶ στήθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου).

ix. And Saul was *raised* (ἤγερθη) from the earth.

xxii. Arise (ἀναστὰς) and go unto Damascus, and there it shall be spoken unto thee of all things that it hath been *commanded* (τέτακται) thee to do.

xxvi. Unto whom I *send* thee as an *apostle* ἀποστέλλω).

ix. The Lord hath *sent me* as an *apostle* (ἀπέσταλκέν με).

ix. How many things he must suffer on behalf of my name.

ix. That thou mayest be filled with the Holy Ghost.

ix. I will *show* him (ὑποδείξω) how great things . . .

ix. To bear my name before both Gentiles and *kings* (βασιλέων).

ix. And he said, Who art thou, *Lord*? (τίς εἶ, κύριε;)—so xxii. and xxvi.

ix. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it were scales,¹ and he recovered sight . . . , and having taken food he became *strong* (ἐνίσχυθη).

In each successive stage of the narrative in Daniel we can observe how closely St. Luke has followed his original. The physical condition of the prophet, the general character of the light, the effect on those who saw, the subsequent discourse, the recovery, all present us with the closest features of comparison. Two observations will readily occur to the reader : (1) that the physical effect of the vision in

¹ For the explanation of this see *St. Luke the Prophet*, pp. 301 f.

Daniel is one of temporary *dumbness* (see Isa. vi. 5, Dan. x. 16),—and few will doubt that the Daniel narrative has its origin in the great vision of Isaiah,—whereas in Acts the contrasted effect was temporary *blindness*; (2) that the vision of Daniel (Dan. x. 5, 6, 12, 19) is chiefly the origin of that in the Apocalypse (Rev. i.)—a fact that has often been pointed out.

There is one remarkable point on which further study is much to be desired, arising out of Daniel x. 8, “I was left *alone*,” and it will be appreciated by those who are interested in the admirable theory of the late Friedrich Blass, whose loss to the cause of scholarship and New Testament theology is indeed to be deplored, and whose edition of the Acts in Greek with a Latin commentary is one of the most important editions of a book of the New Testament in modern times. Blass has maintained, with complete cogency as I think, that the Acts as we have it is the second draft (*a*), and that he has recovered the first draft (β), in many portions of it at least, from the Bezan MS. and other sources. Now it is not conceivable that any copyist in copying Acts xxii. 14 should have had his mind preoccupied with Daniel x. 8 or any other passage apart from the Lucan narrative or narratives, where the word $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (*alone*) was written. There is not much reason to suppose that a copyist desired to emphasize the fact that Saul *alone* heard a voice saying in Hebrew, “Saul, Saul,” etc. There is no transcriptional or doctrinal or other reason apparent why $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ should have crept into the text. Therefore it is not improbable that $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ was always in the first draft of Acts. Now it has not been observed by Blass, though the idea of the two drafts β and *a* will always be associated with his name, that the first draft β shows many traces of being more in the prophetic manner than *a*, that, in other words, β has been curtailed into *a* by the omission of remarks which would interest thoughtful readers of Christian prophecy more than others

of a later time. And upon reflection we may suppose that after the great and crowning fulfilment of prophecy in the catastrophe of 70 A.D. the following years, in the course of which the "Acts" was composed, would bring with them a waning interest in prophecy generally, together with an increased interest in the organization and order of the Church.¹ If it is true, as the present writer is persuaded, that β is more prophetic than α , then the presence in Acts xxvi. 14 β of $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, which is derived from Daniel x. 8, but has no particular necessity in Acts, exactly illustrates the mind of St. Luke as I conceive it to be. He originally wrote $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in ; but later, in the revision of β which resulted in α , he deleted the rhetorical and redundant $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ together with the accompanying $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ τὸν φόβον ἐγώ, and thus it happens that no trace of the underlying Daniel narrative in this line has been preserved to us in the extant authorities for the text of Acts except in the cursive 137 at Milan, the Philoxenian Syriac, and especially the Stockholm Giant Latin version, which frequently takes us back to readings of the fourth century in the Acts, and is therefore in many passages as good an authority as any existing MS. whatever.²

The very old question of the seeming contradictions of the three narratives is not one that seems to me to need a further solution. We can be satisfied with the accounts in the three chapters of Acts as historical. The question that is raised about Saul's companions hearing or not hearing the voice is determined by the mere laws of grammar. To hear part of a voice is naturally expressed by the genitive case, that is to hear it indistinctly. To hear a voice is expressed by the accusative, and this is to hear it directly or distinctly. The companions did not hear it distinctly in Acts xxii. 9, and they heard it indistinctly in Acts ix. 7.

¹ See *St. Luke the Prophet*, p. 360 foll.

² Blass, *Acta App.*, p. 29.

They saw the light in xxii. 9, they saw no man in ix. 7. But yet if any one should ask why the historian should be so careless of seeming contradiction as to put into one account the statement on the positive side "heard," and then into a subsequent account the consistent statement on the negative side "did not hear," or if it should be asked why he should trouble to describe the effect upon the companions either way at all, then I think the answer is provided by the reference to Daniel x. He put these statements because, being true to fact, they corresponded with the ancient account of Scripture in the Book of Daniel. They mark its "fulfilment." They were among "the things which have been brought to their fulfilment among us" (τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, Luke i. 1), and he is giving here a "description" (διήγησις) of them as he promised to do in the preface to his Gospel.¹ Not, indeed, that the "description" or "report" has the same precise meaning in this case that it bears in regard to the missionary journeys of the Apostles, after the conclusion of which the report was regularly required. But when we consider that this occasion was the call of the persecutor to be an Apostle and to be sent (Acts xxvi. 7) as Daniel was sent (Dan. x. 20), and that the original uses the term of apostleship (ἀπεστάλην, Dan. x. 11) precisely as Ananias speaks of his own apostleship to Saul (Acts ix. 17), we need not be surprised at the insertion of details that many historians would have passed over more carelessly than St. Luke, to whom as a prophet and as companion of St. Paul they were instinct with the deepest interest. And in fact we observe that the wavering expression in Acts, conveyed by the two different constructions of "hearing" with the genitive and with the accusative case, follows very closely upon the wavering effect of the original in Daniel, where we compare

¹ *St. Luke the Prophet*, pp. 35, 42 and index.

LXX Dan. x. 6, "the voice of his speech was as the voice of tumult," with 9, "*I heard not* (τῆν) *the voice of his speech*"; and again, Theodotion, Dan. x. 9, "*I heard the voice of his words and in hearing it* (ἐν τῷ ἀκουσαί με αὐτοῦ) *I was dumfounded.*"

That the vision of Daniel x. is represented as the vision of a trance and not of a dream, and was so understood by St. Luke, is beyond all doubt. It is not represented to be a dream, though in earlier chapters (vii. 2, viii. 2) dreams are narrated. In the ninth chapter (ix. 21), as the sequel to a period of fasting (ix. 3), Daniel falls into a trance "and, behold, the man Gabriel, being caused to fly swiftly, drew near unto me at the time of the evening oblation." In fact the Book of Daniel represents "Daniel" in progressive stages. First, he is a learned young scholar (i. 4, 17); then he is an interpreter of dreams as a dreamer himself (ii. 19, etc.); finally he is a prophet subject to the state of trance (x.-xii.). And one reason why the four concluding chapters of this book have so profoundly impressed the Christian prophets, and through them all later students of prophecy, may very well be that they contain the narrative of Revelations or Apocalypses given in accordance with the rules of prophecy established in the first days of the Christian Church.¹

If any one should be disposed to ask why the close connexion between Acts ix. and Daniel x., if it be not imaginary but true matter of fact, has never yet been set forth, as I do not think it has, he has only to realize the other very extraordinary fact that the Septuagint version of the Book of Daniel has never been easily accessible until the *Cambridge Old Testament in Greek* was published in 1894, edited by Dr. Swete. Till then, every Greek Bible contained Daniel in the Greek not of the LXX but of Theodotion, and

¹ See *The Christian Prophets*, 1900, index.

this was so much a matter of course that it was not considered necessary even to draw the reader's attention to this notable exception. The date of Theodotion's version is still uncertain, but it or a close predecessor of it seems to be decidedly pre-Christian. The writers of Hebrews and Apocalypse resorted to that version. But the remarkable fact is that St. Luke in Acts ix. has taken the LXX version and not Theodotion's as his basis. He has done the same with reference to Acts xxi.-xxiii. and Daniel xi.¹ Certainly the publication of the LXX version of Daniel for English readers has been a means of illumination. But a great and fascinating puzzle awaits solution. Who will find out the reason why in times very soon after the Christian era the LXX version of Daniel virtually disappeared from view? Is it possible that it was suppressed deliberately? If so, is it possible that it was suppressed by Jewish controversialists because it exhibited certain remarkable features of Christian "fulfilment" of prophecy, the admission of which it was thought by them undesirable to make? Is it possible that it was also suppressed by the dominant portion of the Church in opposition to the Montanists, who maintained an exaggerated opinion of the importance of prophecy in the Church at a time when its work was practically finished and its usefulness was extinct? The natural conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel is "lost." Tertullian's six books upon Ecstasy were "lost" and are still "lost." The sequel to Acts xxviii. is possibly lost. All these works would have thrown light upon pre-Christian prophecy and Christian prophecy in their mutual relations. There were reasons why both these groups of persons might wish to remove traces of the close connexion between the prophecy of the Old Testament and the prophecy of the New. Whether and how far those reasons operated practically is a perplexity of theology.

E. C. SELWYN.

¹ See *St. Luke the Prophet*, pp. 67-74.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.*

XVI.

κτώμαι.—See *Thess.* on I. iv. 5. A good illustration for Luke xxi. 19 “you shall win your own selves,” as opposed to “forfeiting self” in ix. 25, may be found in Par P 63 iv.^{126f.} τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκ τηλικαύτης καταφθορᾶς ἀρτίως ἀνακτωμένους, “the population just recovering from so great a distress” (Mahaffy in PP III p. 28). So we say of a sick man “He isn’t himself yet.”

κύριος.—The word is very common as an adjective, in legal sense: we must not give space here. In view of Lightfoot’s remark that κύριε is not used in prayer to God before apostolic times by any heathen writer, we may quote TbP 284⁶ (i/B.C.) καὶ ὡς θέλει ὁ Σεκνεβτῦνις ὁ κύριος θεὸς καταβήσομαι ἐλευθέρως = the writer has received an oracular response.

λαός.—See Canon Hicks in *CR* I 42. On PP II 4 τοῖς ἐκ Κερκεήσιος λαοῖς, Mahaffy remarks, “an ancient and poetical form for *people* found both in LXX and in papyri: cf. λαοκρίται, judges of natives.” LIP 16⁸ (iii/B.C.) ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀπεργάζονται οἱ λαοὶ τὸ κέρμα τοῦτο εἰς ἄριστον, “since the natives are working off (?) this small tax as well as they can.” *Syll.* 89⁷ Θεοφίλα Σελεύκου γυνὴ τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν: Dittenberger says the word is often used in epitaphs like this from Larisa.

λιβανωτός.—Grimm’s note makes Rev. viii. 3, 5 confuse λ. = *frankincense* and λιβανωτίς = *censer*. But *Syll.* 588¹⁵⁶ (ii/B.C.) has the latter word in the former meaning, so that the confusion existed “in prof. auth.” as well, or at least in profane inscriptions.

λογεῖα.—Deissmann’s restoration of this word (= *collec-*

* For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) *EXPOSITOR*, pp. 170, 262.

tion) has been plentifully supported since the publication of *B.S.* Two good exx. may be seen in Witkowski (see index): they are very numerous. It is instructive that words like this and the adjective *δοκίμιος*, "genuine," should have disappeared so completely from our literary sources, when the vernacular used them with such freedom.

λογικός.—From the late vulgar Greek of the Pelagia legend (ed. Usener, p. 20) we have an admirable illustration of 1 Pet. ii. 2. A bishop meets Pelagia and tells her he is "shepherd of Christ's sheep." She takes him literally, and he explains that he means τῶν λογικῶν προβάτων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. So Peter means "metaphorical, not literal, 'pure milk'": see on *ἄδολος* *Notes* iv.

λούω.—An interesting example of this word in its ceremonial sense occurs in the new fragment of an uncanonical Gospel, OP 840^{14f.} (iv./A.D.), where a certain Pharisee remonstrates with the Saviour for walking in the temple—*μήτε λουσα[μ]έν[ω] μ[ή]τε μὴν τῶν μαθητῶν σου τοὺς πόδας βα]πτισθέντων*, "when thou hast not washed nor yet have thy disciples bathed their feet" (G. and H.): cf. also ll. 24, 32.

λυτρόω.—The verb and its kindred are well established in the vernacular, cf. OP 530, cited *Prol.* 132 n. : add EP 19^{3a.}, *ὑφίστα[μα]ι τῆς γῆς . . . ἣς λελυτρωμένοι εἰσὶν τῆς πεπραμένης ὑπὸ Μίλωνος*, OP 936¹⁹ (iii./A.D.), *οὐπω λελύτρωται τὸ φαινόλιον* (2 Tim. iv. 13), "the cloak has not yet been redeemed" from pawn.

λύω.—With the use of *λύω* in Rev. v. 2, *τίς ἄξιος ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ*, cf. OP 907²⁸ (iii./A.D.), *ἐλύθη τοῦ αὐτοῦ α* (*ἔτους*) *Ἐπεῖφ*, the "opening," of a will, and the Editors' reference to BU 326^{ii.} 21 (ii/A.D.), *καὶ ἀνεγνώσθησαν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ἣ καὶ ἡ διαθήκη ἐλύθη*. For λ.= "set at naught," "break," as in Matthew v. 19, John vii. 33, see *Syll.* 479, where certain regulations are

followed by the threat, *ἐὰν δέ τις τούτων τι λύη, κατάρατος ἔστω*. For "breaking" the Sabbath we might compare *λύειν τὰ πένθη*, "to go out of mourning," *Syll.* 879¹² (iii/B.C.). In *Syll.* 226¹⁷ (iii/B.C.) the middle is used in the sense of "redeem" property, cf. B.M. III. p. 146⁵¹ (ii/A.D.), *[λύ]σασθαι τὴν ὑποθήκην*.

μαίνομαι.—The proceedings before Festus Acts xxvi. 24 f. find a striking parallel in the curious interview with an Emperor (Marcus Aurelius or Commodus) recorded in OP 33, where the Emperor rebukes the violent language of the condemned Appianus in the words *ἰ(=εἰ)ώθαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς μαινομένους καὶ ἀπονενοημένους σωφρι(=ο)νίζειν*, "we are accustomed to bring to their senses those who are mad and out of their mind," and receives the answer *νῆ τὴν σὴν τύχην οὔτε μαίνομαι οὔτε ἀπονενοήμαι*. For the subst. *μανία* (Acts xxvi. 24) cf. BU 1024^{v.3} (iv/v A.D.).

μάκελλον.—For this N.T. *ἄπ. λεγ.* (1 Cor. x. 25) see the Magnesian inscription (ed. Kern) 179^{20 f.} (ii/A.D.), *παραπράσεις τε ποιήσαντα ἐντῷ μακέλλῳ παντὸς εἴδους*, and cf. P. Herm. i. p. 80, *ἐντὸς μακέλλου*.

μαλακός.—In HbP 54¹¹ (c. B.C. 245) a certain Zenobius is described as *ὁ μαλακός*, probably in the same sense in which the word is found in 1 Cor. vi. 9, rather than simply with reference to his style of dancing (G. and H.) In a Macedonian inscription (Duchesne and Bayet, *Athos*, p. 46, No. 66) the words *ὁ μαλακός* have been added after the name of the person commemorated in a different style of writing, evidently in satirical allusion to his corrupt mode of life.

μάμμη.—For the later sense of "grandmother," as in the N.T., cf. the census return Rein P 49^{14 f.} (A.D. 215-6), *μου μητρ[ὸς καὶ τῆ]ς μάμμης Ἀύρηλίας*, and the corresponding adjective in 46^{18 f.} (A.D. 189), *μέρος . . . πατρικὸν καὶ μαμμικόν*, "the share which comes to them in the succession of their father and grandmother." See also *Syll.* 381⁶

(c. A.D. 220), ἡ πρὸς μητρὸς μάμμη Καλλίκλεια καὶ οἱ γονεῖς κ.τ.λ.

μαρτυρέω.—The common occurrence of this word after a signature, just as we write “witness,” e.g., BM III. p. 162 f. (A.D. 212), may be cited in illustration of the Pauline usage in 2 Cor. viii. 3. For *μ.* = “give a good report” cf. *Syll.* 197³⁷ (iii/B.C.), *πολλάκις μεμαρτύρηκεν αὐτῶν ὁ βασιλεύς*, and for the corresponding sense in the passive just as in the N.T., see, in addition to Deissmann’s examples *BS* p. 265, *Syll.* 366²⁸ (i/A.D.), *ἀρχιτέκτονας μαρτυρηθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς σεμνοτάτης [Βουλῆς]*.

μαρτύρομαι.—See *Thess.* p. 25 f., and add Str.P 5¹⁴ (iii/A.D.), *βιβλία ἐπιδεδώκαμεν τῷ στρατηγῷ αὐτὰ ταῦτα μαρτυρόμενοι*—the judgment of a Prefect.

μαστιγόω.—For this word, which is the regular term for punishment by scourging, it is sufficient to refer at present to the interesting P.Fi. 61⁶⁹ (i/A.D.) where the Prefect, while pronouncing the accused deserving of being scourged—*ἄξιός μὲν ἦς μαστιγωθῆναι*—releases him as a mark of favour to the multitude (*χαρίζομαι δέ σε τοῖς ὄχλοις*, cf. Mark xv. 15).

μαστός.—*Syll.* 804²⁴ (ii/A.D.), *ἤψατο δέ μου καὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς καὶ τοῦ μαστοῦ*: M. Julius Apellas is telling the story of his cure in the Asclepieum.

μάχη.—The weaker sense of *μάχη*, “contention,” “quarrel,” which alone is found in the N.T. (unless in Jas. iv. 1) may be illustrated from *Syll.* 737⁷² (ii/iii A.D.), *μάχης δὲ ἕάν τις ἄρξῃται*. For the corresponding use of the verb, as in Gen. xxxi. 36, John vi. 52, cf. Par. P. 18¹⁰, *ἐὰν μάχουσιν μετ’ ἐσοῦ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου*.

μεγαλείος.—*Syll.* 365⁴ (i/A.D.), *αὐτοῦ τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς ἀθανασίας*—with reference to Caesar Germanicus. The subst. *μεγαλειότης* is common as a ceremonial title, e.g. P. Herm. i. p. 21, *ἡ μεγαλειότης τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἡγεμόνος*.

μεγαλοπρεπής.—This N.T. ἄπ. λεγ. is frequent in the inscriptions united with such words as ἐνδόξως and κηδεμονικῶς : cf. also *OGIS* 308^{5a}. (ii/B.C.), where Apollonis, wife of Attalus I., is described as having left behind her good proof of her virtue, διὰ τὸ κεχρῆσθαι καὶ θεοῖς εὐσεβῶς καὶ γονεῦσιν ὀσίως ὡς καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδραν συνβεβιωκέναι μεγαλοπρεπῶς, the last two words being translated by Dittenberger “egregie vixit.” In the account of the preparations for the reception of a Roman Senator in Egypt in TbP 33⁶ (B.C. 112) it is laid down—μεγαλο{υ} πρεπέστερον ἐγδεχθήτωι, “let him be received with special magnificence” (G. and H.).

μέγας.—The frequency with which μέγας is employed as a predicate of heathen gods and goddesses, e.g. OP 886 (a magical formula, iii/A.D.) μεγάλη Ἴσις ἡ κυρία (cf. Acts xix. 28, μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων), makes it the more noticeable that only once in the N.T. is the same epithet applied to the true God (Tit. ii. 13) προσδεχόμενοι . . . ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. : see Thieme, p. 36 f.

For μέγας of height see PP II. 25(i)⁹ where Μάνρης μέγας is rendered by Mahaffy “Long Manres,” though Leemans (see PP II. p. 32) in similar descriptions prefers the rendering “senior.” In *Ostr.* 144 (ii/A.D.) μείζων appears to be used in this latter sense, cf. Nos. 213, 1199 ; for its occurrence as a title of authority see OP 900¹⁹ (iv/A.D.) [έντυ]χεῖν τοῖς μείζουσιν περὶ τούτου, “to appeal to the officials on this matter,” with the Editor’s note, and cf. the corresponding use of the subst. in TbP 326⁴ (iii/A.D.), ἐπὶ τὸ σὸν μέγεθος καταφεύγω, “I take refuge in your power,” the appeal of a widow to the Prefect with reference to her orphan daughter.

μεθύσκω.—It seems impossible to draw any clear distinction between μεθύσκω and μεθύω : in 1 Thess. v. 7 e.g. they are virtually synonymous. But the idea of “status” as

distinguished from "actus," which belongs more naturally to the latter, comes out well in the recipe of the magical papyrus BM I. p. 90¹⁸⁰ (iii/A.D.) enabling a man *πολλὰ πίνειν καὶ μὴ μεθύειν*.

μέλει.—BM III. p. 207^{26f.} (A.D. 84) *οἶδα γὰρ ἔμαντῶ* (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 4) [*μεν?*] *ὅτι μέλει σοι πολλὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ, μελήσει σοι δὲ ὡς ὑπὲρ ἰδίου τέκνου*: cf. Matt. xxii. 16, etc.

μέλι.—OP 936⁹ (iii/A.D.) *ἡμίχουν μέλιτος*, "half a chous of honey." The same papyrus shows *μελίτινα στεφάνια γ*, which the Editors render "3 honey-sweet garlands": cf. the otherwise unknown adj. *μελίσιος* as interpolated in the T.R. of Luke xxiv. 42, *καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου*.

μενοῦνγε.—For *μ*. standing at the beginning of a clause, as in Rom. ix. 20, cf. *Notes* iii. 434 and add BM III. p. 207¹³ (A.D. 84) *μέντοιγε*, also OP 531¹⁹ (ii/A.D.).

μεριμνάω.—The idea of "over-anxiety" attaching to this word in Matt. vi. 27 is well seen in TbP 315^{8f.} (ii/A.D.), *γράφω ὅπως [μὴ μερ]ιμνήσῃς, ἐγὼ γὰρ σε ἄσχυλ[τον] ποι[ι]ήσω*, "I am writing to prevent your being anxious, for I will see that you are not worried" (G. and H.).

μερίς.—The use of this word in Acts xvi. 12, *πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις*, which Dr. Hort objected to on the ground that "*μερίς* never denotes simply a region, province, or any geographical division" (*N.T. in Greek*² ii. *Notes*, p. 96), is now amply justified on the evidence of the papyri, as well as of later Greek writers generally (see Ramsay in *EXPOSITOR* V. vi. p. 320). It is sufficient to cite the almost contemporary TbP 302⁴ (A.D. 71-2), *τῆς Π[ολ]έμωνος μερίδος*, "the division of Polemon" in the Arsinoite nome: cf. TbP 315^{13f.}, AP 77⁴ (both ii/A.D.) *al.*

μέρος.—With Acts xxiii. 9 *τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων* cf. the use of *μέρος* in PFi. 47^{17, 38} (iii/A.D.) of the "parties" to a suit. The phrase *ἐκ μέρους*, as in 1 Cor. xii. 27, is

common, e.g., BU 538^{34f.} (A.D. 100–1) τὸν κληρὸν ὡς καὶ ἐγ μέρους παρειλήφαμεν.

μεσίτης.—To the examples of the verb in *Notes* ii. and iii. there may be added one or two instances of this important substantive, Rein P 44³ (A.D. 104), ὁ κατασταθεὶς κριτῆς μεσίτης, ChP 29^{iii.5} (c. A.D. 150) μεσειτην ἡμεῖν δός, both with reference to an “arbiter” in legal proceedings, and BM II. p. 251 (ii/iii A.D.), where the reference is apparently to the “surety” for a debt.

μεταβαίνω.—The ordinary meaning of *μ.* is well brought out in TbP 316²⁰ (A.D. 99), where for purposes of registration certain ephēbi promise εἰὰν δὲ μεταβαίνωμεν ἢ ἐγδημῶμεν μεταδώσωμεν ἀμφοτέροι τῷ συμμοριάρχῃ, “if we change our abode or go abroad we will both give notice to the president of the symmory” (G. and H.).

μεταδίδωμι.—The usage of this verb in the immediately preceding citation shows that the idea of “sharing” does not necessarily belong to it; cf. further BM III. p. 109 (A.D. 144), ἀξιούμεν δὲ τοῦ διαστολικοῦ ἀντίγραφον αὐτῷ μεταδοθῆναι, and see Preisigke’s elaborate note in the introduction to StrP 41, where the sense of “responsibility” conveyed by the verb in legal phraseology is fully discussed.

μεταλαμβάνω.—For the acc. construction as in Acts xxiv. 25 cf. AP 39^{6f.} (late ii/B.C.), μεταλαβόντες τοὺς συντετελεσμένους πρὸς τοὺς τεβεις Ἐρμωνθίτας ἀγῶνας μεγάλως ἐχάρημεν.

μετέχω.—With the use of *μ.* in 1 Cor. x. 17 οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν, cf. *Magn.* 44¹⁷ μετέχειν τῆς τε θυσίας καὶ τοῦ ἀγῶνος, where too the immediately following τοὺς κοινωνησοῦντας τῆς τε θυσίας proves that here, as in the Corinthian passage (τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν;), μετέχω and κοινωνέω must be regarded as synonymous: see Thieme, p. 29f. For the acc. after μετέχω cf. PP III. 32(f)^{5f.} Φίλωνος, τοῦ μετέχουτος μοι τὴν μερίδα, “Philon, my partner in the division.”

The corresponding adj. is common in the same sense, *ibid.* 37(a)^{ii. 7} διὰ Πασίτος καὶ τῶν μετόχων, cf. Luke v. 7.

μικρός.—For the reference to *stature* rather than to *age*, when employed as a personal designation, see *Notes* iii., and cf. what is said above under μέγας.

μισθός.—For the primary sense of this word cf. OP 724⁵ (A.D. 155), where a slave is apprenticed to a shorthand-writer to be taught shorthand μισθοῦ τοῦ συμπεφωνημένου “at a salary agreed upon” of 120 silver drachmas. The verb is common, e.g. *Ostr.* [1256], οὐ καὶ γὰρ ἤμην μεμισθωμένος οἴκου. A new compound μισθοπρασία is found in BM III. p. 164⁶ (A.D. 212), and is understood by the Editors as denoting a sale under the terms of a lease.

μογγιλάλος.—With this variant found in Mark vii. 32 and in MSS. of the LXX. cf. μογγός in BM. III p. 241¹⁶ (early iv/A.D.) οὐκ εἰμὶ μογγός.

μολύνω.—Cf. the uncanonical fragment OP 840, where after the words cited under λούω we find—ἀλλὰ μεμολυ- [μμένος] ἐπάτησας τοῦτο τὸ ἱερὸν τ[όπον ὄν]τα καθαρὸν, “but defiled thou hast walked in this temple, which is a pure place.”

μονή.—Some further examples (cf. *Notes* iii.) of this important Johannine word may be given. In HbP 93² (ἐγγύωι μονῆς), 111³¹ (both B.C. 250) and GH 62¹⁰ (μονῆς καὶ ἐμφανίας—A.D. 211) it is used technically in sureties for the “appearance” of certain persons. The meaning is doubtful in this fourth century complaint ChP 15¹⁹, addressed to the *riparii* of the Hermopolite nome, where the complainant Aurelia states with regard to violences to which she had been subjected—ἐφάνερωσα τῇ μονῇ καὶ τῷ βοηθῷ τοῦ πραιποσίτου, which the Editor translates, “I have made known both to the establishment of the *praepositus* and his assistant.” In a note he dismisses as impossible in the above context the later sense of “monastery” which μονή

has for example in BM II. p. 333² (vi/vii A.D.), *Δανιήλ οἰκονόμου τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Λευκωτίου*, "Daniel steward of the monastery of Leucotius."

μνέω.—For the original technical sense of this word, which may underlie the Pauline usage in Phil. iv. 12, *ἐν παντὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν μεμύημαι*, it must be enough at present to refer to such passages from the inscriptions as *OGIS 530*¹⁶ *θεοπρόποι . . . οὔτινες μνηθέντες ἐνεβάτευσαν*, *ibid.* 764¹² *ταῖς παραγεγενημέναις θεωρίαις . . . καὶ μνηθείσαις*. The N.T. usage of the corresponding subst. *μυστήριον* is fully discussed by Dean Robinson in an instructive note in his *Ephesians*, p. 234 ff. See also the interesting notes on MGr *μυστήριον*=*marriage*, by G. F. Abbott in *Nineteenth Century* for April, 1908, p. 653 ff.: he compares the modern wedding week in Macedonia with the Eleusinian Mysteries.

μωρός.—In the curious nursery acrostic TbP 278³⁵ (early i/A.D.) it is said of a lost garment—*λέων ὁ ἄρας, μωρός <ὁ> ἀπολέσας*, "a lion took it, a fool lost it." BU 1046^{ii.22} (ii/A.D.), *Μάρων ἐπικαλ(ούμενος) μωρός* shows the word used as a nickname: so also the great athlete Herminus, *ὁ καὶ Μωρός* in BM III. *passim*.

Νάρκισσος.—Thieme (p. 40) quotes instances of this proper name from Magnesia (Magn. 122 d¹⁴) and Hierapolis (Hierap. 80), proving that its occurrence outside Rome was well established, and consequently that the common identification of *τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου* (Rom. xvi. 11) with the household of the well-known freedman of that name is by no means certain.

νεκρός.—With the use of *νεκρός* in Luke xv. 24, 32, Rev. i. 18, ii. 8, iii. 1, cf. BU 1024^{vii.24ff.} (iv/v A.D.), *ἐλέησα τὴν δυσδ[αίμον]α, ὅτι ζῶσα προσεφέρετο τοῖς βου[λομένοις] ὡς νεκρά*. For Rom. iv. 19, *κατενόησεν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα [ἤδη] νεκρωμένον*, Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* p. 62, finds a striking parallel in *Inscr. Graec.* III. 2, No. 1355, *ἄνθρωπε . . . μὴ*

μου παρέλθης σῶμα τὸ νεν[ε]κρ[ω]μένον, "O man, do not pass by my body as good as dead."

νέος.—For the relation of νέος to καινός in the papyri see under καινός. With the comparative in Luke xv. 12 cf. ParP 38²² (B.C. 162), Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ νεωτέρῳ μου ἀδελφῷ, TbP 312⁵ (A.D. 123-4), Παώπειος νεωτέρου τοῦ Παώπειος, "Paopis younger son of Paopis."

νεόφυτος.—See BS p. 220 f., and add OP 909^{15f.} (A.D. 225), ἀμπελικῶς κτήματος νεοφύτου, "a newly planted vineyard."

νεύω.—BM III. p. 233⁷ (A.D. 331), [ἀνδρεῶνα] νεύοντα εἰς νότον, "[a dining-hall] looking to the south."

νεωκόρος.—For the application of this term to Ephesus as the "warden" of the temple of Artemis, as in Acts xix. 35, it is sufficient to refer to OGIS 481¹ (A.D. 102-6), Ἀρτέμιδι Ἐφεσίᾳ . . . καὶ τῷ νεωκόρῳ Ἐφεσίων δήμῳ, with Dittenberger's note. Later the city came to be known as δις, τρὶς νεωκόρος: see Ramsay, art. "Ephesus," in Hastings' *D.B.* i. p. 772. In a papyrus of B.C. 217 edited by Th. Reinach in *Mélanges Nicole*, p. 451 ff., we hear of a certain Nicomachus who was νακόρος (= νεωκόρος) of a Jewish synagogue in an Egyptian village. According to the editor this term, the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *hazzân*, was borrowed from the usage of pagan religion, and is still the current title in Greece for the "sacristan" of an orthodox church, as well as of a Jewish synagogue. See also Lumbroso in *Archiv* iv. p. 317.

νή.—For this participle with negatives see *Notes* iii., and for its correct use, as in 1 Cor. xv. 31, cf. ParP 49³⁰ (ii/B.C., =Witk., p. 47), ἐγὼ γὰρ νή τοὺς θεοὺς ἀγωνιῶ, BM III. p. 207^{11f.} (A.D. 84), κέκρικα γὰρ νή τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπιμένειν.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D., LL.D.	
The Ascension in Luke and Acts	254
Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D.	
The David of the Book of Samuel and the David of the Book of Chronicles	49
W. M. Calder, B.A.	
A Fourth-Century Lycæonian Bishop	307
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
Christus Aedificator	41
Covenant or Testament? A Note on Hebrews ix. 16, 17	347
Rev. R. H. Charles, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Relation to the New Testament	111
Rev. Professor G. A. Cooke, M.A.	
Some Principles of Biblical Interpretation	193
Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, D.D., Litt.D.	
Competition and Co-operation	400
Rev. Professor Adolf Deissmann, D.D.	
Primitive Christianity and the Lower Classes	97, 208, 352
Rev. Professor James Denney, D.D.	
Jesus' Estimate of St. John the Baptist	60
Rev. Principal A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.	
The Doctrine of Christ	30, 126
The Need of Salvation	241
The Righteousness of God	333
The Sanctification of Man	508
Rev. Professor G. Buchanan Gray, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Excavations at Gezer and Religion in Ancient Palestine	423
Professor J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Litt.D.	
An Emendation to 1 Peter ii. 8	155
Rev. Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.Sc.	
Apostolic Preaching and Emperor Worship	289

	PAGE
Rev. Professor Kirsopp Lake, M.A.	
The Date of Q	494
Agnes Smith Lewis.	
Letter to the Editor	95
Rev. Stephen Liberty, M.A.	
St. Peter's Speech in Acts i. 15-22	77
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil.	
The Unio-Mystica as a Theological Conception	138
J. D. Maynard, M.A.	
Justin Martyr and the Texts of Hebrews xi. 4	163
Rev. Professor J. B. Mayor, Litt.D.	
The Brethren of the Lord : Second Thoughts	18
Note on <i>'Ενεργείσθαι</i>	191
Rev. George Milligan, D.D.	
Paulinism and the Religion of Jesus	534
Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.	
Wellhausen and others on the Apocalypse	224
Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, M.A., Litt.D.	
Some Criticisms on Professor Harnack's "Sayings of Jesus"	411
Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, M.A., Litt.D., and the Rev. George Milligan, D.D.	
Lexical Notes from the Papyri 88, 282, 375, 470, 559	
Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay.	
Dr. Milligan's Edition of the Epistles to the Thessa- lonians	1
Luke's Authorities in the Acts, chaps. i.-xii.	172, 262, 358, 450
Historical Commentary on the First Epistle to Timothy	481
John Ross, M.A.	
<i>'Ενεργείσθαι</i> in the New Testament	75
Rev. Canon E. C. Selwyn, D.D.	
The Carefulness of Luke the Prophet	547
Rev. Professor James Stalker, D.D.	
Studies in Conversion :—	
1. Justin Martyr	118
2. Constantine the Great	322
3. St. Augustine	521
Rev. F. R. Tennant, D.D.	
The Positive Elements in the Conception of Sin	385

INDEX OF TEXTS

571

Lieut.-Col. W. H. Turton, D.S.O.

How the Resurrection Narratives explain one another 442

Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, M.A.

The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue 286

INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. xvi. 11	29	Matt. vi. 30	413	Luke iii. 1	383
xxxi. 36	562	34	476	2	60
Exod. xxiv. 8	348	vii. 24-27	419	7	62
Lev. xvii. 3	113	ix. 34	27	15	69
Deut. xvii. 14-20	57	36	220	iv. 21	86
xxi. 23	132	xi. 2-19	65	v. 7	566
xxxii. 21	35	7	67	33	63
Josh. vi. 26	433	16, 17	421	vii. 18-35	65
1 Sam. x. 7, 8	551	18	26	24	67
xiii. 14	54	22	244	33	26
xiv. 18	198	xii. 43-45	67	47	508
2 Sam. ii. 2	51	xiii. 13	48	x. 24	414
v. 6	54	16	70	xi. 41	282
1 Kings xvi. 25	433	20-32	27	xii. 1	219
2 Kings xviii. 4	58	25	379	26	470
xix. 14	58	xvii. 26-27	128	33	417
xxii. 8	57	xxi. 12	89	58	478
1 Chron. xi. 1-8	50	41	477	xiii. 34	413
xii. 23	51	xxii. 41-46	46	xiv. 26	415
xxi. 7	52	xxiii. 23	282	29, 30	91
Neh. xiii. 29-31	53	35	92	xv. 12	568
Job xxxiii. 15, 16	323	37	413	xvi. 3	376
19-24	323	xxvi. 59-61	42	xviii. 5	90
Psa. ii. 7	293	63	376	xix. 3	470
xli. 9	83	xxvii. 63	383	10	299
li. 16	343	xxviii. 1	380	xxi. 19	559
lxix. 26	79	9	444	xxii. 29, 30	351
lxxiv. 9	203	20	470	32	260
cix. 7	80	Mark i. 22	376	xxiii. 2	292
cxxviii. 22	160	ii. 18	63	xxiv. 37	445
cxxvii. 2	480	iii. 20-35	26	51	256
Isa. viii. 14	157	vi. 21	382	John i. 14	77, 126
xxviii. 16	91	vii. 32	566	20	69
lxi. 1	416	x. 18	128	ii. 19	41
Jer. vii. 4	47	xii. 1	89	iii. 14	49
Dan. x.	552	14	479	vii. 5	448
Zech. vi. 13	41	xiv. 58	42	49	377
viii. 19	47	xv. 43	383	viii. 15	19
Matt. i. 16	95	xvi. 7	443	ix. 6	381
ii. 1	444	11	445	24	383
iii. 14	61	19	448	xii. 35	478
iv. 6	414	Luke i. 31	29	xiii. 18	83
v. 13	350	37	269	xv. 7, 10	145
22	284	78	45	xix. 12	292
vi. 20	417	ii. 52	470	xx. 2	443

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
John xx. 17-18 . . .	258	Rom. xiii. 13 . . .	533	Eph. v. 11 . . .	92
19 . . .	445	xvi. 11 . . .	567	vi. 7. . . .	382
xxi. 13 . . .	446	1 Cor. i. 26 . . .	110	Phil. i. 1 . . .	182
Acts i.-xii. 172, 367, 450		iii. 16 . . .	44	19 . . .	381
i. 3 . . .	255	vi. 17 . . .	140	ii. 5-8 . . .	134
5 . . .	447	vii. 6 . . .	380	9, 10 . . .	293
15-22 . . .	77	35 . . .	383	iii. 6 . . .	246
ii. 17 . . .	285	ix. 5 . . .	189	13 . . .	378
31 . . .	82	x. 17 . . .	565	20 . . .	300
iii. 5. . . .	377	25 . . .	561	21 . . .	31
iv. 6. . . .	475	xii. 27 . . .	564	iv. 13 . . .	32
32 . . .	352	xv. 5 . . .	544	Col. i. 13 . . .	341
vii. 21 . . .	92	8 . . .	30	16, 17 . . .	37
viii. 21 . . .	95	10 . . .	218	20 . . .	345
x. 30 . . .	362	47 . . .	250	29 . . .	76
36 . . .	297	xvi. 1 . . .	221	ii. 9 . . .	31
41 . . .	446	2 Cor. i. 6. . . .	76	iii. 11 . . .	546
xiii. 33 . . .	91	ii. 14 . . .	473	1 Thess. i. 9 . . .	88
xiv. 23 . . .	374	iv. 12 . . .	76	ii. 13 . . .	76
xv. 20 . . .	379	v. 14 . . .	143	v. 4 . . .	478
xv. 23 . . .	374	21 . . .	131	14 . . .	2
xvi. 12 . . .	564	vi. 16 . . .	44	2 Thess. ii. 7 . . .	76
xvii. 7 . . .	292	viii. 3 . . .	562	8 . . .	380
xviii. 18. . . .	489	6 . . .	297	13 . . .	518
xix. 22 . . .	377	8 . . .	380	iii. 6. . . .	2
22 . . .	471	9 . . .	40	2 Tim. i. 10 . . .	300
28 . . .	563	13. . . .	355	iv. 13. . . .	560
39 . . .	283	x. 6 . . .	381	14. . . .	282
xxi. 13 . . .	382	13 . . .	477	Heb. vi. 17 . . .	378
xxii. 5 . . .	90	xii. 1 . . .	30	vii. 19 . . .	377
11 . . .	31	1, 4 . . .	513	ix. 16, 17 . . .	347
xxv. 19 . . .	545	14 . . .	382	17 . . .	475
xxvi. 24. . . .	561	Gal. i. 18 . . .	474	x. 19 . . .	88
xxvii. 33 . . .	415	ii. 20 . . .	135	xi. 4. . . .	163
Rom. i. 3 . . .	126	iii. 10-13 . . .	243	xiii. 22 . . .	379
4 . . .	303	10 . . .	377	Jas. i. 24 . . .	381
28-32 . . .	242	13 . . .	131	26 . . .	473
v. 12 . . .	31	26 . . .	509	v. 16 . . .	75
13 . . .	93	iv. 4 . . .	126	1 Pet. ii. 2 . . .	560
16, 18 . . .	478	v. 6 . . .	76, 192	4 . . .	91
17 . . .	335	22 . . .	282	5 . . .	355
vi. 10 . . .	132	vi. 14 . . .	340	8 . . .	155
vii. 5 . . .	76	Eph. i. 4 . . .	141	21 . . .	475
7-25 . . .	243	19-20. . . .	33	iii. 3 . . .	94
vii. 24 . . .	509	ii. 3 . . .	243	2 Pet. i. 4. . . .	471
viii. 1 . . .	143	iii. 9. . . .	44	iii. 15 . . .	487
ix. 32 . . .	157	16 . . .	345	Rev. v. 2 . . .	560
x. 5, 6 . . .	335	20 . . .	76	viii. 3, 5. . . .	559
9. . . .	34	iv. 13 . . .	470	xxi. 18 . . .	282
xii. 19 . . .	90, 377	20 . . .	545		

