NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING
IN THE LIGHT OF ST PAUL'S

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
LONDON: FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.
BOMBAY
CALCUTTA } MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
MADRAS
TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TOKYO: MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING IN THE LIGHT OF ST PAUL'S

BY

A. H. McNEILE, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN, CHANCELLOR OF ST PATRICK'S, FELLOW OF SIDNEY SUSSEX COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1923

εἴτε οὖν ἐγὼ εἴτε ἐκεῖνο
οὕτως κηρύσσομεν

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

MANY are the works on New Testament Theology, and on particular doctrines, and on the doctrines of particular writers. But it needs more careful reading than most students have time for to gain from them a general grasp of the development of Christian thought. In the following pages, which contain an expansion of lectures delivered in Dublin to Divinity students and others, a method is followed which the writer believes has never been applied systematically to the New Testament as a whole. As the motion of objects at a distance can be more easily observed by noting their positions relative to a fixed mark, so the teaching contained in the several writings is noted in relation to St Paul's. The analogy will not strictly hold, because St Paul moved himself. But he has allowed us to know him so well that this method offers the best criterion for placing the other teachers of the Church in the general movement. And although St Paul's own doctrine is not dealt with as a whole, we gain incidentally a wonderful impression of his uniqueness and spiritual power.

A. H. McNEILE.

DUBLIN.
F. of the Conversion of St Paul, 1923.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

THE Introduction to the present writer's manual on St Paul opens with the words 'The Christianity of to-day is broadly speaking the Christianity of St Paul.' And the extent to which that is true is the measure of the apostle's greatness. The value of a man's life work is always to be gauged by its abiding effects upon others. But when this test is applied to him and to Jesus Christ there is discovered an essential difference between them. The effects of the apostle's life are the effects of his teaching, reinforced by his character; those of the Lord's life are wrought by the imparting of His character through His permanent spiritual presence, reinforced by His teaching. Christianity *is Christ*; the Christian Body is the growing expression of Himself; and no other human being has ever borne, or can ever bear, the same relation to any movement, organization or society. And it is because St Paul was the principal exponent of this truth that his work holds the first place in the apostolic presentation of our religion. But as it takes all sorts to make a world, so it takes all sorts of teachers to expound a world-religion. πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, 'in many parts and by many methods,' is as true of man's grasp of God's message to us in His Son as it was of His self-revelation to the fathers in the prophets; indeed the order of the words in Heb. i. 1, by which the adverbs stand at the opening of the sentence, may have been intended to express that truth. It is abundantly illustrated in the New Testament, as the following pages shew. They contain a study of the writings

which come from other pens than St Paul's,—not, of course, a study of them in detail, but of the main elements of their teaching; and an attempt is made to examine their Christian doctrine in the light of his, using his as a norm by which to determine the place which they respectively occupy in the Christianity of the New Testament.

This is far from being merely academic. It is of great practical importance to achieve even the slightest advance along the road towards the wholeness of truth. We tend, each of us, to be Pauline, Jacobean, Johannine and so on according to temperament and past influences; and it is always worth while to study with special care minds that are constituted differently from our own, on the look out for anything of correction or addition that they can supply to us.

Three reasons may be noted for St Paul's paramount position in the Christian thought of to-day. The first is the simple and prosaic fact that the Pauline epistles, with the Pastorals, are more than one-third as long again as the other epistles with the Apocalypse. The Bible, for the most part, is not studied; it is only heard as read in Church services; and therefore congregations hear St Paul's teaching more often than that of any other writer. Secondly, St Paul impresses himself by a tumultuous force of character. The ear is so filled with his trumpet tones that it is difficult to listen to any other music. But thirdly, he had passed through a spiritual experience which was for him a violent crisis, which determined his entire outlook on the Person and work of Christ and man's relations with Him. That crisis must have been, in some degree, repeated in the case of large numbers of the early Christians who took the difficult

and dangerous step of passing over to Christianity from either Judaism or paganism. It was natural, therefore, that his teaching and influence found a ready response; indeed the majority of Christians up to the time of his death must have been converted by him or his immediate delegates. And to this day the evangelical doctrine of salvation meets the deepest and most urgent need of human life. Whenever anyone reaches the point of feeling the burden of sin, of realizing that he needs a complete transformation of his being, and yet knows by bitter experience that he cannot by himself leap the great gulf fixed between sin and newness of life, there is one who needs the special contribution to Christian thought made by St Paul. It is for those in whom Rom. vii. 14–24 finds a real echo. God, of His free grace and love, effected (potentially) by the death and resurrection of His Son the glad translation of sinners, all implicated hereditarily in the sin of Adam, into the divine kingdom, with all that that involves of pardon and peace, 'justification,' and spiritual power for progressive 'sanctification'; and each man can, by 'faith,' appropriate the saving work of Christ, and make real and kinetic for himself that infinite store of potential energy, and by God's continued free grace obtain the living, working power of the Spirit to walk as one translated. That, in a sentence, is the Pauline gospel; and it is one of the chiefest of the world's spiritual treasures.

And yet St Paul himself said 'I count not myself yet to have grasped [what I am aiming at].' That is as true of his intellectual and intuitive grasp of the things of God as of his attainment to the Christian ideal of character. He said and wrote, of course, much more than we possess; but his extant epistles are so many-sided and alive that

it is difficult not to feel that, as regards his Christian doctrine, we practically have before us the whole man. If other of his epistles could be discovered it is unlikely that they would add anything of serious import to his presentation of Christianity. And that presentation omits elements which we cannot omit without loss. The other writers bring forth from their treasures things new and old,—new truths or aspects of truths which he did not bequeath to them, and old truths which the Church had already learnt from him, but which they expressed differently. And subsequent generations of Christians to this day, guided by the Holy Spirit, have continued the process.

In one respect he had no imitators in the New Testament literature that we possess. We know of no one whose pen supported him in his fight for the liberty of Gentiles from the yoke of Jewish ordinances. It was that fight which made him lay his peculiar stress on the depravity of human nature, and the helplessness of man's unaided will, and therefore on the gratuitous gift of God in the 'justification' of those who had faith in Christ. The battle which led him to place 'grace' and 'works' in sharp opposition was won by him. Other writers had different battles to fight, as he himself had in his later epistles. He remained, in the Church's estimation, 'the apostle' *par excellence*, but this particular contribution to Christian thought did not exercise much influence in the next three centuries. It needed a teacher in close spiritual kinship with the apostle, and confronted with difficulties which seemed to him analogous to his, to bring to the front again the necessity of 'grace' as opposed to 'works.' St Paul was 're-discovered' by Augustine. He also experienced a volcanic spiritual crisis, after long kicking against the

pricks. And he also was roused to combat by what he felt to be a mistaken trust in works and in the freedom of the human will. The Judaism of the 1st century, as it appeared to St Paul, found its counterpart in the Pelagianism of the 5th, as it appeared to Augustine. The apostle, who was a Roman citizen from birth, had caught something of the Roman systematizing spirit, and he worked out the logical implications of much previous Jewish thought. The bishop, who spoke and thought in the Latin of Africa, systematized with Latin accuracy much previous patristic thought, and did so, as regards the doctrine of grace, on a strictly Pauline basis. Broadly speaking, in the intervening centuries, what may, for want of a better term, be called the Johannine aspects of Christian doctrine—what God is, what Christ is, what the Holy Spirit is—were more in evidence than the Pauline aspects—what man is, and what Christ has done for him. Theology and Christology absorbed men's interests rather than anthropology and soteriology. And when the nature of man was discussed, a non-Pauline emphasis was often laid on his *αὐτεξουσιον*, freedom of will, voluntary self-determination[1]. This emphasis was partly due, in the earlier years, to the necessity of opposing pagan ideas of Fate, but also from an appreciation of the truth enunciated by Origen, its principal advocate, that 'if you destroy the voluntariness of virtue, you have destroyed its very essence' (c. Cels. iv. 3). This fact, thoroughly recognized during the three centuries after the New Testament, when logically, but unduly, pressed, led to the Pelagianism which Augustine combats with St Paul's epistles, especially *Romans* and *Galatians*, as his weapons, always logically, and sometimes unduly, pressing the apostle's language.

[1] See Moxon, *The Doctrine of Sin*, pp. 17–48.

But the system of Augustine was of such range and complexity that he was not successful in making it entirely coherent. Hence the most opposite extremes of later doctrine claimed his support. Scholasticism, which was little more than a Christianizing of Aristotle, drew men away from the study of the New Testament. There were commentaries, and commentaries upon the commentaries. As a result, the distinctively Pauline side of Augustine's system fell increasingly out of sight. On the other hand his doctrine of the Church, resting upon all that he inherited from Cyprian, and developed under the stress of the fall of imperial Rome, and in the struggle with Donatism, became the quarry from which were drawn the stones for the edifice of Roman Catholicism in the period preceding the Reformation[1]. The time, therefore, came when the need again began to be felt of emphasizing those aspects of Pauline teaching which had become discredited. St Paul, reflected in Augustine, was once more re-discovered by Luther. The monk of Erfurt, no less than the Pharisee of Tarsus and the lecturer in rhetoric at Milan, passed through a spiritual crisis, from which he emerged a new creature, and which burnt in upon his soul the need of divine grace. Thus the Christianity of St Paul, re-moulded in the course of its history by two strong thinkers, reached modern Europe as an evangelical doctrine of salvation. Without a message of salvation the Christian religion would not be alive to-day; but in the form in which they presented it, it was very far from exhausting the teaching of St Paul, not to speak of the rest of the New Testament.

[1] Augustine did not, indeed, create them all; many of them were scattered loosely in patristic writings, but he shaped and combined them, inconsistent though some of them were into his own amazing edifice.

To study St Paul's teaching, therefore, by itself, is to study only a section, though a large and important section, of New Testament Christianity. The other writings, while they include, on the one hand, additions that were made in development of Pauline doctrine, include also, on the other hand, that of which the Pauline doctrine was itself a development, and without reference to which the full value of his work cannot be measured. The study of both makes it evident that 'pre-Pauline' and 'post-Pauline' are not chronological terms. It is probable that every book in the New Testament that is not from the apostle's pen appeared, in its present form, after his death, though much of the materials of the Gospels was no doubt being shaped and collected during his lifetime; and his influence on the writers is frequently strong and marked. But they were influenced by him in very unequal degrees; and some of them present earlier elements which are, for the most part, clearly discernible. For our purpose, therefore, dates are a matter comparatively unimportant; and the writings can be studied with the principal object of tracing growth.

But the growth of what? It is not merely the growth of the understanding and interpretation of the teaching and claims of Jesus, but rather of the understanding and interpretation of what He *was*, what He and His claims meant to the world, and His relation to God. The former has been called the Gospel of Jesus, the latter the Gospel about Jesus. But neither is, by itself, the whole of Christianity, as some would have us think. The question What is Christianity? is not fully answered by saying The teaching and doings of Jesus, nor by saying The doctrine of the New Testament writers or of the Creeds. It must include both what He said and did, and also what He was, and is still being, realized to be. It was

only at a comparatively late date that men were led to understand how vital were His teaching and claims and character and life. The result was the compilation of the Gospel records. But for the first disciples the experience of living with Him during His ministry remained a penetrating influence which rendered possible the conception of what He was and meant for the world—but a conception which could reach its fullness only after His death and exaltation. We study, then, His teaching, claims, character, and life, not as the elementary beginnings of a system of thought which is called Christianity, but as the fundamental and permanent basis on which a Christianity could be reared, an undying seed which could grow, and is still growing.

The following outline indicates the nature of our material:

1. *The teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels*, naturally, comes first. We shall consider the main elements in His prophetic teaching, in His dealing—as the Israelite prophets dealt—with the popular morals and the popular eschatology. It was a proclamation of good tidings which in its nature was revolutionary because it transcended the limits of the privileged classes, and which included teaching on the true meaning of sonship to God, and on true allegiance to the divine sovereignty about to be revealed in its final consummation. His first disciples, who had heard all this from His lips, taught the new-born Church the impressions which had been stamped upon their minds. The spiritual revolution spread, and its principles formed the starting-point of new developments, so that St Paul, who was the prime mover in the developments, even if he had not known a single word of the actual preaching of Jesus, could work upon inherited

material. His revolutionary universalism, together with his conceptions of sonship and of the divine kingdom, may be ascribed to his creative genius, but it was not a creation *ex nihilo*, but rather a creative evolution from the germ planted by the Lord, *ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου.*

But sonship is revealed in a Son, and sovereignty in a Sovereign. The ethics and eschatology of Jesus are inseparably bound up with the claims of His own self-consciousness in relation to both. To these must be added His teaching on the Spirit of God and the Wisdom of God, which He knew Himself to possess. And the thoughts of divine Sonship and Messiahship, divine Spirit and Wisdom, were, again, germs capable of great expansion. To the disciples His Death and Resurrection, and the outpouring of the Spirit, were the opening of a new world of ideas. His claims seemed for the first time to spring out from the obscurity of enigma, to be magnified in the radiant certitude of experienced facts. Here was a further wealth of material for the 'master-builder,' and, as before, whether he knew our Lord's words or not, he erected his edifice of doctrine on *Him.*

Thus an examination of the principal elements in the teaching of Jesus is indispensable for appraising the value of St Paul's. From that starting-point we shall go on to determine the place which other teachers occupied in respect to him.

2. The writer who stands nearest to the ethical teaching of our Lord, and furthest from St Paul's point of view, is the author of the *Epistle of St James.* It is the only writing in the New Testament in which an echo of the apostle's struggle with Judaizers is heard. His battle-cry 'Faith and not Works' has the appearance of being directly

opposed by this writer, who asks 'Can faith save him? 'Was not Abraham our father justified by works?' If the epistle was written at the early date which has often been assigned to it, the opposition must have come, on the contrary, from St Paul. The divergence between them calls for investigation, which points the way to an understanding of the true inwardness of the epistle.

This writing stands by itself as a purely ethical appeal. Pfleiderer[1] is quite justified in saying 'It is certain that, with James as its pioneer, Christianity would never have become a universal religion, nor indeed a religion at all, distinct from Judaism.' What will chiefly concern us in the other writings falls broadly under four heads: the Nature of Christ, the 'plan of salvation,' the doctrine of the Spirit, and eschatology. The chapters are not arranged under these heads, but they include most of the subjects to be dealt with.

3. Christian doctrine in the *Acts* is mostly expressed in the speeches which the author (whether St Luke or not) attributes to St Peter and St Paul. But the teaching in both belongs to a less developed stage of thought than that in the Pauline epistles. It is probable that the author had not moved far from the doctrinal position of the first disciples; so that while he expresses his own view throughout, he represents not inaccurately the early apostolic doctrine. The facts which are taught of the earthly life of Jesus, the Nature and functions of the exalted Christ, the bearing of the Old Testament on these, the eschatology, and the conception of the divine Spirit, will pass under review in comparison with St Paul's treatment of the same subjects, and the Hebraic character of the

[1] *The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the development of Christianity*, p. 169.

author's thoughts will be noted. On the other hand he ascribes to St Paul a universalism which is his own, and is even larger and more generous than that in the epistles.

4. We move nearer to St Paul in 1 *Peter*; but it will be seen that, in spite of similarities with *Romans*, it does not on the whole reach the doctrinal position of the apostle. The writer (very possibly St Peter) had a Hebraic cast of mind, which shews itself in his doctrine of God, and in his conception of the relations of Christians to Israel, which in turn shapes his teaching on Salvation, together with that on the great themes of Faith, Grace, Holiness, Righteousness, Sin, the nature of man, and of the Spirit, on all of which St Paul's epistles represent a further stage of reflexion.

5. The next three writings doctrinally form a group, being Jewish in their eschatology, but Pauline in their Christology.

The *Apocalypse* is deeply Hebraic in language and in its use of the Old Testament, and distinctively Jewish in the eschatology which is its main theme. The writer's doctrine of God is cast in a somewhat Hebrew mould, while, on the other hand his Christology is thoroughly Pauline. But his thoughts on Salvation are determined by the dominating influence of his eschatology,—the Parousia, the Millennium, the Second Resurrection, and the Judgment.

6. The short *Epistle of St Jude* stands in much the same category, deeply influenced by Jewish eschatology, but Pauline in Christology though not in language.

7. With it, and partly based upon it, may be coupled the late writing 2 *Peter*, the two main objects of which are to keep alive the fading expectation of the Parousia, and to uphold Christian orthodoxy by denouncing antinomian heretics who denied that Christ would come.

8. The nearest approach to an echo of St Paul is found in the *Pastoral Epistles*. But the writer, confronted with different difficulties of a later date, found it necessary to 'underline' certain truths about God, and Jesus Christ, and the Law, which St Paul had no occasion to emphasize.

9. Hitherto the adjectives 'Hebraic' and 'Pauline' have covered most of the varieties of New Testament teaching. But in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* a wholly new element makes its appearance which may be described as 'Alexandrian.' Large use is made in the epistle of the thought of the fulfilment of the Old Testament, but it is fulfilment in a very different sense from that in the synoptic Gospels and the Acts. It is more akin to the idea of Israel in 1 *Peter*, but is conceived in the spirit of Plato. The Christology, as such, is in line with St Paul's, but the bulk of the teaching about Christ is concerned with His priestly work by death and exaltation rather than with the rescue from the power of sin wrought by His death and resurrection. And since a Priest is a Representative of his people, an emphasis, which is entirely absent from St Paul's doctrine, is laid on Christ's real humanity. On the other hand, while the writer, from his new point of view, makes a contribution to Christian thought of profound value, he is so much dependent, for his dialectic, upon the Old Testament, and especially the Levitical portions of it, that he hardly rises to St Paul's living and burning experience of life in Christ—growth in sanctification, carried on in the Spirit, and by Faith.

10. The building upon Christ the Foundation has been growing; but in the *Fourth Gospel* the coping stone is laid. The evangelist tries to re-state the fundamentals of Christianity in such a way as to commend them to the world of Hellenism. He makes use of Jewish thought,

but opposes the Jews. With St Paul he sees 'the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,' the light which had shone in the spiritual experience of the Church for more than half a century; but he sees it not only in the face of the risen Christ, but of Jesus of Nazareth in His human life in Palestine. He relates what He was then, to express the radiant truth of what Christians know Him to be now.

11. Lastly, 1 *John* touches, more humanly and immediately, the personal life of Christians, their attitude towards God and man, and thus comes, in some respects, nearer to the thought of St Paul. It is the aftermath of the Fourth Gospel, and contains a twofold appeal, for a right belief in Christ, and for the moral life which can be lived only by abiding in Him.

CHAPTER I

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

§ 1. The Problem

The study of the first three Gospels presents a problem to which we cannot close our eyes. Each of them reached its present form after at least a generation[1] of reflexion on the nature and meaning of Christ. They wrote in an age when the modern historic sense, and the strict conception of historical accuracy were unknown. And they would have been non-human if they could have compiled their gospels wholly free from their own presuppositions formed by the general Christian consciousness as it had been developed up to their date. It is, indeed, fully recognized to-day that a historian is not a mere chronicler, but one who presents historical facts in such a way as to indicate the meaning which they bear for himself. To say that a man is a historian, and at the same time 'absolutely impartial' is almost a contradiction in terms. And in the case of a first century writer the contradiction would be more violent. We shall not be mistaken, therefore, in recognizing that the Gospels contain 'later ideas,' that is ideas which the writers, as purposeful historians, 'found' in the facts before them. They presented the facts, as we do to-day, with the deliberate intention of conveying what they believed to be their meaning. And the differences in the conceptions of Jesus during His earthly life held by modern writers mostly resolve themselves into differences of opinion as to the extent to which this interpreting

[1] The Second Gospel at about 70 A.D., the First and Third between 80–100 A.D.

process was at work in the minds of the evangelists. It is generally agreed that in the mind of the writer of the Fourth Gospel the process was at work to a very considerable extent. But what is true of him cannot be wholly untrue of the others. Nevertheless when we compare the ideas which the synoptists enshrined in their records with those of the other Christian writers of the same generation, we find that the former were faithful, to an astonishing degree, in preserving the main elements in the life and teaching of our Lord as handed down to them by 'those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word.'

In comparing our Lord's teaching with St Paul's, care is needed not to lose one's way in a multitude of details. We must single out the great, primary subjects where they are comparable. A few years ago there was a tendency, brought to a head by Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Engl. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*) to find the keynote of the teaching and claims of Jesus in His eschatology alone. The inauguration of the Kingdom of Heaven would be a catastrophic event of the immediate future, and He would be the Messiah of the Kingdom. All His ethical teaching was an *interimsethik*, the moral life appropriate, during the short remaining interval, for those who were about to experience the crisis. Schweitzer undoubtedly opened the eyes of many, especially English-speaking people, to see that eschatology holds a larger place in the synoptic Gospels, and in the Pauline epistles also, than had previously been realized. But he was so 'consistent' in the application of his theory as to provoke a reaction. And there is now a danger of the opposite extreme, i.e. to discount most of the eschatology in the Gospels as the work of later thought, and to confine our

Lord to the 'sane and sober' enunciation of ethical principles[1]. But we must refuse to be tied to the alternatives that He was *either* a fantastic visionary, a mental victim of the Jewish apocalypses, *or* a liberal Protestant, moral, pacifist, and socialistic. Of the two we can say without hesitation that the former would go further than the latter in accounting for the spiritual enthusiasm of His first disciples in their triumphant witness to His Messiahship.

Imagine the situation supposed in the latter case. A prophet, a teacher of a high morality, who openly expressed his independence of cherished traditions and conventions, brought upon himself violent religious opposition, and was executed at the hands of the authorities. His handful of devoted disciples underwent an experience which convinced them that He had appeared to them alive after death. What was there in this to afford the faintest reason for their glad and unshakeable certainty that He was not only alive (the idea of risings from the dead was not at all foreign to Jewish thought; cf. Mat. xiv. 2, xxvii. 52; Heb. xi. 35), but exalted to God's right hand as the heavenly Messiah; that it was He who had not only been anointed with, but had Himself poured out upon them, the divine Spirit; and that He would very soon be seen in the terrible glory of His world-shaking Parousia to inaugurate the Kingdom of God upon earth? There is no psychological means of transit from the first set of ideas to the second.

On the other hand, the former alternative, rigidly adhered to, wholly fails to account for the inclusion in the Gospels of the large element of moral teaching. 'He began

[1] Some of which, nevertheless, it is not considered sane and sober to put into practice *ad literam* today.

to teach them many things' (Mk vi. 34). 'He was accustomed' to teach them (x. 1). The theory of an *interim-sethik* covers only portions of it. If, as Schweitzer holds, Jesus did not think of Himself as a 'teacher' at all, what place in the eschatological theory can be found (to take a single example) for the parable of the Prodigal Son? Must those who can discern nothing eschatological in it deny its genuineness, and 'put[1] it down to the account of "primitive theology," which serves as a scrap-heap for everything for which they cannot find a place in the "historical life of Jesus"'?

Thus it is not mere dislike of a dilemma that makes us refuse to be pinned down to one of two alternatives, but the fact that neither of them by itself satisfies the *data*. It is evident that we must search for something which would give rise both to the moral teaching ascribed to our Lord by the synoptists, and to the belief in His Messiahship held by the primitive Church.

We can start from the statements in the Gospels that He was thought of as a Prophet. 'This is the prophet Jesus who is from Nazareth of Galilee' (Mat. xxi. 11). 'A great prophet is risen among us' (Lk. vii. 16). He was even thought to be one of the Old Testament prophets come to life again (Mk vi. 15, viii. 28). And He is recorded to have applied the title to Himself: 'A prophet is not without honour except in his own country' (Mk vi. 4), 'I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and on the day following, for it cannot be that a prophet perish outside Jerusalem' (Lk. xiii. 33). Now the Jewish race knew very well what they meant by a prophet; the cessation of prophets is lamented in Psalm lxxiv. 9; and the word

[1] The sentence is Schweitzer's, but it lends itself to be quoted against him.

carries us back into the distant past of Hebrew thought. In so far, then, as it could be rightly used to describe our Lord, a parallel should be traceable between Him and His predecessors.

The essence of the work of the prophets from Amos onwards is to be found not in their moral teaching alone, nor in their eschatological predictions alone, but in something which combined them both, i.e. in the correction of the popular nationalistic self-consciousness, and the eschatological ideas in which it found expression, by placing them in the light of the moral Being of God. Both the self-consciousness and the eschatology were created by the experiences of the Exodus and the settlement in Canaan. They believed that each land and nation had a real God of their own; Israel's God was Yahweh, but He was the most powerful of them all, and gradually proved it by helping them to overcome their enemies. The 'sons of Israel' were naturally and necessarily sons of the God of Israel. 'Israel is My son, my firstborn' (Ex. iv. 22); 'I called My son out of Egypt'[1] (Hos. xi. 1). Their defeats were His defeats, their triumphs His triumphs; their conceptions of His greatness and their greatness grew together.

And thus arose the confident expectation that the day must come when He and they would arrive at complete supremacy over all foes. He was naturally and necessarily bound to bring this about; it was an obvious certainty that the 'day of Yahweh' would be a day of 'light,' ushering in a golden age of perpetual prosperity and world-wide dominion. They had as yet little conception of Him as a moral Being, who required to be served by moral character. But Amos stood forth and declared that the

[1] The rendering of the Hebrew is doubtful, and the versions differ. See the writer's note on Mat. ii. 15.

day of Yahweh would be not light but darkness (v. 18). And he and his successors declared that the golden age to which the nation looked serenely forward would come to them not as a consequence of their unique position as the privileged sons of Yahweh, but of their obedience to His moral commands. The eschatology of the prophets was thus bound up with, and conditioned by, their moral teaching. The good time to come was not an inevitable consummation of national privilege, but an event which was impossible without national righteousness.

It is not difficult to trace the circumstances which led the Prophet of Nazareth to adopt a similar attitude.

§ 2. Sonship

After the return from exile the lesson of the prophets, pressed home in the hard school of suffering, was thoroughly understood. God's commands must be obeyed; and the *ḥᵃsidim*, the pious, strove to obey them, many no doubt with the frank and simple delight of the author of Psalm cxix. But their zeal for obedience so consumed them that they felt it necessary to keep themselves more safe from stumbling by means of bye-laws which were not in the Torah; the 'tradition of the elders' began to grow up as a fence round the Law. And it grew to such dimensions and complexity that it was beyond the mental range of the ordinary population. It is true that the new rules were not all on the side of strictness; many of them were intended to mitigate the severity of the Law and of rules already made. But the whole *corpus* of regulations could be known only to those who were rich enough, or self-sacrificing enough, to give up ordinary occupations, and to devote themselves wholly to the study of it. And those who did, tended increasingly

to despise the unlearned and ignorant, and to consider them unfit for the blessings of the age to come. Scholarship held the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. And to it was being added in certain quarters speculations about the age to come, which are reflected in the apocalypses. From all this the Sadducaean, aristocratic, priestly party held aloof. They might be worldly and time-serving, they might for political purposes acquiesce in the movement to Graecize their nation; but with scribal rules and apocalyptic speculations they would have nothing to do. They claimed to adhere only to the sacred Scriptures, and especially to the Pentateuch. And they were concerned mainly with the preservation of their privileges of position with its attendant prestige and wealth. They held the keys of worldly office, which attracted many of them more than the Kingdom of Heaven.

Thus the legalists on the one hand, and the ecclesiastics on the other, possessed a monopoly of religious knowledge and privilege, over against the *'am ['ammê] hā-'ārez*, the common folk, the masses, whom they despised as lacking in culture and piety[1]. Cf. Jn vii. 49, 'This people [*or* mob] that knoweth not the Law are accursed.' The poor, though not, of course, identical with the humble and pious in the land, were broadly speaking nearer to being so than the labouring classes today. They could say with the Psalmist 'our soul is exceedingly filled with the scorning of those that are at ease, and with the contempt of the proud.' Those that were humble and pious among them were nothing accounted of in the days when our Lord began His ministry. *And He was one of them.* That is a salient fact which conditioned His work. He had lived

[1] On the contempt in which they were held see Foakes Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i. Appendix E.

all His life in Galilee as one of the 'mob.' Publicans and sinners were held by the scholars and ecclesiastics to be scarcely further from the Kingdom of God than such as He. And while He mused upon it the fire kindled, and at last driven by the impelling force of divine inspiration He emerged from His secluded life to proclaim that the Kingdom of God was not the monopoly of culture and privilege, but was open to any and every one who repented of his sins and lived a life of righteousness. The prophets had taught that a sonship of mere privilege would not of itself bring with it blessings in the day of Yahweh. And the better minds in Israel had begun to understand that a 'son' of God was one who received His fatherly discipline (cf. 2 Sam. vii. 14, 15; Hos. i. 10), and exhibited a character like unto His. The following late passages are noteworthy: Ecclus. iv. 10, LXX., 'Be to orphans as a father, and instead of a husband to their mother, and thou shalt be as a son of the most High' (Heb. 'and God shall call thee son'); Wisd. ii. 16, 18, 'He [the righteous] boasteth that God is his Father'; 'If the righteous be God's son, He will uphold him'; v. 5, 'How was he [the righteous] reckoned among the sons of God!'; Psalms Sol. xiii. 8, 'He shall admonish the righteous man as a beloved son, and his discipline shall be as that of a first-born'; xviii. 4, 'Thy discipline is upon us as upon a first-born only son.' And our Lord is recorded to have used similar language: 'Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called sons of God' (Mat. v. 9); 'Love your enemies . . . that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven' for He also does kindnesses to bad men as well as good (*v.* 44 f.). The parallel in Lk. has 'ye shall be sons of the most High' (vi. 35). It was the burning centre of His message that since character and not privilege constitute

true sonship, every blessing provided for God's sons is attainable by *anyone*. That was fundamental in His good tidings, and a study of it sheds a bright light upon much of the synoptic records.

(*a*) It was a revolution. It had nothing akin to socialism in the modern sense, or to politics in any sense, because it was 'not of this world.' But to eat and drink with publicans and sinners, and to defend Himself as He does in Mat. ix. 12, 13 and Lk. xv., to be known as their friend (Mat. xi. 19), and to treat them as is recorded in Lk. vii. 37–50, xix. 5–7, Jn viii. 1–11, in a word to open the Kingdom of Heaven to *all*, was to attack privilege. And an enthusiastic crowd was storming the Kingdom of Heaven, and taking possession of it by force, as a band of spiritual revolutionaries against the intellectual autocrats who would keep them out (Mat. xi. 12). It was 'the revolt of true prophecy against the monopolising of the Lord of heaven and earth by an intellectual coterie' (Bacon). It was the principle underlying His whole attitude to the Law and the scribal tradition. To be learned in either was not essential. '*I* say unto you' shew a righteousness exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees, one which involves the fundamental principles of human ethics, which are binding upon, and can be observed by, *everyone*,—as distinct from the casuistries of scholastic moral theology, in which even the learned were divided, on such subjects as the Sabbath, divorce, oaths and vows, washings, and tithes. 'Woe unto you, professors of the Law, because ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye yourselves entered not in, and them that were entering in ye hindered' (Lk. xi. 52). 'I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed

them unto babes' (Mat. xi. 25 = Lk. x. 21). When those who were called to the feast refused to come, the masses scattered on the high roads were gathered in (Mat. xxii. 1–10). Of the two sons, he that 'repented and went' was the one that really did his father's will, and the publicans and harlots are his analogue (Mat. xxi. 28–32). The publican in the temple, with his true penitence for undoubted wrong-doing, was better than the Pharisee (Lk. xviii. 10–14). The one wandering sheep, the one lost coin, gives more joy than the others (xv. 1–10), and the prodigal son than the scrupulous, privileged elder brother (*vv.* 11–32). And the revolution culminated at the capital, the august centre of priestly and aristocratic privilege, in the cleansing of the temple to be a house of prayer for all.

(*b*) Since sonship consists morally in likeness to the Father, we are enabled to see where the emphasis lies in our Lord's references to the Fatherhood of God. It is not the case that Jesus was the first to teach that God is Father. In the Old Testament, God is the Father of Israel the privileged nation, and of its representative or king. In later writings there is the beginning of the conception that He is the Father, in a more immediate and personal sense, of individuals. E.g. 'O Lord, the Father and Master [God] of my life' (Sir. xxiii. 1, 4). 'They all ...called upon the all-Sovereign Lord and all-powerful Ruler, their merciful God and Father' (3 Mac. v. 7). 'Cause us to return, O our Father, unto Thy law'; 'Forgive us, O our Father, for we have sinned' (*Sh*^{e}*mōneh 'esrēh*[1]). It is true that the instances that can be cited are not numerous, while for our Lord the truth of God's

[1] I.e. 'Eighteen,' a title given to a collection of pre-Christian Hebrew prayers. See the *Authorised Daily Prayer Book* (ed. Abrahams, p. lv ff.).

Fatherhood was the very air that He breathed. But it was not so much the fact, as man's attitude to it, which was a distinctive mark of His teaching. He spoke in such a way as to imply that the Fatherhood was universal, embracing every member of the nation without exception; but that upon each individual lay the necessity of making the relationship a real thing for himself. Each one *became* God's son who became like Him in character, to whatever social grade he belonged, and from whatever depth of moral degradation he may have risen by penitence. 'God does not become the Father, but is the heavenly Father, even of those who become His sons[1].' St Luke the artist expresses this truth chiefly by the selection of subjects for his canvas, the outcast and despised, women, children, the poor, the Samaritan, the penitent sinner; it is the inspiration of the parable of the Prodigal. St Matthew expresses it partly by the frequency with which he reports our Lord as speaking of God as the Father of men: v. 16, 45 (Lk. vi. 35, 'the most High'), 48 (Lk. vi. 36), vi. 1, 4, 6, 8, 9 (Lk. xi. 2), 14, 15, 18, 26 (Lk. xii. 24, 'God'), 32 (Lk. xii. 30), vii. 11 (Lk. xi. 13), x. 20, 'the Spirit of your Father' (Lk. xii. 12, 'the Holy Spirit'), xiii. 43, xviii. 14, xxiii. 9. Some of these may not be original; but where the evangelists differ it is not safe to assume in every case that Lk. must be preferred. In v. 45 (Lk. vi. 35), for example, 'your Father which is in heaven' is much more probable than 'the most High' which St Luke not infrequently uses in imitation of the LXX. And he once has 'your Father' in a passage (xii. 32) peculiar to his gospel.

(*c*) Since man's relations with God must be expressed in terms of personal character, not of national, or class,

[1] Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, i. 193.

privilege, there follows what has often been pointed out as an important factor in our Lord's teaching, a necessary emphasis on the individual value of every human being,—a truth which lies at the heart of the religion and of the social life and civilization of the Western world.

(*d*) If sonship is something which man acquires, or realizes, as he becomes like God, it is a supreme privilege, to which divine blessings are attached. These blessings are summed up in the much-discussed expressions 'the Kingdom,' 'the Kingdom of God,' 'the Kingdom of Heaven.' Their meaning will come before us later. But whatever be the true content of the word 'Kingdom' as used by our Lord, its blessings are not for those who expect them by right of earthly privilege, national, social, or intellectual. 'The sons of the Kingdom,' i.e. those who so expected them, 'will be cast out into the outer darkness' what time many come from East and West and recline with the patriarchs at the banquet in the Kingdom of Heaven (Mat. viii. 11, 12). The same thought is repeated in other words: 'The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits of it' (i.e. the fruits which belong, are proper, to the Kingdom) (xxi. 43). And the privilege of earthly wealth is an almost insuperable barrier which prevents men from entering into it (Mk x. 23–27 = Mat. xix. 23–26). On the other hand it is for publicans and harlots who repent and do God's will (Mat. xxi. 31); it is for 'the poor [in spirit]' (Mat. v. 3 = Lk. vi. 20), and for those who are 'persecuted for righteousness' sake' (Mat. v. 10); 'Of such'—the precious possession of the childlike—'is the Kingdom of God' (Mk x. 14 = Mat. xix. 14; Lk. xviii. 16); the scribe was 'not far from the Kingdom of God,' not because of his learning but because of his right state of mind

(Mk xii. 34); 'Seek His Kingdom' rather than the supply of earthly needs; and to the little flock who do that, the Father has of His good pleasure determined to give the Kingdom (Lk. xii. 31, 32).

Descriptions are given of its secret growth, independent of human means and contrivances, in the parable of the Seed growing of itself (Mk iv. 26–29), and of its great expansion in those of the Mustard seed and the Leaven (Mat. xiii. 31–33 = Lk. xiii. 18–20). Whatever explanation of the meaning of the Kingdom may be drawn from these passages, they are wholly opposed to the idea of a reward which will accrue to privileged intellectuals or ecclesiastical officials. So is also the severe moral effort, the struggle and self-sacrifice needed to win it. It is as a treasure hid in a field, or a goodly pearl, which a man will sell all that he has to buy (Mat. xiii. 44–46). 'Not everyone that saith unto me "Lord, Lord," shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in Heaven' (Mat. vii. 21). 'If thine eye make thee stumble, cast it away; it is better for thee to enter one-eyed into the Kingdom of God than having two eyes to be cast into Gehenna' (Mk ix. 47). 'No one having put his hand to the plough, and looked behind him, is fit for the Kingdom of God' (Lk. ix. 62). And the reward is for those who have 'left house, or wife, or brethren, or parents, or children for the sake of the Kingdom of God' (xviii. 29). And there are numerous passages of the same kind in which another word or expression is substituted for 'the Kingdom,' but the meaning is the same.

Further, all this teaching, that the opportunity of gaining the divine blessings of the Kingdom is open to everyone, received optical demonstration in miracles of healing. 'If I with the Spirit [Lk. "finger"] of God cast

out demons, then the Kingdom of God is come upon you' (Mat. xii. 28 = Lk. xi. 20). That message is implicit in every cure. The privileged classes could live healthier lives, and there is very little evidence that any of them came to Jesus for healing. His patients were of the poorer sort, who suffered physical hardships, and were an easy prey to every scourge in an age when there was little knowledge of medicine or sanitation, and none of the pathology of nervous diseases. Our Lord's casting out of demons, as they were believed to be, was well understood by the scribes and Pharisees to be part of His 'revolution,' and was therefore officially condemned as Satanic. The blind, lame, deaf, dumb, fevered, paralytic, leprous, lunatic—the poor, neglected dregs of society—could all receive the blessings involved in the Kingdom of God, if they shewed a confident trust in His power.

This universalism is of the essence of the teaching of Jesus. In practice He did not extend it beyond the limits of His own nation, with only four recorded exceptions, for a slave (Mat. viii. 5–13 = Lk. vii. 2–10), and for a little girl (Mk vii. 24–30 = Mat. xv. 21–28), because of the irresistible faith of those who sought His help; for a Samaritan leper (Lk. xvii. 16) and for a Samaritan woman (Jn iv.). But it was obviously a basis upon which more could be built. The extension of the divine blessings to the Gentiles is a logical conclusion from His premisses. The first Christians did not see this at once. But as St Peter dwelt upon his recollections of the 'revolution,' they must have led him towards the convictions which found expression in the vision on the housetop and the visit to Cornelius.

At this point we turn, for the first time, to St Paul, to compare his idea of man's divine sonship with that

of our Lord. He became the leader in a new phase of the revolution. The essence of it was still the same—sonship *versus* privilege—but the conception of sonship differed. And the privilege against which he fought differed also. 'Not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many high-born [are called]' (1 Cor. i. 26). That was an immediate effect of the work and teaching of Jesus which he inherited and took for granted. The privilege was for him not primarily of class but of Jewish nationality. He put 'the Jew first,' as our Lord did, but his fight was for 'the Gentile also' (Rom. i. 16, ii. 9, 10). And his universalism was a deduction from the nature of the exalted Christ. That is to say, sonship depends not on what we are, but on what Christ is. Because He has been raised and exalted, His life and power are of universal efficacy; they have become available to be man's real, personal possession. The centre and heart of St Paul's religion is seen, not in the special features perpetuated by Augustine and Luther, the doctrines of grace and justification by faith but, in the experimental knowledge that Christ and Christians are *one*. All who accept by faith the free grace of God shewn in the Death and Resurrection of His Son, and are baptized into Christ (Rom. vi. 2–11), have been brought into a mystical unity with Him so real and profound that His Sonship carries with it their sonship; His Spirit becomes the indwelling life of their spirit, enabling them to claim God as their Father, and to be assured that they are His children; His career of death unto sin and resurrection to life and glory is reproduced in them (Rom. viii. 15–17; Gal. iv. 4–7). That this view of sonship, no less than our Lord's, is a revolution against privilege of race, rank, or sex is expressed in Gal. iii. 26–29; cf. Col. iii. 11. It is the mystical

indwelling of God in His people, as in a temple, when they are separated from the pollutions of sinners, that makes it possible for Him to say 'I will be to you for a Father, and ye shall be to Me for sons and daughters' (2 Cor. vi. 16–18). Thus the two points of view from which Jesus and St Paul regarded man's sonship may be described respectively as the moral and the mystical. It was possible to overpress each of them to a logical, but mistaken conclusion, the former to a self-satisfied trust in moral works wrought by man's unaided will, the latter to antinomian licence which neglected moral works as unnecessary. The one is attacked by St Paul, the other by St James.

§ 3. Eschatology

The same difference between our Lord and the apostle is involved in their teaching on the divine Kingdom. The questions relating to the Person of the Messiah will be studied later. But apart from that, the teaching of Jesus was inseparably bound up with His conceptions of the 'Kingdom of God' [*or* 'of Heaven'][1]. What would this expression mean for Jews of that date? Israel was a Theocracy. They had had earthly kings, whose function it was to rule as representatives and champions of their people; but the real King was God. His 'Kingdom' (*βασιλεία*) was His sovereignty, rule, sway, divine authority. Earthly kings were 'underlings of His Kingdom,' *ὑπηρέται τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας* (Wisd. vi. 4). Ideally, He was King over the whole world: 'the Lord hath established His throne in the heavens; His Kingdom ruleth

[1] In Mat. viii. 12, xiii. 19, 38, xxiv. 14; Lk. xii. 32: 'the Kingdom,' with no further definition, occurs in words ascribed to Him. Dalman (*The Words of Jesus*, 95 f.) contends that in early Jewish literature this meant only the secular government. If so, it is improbable that our Lord used it in these passages.

over all' (Ps. ciii. 19). But actually, only a small portion of mankind, i.e. Israel, acknowledged His sovereignty. The privileged class of cultured and learned piety were still more exclusive; their claim was that they alone—in Talmudic phrase—'took upon them the Kingdom [*or* the yoke of the Kingdom] of Heaven.' Therefore while He was King to them in a real and immediate sense, the consummation, the full actuality of His sovereignty was a great event of the future. But though it was not yet, it was bound to come. God would not submit for ever to the rebellion of the nations, and the sins of the wicked (Ps. ii. 1–5). He, and therefore His chosen people, the elect, the beloved, the saints, the righteous (whether interpreted in a wider sense of the nation, or more narrowly of the religious class), must one day be supreme, and His foes and theirs subdued or destroyed. Thus it is that the Kingdom of Heaven could be said to 'come'; and thence, by an easy transition, its meaning could pass to that of the blessed and happy condition of those who would be the King's willing subjects in His consummated sovereignty. And so they could be said to 'enter' into it, to be 'given' it, to 'inherit' it, to 'possess' it, etc.

That, in general terms, was the twofold belief common to all Jews—a divine sovereignty in the present to which only a few gave allegiance, and the certainty of its future consummation. But there were numberless differences of opinion as to the sphere in which it would take place, whether on this earth within the present order of things, or in a new order, a new heaven and a new earth; the precedent conditions needed to bring it about; the physical portents or other accompaniments of it, and so on. This kaleidoscopic background of Jewish thought is reflected in the synoptic Gospels, and to a greater or less extent

in the whole of the New Testament. And there is very little doubt that it was reflected in the utterances of our Lord. It is difficult to imagine any Jew living quite unaffected by the prevailing atmosphere or stream of thought. And if Jesus had shewn Himself uniquely independent of it, tradition would almost certainly have preserved the fact in such a way that the addition of the strong eschatological colouring to be seen in His words would have been impossible.

But to decide how much the original colour has been heightened (as it probably has) by the artists' brushes is a difficult matter. It may be safely assumed, as a basis, that our Lord held the two-fold belief summarized above—a divine sovereignty in the present to which only a few gave allegiance, and the certainty of its future consummation. It is with regard to the latter, especially in the scenic setting of the crisis, and the metaphors describing the subsequent bliss or woe, that the difficulty is greatest of estimating how much came originally from His own lips. Probably a good deal was added from Christian apocalyptic speculation which was growing during the first century. It is widely agreed, for example, that Mk xiii. 5–27 (Mat. Lk.) was incorporated from, or compiled out of, a Jewish-Christian apocalyptic writing, which included 'doubtless genuine sayings of Jesus, and also some that reflect a later date, when Christians had begun to realize that some delay must be expected before the Parousia[1].' Whatever be the extent to which our Lord made use of Jewish metaphors and pictures, modern study has taught us to recognize them for what they are, and to penetrate to the underlying truths which He wished to teach. For Him the true meaning of the final consum-

[1] See the writer's *St Matthew*, p. 343 f.

mation was determined by His thought of the divine sovereignty in the present. The scenic details can on no account be interpreted as literal predictions to be accepted merely as having been made by Him, or as having any intrinsic doctrinal importance of their own.

St Paul also gives some scenic details. But it is remarkable at how few points they appear to depend upon those in the Gospels. Their common features are those which are known to us in the Jewish apocalypses. He expects the Parousia of the Messiah in the near future. And it will be as sudden and unexpected as a thief (1 Thes. v. 2; cf. Mat. xxiv. 43 = Lk. xii. 39), a simile which is not found in the apocalypses that we possess. He speaks of the 'gathering together' (ἐπισυναγωγή) of Christians unto the Lord (cf. ἐπισυνάξει Mk xiii. 27 = Mat. xxiv. 31), which appears to mean in both cases a gathering into the air (1 Thes. iv. 17). And *vv.* 15–17 are introduced by 'For this we say unto you by the word (ἐν λόγῳ) of the Lord,' as though the passage were based upon some traditional utterance, or utterances, of Jesus. The Messiah will appear 'with all His holy ones' (1 Thes. iii. 13), 'with the angels of His power' (2 Thes. i. 7), as in Mk viii. 38 (Mat. Lk.); cf. Mk xiii. 27 (Mat.), Mat. xxv. 31; but this is based on Zech. xiv. 5: 'Yahweh my God shall come, and all the holy ones with Him.' At His Parousia sinners will be destroyed (2 Thes. i. 7–9), as our Lord is frequently reported to have said. And a signal of His coming will be a trumpet (1 Thes. iv. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 52), as in Mat. xxiv. 31, but based on Is. xxvii. 13. Of all the vivid metaphors of punishment ascribed to Jesus no use is made by St Paul, with the exception of 'a flame of fire' (2 Thes. i. 7). On the other hand, especially in 1, 2 Thes., and 1 Cor., he has some remarkable features

which are absent from the Gospels. Moreover eschatological detail came to have less interest for him as time went on; and in his latest epistles he seems practically to have given up all expectation of an imminent catastrophe. His ideas on the End will be further discussed in connexion with the Apocalypse (ch. v).

Where Jesus differed from His contemporaries in regard to the Kingdom of God was primarily in His teaching on the true allegiance to the divine sovereignty. His 'revolution' comes before us again. It was not Jews *qua* Jews, because they were members of the privileged nation, who would gain these blessings. His teaching was utterly free from any vestige of nationalism. It gave no sort of support to the Zealots of His day, and it gives none to their modern successors who identify or fuse their political and religious ideals. The true allegiance was repentance of sins, and a becoming like the Father in moral character, in obedience to the ultimate ethical principles in which the Law was 'fulfilled.' And, as has been said, this was open to *all*; and for all who gave this allegiance—exhibited, for example, in love to their neighbours—the Kingdom was 'prepared from the foundation of the world' (Mat. xxv. 34). And He rejoiced to think that the divine sway, the spiritual movement in preparation for the final supremacy of God, was slowly growing in the hearts and lives of the masses, like a seed of corn or mustard, or like leaven. But though the movement was progressing, there were some who refused to play their part; there was seed that was prevented from growing up into good fruit; there were tares in the field that would be burnt; there were fish in the net that would be rejected. The Kingdom of God would be brought to completion, not by the universal obedience of man but, by the act of God

at the day and hour that He alone knew. Men were called to repent, and to enter into the King's service, because the divine act was close at hand: 'The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is near; repent and believe in the good news' (Mk i. 15). Every individual ought so to live that the 'irruption of God' will find him already God's. This was, potentially but assuredly, to 'enter into the Kingdom of God' (Mk ix. 47; Mat. vii. 21, xviii. 3, xxiii. 14; cf. xxi. 31); to 'enter into' or 'inherit (eternal) life' (Mk ix. 43 f. (Mat.), x. 17 (Mat. Mk)); to 'receive' the Kingdom (Lk. xviii, 17); to be 'given' it (xii. 32); to be of those to whom it belongs: 'of such is the Kingdom of God' (Mk x. 14 (Mat.)); also to 'seek' it, to pursue it as a permanent ideal of life (Mat. vi. 33 (Lk.), xiii. 45 f.). So that it may be said, potentially but assuredly, to be 'within you' or 'in your midst' (Lk. xvii. 21)[1].

St Paul's conception of the meaning of the divine Kingdom does not differ essentially from this; but he came to regard it from his own new angle of vision. He wrote when the Spirit of the Messiah had been poured out upon His servants, which was, in Old Testament expectations, one of the blessings of the ideal age to come (Is. xliv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 27, xxxvii. 1–14, xxxix. 29; Joel ii. 28 f.). Thus he learnt to think of the Kingdom not only as the divine sovereignty in the present, to which only a few gave allegiance, or as the final goal in the future, but something of which the realization, the actuality, the consummation had, in some real though inchoate sense, already begun. Christians had been brought into the mystical union with Christ, the Messiah, by which God

[1] The force of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν is uncertain; but whether it means within the individuals or within the community the teaching of the verse is the same.

of His grace granted them 'righteousness': they had been 'translated into the Kingdom of the Son of His love' (Col. i. 13); they were dead to sin; they were a new creation; old things had passed away; to live any longer in sin was a contradiction in terms, and unthinkable. The Kingdom, the sovereignty, the sway, of God was, for Christians, a spiritual condition 'in Christ,' 'in the Lord,' 'in the Spirit,' into which they had already been transferred. 'The Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in (the) Holy Spirit' (Rom. xiv. 17). It shews its true activity 'not in word but in power' (1 Cor. iv. 20). And all the apostle's moral exhortations are to live accordingly, to walk as children of light. He speaks of certain persons as his 'fellow-workers unto the Kingdom of God' (Col. iv. 11), i.e. to bring non-Christians into it, and to keep Christians true to it[1].

But this conception of God's Sovereignty exercised through Christ by His mystical union with Christians did not, apparently, take the first place in St Paul's mind all at once. His own words can be applied to his grasp of truth: 'first that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual.' When he was a child in Christianity he spake as a child. He started with Jewish eschatological ideas occupying the foreground of his thoughts. But the mystical doctrine already begins to find expression in 1 Thes. i. 1, 'the Church of the Thessalonians *in* God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.' And it is interesting

[1] He never speaks of the Kingdom of God distinctly as equivalent to the Church, though it was open to him to do so, because the mystical union of Christians with Christ involves their common share (κοινωνία) in one and the same Spirit and Life. Their condition is therefore a corporate union. And the Body of Christ might easily have been called the realm, the sphere, the area, of God's sovereignty. But this quasi-local meaning of the Kingdom nowhere occurs in the New Testament.

to see, in his subsequent epistles, the coalescing of the two, until the eschatology fades away. He nowhere explicitly recognizes that our oneness with Christ empties eschatology of all idea of time. Not a single writer in the New Testament reaches the point of drawing that logical conclusion.

In connexion with the Kingdom there is an important point on which the teaching of St Paul was identical with that of his Master. To inherit, possess, be given, receive the Kingdom is to obtain it as in some sense a reward. In the present writer's *St Matthew*, p. 54 f. it is pointed out that our Lord pictures this reward under two aspects, quantitative and qualitative. Jewish thought generally understood the relation of God to men as analogous to that of a human employer or master to labourers or slaves, and this is reflected in the teaching of Jesus (Mat. xx. 1–16, xxiv. 45–51, xxv. 14–30). And the Jewish sense of legal justice demanded that the reward should be a strict equivalent for something done (Mat. v. 7, vi. 14, x. 32, 41 f., xxv. 29), graduated according to the success with which a duty is performed (v. 19, xviii. 1–4, xix. 30; Mk ix. 41; Lk. xix. 17, 19); and punishment is similarly graduated (Mat. x. 15, xi. 22, 24; Lk. xii. 47 f.). But given that we are God's slaves, no reward or payment whatever is really due to us; it is sheer undeserved kindness on the Master's part; we have done only what it was our duty to do (Lk. xvii. 9 f.). And the free gift on His part is represented as out of all proportion to any service rendered (Mat. xix. 29, xxiv. 47, xxv. 21, 23; Lk. vi. 38, xii. 37); it is the Kingdom of Heaven with all that that involves (Mat. v. 3–10). Thus our Lord altogether eliminates the idea of a reward in the Jewish sense of an earned payment.

Nevertheless our sense of justice still demands some graduation; and with the help of His teaching it is not difficult to arrive at a synthesis of the two ideas. To enter or inherit the Kingdom is to enter or inherit '(eternal) life.' Physical life is for all men the same broad, grand gift of God; but men are fitted in very different degrees to enjoy it. And of the spiritual life the same is true. The Kingdom of Heaven is, for one and all, the realized Sovereignty of God; but within it each individual has the joy and honour of responsibilities proportionate to the success with which they were performed in this life. 'Authority over ten (or five) cities' (Lk. xix. 17, 19), responsibility over 'many things' (Mat. xxv. 21, 23), is a graduated reward, but 'the joy (i.e. the joyful feast of) your Lord' is something in which all good and faithful servants obtain a share. We are not faced with the mere alternative of 'going to Heaven' or not going to Heaven, as many uninstructed Christians still think. We are faced with conditions after death which we are daily framing in this life.

St Paul thinks of the reward under the same two aspects, quantitative and qualitative, though it is on the latter that he lays the greater stress. The truth that no one deserves it, that it is due to the sheer, gratuitous kindness of God, is one of the keynotes of his teaching. His whole battle about faith and works aimed at eliminating the idea of a reward in the Jewish sense of an earned payment. 'To him that worketh the reward is not reckoned as a matter of grace but of debt' (Rom. iv. 4). 'If by grace it is no longer from works, otherwise grace ceases to be grace' (xi. 6). But in order to earn it in the Jewish sense, a man must keep the law perfectly, which no one can do; 'therefore it is by faith, that it might be a matter

of grace' (iv. 16). This way of putting it is specially characteristic of St Paul, but it does not differ in essence from our Lord's teaching that the reward is qualitative and immeasurably beyond anyone's deserts.

The distinctively Pauline antithesis of faith and works, as we have seen (p. x), did not exercise much influence on subsequent Christian writers before Augustine. They mostly laid stress on the other aspect of his teaching—reward according to results, the responsibility of each individual for the conditions in which he will find himself hereafter. The whole process of sanctification, the whole moral life of the Christian which the apostle inculcates in every epistle, is inseparable from works. Salvation is a process carried on in this life in those who are 'being saved,' and therefore some have life more 'abundantly' (to use the Johannine phrase) than others. The reward is the result attained. This quantitative aspect is further illustrated on p. 193 f., where St Paul's teaching is compared with that in the Apocalypse.

§ 4. The Son

The moral and the eschatological elements in our Lord's teaching have been seen respectively in His two leading conceptions of God's sons and God's Kingdom. Corresponding to them are the two chief aspects of His own self-consciousness, Sonship and Messiahship.

It is not always realized how great were the issues involved in the fact that Jesus was 'a man of the people,' a member of the *'am hā-'ārez*, the despised masses, whose right to sonship was the burden of His moral teaching. A ministry which did not begin till He was nearly thirty years of age must have been preceded by a long preparation of thought. Since sonship was likeness to the Father,

it was open to Himself as well as to all His friends and associates in the humble classes. How early the spiritual ferment of this conviction began to move Him we cannot say. The story of His visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve is regarded by many as unhistorical; but the words 'Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?' accurately represent the thought which became the impelling force of His life. He had as much right to call God His Father as the teachers of the Law in the temple. By obeying the wishes of His Father He realized and achieved true Sonship. And we can with some confidence penetrate behind the veil of silence which covers the years of His growing manhood, and think of Him brooding and pondering upon the sonship of Israel—of the masses in Israel—and His own Sonship as a member of them. Then came the day when the resistless force of a heaven-sent conviction drove Him from Nazareth, feeling, as Amos puts it, 'The Lord God hath spoken; who can but prophesy?' It had been borne in upon Him, perhaps gradually, in the course of several years, till He was flooded with the overwhelming certainty, that He was called to be the Champion, the Representative, of the Sonship of His nation. Sonship is likeness to the Father, and He knew that He was like the Father. It had been growing upon Him that He stood in a unique relationship to God; that God's Fatherhood to Him meant something more than God's Fatherhood to anyone else, because He was a unique embodiment of the principle of moral Sonship, the supreme personification of the true Sonship of Israel. At His baptism the conscious certainty of this found full and final expression, in the shape of a vision of the descent of the Spirit upon Him in the form of a dove, as He had in the beginning brooded upon the face

of the waters, and of a heavenly voice assuring Him that it was the good pleasure of God that He should enter upon His work of representing in His own Person the divine Sonship of His nation. 'Thou art My Son, the beloved, in Thee I am well pleased' (Mk i. 11 = Lk. iii. 22; Mat. iii. 17, 'This is[1]...in whom I am well pleased'). The verb εὐδόκησα does not mean merely 'I am pleased with Thy life and conduct'; it expresses a determination: 'In Thee it is my good pleasure to reveal the perfect Sonship for which Israel was destined[2].' His Sonship was therefore an *office*—that of Representative and Champion—in virtue of character. The same thought appears more clearly in the reading, in Lk., 'I have to-day begotten Thee,' ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, found in D, some Old Latin MSS., and several patristic passages. It was easy for the Ebionites to see in the words the idea of a heavenly addition to the human *nature* of Jesus. But their original meaning is that of office, as is seen in Ps. ii. 7 from which they are drawn, where they refer to the accession of the Davidic king, when he entered upon the office of representative and champion of his people.

The representativeness of the office is seen in the sequel. After the great moment of spiritual exaltation came the mental and physical reaction in the wilderness, when Jesus felt tempted to doubt His Sonship. But the temptations were in every case parried by words from the Old Testament (Deut. viii. 3, vi. 16, vi. 13), addressed to Israel, God's son. He felt them to be addressed to Himself, and they strengthened Him in the moment of need.

[1] 'Thou art' in D a Syr sin. cur. pal. Iren. Aug.

[2] In the account of the Transfiguration it is related that the three disciples in a 'vision' (Lk.) learnt the same truth: 'this is My Son, the Beloved; hear Him' (Mk ix. 7 = Mat. xvii. 5: Lk. ix. 35).

And when the struggle was safely over, He began at once to proclaim His good tidings to the poor, and to set on foot His spiritual revolution.

We can now understand three passages in which He speaks about Sonship with direct or implied reference to Himself[1].

(*a*) 'All things have been delivered to Me by My Father, and no one knoweth the Son except the Father, neither doth any one know the Father except the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to make the revelation' (Mat. xi. 27 = Lk. x. 22). The details of the passage, and the differences in the Lucan version are discussed in the writer's *St Matthew*, pp. 161–6. It has often been held that this great saying may be taken as a synoptic parallel in language and thought to sayings ascribed to our Lord in the Fourth Gospel about His relation to the Father. Some have felt so sure of this that they have doubted the genuineness of the passage. But it is hard to say which alternative is the more unlikely, that, if He really spoke at times in the 'Johannine' style, Mat. and Lk. (= Q) should have preserved only this isolated instance, or that, if He did not, a 'Johannine' saying should have been interpolated once and not oftener. The passage can be explained without either supposition. Our Lord speaks with the conception of His Sonship that we have already studied; He knows Himself to be the Champion and Representative of the true Israel, the pious, humble, and oppressed. He thanks His Father for revealing truths to them, the 'babes,' not to the privileged, learned class, the 'wise and prudent.' Even so Father, for so it was Thy

[1] Not including His assent to the words 'Son of the living God' in St Peter's confession, according to Mat. xvi. 16. They are absent from the Marcan and Lucan parallels, and are clearly an addition.

good pleasure[1]. To Me, their Representative, 'the Son,' the whole truth has been entrusted. None except Thee can know My Sonship, i.e. that I hold this representative office; none has the immediate, experimental knowledge of Thy Fatherhood, which is the prerogative of My Sonship, except Myself, the Son, and those to whom I reveal it. Such an utterance must not be interpreted as a full statement of what the Church subsequently learnt: but it was a basis on which Christian reflexion after the Resurrection could build. As our Lord spoke it, it declared that His Sonship was perfect and unique, as being a perfect and unique moral relationship to God, which carried with it a representative relationship to man.

(*b*) The parable of the Husbandmen (Mk xii. 1–9 = Mat. xxi. 33–41). Jesus had come up to Jerusalem, and had carried His revolution into action by casting the traffickers out of the Temple courts. He knew that it would lead to His death; and in this parable He gives expression to the thought. The privileged officials of the vineyard would kill Him, the Son, as they had killed the prophets. And 'they knew that He had spoken the parable against them' (Mk). The mistakes which can arise from over-pressing the details in our Lord's stories are well illustrated here. The words in Mk are 'He had yet one [*sc.* whom He could send], a beloved Son; He sent him last unto them'; and in Mat. more simply 'and afterwards He sent unto them His Son.' Neither gives the least warrant for supposing that He intended the teaching of the parable to include the truth of His heavenly pre-existence, not to speak of denying on that supposition

[1] εὐδοκία ἐγένετο, with a force similar to that of εὐδόκησα in the words at the Baptism.

the genuineness of the words. God had 'sent' the previous messengers; and they were not pre-existent. The purpose of the parable is to predict that the Heir, the representative Son, would be killed by the privileged classes who wanted to make themselves sole proprietors of the vineyard.

(*c*) 'But concerning that day or hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven nor the Son, but the Father' (Mk xiii. 32 = Mat. xxiv. 36). The genuineness of this passage, in which our Lord speaks of His ignorance of 'that day or hour,' would be denied by no one if it did not represent Him as applying to Himself the title 'the Son.' Even B. W. Bacon, who maintains the genuineness of Mat. xi. 27 (passage (*a*) above), takes exception to the title here. In Acts i. 7, 'It is not for you to know the times or seasons which the Father hath appointed by His own authority,' there is no apposition of Son and Father; and he assumes that this is 'the Lukan version of the same saying,' and more trustworthy as regards its omission of the title. That is to say, the title was introduced by Mk in the interests of the theological doctrine reached by the Church of his day. But it is very extraordinary that he should have done so in such a way as to ascribe to Jesus a non-genuine statement that He was ignorant of something. It is difficult to imagine the state of mind of a Christian who could transform a simple saying such as that in Acts i. 7 into the strange complex of Mk xiii. 22, if 'the Son' has a late theological and metaphysical meaning. In Mat. the textual evidence admits of the question whether the evangelist did not shrink from the statement of ignorance, and omit *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός*. But there is no doubt about the reading in Mk. I am not disputing the possibility of Mk's introduction into

his gospel of a word expressive of Church Christology, but of his selecting this particular saying for the purpose.

The thought implied in the apposition of Father and Son is in harmony with that in (*a*). Not to the privileged, but to His true sons has God revealed His truth; to Me, the representative Son, He has revealed the whole truth involved in His Fatherhood. But here is something which is involved, not in Fatherhood but, in the omniscience of Deity, something which He has not revealed to Me, the Son.

The difference between this and St Paul's conception of Christ's Sonship is very great. But it cannot be too clearly recognized that the teaching of Jesus on His Sonship was not a full declaration of His Nature. He Himself taught people, during His earthly life, 'as they were able to hear it' (Mk iv. 33); and to the disciples He taught more than to others. Christianity is not confined to the acceptance of His teaching, and the following of His example. That was only what He 'began to do and teach' (Acts i. 1). By His resurrection, and the inspiration of the Church at Pentecost He was able to go on doing and teaching far more. If St Paul reached a developed conception of His Sonship, we must refuse to regard his presentation of Christianity as a new religion, so that we must choose between Jesus or Christ, the Jesus of synoptic history or the Christ of St Paul's experience (see below, § 8). Nevertheless the truth of His Sonship is taught in very different terms by our Lord Himself and by the apostle. To the One it was Israel's moral sonship represented and consummated in His own human Person; to the other it is an eternal fact, in virtue of which, and by means of all Christ's saving work, sonship is mercifully

accorded to all who are carried into mystical union with Him in His risen and exalted life. 'God sent forth His Son' in order that we might acquire this status (Gal. iv. 4), and we could not have acquired it without that divine act of grace. But still it is moral. He 'predetermined' Christians 'to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be'—not alone in His Sonship, but—'the First-born of many brethren' (Rom. viii. 29). This mystical union is our 'share in' or 'fellowship with His Son Jesus Christ our Lord' (1 Cor. i. 9). St Paul felt that Christ and God could be revealed in his own person and work: 'It was God's good pleasure to reveal His Son in me' (Gal. i. 16); 'they glorified God in me' (*v.* 24). It was a sending forth of the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, making our sonship possible, so that we could gain the right to say Abba, Father (iv. 6). It was a translation into the Kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. i. 13).

But one with whose Sonship all men can be joined in mystical union is more than man. It is probable that St Paul did not after his conversion arrive at once at his fully developed Christology. His preaching consisted at first in the declaration to Jews that Jesus was the Messiah (Acts ix. 20, 22[1]). But the term Messiah could mean different things to different minds. Among the Jews themselves the conceptions varied widely. The most spiritually minded thought of a Heavenly Man[2], a development of

[1] 'The Son of God' in the former verse is St Luke's equivalent for 'the Christ' in the latter.

[2] Reitzenstein, *Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, has suggested that the idea is of Iranian origin, being found in the writings of the Persian gnostic Mani. And see his article in *Z.N.W.* 1921, 1–23. Mani, however, wrote in the middle of the 3rd century A.D., and may have been influenced by Judaism. But it is not a matter of importance for our purpose to decide whether some of the Messianic ideas of the Jews had a foreign origin or not. They

the human Figure in Daniel's vision (vii. 13). And the growth of St Paul's ideas probably began at that point. It is Jewish language which he uses in 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47: 'the first man Adam,' and 'the last Adam'; 'the first man is from the earth, earthy; the second Man is from heaven.' Again, so far as language goes, 'the Son of God' would mean to Jewish ears the Messiah, whatever particular view was held of His Nature and Person; and to many the pre-existence of the Messiah was an accepted fact. 'His Son, who was born (lit. became) of the seed of David according to the flesh' (Rom. i. 3), 'God having sent His own Son' (viii. 3), 'God sent forth His Son' (Gal. iv. 4), would not, as regards the terms employed, have sounded strange to them, though it would have been a new speculation for a Jew to *combine* the Heavenly Man with the earthly Davidic Messiah. That which made it possible for St Paul to combine them was the Resurrection. Christ was 'designated Son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness by resurrection from the dead' (Rom. i. 4). Whether 'designated' (ὁρισθέντος) means only 'shewn to be' what He always was, or, more probably, 'appointed,' 'ordained' to enter upon the exercise of His office, the words 'who became of the seed of David according to the flesh' (*v.* 3) clearly imply His pre-existence as Son of God before His Davidic birth, so that He did not *become* for the first time Son of God by the Resurrection. The idea of deification, apotheosis of human beings was common among pagans; and because many were deified, their θεότης did not approach what Jews meant by Godship, Divinity. Thus the notion would be abhorrent to

were undoubtedly influenced in other respects by Zoroastrian thought, so that the later Iranian speculations may have affected them also.

Jews, and it is contrary to the evidence of *v.* 3 to ascribe it to St Paul. The fact that Christianity arose out of Judaism but embraced Hellenism accounts for the difficulties that we feel in the early Christian use of Greek terms. See K. Lake, *Amer. Journ. Theol.* 19 (1915), footn. p. 494 f.

But though his ideas began at the point of the best Jewish apocalypses they did not stop there. We see a growth and deepening of his conception of what the Christ meant With all his Jewish language the thought of mystical union with a Messiah who can be universally immanent in men is wholly new. It appears as early as 1 Thes. i. 1, 'The Church of the Thessalonians *in* God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ'; and in Gal. iv. 19 (which is possibly earlier still[1]), 'My little children, of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you.' Thus He is the spiritual life of men: 'The last Adam became life-producing spirit' (1 Cor. xv. 45); 'the Lord is the Spirit' (2 Cor. iii. 17). In 1 Cor. viii. 6 another conception, unknown to Judaism, makes its appearance: Christ was the Agent of the physical, as He is now the Agent of the spiritual, creation; 'one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom[2] are all things, and we through Him.' This is in no sense Messianic. It is the doctrine of the divine Wisdom, the divine Logos, Word. And this finally found full expression in *Ephesians* and *Colossians*. 'In Him it was the good pleasure [of God] that all the *pleroma* should dwell' (Col. i. 19). 'Who is the Image of the invisible God, First-begotten of every creature, because in Him were created all things in the heavens and on

[1] See *St Paul*, p. 169 ff.

[2] The reading of B, δι' ὅν 'on whose account,' may be neglected.

earth, the visible things and the invisible, whether thrones or lordships or principalities or authorities. All things have been created through Him and unto Him' (Col. i. 15, 16). 'We are His [God's] workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works' (Eph. ii. 10). He is the Bond and Sum of all things: 'He is before all things, and all things in Him cohere' (Col. i. 17); 'according to His [God's] good pleasure...to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things on earth' (Eph. i. 10).

Thus the eternal Son, the Agent of creation, the Bond and Sum of all things, is the risen and exalted Jesus Christ, the Agent of our spiritual creation and our indwelling Life. St Paul says very little to *explain* the relation between the human Jesus in His earthly life and this divine Being of cosmic and spiritual attributes. That will come before us later. But his doctrine of the heavenly Christ must first be compared with our Lord's expression of other aspects of His self-consciousness.

§ 5. The Messiah

That our Lord was conscious of Himself as in some sense the Messiah is psychologically demanded in order to account for the immediate and overwhelming conviction of His Messiahship arrived at by the first Christians. There would be nothing whatever to account for it in the mere fact that He had shared in the eschatological hopes of His day, and expected that the Messiah—a Person other than Himself—would come. Some modern writers who will not admit more than that do not appear to feel the difficulty. But it is very real. What bridge is to be found to connect what the disciples knew of Him, a saintly prophet who was martyred and afterwards appeared to them alive, and what they believed and immediately

began to say about Him, that this is the Messiah? 'There was no connection, either historical or inherent, between "rising again" and Messiahship; no reason to suppose that the coming to life again of *any* man would lead Jews at any time to the conclusion that He was the Messiah[1].' If, however, we conclude that some expression on His part of a Messianic consciousness is required to account for the facts, we are at once faced with the need of another bridge. Where is the connexion between that consciousness and His moral teaching in preparation for the great End, the consummation of the divine Sovereignty? Writers who do not feel the former difficulty feel this one acutely. And some of them present it to us in the form of the alternative already spoken of (p. 2 f.): Jesus was either a moral teacher or a fantastic visionary;—which is not far removed from *aut sanus aut insanus*.

This uncompromising attitude has been partly due to the exaggerated estimate formed by many in recent years of the influence of the Jewish apocalypses. They were literary efforts, tracts for the times, some of which had an appreciable effect on writings in the New Testament, the Gospels included. But of those which we possess, the number of Palestinian apocalypses earlier than 50 A.D. is very small. And though it is probable that our Lord was not unaffected by them, it has yet to be proved that they influenced Him to an extent even remotely comparable with the profoundness with which He was steeped in the thought of the Old Testament.

We recall, yet again, His revolution. He came forward to champion the cause of the despised masses, the poor, the humble, the meek, the mourners, the pure in heart, the 'babes,' the 'little ones'; to proclaim that sonship

[1] C. A. Anderson Scott, *Dominus Noster*, p. 166.

was not a monopoly of the privileged. And He was Himself a member of the class whom He championed. Sonship is likeness to the Father; and He knew that He was like the Father. In His life the Fatherhood of God was a complete and actualized reality, the Sovereignty ('Kingdom') of God a complete and consummated fact. Thus He recognized Himself to be the Representative of the true sons of God. His meditations, as we have seen, had probably been carrying Him to this conviction before His ministry began; and they came to fruition in the mystical experience of the vision at the Baptism.

But in the Old Testament the ideal Representative who would one day be given to Israel was mostly pictured as a king or line of kings, occasionally associated with a priest or line of priests. Jesus was neither king nor priest such as had been expected; and yet if He was the Champion of the true Israel, something greater than David or Aaron was here. He embodied in His own Person and teaching the moral aspirations and ideals of the prophets. Men's right relationship to Him was a condition of their right relationship to the Father. Our Lord was 'Messianic' because He was Son, not *vice versa*. Apart from all apocalyptic, His consciousness of His moral mission and of His unique moral *status* was, in the most real sense, a Messianic consciousness, although His claim involved, by its very nature, a repudiation of any claim to earthly sovereignty. The earthly king, the Lord's anointed, is the champion, representative, personification of the nation as it is; the Son, anointed with the Holy Spirit, is that of the nation as it ought to be. He 'fulfilled' the Old Testament ideal of perfect kingship by the higher idea of perfect Sonship. Whether or not the Messiah was to be of Davidic descent, His Sonship to

God was a higher thing than His sonship to David (Mk xii. 35–37 = Mat. xxii. 41–45). When the high priest demanded whether He were 'the Messiah the Son of the Blessed' (Mk xiv. 61; of God, Mat. xxvi. 63; Lk. xxii. 70[1]), He assented. But while His reply in Mk is 'I am,' in Mat. it is 'Thou sayest,' in Lk. 'Ye say that I am,' which probably express His meaning better: You are verbally correct, but mistaken in the meaning attached to the words. Dalman is entirely justified in saying (p. 287), 'Nowhere do we find that Jesus called Himself the Son of God in such a sense as to suggest a merely religious and ethical relation to God,—a relation which others also actually possessed, or which they were capable of attaining or destined to acquire.'

But a Sonship which made a human being to be Messianic, the Representative and Champion of the ideal people of God, necessarily involved more. 'It is apparent,' as Harnack says, 'that Jesus' consciousness of Sonship must have antedated His consciousness of Messiahship, and paved the way for it.' At whatever date He reached it, He must have come to realize that it involved two things, *Suffering* and *Glory*.

1. *Suffering*. The moral community of sons were those who now accepted, and would hereafter share in the bliss of, the Kingdom, the Sovereignty, of God. But such a community at all times suffers at the hands of the unrighteous. To those who are persecuted and hated belongs the blessed happiness of the Kingdom of Heaven; as the prophets suffered of old so must God's true sons suffer

[1] Lk. *vv.* 67, 70 divides this into two separate sentences. But the Messiah and the Son of God had for him the same meaning (cf. iv. 41). Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 268–87) holds that the latter title was not applied to the Messiah by Jews as early as the time of our Lord.

now (Mat. v. 10–12 = Lk. vi. 22, 23). From the time when the great conception of Sonship dawned upon the mind of Jesus, it must have become increasingly clear to Him that it involved suffering. And when the conception reached its full maturity at His baptism, the certainty of suffering must have been, or soon have become, of the tissue of His thoughts. 'The baptism that He was baptized with[1]' (Mk x. 38) was His entrance into participation of all the suffering which the true sons, and therefore the representative Son, must bear. And the physical baptism in the Jordan was an act expressing His self-identification with them, i.e. with those who repented of their sins.

A suffering Messiah played no part in Jewish expectations. He was always one who would be the agent of national victory and glory, and ruler over a saved and perfected people. That condition would, indeed, be reached, as the prophets had proclaimed, only after the purification of national suffering; but the thought that the Messiah would share in the sufferings never suggested itself[2]. He was not expected to appear on the scene until the sufferings had produced their moral result. But our Lord, who was conscious of Messiahship of a very different kind, could not fail to realize that the function of Champion and Representative of God's sons must include a participation of their sufferings. In many passages in the Psalms

[1] Apparently identical in meaning with 'the cup which I drink.' Mat. xx. 22, 23 omits the 'baptism.' But it occurs in another saying in Lk. xii. 50.

[2] Apoc. Ezra vii. 29 (later than the fall of Jerusalem) has the strange speculation that after the 400 years of the Messiah's reign He would die suddenly (it appears) with the rest of mankind ('My Son the Messiah shall die and all that hath the breath of life'), and that after seven days the next world would open with the Judgment. See p. 181.

and elsewhere, especially after the Exile, expression was given to the undeserved sorrows and troubles of the poor, the meek, the oppressed, the persecuted, the pious, 'Thy holy one' (Ps. xvi. 10). And sufficient account is seldom taken of the meaning which such passages must have had for Jesus. The cry 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me' (from Ps. xxii. 1), which has the most right to be considered genuine of all the utterances from the Cross, is an indication of it. Moreover, among the masses whom He championed there was illness and disease, open and manifest in the streets in a way which modern civilization does not permit. And because of His intense feeling of oneness with the sufferers, He felt their sufferings as His own with a sympathy which was perfect because it was an aspect of His moral perfectness. The words of Is. liii. 4, in the form in which they are quoted by the evangelist in Mat. viii. 17, 'He took our infirmities and bare our diseases,' express a very literal fact. The compassion to which the sight of suffering always moved Him must have been unique in its intensity, because it sprang out of His Messianic representativeness. In all His healing, as well as in His preaching, He felt Himself to be 'Messianic.' This, though it would not be understood at the time by those who heard it, was part of the meaning of His reply to John the Baptist: 'The blind receive their sight,' etc. (Mat. xi. 5 = Lk. vii. 22), and finds explicit expression in St Luke's account of the sermon at Nazareth (Lk. iv. 18, 19), where Is. lxi. 1, 2 is quoted.

It now becomes clear how little weight can be attached to the contention that He could not have applied to Himself the words about the suffering Servant of Yahweh in Is. liii. It is true that no known Jewish writing before the Christian era explained the passage as referring to

the Messiah[1]. But that was because the Jewish conception of the Messiah was not our Lord's conception. The suffering Servant was the ideal Israel personified, or a righteous and saintly minority in Israel. And it was exactly that of which Jesus knew Himself to be the Representative and Champion. His ministry had not lasted long before He began to meet opposition, and to participate in the sufferings of the despised and persecuted. And perhaps only a very short time longer was needed to make it clear to Him that His function of Champion must bring Him to a violent death. It needed no superhuman power on His part to predict such an end. And once that conviction was reached it was entirely natural for Him, though impossible for any other Jew, to give a Messianic meaning to Is. liii. If He made use of the LXX. in His meditations, the ambiguity of παῖς as the rendering of עֶבֶד 'Servant' might help, as it certainly did in subsequent Christian thought, in connecting His Servantship with His Sonship. But He could read Hebrew, as we know from Lk. iv. 17 f., and was not in need of any verbal connecting link. Ideal Israel, or a nucleus of Israel, suffered violence and death, though innocent, and suffered to the advantage of others, and was finally glorified. That being the destiny of the true sons of God, it was the destiny of the Son, their Representative. His expectations of death were probably independent of the chapter; but who can measure the extent to which it may have helped to shape His understanding of the meaning and purpose of His death? And this, not because there is evidence that He frequently quoted it. Only once is He definitely recorded to have done so: 'This which is written must be fulfilled in Me, "And He was reckoned with transgressors"' (Lk. xxii. 37). The words 'give His life a ransom for many' (Mk x. 45

[1] See Dalman, *Der leidende und sterbende Messias.*

= Mat. xx. 28), and 'My blood...which is [about to be] shed in behalf of many' (Mk xiv. 24 = Mat. xxvi. 28) may be allusions to it (cf. Is. liii. 12, 'He bare the sin of many'); also the reference to the Scriptures that 'thus it must be' (Mat. xxvi. 54), and 'The Son of Man goeth as it hath been written concerning Him' (Mk xiv. 21). But even if it were conceded that none of these is a genuine utterance[1], it would remain probable that He saw Himself foreshadowed in the suffering Servant, that is to say saw Himself to be the Representative of the ideal body of Israelites whom the Servant symbolized or personified. The disciples were not prepared for His predictions of death; much less were they ripe for explanations of its meaning; and consequently He would not reveal to them all His meditations. But they must have been influenced by His habitual appeal to Scripture; and when the time came that they searched the Scriptures for support in their *apologia* against Jews, the great chapter which had lived in His mind began to live in theirs. He had proved to be Messiah because He had been glorified; but He had previously suffered; therefore Is. liii. was a prediction fulfilled in Him.

What Christ's death meant to St Paul can hardly be measured. He states that he learnt from the first Christians that 'Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures' (1 Cor. xv. 3)[2]; but such a statement would not content him. Our Lord, by His use of Old Testament language, had done no more than drop veiled hints that His Messiahship was such as to include suffering in behalf of many.

[1] If, however, it had been the first Christians and not He who applied the chapter to Him, would they not have introduced more frequent and explicit references to it?

[2] Passages interpreted as bearing upon it had probably begun to find their way into early *testimonia*.

He could not do otherwise when even those who best understood Him refused to believe that He was about to die at all. But when His death was followed by resurrection, and an exaltation so complete that He could send forth the divine Spirit in an outpouring which marked the dawn of the final age, then the truth of a suffering Messiah assumed new and immense proportions to one for whom Christianity was first and foremost a religion of salvation,—salvation from the curse of the Law, from the Powers of evil, and from sin. Various aspects of St Paul's soteriology will come before us later. It can here be noted only that it is built upon the foundation already laid, i.e. Jesus Christ and Him (as a historical fact) crucified. Materials were provided in the early traditions which related His convictions concerning Himself and the nature of His sufferings; and for the apostle the binding medium was his own spiritual experience of His power to save.

2. *Glory*. Is. liii. ends on a note of triumph: 'Therefore will I divide for him [a portion] among the great, and he shall divide the strong as spoil[1].' In other words, Israel, after its martyr-sufferings for the spiritual advantage of many, shall gain possession of mighty nations and exercise dominion over them. It was the triumphant reward in the ideal future to which all looked forward who pictured any ideal at all. And if our Lord applied the chapter to the suffering servants of God, and in particular to Himself as their Representative, the more vividly that the

[1] R.V. 'a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong' is a possible rendering, but more difficult of interpretation. That given above is supported by the LXX.: *διὰ τούτου αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλούς, καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα.* 'Therefore shall he inherit many, and he shall divide the spoil of the strong' (cf. Lk. xi. 22).

thought of suffering for the advantage of others presented itself to His mind, the more certain He must have been that these servants of God, and in particular Himself as their Representative, would finally be rewarded with glory and dominion. That the righteous would be raised to life was widely held in Palestine in the time of His ministry; and His own resurrection as their Representative was a necessary corollary. In other words, the Messiahship of Sonship, which He knew Himself to possess on earth (profoundly different in many respects from the Messiahship of current expectations), would reach through suffering its full consummation of royal authority and glory. He could see lying before Him 'the sufferings (destined) for Christ and the glories after them[1].' 'For the joy set before Him He endured the Cross[2].' This needed no dependence upon particular passages in the Apocalyptic writings. The popular hopes and longings which those writings expressed tended increasingly to transfer the ideal future of God's people from this earthly existence to a heavenly one. The Sadducees 'say there is no resurrection' (Mk xii. 18), but the masses, probably, for the most part believed in it, though their leaders deemed them unworthy to gain it. Our Lord, who championed the masses and preached to the poor the good tidings of the Kingdom, knew that all true sons of God would have a share in it. And He, their Representative in this age, could not cease to be their Representative in the coming age. It is important to recognize clearly that His Messiahship after death was not a sudden or unaccountable *idée fixe* of an otherwise sane and sober man, a notion about Himself without discernible root or motive. It was the natural and inevitable outcome of convictions which He

[1] 1 Pet. i. 11. [2] Heb. xii. 2.

had developed by meditations upon Himself and God's sons.

But the exaltation, after suffering, of God's faithful sons, the saints of the Most High, is the burden of another famous passage, which had with little doubt entered into the meditations. Daniel vii. contains a vision (*vv.* 2–14), followed by its interpretation (*vv.* 17–27). In the former appear four great beasts; in the latter they are explained as four kings or kingdoms. Out of the last arise ten horns (kings), and then yet another. This last, eleventh, horn or king 'shall speak words against the Most High and shall wear out the saints of the Most High (25)...But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end (26). And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; his kingdom [*sc.* the kingdom of the people of the saints; cf. *v.* 14] is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him' (27). In the vision the *dramatis persona* who is afterwards interpreted as the people of the saints is 'one like unto a son of man' (*v.* 13), i.e. one whose appearance was that of a human being in distinction from the savage beasts with horns. It does defiance to *v.* 27 to find (as is done, e.g., by Gould, Hastings' *Dict. of Chr. and the Gosp.* 660) in this human figure the definite, individual Messiah. The people of the saints would, of course, be represented by and embodied in their king; but he is not, in fact, mentioned. Gould feels the difficulty, and speaks of 'that figure which was presented so suddenly [in the vision] to be so speedily withdrawn [in the interpretation].' But it was not long before the figure became individualized, as is seen a century later in the

Similitudes of Enoch (En. xxxvii.–lxxi.), and '*the* Son of Man[1]' becomes a title of the Messiah.

The use of this expression, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, is ascribed to our Lord 69 times in the synoptic Gospels (if Lk. xxiv. 7 be included), or, reckoning off parallels, in 37 distinct sayings[2], which may be briefly analysed in groups. A. Four which, independently of the expression, are of doubtful genuineness. 'As Jonah was in the belly of the monster three days and three nights, so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights' (Mat. xii. 40). 'He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man' (xiii. 37); 'the Son of Man shall send His angels,' etc. (*v.* 41). 'Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?' (Lk. xxii. 48). B. Three in which the title appears to represent an expression which originally meant 'mankind,' 'men.' 'The Son of Man hath authority to forgive sins on the earth' (Mk ii. 10). 'The Son of Man is lord even of the Sabbath' (*v.* 28; each with Mat. Lk.). 'Whosoever shall say a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him,' etc.[3] (Mat. xii. 32, with Lk. = Q). C. Three in which it seems to be a mere substitute for 'I,' with no distinctive meaning. 'The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head' (Mat. viii. 20). 'The Son of

[1] Nowhere found with the article in the Old Testament. The careful discussion of the philology of the expression by Wellhausen, Lietzmann, Dalman, Fiebig and others has made it probable that (though we possess no contemporary evidence of the exact dialect spoken by Jesus) 'the Son of Man' does not represent any good ordinary Aramaic idiom, but that it could be artificially turned into Aramaic as it could be, and was, into Greek. It cannot, therefore, on philological grounds be maintained that in speaking Aramaic He never adopted it.

[2] See the writer's *St Matthew*, p. xix.

[3] Mk iii. 28 suggests that the saying, whatever its original wording, was concerned with *men*, not with the Son of Man. Mat., *vv.* 31, 32 combines Mk and Q.

Man came eating and drinking,' etc. (xi. 19; each with Lk. = Q). 'The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost' (Lk. xix. 10). When it is remembered that the expression was a recent, artificial product of apocalypse, and weighted with the Messianic idea, it seems very improbable that our Lord used it in this way. The saying in each case has nothing eschatological in it, and its force and meaning would be obliterated for the hearers by the strange and unexpected apocalyptic title. To these should probably be added 'Who do men say that the Son of Man is?' (Mat. xvi. 13[1]), a question which anticipates the reply which it is intended to elicit; Mk, Lk. have simply '...say that I am?'

Thus eleven occurrences for various reasons must probably be discounted. Our Lord seems to have applied to Himself the title only in the particular sense that its literary origin suggests. It is not surprising that its use should have been extended in the course of the growth of the evangelic traditions; but, on the other hand, it is quite unsafe to argue that because Christians sometimes erroneously ascribed its use to Him, every instance of its occurrence is probably unauthentic. The reverse is the more probable; they would hardly have ascribed it to Him if He had never used it.

The remaining twenty-six instances fall into two groups: D. Nine in which He refers to His coming betrayal and sufferings, death and resurrection: Mk (with Mat. Lk.) ix. 31, x. 33, xiv. 21 *bis*; (with Mat.) ix. 9, 12, xiv. 41; Mat. xxvi. 2; Lk. xxiv. 7. E. Seventeen in which He pictures the heavenly Messiah in His Parousia and Judg-

[1] There is strong evidence for the reading *τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, 'Who do men say that I am (the Son of Man)?' in which the title seems to be a mere scribal addition.

ment: Mk (with Mat. Lk.) xiii. 26, xiv. 62; Mat. (with Lk.) xxiv. 27, 37, 44; Mat. x. 23, xvi. 28, xix. 28, xxiv. 30, 39, xxv. 31; Lk. xi. 30[1], xii. 8, xvii. 22, 30, xviii. 8, xxi. 36. Some of these may not be genuine; but the only ground for rejecting them all is the subjective reasoning that our Lord *could not* have 'entertained the fantastic dreams of apocalypse as applying to Himself.' Wellhausen, for example, held that He never used the title of Himself. Bacon, following him, suggests that: (1) He used it of One who was *not* Himself, thus disclaiming a heavenly and apocalyptic Messiahship. This appears in the only passages which Bacon will allow to be genuine, Mat. (with Lk. = Q) xxiv. 27, 37, 44; (2) it was introduced first by the compiler of Q, and then by others, into the remaining passages in group E, in many of which Jesus distinctly refers to Himself in speaking of Parousia and Judgment; (3) it was then extended backwards to the passages in group D; (4) and finally it found its way, even in Q, into the passages in the other groups. This explanation would doubtless cover the facts if our Lord *could not* have adopted the title. But to many modern students it is more probable, on the contrary, that He did.

If the references in A–C are omitted it will be seen that He never used it earlier than St Peter's confession of His Messiahship. After the disciples had gained their first elementary notion of that truth, He could begin to use the title in conversation with them, speaking of Himself in the third person, an unusual method of speech which, together with the philological strangeness of the expression, would draw attention to it. But they had no means of grasping all that He meant by it till after His resurrection, and it must have remained a standing enigma,—in itself

[1] The parallel in Mat. xii. 40 is late, and cannot be genuine.

a claim to the Messiahship of apocalyptic speculation, but as used by one who walked and talked with them mysteriously unintelligible. No passage in D is said to have been spoken to others than the disciples. But in four of the E references He is reported to have used it on occasions when He was certainly, or probably, speaking to a larger audience. 'When the Son of Man cometh in His glory'—the opening of the parable of the Sheep and the Goats (Mat. xxv. 31). 'As Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation' (Lk. xi. 30). 'Will the Son of Man when He cometh find faith on the earth?' (xviii. 8). In these three instances, though the disciples would know that He was speaking of Himself in the strange way that He had often done recently, the people would take it simply as referring, not to Himself at all but, to One who was other than He, the heavenly Son of Man or Messiah of the apocalypses. In none of these three passages is there any difficulty in explaining it thus. In the fourth (Mk xiv. 62, with Mat. Lk.) our Lord, for the first time outside the circle of His disciples, deliberately and openly claimed, in the high priest's presence, to be the Messiah, and incurred the condemnation of blasphemy.

This survey of the usage of the term in the synoptic Gospels shews that our Lord attached to it the double thought found in Is. liii. and Dan. vii.—God's true people, represented in the form of a Messianic Individual, would reach glory through suffering. To claim that office in this life in Sonship and suffering is not, in reality, a whit less 'fantastic' than to claim that He would reach it after death in 'dominion, glory, and a kingdom.'[1] His personal

[1] Gould (DCG. 664) misses part of the force of Daniel's vision when, in speaking of the title 'the Son of Man' as blending the

relationship to God He felt to be such that death would not cancel it. There was nothing essential in His claim to Messiahship which implies more than meditation on Dan. vii. of the same character as His meditations on other Scriptures. He borrowed from non-canonical sources the Enochian title 'the Son of Man,' and probably some scenic and symbolic details; how many of them were due to later amplification in tradition it is impossible to say. But it was on the basis of what the sacred Scriptures said about God's faithful sons and servants and saints that He arrived at His own claim to be their Messianic Representative in each of these three aspects, moral perfectness, suffering, and future glory,—'the Son of God,' 'the Servant of Yahweh,' 'the Son of Man.'

St Paul does not use the last title to express his ideas of Messiahship; it occurs nowhere in his writings, nor, indeed, in the New Testament outside the Gospels[1], except in the account of St Stephen (Acts vii. 56). Those who hold that our Lord never used it of Himself, and that it was first inserted in Q, point out that Q was later than the Pauline epistles. But that reasoning would lead us to expect to find it in the New Testament epistles which were later than Q; but that is not the case. It is noteworthy, for instance, that while it occurs twelve times[2] in the Fourth Gospel, it is not found in the Johannine epistles, though the apocalyptic conception of Anti-Christ is prominent in them. Christian tradition, while ascribing

conception of the Suffering Servant with that of the Messianic King, he says 'True, there was nothing in Daniel's delineation of "one like unto a son of man" to suggest such a blending, but there was also nothing to preclude it.'

[1] Not in Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14, where the words are quoted direct from *Daniel*, 'one like unto *a* son of man.'

[2] Thirteen if the reading of D in v. 19 be included, 'the Son of Man can do nothing,' etc.

the use of the title to Jesus, did not perpetuate it. It has been suggested by some writers that the use of it was avoided because Gentiles would not understand it. But the explanation is improbable. They would not be more likely to understand the allusions to Anti-Christ in *1 John*, and to other peculiarly Jewish ideas and traditions which St Paul did not hesitate to introduce into his letters. A truer explanation seems to be that while the Master's use of it had always mystified the disciples because it expressed more than they were able to believe of Him, directly He was raised from the dead and exalted, and sent the divine Spirit upon them, they found that it expressed *less* than they immediately learnt concerning Him. Any ideas about His Messiahship to which they had attained before His death were, for the moment, blotted out by that crushing blow. But when their thoughts of Him were transfigured by Easter and Pentecost, they came to realize that He was the Christ after all, but the 'Christ and more[1].' It was this wonderful *plus* which St Paul received in the Christian tradition, and the meaning of which continued to grow deeper and more intense by his own spiritual experience. It was expressed in the title κύριος, 'Lord.' This was a substitute for 'the Son of Man,' but not a mere equivalent[2]. It did not do away with the apocalyptic conception. St Paul makes frequent reference to the Parousia[3]; and *Maran-atha*,

[1] Anderson Scott, *Dominus Noster*, ch. ii.

[2] As Bacon holds. Because 'the Son of Man' is found in the *Gosp. according to the Hebrews* (Jer. *Vir. illustr.* 2), Hegesippus' report of the martyrdom of St James (Eus. *H. E.* ii. 23), and the so-called 'Traditions of Matthias' (Clem. Al. *Strom.* IV. vi. 35), he thinks that that title, having been originally due to the compiler of Q, was confined to circles influenced by him, that is to say Palestinian circles which preserved the Matthaean tradition.

[3] See the writer's *St Paul*, p. 270 ff.

'Our Lord has come' or 'is coming' (1 Cor. xvi. 22) was evidently an early Christian formula of Palestinian origin. But it expressed not only Christ's heavenly *status* and functions but also the attitude and feelings of His followers in regard to Him. During His earthly life He was, indeed, addressed as κύριος, 'Sir,' as a human title of respect (Mk vii. 28, and frequently in the other Gospels; cf. Acts xvi. 30, xxv. 26). But when 'Jesus [Christ] is Lord' is found as a Christian formula of faith (Rom. x. 9; Phil. ii. 11) it is clear that the word had gained a far higher meaning. By resurrection and exaltation God had 'made that same Jesus both Lord and Christ' (Acts ii. 36; see p. 126). This is the Name which Christians invoke (1 Cor. i. 2; cf. Acts ix. 14, 21), and in invoking which every knee shall bow (Phil. ii. 10). (It is noticeable that the evangelists, with true historical feeling, refrained from using the title 'the Lord' as a narrative subject, with the exception of St Luke. But this exception is, perhaps, only apparent. In all the passages where it occurs in the Greek (vii. 13, x. 1, xi. 39, xii. 42, xiii. 15, xvii. 5, 6, xviii. 6, xix. 8, xxii. 31[1], xxiv. 3) Syr^{sin} has 'Jesus,' or (xvii. 6 only) 'He,' or (xxiv. 3 only) omits it[2].) It is improbable that this was due to the use of κύριος in the LXX. as the equivalent of יהוה, since that was a Hellenistic usage. 'An Aramaic name for God directly answering to κύριος never existed among the Jews....The significant transition from the divine name Jahve to the divine name Lord did not take place in the region of Hebraic Judaism[3].' So that when the later Jews read the tetragrammaton as *Adonai*, it was a result and not a cause of the LXX.

[1] W.H. omit εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος with BLT.

[2] This is occasionally supported by Greek MSS. chiefly D, and some of the versions. 'The Lord' may have been introduced liturgically in Church lections.

[3] Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 179 f.

κύριος. When, therefore, Palestinian Christians, especially in Jerusalem the capital of conservative Hebraism addressed Christ as 'Lord,'[1] and spoke of Him as 'our [*or* my] Lord[2],' it was a perpetuation of the title of courtesy which had sometimes been employed when He was on earth, but with an immeasurable increase in its content and significance. Before His death they had probably called Him 'Rabbi,' 'my Teacher,' more often than 'my Lord'[3]: but risen and exalted He was first and foremost their Master[4], Lord, Sovereign, to whom they yielded themselves up in an ecstasy of veneration and devoted obedience. This may have been, if it were possible, deepened for Hellenistic Christians by the LXX. use; and they were doubtless the more ready to adopt it in opposition to pagans who applied it to their deities[5]. But nowhere in the New Testament is it a theological term for Christ connoting divinity[6]. We can say only that the fullness and splendour of the title, and the intensity and fervour of their veneration would increase as they realized more profoundly the mystery of His Person, until they learnt to say 'my Lord and my God.'

[1] Bousset, *Kurios Christos*, and *Jesus der Herr*, holds that 'Lord' as a title was late and purely Hellenistic. With a good deal of subjective criticism he eliminates all the passages which conflict with his thesis. Other scholars hold varieties of the theory. See Vos, *Princetown Theol. Rev.* 1917, pp. 21–89.

[2] Case, *Journ. Bibl. Theol.* 26 (1907), p. 151 ff., notes that the pronoun tends to disappear as tradition moves further from the Aramaic.

[3] See the combination of the two in Jn xiii. 13 f. But Rab was, in fact, a larger term than διδάσκαλος, 'teacher'; it corresponds more nearly to *magister*, which, like 'master,' can combine the force of 'teacher' with that of something approaching κύριος in meaning.

[4] Cf. the similar word δεσπότης, which is used of an earthly master or owner (1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; 2 Tim. ii. 21; Tit. ii. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 18), of Jesus Christ (Jude 4; 2 Pet. ii. 1), and of God (Lk. ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; Rev. vi. 10).

[5] See other instances in the Pastoral Epistles (p. 210 ff.).

[6] See K. Lake, *Amer. Journ. Theol.* xix. (1915), p. 489 ff.

§ 6. Spirit and Wisdom

Beside revealing His 'Messianic' consciousness in its three aspects of moral Sonship, vicarious Suffering, and future Sovereignty, our Lord also indicated the divine Power by which He was what He was, in the two-fold aspect of the Spirit of God and the Wisdom of God, the one drawn from the prophetic writings and the other from the Wisdom writings of the Old Testament. And He speaks of the Spirit and the Wisdom as exactly equivalent, and of Himself as their embodiment.

In the Old Testament the Spirit is mostly an effluence from God, an *afflatus* which came upon individuals and produced in them abnormal results, ranging, according to the ideas of different ages, from the martial fury of Samson or the ecstatic frenzy of Saul and the prophets up to the moral and prophetic inspiration of the great teachers of Israel, and the full endowment of the ideal King and Servant of Yahweh (Is. xi. 2, xlii. 1, lxi. 1). In some later writings, where the spiritual Nature of God and His transcendent separateness from the world are increasingly recognized, there is seen a personifying of God's activity and presence as His Spirit (cf. Hag. ii. 5; Neh. ix. 20; Is. lxiii. 11; Ps. cxxxix. 7). But as His Wisdom the personification becomes far more clear and definite. In Job xxviii., although the fear of the Lord is wisdom (*v.* 28), yet it is thought of as having a hidden existence with God (*vv.* 12 ff., 20 ff.). A further step is taken in Prov. i. 20 ff., viii. 1–ix. 6 where Wisdom makes a personal appeal to men; and in viii. 22–31 she describes her own quasi-individual existence with God from the beginning, and her taking part in the Creation. In Sir. xxiv. she similarly describes her divine origin and her finding a dwelling in Israel, a tabernacle in Zion. In Wisd. i. 4–7

God's kindness to men, and hatred of their sins, are ascribed to Wisdom; and this is illustrated by her activities in the history of Israel (x. 1–xi. 1). Finally, in chs. vii.–ix., put into the mouth of Solomon, she is completely hypostasized, under the influence of Stoicism, and there emerges what is virtually a Logos-doctrine, though the Greek word is not used[1]. Wisdom is an emanation from God, contriver and orderer of all things, in kindness entering into and pervading all men and all things. In Bar. iii. 38 her entering into men is even conceived of as a personal incarnation: 'She[2] was seen on the earth and lived (*συναν-εστράφη*) among men.' But in two sections of *Enoch* it is said that she cannot dwell among men, for they refuse to receive her: 'I know that sinners will tempt men to evilly-entreat Wisdom, so that no place may be found for her' (xciv. 5). 'Wisdom found no place where she might dwell, then a dwelling was assigned her in the heavens. Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the children of men, and found no dwelling-place. Wisdom returned to her place and took her seat among the angels[3]' (xlii. 1 f.). But in the Messianic age she will again be given to the elect (v. 8, xci. 10), poured out as a fountain of water for the thirsty (xlviii. 1, xlix. 1).

There is here plenty of material for the conceptions that are found in the New Testament.

1. *The Spirit.* In His sermon at Nazareth (Lk. iv. 18, 21) our Lord claims to be the fulfilment of the prediction in Is. lxi. 1 of the endowment of the Messianic Prophet with the Spirit of Yahweh. And He declares that the divine Spirit is the Source of His power in casting out

[1] Philo uses 'Wisdom' and 'Logos' indiscriminately.

[2] Or perhaps 'He,' i.e. God. But in either case the verse is probably a Christian addition.

[3] These are from Charles' translation.

demons, condemning those who charged Him with casting them out by Beelzebub (Mat. xii. 24–30; Mk iii. 22–27; Lk. xi. 15–23). 'If I in the Spirit [Lk. "finger"] of God cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out?' It is that Spirit which has the power to 'bind the strong man' (Mat. Mk), because He is 'a stronger than he' (Lk.). Then follows in Mat. Mk, the passage about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which St Luke places at xii. 10. There is very little doubt (see the writer's *St Matthew ad. loc.*) that what our Lord taught was that blasphemy against *men* (not 'the Son of Man') could be forgiven, but blasphemy against the divine Spirit in which He worked was an unforgiveable sin. That is to say, He identifies Himself in His works of power with the Holy Spirit of God which is in Him.

2. *Wisdom.* In the First and Third Gospels our Lord is recorded to have delivered discourses in which He similarly identified Himself with the divine Wisdom which dwelt, spoke, and acted in Him; and the language which He uses echoes passages in the Wisdom writings.

(*a*) Mat. xi. 19 = Lk. vii. 35. 'And Wisdom is justified of [all, Lk.] her children[1].' This is the conclusion of our Lord's denunciation of those who rejected alike the sternness of the Baptist's message and manner of life and the graciousness of His own (Mat. xi. 16–19; Lk. vii. 31–35). In contrast with this rejection the divine Wisdom (which dwelt in Him, and inspired His message and manner of life, and with which He identified Himself) was justified by her children, i.e. those who repented and accepted Him. In Lk. vii. 29 f. is prefixed a remark on the acceptance and rejection of the Baptist, the former by 'all the people and

[1] On the *v. l.* ἔργων, 'works,' see the writer's *St Matthew*.

the tax-collectors,' the latter by 'the Pharisees and the lawyers.' Cf. Mat. xxi. 31 f., where Jesus explained the parable of the Two Sons spoken to the chief priests and elders. They were the son who did not his father's will, while the tax-collectors and the harlots were the son who 'repented and went.'

The first evangelist goes on to gather other sayings into a connected discourse. In the next paragraph (xi. 20–24; Lk. places it at x. 13–15) the denunciation of those who rejected the mighty signs of the divine working is continued in the Woes on Chorazin and Bethsaida. This is followed (Mat. xi. 25 ff. = Lk. x. 21 f.) by the Lord's thanksgiving for the revealing to 'babes' of that divine knowledge which has been delivered to Him, which is interpreted, by the connexion of the paragraphs in Mat., as the Wisdom which dwelt in Him. Finally there is appended in Mat. xii. 28–30 (absent from Lk.) an appeal similar to appeals of Wisdom in Old Testament passages, and echoing the actual language of Sir. li. 23–27, which runs: 'Draw near to me, ye unlearned.... Place your neck under the yoke, and let your soul receive instruction. Behold with your eyes that I have toiled a little, and found to myself much rest.'[1]

(*b*) Lk. xi. 49–51 = Mat. xxiii. 34–36. 'Therefore also the Wisdom of God said, "I will send unto them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall kill and persecute,"' etc. This is no doubt quoted or adapted from some lost passage of Jewish Wisdom literature, and we have already seen in that literature the thought of the rejection by men of the divine message. In Mat. the passage begins 'Therefore behold I send unto you prophets and

[1] And compare 'I thank (ἐξομολογοῦμαι) Thee, O Father' (*v.* 25) with 'I thank (ἐξομολογοῦμαι) Thee, O Lord King' (Sir. li. 1).

wise men and scribes,' etc., where 'Therefore' may be the first word of the quotation, well known to His hearers, which our Lord makes without referring to its source; and 'Therefore also the Wisdom of God said' is St Luke's comment for Gentiles. This is simpler than to suppose that Jesus is represented in the First Gospel as identifying Himself explicitly with Wisdom, declaring that He Himself would send messengers to the nation. And there can be little doubt that 'wise men and scribes' is more correct than 'apostles.' Further, in Mat. *vv.* 37 f., 'Jerusalem, Jerusalem,' etc. (which St Luke has placed elsewhere, xiii. 34 f.) it is very probable that the quotation is continued, or another quotation from a Wisdom writing added. The figure of the bird and her nestlings is more suitable in the mouth of Wisdom, or of God, than of Jesus Himself. In 4 Esd. i. 30 *Deus omnipotens* (i.e. θεὸς παντοκράτωρ, God of Hosts) says to His people who rejected Him, 'Thus have I gathered you, as a hen her chickens under her wings. But what shall I do unto you? I will cast you forth from My presence.' The whole context, i. 28–37, is coloured by the Gospel passage, but it shews how the writer understood the words. And cf. Deut. xxxii. 11; Ps. xxxvi. 7; Is. xxxi. 5. The closing words of the quotation, 'Behold your house is left unto you[1],' mean that the Jewish nation, with the city and temple as its centre, will be deserted by Wisdom. Cf. Jer. xii. 7.

This section is based upon Bacon's article 'Wisdom' in the *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, ii. 825. He pursues the idea of Christ as identified with the Wisdom or the Spirit of God in much fuller detail, drawing together all

[1] The word ἔρημος 'desolate' is added in good authorities in both Gospels, and may be the more original reading. It is not necessarily an *ex post eventu* reference to the fall of Jerusalem. Cf. Jer. xxii. 5.

that seems to bear upon it in the Gospels and Acts. And he thinks that these passages, and others, were drawn by the two evangelists not from Q but from a special written Greek source, whose origin was the preaching of St Peter. However that may be, there is enough to shew that our Lord did speak of Himself in such a way that in the source, whatever it was, His own words, and words about Wisdom drawn from Wisdom writings, had already been inseparably fused.

But it is noticeable that in His consciousness of being in close relationship to the Wisdom of God there was nothing corresponding to the cosmological and mythological elements in the Jewish ideas. He does not hint that the Wisdom of God was Himself in an eternal pre-existence, and now Incarnate. That is mistakenly ascribed to Him in the Oxyrhynchus *Logia* papyrus; in no. 3 Jesus says: 'I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them; and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and My soul grieveth over the sons of men because they are blind in their heart.' In the Gospels the relation which He bears to Wisdom is strictly analogous to that which He bears to the Spirit. 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me' (Lk. iv. 18), supplying Me with the gracious message of deliverance. And though men wondered at His words of grace (*v.* 22), the message was rejected (*v.* 28 f.). So the Wisdom of God abode in Him, uttering sorrowful appeals to men who rejected Him, and delivering a gracious message to those who would accept it. But He realized that that indwelling of Wisdom in Him was so complete as to constitute identity.

And this naturally supplied the Church with a basis on which to build. The Wisdom writings helped them to take the step which He did not take, and to see in that identity

the continuation in the flesh of a previous identity. The Jews after the fall of Jerusalem were in strong reaction against the earlier cosmological conceptions of a divine emanation; and the personification of Wisdom was confined to the message of God in the Mosaic Law. But that was partly in opposition to the Christian church, which was led first by St Paul, and then by the author of *Hebrews* (see i. 3) and the fourth Evangelist, to the cosmic and mystical Christology which culminated in the Catholic creeds. St Paul never, in fact, speaks of Wisdom as an hypostasis equivalent to Christ, though he approaches it in 1 Cor. i. 24: 'Christ the Power of God (cf. Acts viii. 10) and the Wisdom of God,' playing with the word in chs. i., ii., where he uses it fifteen times. Elsewhere he speaks of Wisdom in connexion with Christ in Col. ii. 3 only: 'Christ in whom all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid.' He mostly refers to wisdom as a spiritual endowment of Christians. But his acquaintance with the Wisdom literature (especially with the book of *Wisdom*; see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 51), and the basis supplied him in the tradition of our Lord's words, must have formed an important element in the growth of his ideas towards the Christology which we have already seen (p. 33 ff.).

But if he plays with the word Wisdom he revels in the word Spirit. His teaching on the Spirit will come before us repeatedly in connexion with other New Testament writings. But here it may be noticed that thinking, as he always did, of the heavenly Christ, he identifies the Christ in the Christian with the Spirit in the Christian; 'the Lord is the Spirit' (2 Cor. iii. 17); 'the Lord Spirit' (*v.* 18); 'the last Adam became life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor. xv. 45); and the Spirit of the Father in the inner man is

equivalent to Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith (Eph. iii. 16 f.). Similarly, 'in Christ' and 'in the Spirit' are expressions which he frequently uses for one and the same spiritual condition. But this is not a formal, but a practical, identification, arising out of his personal experience. Thus while our Lord occasionally spoke of the Spirit of God as working in Himself, and in His followers (Mk xiii. 11 = Mat. x. 20 [Lk. xxi. 15, 'a mouth and a wisdom'], Lk. xi. 13 [Mat. vii. 11, 'good things'], xii. 12), for St Paul after the Resurrection the permanent indwelling of the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of Christ, or Christ Himself, was the heart and kernel of his Christianity.

§ 7. Kenosis

The culmination of Christological belief expressed in 'my God' (Jn xx. 28), though for all practical purposes of worship and self-surrender it was reached, as we have seen, by St Paul, is never explicitly stated in his writings. It is probable that if it had been suggested to him that the mother of Jesus could be called *Theotokos*, it would have startled him, because it would have required him suddenly to carry his thoughts a stage further than he had had time to reach, i.e. the stage in which it was necessary, in the region of Christology, to 'know Christ according to the flesh' as well as according to the spirit, to carry back, as a logical necessity, to His earthly life all that he had learnt of His Nature and Being 'in the heavenlies.'

There are only two passages which can be interpreted as the apostle's attempts to explain doctrinally the relation between the Jesus of history and the Christ of experience, by means of a theory of *kenōsis* or Self-emptying. Phil. ii. 6, 7 (R.V.): 'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with

God, but emptied Himself[1], taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.' 2 Cor. viii. 9 (R.V.): '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 meaning of these verses is discussed in the following note. But remembering that 'self-emptying' and 'becoming poor' are metaphors, and therefore refraining from over-logical exactness in basing doctrine upon them, we can employ them as expressions of a great truth. At all costs the mistake must be avoided of thinking that in the eternal life of God the Son, the Logos, there was a brief interval of time during which, in His essential Nature and Being, He was 'less' than He was before, and became afterwards. That is unthinkable, whatever St Paul says or seems to say. But God *as revealed* in the Incarnate life was without, what Lightfoot calls, 'the glories and prerogatives and insignia of majesty.' God the Son is 'the effulgence of God's glory' (Heb. ii. 2), as the light which proceeds from the sun. But we can have no sight or immediate knowledge of the nature of pure sunlight. If we could suppose the earth to be surrounded by no atmosphere, sunlight would not appear to us as light. It is revealed by means of the limitations which the atmosphere imposes. It does not cease to be in itself the invisible and unknowable thing that sunlight really is; but it is only as passing through atmosphere that it becomes a phenomenon. God is manifested to men in the Incarnate Christ, and without the limitations imposed by the conditions of time and space He 'who dwells in light unapproachable, whom no man hath seen or can

[1] The Greek pronoun ἑαυτόν has the effect of emphasizing the voluntariness of the act, as if 'Himself' were italicized.

see'[1] would be to us unknowable. If, then, He was limited, it was *in relation to us*. He did not cease to be the Lord of glory, 'carrying on all things by the utterance of His power[2].' But as regards our knowledge of Him, He may be said, though not in language of strict accuracy, to have emptied or impoverished Himself of that fullness of glory which renders Him, in His true Being, unknowable. Whether St Paul had something of that kind in his mind we cannot say. The evidence of his two metaphors is so uncertain that it supplies no ground for exact and dogmatic theories of *kenōsis*.

Note on Phil. ii. 6, 7 *and* 2 *Cor.* viii. 9

The interpretations of these passages have been numerous, owing partly to the uncertainty of the exact force of the terms employed, but also to the difference of the views held as to St Paul's Christology. One view is that he accepted the doctrine of the Heavenly Man, not God but divine; *ein gottartiges Wesen*. 'Of a nature very like God's,' and 'Possessed of similarity to God,'—these two expressions, identical in meaning, are paraphrases of ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as understood by many writers[3]. And the verse is then explained in one of two ways: (1) 'Because He was of a nature very like God's, He did not think it something wrongfully robbed that He possessed this similarity to God; but nevertheless He emptied Himself of it.' (2) 'Though He was of a nature very like God's, He did not think it a prize (a privilege

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 16. [2] Heb. i. 3.

[3] The words can undoubtedly bear these meanings. μορφή can be employed without its strict philosophical force, as in the LXX. where it corresponds with a variety of Hebrew words meaning 'likeness,' 'shape,' 'countenance,' 'splendour.' And ἴσα in the LXX. means 'like,' 'similar to'; e.g. in Job xxx. 19, ἤγησαί δέ με ἴσα πηλῷ, 'Thou hast deemed me like unto clay.'

to be maintained at all costs[1]) that He possessed this similarity, but on the contrary emptied Himself of it.' According to the view expressed in both these interpretations St Paul's notion was that of a Heavenly Man, a semi-divine Being, who divested Himself of everything that was semi-divine, and transformed Himself into a mere human being[2]; but because of His humility and death He was exalted to a condition even more divine than before.

But if 'emptied Himself' is to be understood strictly, those who see in St Paul's pre-existent Christ One who was wholly divine, the eternal Logos in everything but name, explain ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ as not identical with ἴσα θεῷ[3]. The μορφή of God is His essential Nature—that in virtue of which He is God—which Christ eternally shares, and did not cease to share when He became Man. The 'equality,' ἴσα εἶναι, is the share which He has in dignity, 'the glories and prerogatives and insignia of majesty.' And with the same variety in the meanings of ἁρπαγμός and ἀλλά, there are two explanations of the verse: (1) 'Because He was subsisting in the essential Nature of God, He did not [*sc.* before His Incarnation] think it something wrongfully robbed that He was on an equality of dignity and majesty with God; but nevertheless He emptied Himself of that dignity and majesty.' (2) 'Though He was

[1] The question whether the rare ἁρπαγμός means a *res rapta* or a *res rapienda* has often been discussed in the commentaries. The commoner ἅρπαγμα sometimes has the former force, like ἁρπαγή, sometimes the latter, like εὕρημα or ἕρμαιον. See Wettstein, and Moulton-Milligan, *Vocab. of the Gr.T.*

[2] Jülicher, *ZNW.* 1916, p. 8, compares the archangel Gabriel metamorphosing himself into a palm tree!

[3] See especially Gifford, *The Incarnation*, a monograph on the passage. Chrysostom who identifies them subtracts from the force of 'emptied' by using the word ἔκρυψεν 'concealed.'

subsisting in the essential Nature of God, He did not think it a prize (a privilege to be maintained at all costs) that He was on an equality of dignity and majesty with God, but on the contrary emptied Himself of that dignity and majesty.' Of the two, the latter is preferable. Is it possible that St Paul would have suggested, even for the purpose of denying it, that He who eternally shared in God's essential Nature could think that He had wrongly snatched and robbed a share in His dignity and majesty?

There is yet another interpretation according to which the words cannot be employed to support any theory of *kenōsis*. Many have doubted whether St Paul would have appealed in such a context to a mystery so transcendent. He is begging the Philippians to cease from dissensions, and to act with humility towards each other. And in 2 Cor. viii. 9 he is exhorting his readers to be liberal in almsgiving. It is asked whether it would be quite natural for him to enforce these two simple moral lessons by incidental references (and the only references that he ever makes) to the vast problem of the mode of the Incarnation. And it is thought that his homely appeals would have more effect if he pointed to the inspiring example of Christ's humility and self-sacrifice in His human life[1], as e.g. in 2 Cor. x. 1, 'I exhort you by the meekness and forbearance of Christ.' Gifford lays great stress on ὑπάρχων, in its fullest force, 'being originally and continuing to be.' But it need not necessarily mean as much as this; it might mean, for instance, 'though He

[1] If both passages refer to His human life only, it need not be in the sense in which Luther understood them. He explained μορφή not as the essential Nature of God but as 'those attributes of the God-Man which chiefly befit God.' Correspondingly the μορφή of a slave was not the essence but only the appearance and form of a slave. This incurs the danger of the docetism which Marcion found in the whole passage (Tert. *c. Marc.* v. 20).

was from the first moment of His life to the last.' The passage may be paraphrased as follows: 'Though He was throughout the whole of His life divine, yet He did not think it a prize (a privilege to be maintained at all cost) to be treated as on an equality with God, but of His own accord emptied Himself (*sc.* of all self-assertion or desire for divine honour) by adopting the nature of a slave when He had come into being in the likeness of men. And being found, in all external respects, as a man, He humbled Himself,' etc. Gifford says that to the question Of what did Christ empty Himself? 'the only possible answer is that He emptied Himself of that which He did not regard as an *ἁρπαγμόν*.' This is rather too rigorous. That of which He emptied Himself is not expressed, and it is unsafe to build dogmatically upon something which has first to be mentally supplied. The verb can mean that Christ Jesus kept Himself during His earthly life in a condition of self-voidance, selflessness. The aorist *ἐκένωσεν* in this case does not refer to the single moment of the Incarnation; it denotes the completeness of a series of repeated acts[1]; His earthly life, looked at as one whole, was an unfailing process of self-emptying.

And this explanation finds some support in the earliest patristic quotation of the passage that we possess[2], in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (A.D. 177). The writers speak of the humility of those who endured torture in the persecution of M. Aurelius, as shewn in the fact that they would not allow themselves to be treated as martyrs. The words are as follows (Eus. *H. E.* v. 2): *οἱ καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ζηλωταὶ καὶ μιμηταὶ χριστοῦ ἐγένοντο, "ὃς ἐν μορφῇ—ἴσα θεῷ," ὥστε ἐν τοιαύτῃ δόξῃ*

[1] See Blass, *Gram. N.T. Gk.* § 57, 8.
[2] Apart from Marcion, *ap.* Tert.; see above.

ὑπάρχοντες...οὔτ' αὐτοὶ μάρτυρας ἑαυτοὺς ἀνεκήρυττον, οὔτε μὴν ἡμῖν ἐπέτρεπον τούτῳ τῷ ὀνόματι προσαγορεύειν αὐτούς. 'Who proved themselves to such an extent zealous for, and imitators of, Christ, "who being in the form—equality with God," that being in such honour... they did not proclaim themselves martyrs, nor even permit us to address them by that name.' The phrase 'being in such honour' is framed in imitation of St Paul's wording. Though they were martyrs[1], they did not insist on being treated as such, but emptied themselves of self-assertiveness.

In the earlier and simpler passage, 2 Cor. viii. 9, the problem of interpretation is similar. The aorist ἐπτώχευσεν can be correctly rendered 'He became poor,' as in the A.V. and R.V., expressing the thought of a *kenōsis*, a surrender of His pre-incarnate wealth, the divine glories and prerogatives implied in 'though He was rich.' But the aorist can also be explained, as above, as denoting the completeness of a series of repeated acts. 'For your sake He lived His whole life as a πτωχός, a poor man[2], though He was all the time rich' (as being ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ). The participle ὤν is identical in meaning with ὑπάρχων. If the passage is explained thus, the closing words 'that ye through His poverty might become rich' find a parallel earlier in the same epistle (vi. 10), where St Paul speaks of himself and his fellow-workers 'as poor yet making many rich, as having nothing and yet possessing all things'; the difference being that their possession was in and through Christ, while His was in His own essential Being.

[1] The authors might easily have written ἐν μορφῇ μαρτύρων ὑπάρχοντες.

[2] One of those whom He represented and championed.

While it is clear, therefore, that St Paul held an exalted view of Christ's real and full divinity, we cannot with the same confidence say that he has left us any statement which is intended to *explain the mode* of the Incarnation.

§ 8. The human Jesus and the glorified Christ of St Paul[1]

Up to this point there have passed under review the primary elements of our Lord's teaching, i.e. God's *sons* and God's *kingdom*, and parallel with them God's *Son* and God's anointed *King*, and also His relation to the Spirit of God and the Wisdom of God. It has been seen that on each of these we enter a new atmosphere of thought when we reach St Paul. But that fact suggests a question of vital importance, to which allusion has been already made: Does the Christian religion, with its organ the Church, come to us from Jesus Christ, or must it be traced to a different and later origin in the mind of St Paul? Did St Paul overshadow Jesus so that the religion of the Prophet of Nazareth largely faded out of sight? Was the religion of Jesus the earlier writing of a palimpsest which has been saved from obliteration in recent years by the skill of criticism, and the discovery of which renders the later Pauline subject-matter comparatively worthless? As typical of this attitude let us take some remarks of Wrede[2]: 'If we do not wish to deprive both figures [Jesus and Paul] of all historical distinctness, the name "disciple of Jesus" has little applicability to Paul, if it is used to denote an historical relation. In comparison with Jesus Paul is essentially a new phenomenon, as new, considering the large basis of common ground [of Old Testament and Jewish thought], as he could possibly

[1] Most of this chapter is reproduced, by permission, from *Theology*.

[2] *Paul*, transl. Lummis, p. 165 f.

be. He stands much farther away from Jesus than Jesus Himself stands from the noblest figures of Jewish piety.... The life-work and life-picture of Jesus did *not* determine the Pauline theology....He, indeed, felt himself to be a disciple and Apostle of Jesus, and felt it his honour to be so; he was not conscious of his innovations. But in view of the facts this is really far enough from proving that he was only a continuator of Jesus' work, and that he understood Jesus; and, besides, the being whose disciple and Apostle he wished to be was not actually the historical man Jesus, but another.'

Wrede, then, is one of those who assume that it is right to say Jesus *or* Christ, the Jesus of history *or* the Christ of experience. No one must be blamed for having presuppositions; it is impossible for the human mind to approach any problem with the blank emptiness of a *tabula rasa*; presuppositions due to heredity and environment there must inevitably be. When a presupposition has been *proved* to be mistaken, the scientific mind will, of course be humble enough to delete it; but until that takes place, the most scientific and honest enquiry tends to be affected by it. The presupposition of Wrede and his school, that He whose Apostle St Paul claimed to be 'was not actually the historical man Jesus, but another,' underlies the greater part of their criticism. On the other hand, anyone who believes in the Resurrection, or, to put it in another way, who believes that there is a real personal continuity between the human Jesus and the glorified Christ, that the words 'I am Jesus' in the Damascus vision stand for a concrete fact, shares the presupposition of St Paul which has been inherited by the Catholic Church. Jesus was 'marked out as Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness by resurrection

from death.' If that is not true, then was the Apostle's teaching vain, and our faith is also vain. But for Wrede, to whom this is 'mythological,' there is no bridge between the human Jesus and the glorified Christ; if the bridge is removed, the road is, of course, impassable.

Wrede lays stress on two points (pp. 147, 151): First, that 'the picture of Christ did not originate in an impression of the personality of Jesus'; and second, that 'Paul believed in such a celestial being, in a divine Christ, before he believed in Jesus.' How much he could have known of the personality of the human Jesus before he formulated his thoughts in his epistles is a matter which we must examine, and in which there is room, perhaps, for different estimates. But the second statement is more serious, and must be dealt with first. Wrede rejects the theory that the apostle himself exalted Jesus into the heavenly Son of God; 'but in the moment of conversion, when Jesus appeared before him in the shining glory of His risen existence, Paul identified Him with his own Christ, and straightway transferred to Jesus all the conceptions which he already had of the celestial being.' If so, we can only say that the conceptions which, as a Jew, he already had of the Messiah were higher and nobler than those of any other Jew known to us. Many Jews, indeed, expected a Messiah who was existent in heaven before appearing on earth. But where in Jewish literature is there anything remotely approaching in height and range what St Paul says of the pre-existent Christ? (see above, p. 33 ff.). The highest and most spiritual thought before our Lord's time succeeded only in hoping for something that was impossible. A heavenly Son of God, who was less than God and more than man, a semi-divine *tertium quid*, the product of troubled longings and devout

imaginations, was not the indwelling Christ of St Paul's spiritual experience. 'Here again,' says Wrede, 'we see the great importance of the fact that he had not known Jesus. Intimate disciples could not so readily believe that the Man with whom they had sat at table in Capernaum, or sailed on the Lake of Galilee, was the Creator of the world. But in Paul's way there was no such obstacle.' We need not delay to discuss how much the intimate disciples were ready to believe about the Man who rose from the dead. But it is implied that Saul of Tarsus before his conversion had reason to think of the Messiah as the Creator of the world. I do not think that any pre-Christian Jewish writing which we possess contains a shadow of a trace of the idea. The utmost that Wrede can say is 'that Jewish apocalyptic books are really cognizant of a Messiah, who before His appearance lives in heaven, and is more exalted than the angels themselves'; and he continues: 'Whether, however, every feature in the Pauline Christ can be explained by means of the extant apocalyptic accounts of Messiah, is a question which we shall not here attempt to decide.' This is hardly fair. Anyone with the most cursory knowledge of the Jewish apocalypses knows that 'every feature of the Pauline Christ' cannot be found in them or explained by them. Could any Jew have said 'Messiah liveth in me' as the apostle says in Gal. ii. 20? His entire conception of mystical union with Christ in all its aspects and consequences is un-Jewish. The point is crucial. If there are any features which were absent from his pre-Christian notion of the Messiah, they need to be accounted for. And if Jewish thought will not account for them, the factors which contributed to them must have been—on the one hand, what he managed to learn about our

Lord when He was on earth, and on the other, his certainty that the same Lord was henceforth in heaven. And the bridge between the two was the Resurrection, the ground and explanation and centre of cohesion of the whole range of his teaching.

The former of Wrede's two statements quoted above must next be considered: 'The picture of Christ did not originate in an impression of the personality of Jesus.' We are to suppose, that is to say, that St Paul knew virtually nothing about our Lord's earthly life, and cared less. This is the explanation which is sometimes given of his words in 2 Cor. v. 16: 'So that we from henceforth know no one according to the flesh; even if we know Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him no longer.' We have, it is true, no evidence at all that St Paul came into actual contact and acquaintance with our Lord in His earthly life, though He may just have met Him in Jerusalem. He is fighting against his Judaizing opponents. And we can imagine the sort of thing that they must have said. They would ask what right he had to preach such a gospel as his; to what personal acquaintance with Jesus could he point as his authorization? And he replies that all this reference to his relations with the earthly Jesus is beside the mark, and does not trouble him. The original Apostles are not nearer to Christ than he, merely because they had lived with Him for a few months or years; he is a new creation, old things have passed away; what matters for him is the risen, glorified Christ. If, in the early days after his conversion, he had tried to learn as much as he could about Christ according to the flesh from those who had walked and talked with Him, yet now all that, in itself, meant nothing to him. It was not the earthly life, as such, but the *effects* of the

earthly life as followed by death and risen glory, which were everything to him. If this is the true explanation, that he is meeting the claims of Judaizing opponents, his words do not mean that Christ's earthly life was unimportant for Christianity, or that he had learnt very little about it—he had probably learnt a good deal—but only that he would not base any claim on his own personal connexion with it or knowledge of it. And all subsequent Christians, of course, are in the same position. It is not an authoritative knowledge of our Lord's exact words and actions on earth that matters (if it were, the modern criticism of the gospels would indeed place us in a precarious position!), or even an accurate impression of His human personality, which to us must necessarily, as regards details, be very dim and imaginary, but living union with Him who was born of a woman, obedient even to the extent of death, the death of the Cross, and therefore highly exalted. The verse which we have been studying really has no bearing on the question how much of our Lord's earthly life was known to St Paul.

Now, Wrede declares that 'the life-work and life-picture of Jesus did *not* determine the Pauline theology.' That they did not exclusively determine it goes without saying; but it is implied that they played no part at all in the process.

But, to begin with, is it possible to suppose that a missionary to heathen could have even interested his hearers, not to speak of drawing them to a living faith in Christ, if he had omitted from his preaching as unnecessary all account of His earthly life? His epistles do not say very much about it, because his readers were already converts, and had been taught what he could tell them by word of mouth when they were first evangelized. But there is enough to shew that he had gained himself,

and assumed in his readers, a knowledge of at any rate the main features of the Lord's human life. The vision on the Damascus road, with the words 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest' would have had no intelligible meaning for him unless he had known something about the 'Jesus' spoken of, as well as something about the heavenly Messiah. In 1 Cor. vii. 10, when he refers to our Lord's prohibition of divorce, he has before his eyes a real Man, a human Teacher. In 2 Cor. x. 1 he entreats his readers 'by the meekness and gentleness of Christ,' a real trait in a real Man of flesh and blood. And in Phil. ii. 8, 'He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even to the extent of death, the death of the Cross,' it is the humility and obedience of a real human life. Again, the parallel which he draws between the First and Second Adam (Rom. v. 12 ff.), if it is to have any meaning, must imply a real human life which afforded to Jesus, as to Adam, time and opportunity to decide between good and evil. The reality of His humanity, of His temptations, of His need of choice, is required by St Paul's theology. As Jülicher says, 'Within these verses as a frame he leaves room for the whole content of the Gospel history.'

Once more, the death of Christ is all in all to him. And he knows more than the mere fact of the death. In 1 Cor. xi. 23–25 he shews a knowledge of the Last Supper, and that Jesus was betrayed, and by night. And though he probably did not write 1 Tim. vi. 13, he must have known that the punishment of crucifixion was inflicted by Pontius Pilate. Look also at Gal. iii. 1: 'O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?—before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly written [*προεγράφη* displayed, placarded] as crucified.' Does not that imply that in his first preaching to the Galatians the Apostle drew the most

vivid and heart-stirring word-pictures of the scene of the crucifixion?

Further, those who think that he knew little or nothing about our Lord's life on earth do not take account of the fact that he persecuted Christians for some time. They, of course, had trials in the synagogues or before the Sanhedrin, and they would be asked all sorts of questions in his hearing about the Jesus whom they proclaimed to be the Messiah. All the time that he was 'kicking against the goads' he was kicking against the impressions which he had received of the personality of the human Jesus[1].

And these impressions appear in another way. If St Paul 'transferred to Jesus all the conceptions which he already had of the celestial being,' it is at least equally true that he transferred to the celestial being the conceptions which he already had of Jesus. And chiefly that of His love. 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ'[2] (Rom. viii. 35). 'The love of Christ constraineth us' (2 Cor. v. 14). 'The Son of God who loved me and gave Himself up for me' (Gal. ii. 20). 'Christ loved you and gave Himself up for you' (Eph. v. 2). 'Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself up for her' (*v.* 25). All that he says about Christ's love, grace, gentleness, kindness, meekness, is derived from his conception of His human personality. No Jewish writings or expectations known to us could have given him the slightest suggestion that the Messiah was a Being of tenderness, sympathy, and love.

We can now go on to other points at which it is claimed that there was a complete break, a chasm, between the

[1] I am glad that this has been clearly stated by Dean Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, p. 106 f.

[2] But the reading is uncertain. Some of the best MSS. have τοῦ θεοῦ, 'of God.'

teaching of Jesus and that of St Paul. On the one hand, our Lord said 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel'; and sending out the Twelve on their mission He told them not to go to the Gentiles, or to any city of the Samaritans, 'but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' On the other hand, St Paul claimed, and fought vehemently for his claim, to be the Apostle of the Gentiles. This might seem to be a new departure. We know how the Judaizers said, 'Gentiles may certainly become Christians, but they must do so *via* Judaism; they must be circumcised before they are baptized; they must be members of the Jewish Church before they are members of the Christian Church.' And St Paul fought with all the tumultuous energy that he possessed for the freedom of Gentiles from the yoke of the Law. And at the council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 1–29) he won; he gained the victory which has saved the Christian Church from becoming a Jewish sect. Does not this make a chasm between Jesus and St Paul? The answer depends on whether we can accept a Resurrection of such a kind as to supply a bridge over the chasm. If the heavenly Messiah was not really and truly the human Jesus, but only a traditional figure of Jewish imagination identified in the apostle's thoughts with the Galilean Prophet who had recently died, then the chasm is impassable; Gentile Christianity, as St Paul with his splendid universalism conceived of it, was a new departure. But it was not, if the human Jesus was really 'marked out as Son of God... by the Resurrection.' When He was in the flesh He was subject to human limitations. Omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, are prerogatives which we ascribe to God; we do not ascribe them to a Man who was God's means of Self-expression within the conditions of space and time.

He shared the belief of the whole of His nation from the days of the prophets that Israel was divinely chosen to bring the world to God. Israel was to be the light to the Gentiles. Israel, therefore, must first be fitted for the Kingdom by repentance and righteousness. But when He had passed through death to His risen glory, and the divine prerogatives could be ascribed to Him, St Paul realized what was involved in an omnipresent Christ. The germ of universalism in the Old Testament and in our Lord's teaching could now spring into full growth. Gentiles need no longer be gathered into the Jewish Church in order to draw near to God. What they need is to be gathered into Christ, where Jew and Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free, are all one.

The same explanation is required for our Lord's words, 'The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for *many*,' as compared, for example, with the Pauline thought expressed in 1 Tim. ii. 6: 'Christ Jesus who gave Himself a ransom for *all*.' The former should be compared with Is. liii. 12, 'He bore the sin of many.' 'Many' is the nation contrasted with His single Self, whose death was to work their national salvation. The Resurrection, and nothing but the Resurrection, revealed to St Paul the necessary logical universality of salvation in Christ; it supplied the conditions which developed the soteriology of the Apostle out of that of his Master.

Closely bound up with this is the machinery of salvation, if we may call it so—the Church and the Sacraments. It is said that our Lord never intended to found a Church; but that St Paul, impressed with the wonderful colonial organization of the Empire, controlled by the Emperor, its head, by means of high roads and postal arrangements and shipping routes, and proud of all this as a Roman

citizen, conceived the idea of the Church as an analogous world-wide organization, each member performing his appointed function for the good of the whole, all kept in control and coherence by Christ, the Head, from whom the whole Body, supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God. There are two passages in which Jesus is said to have used the word *ecclesia*—(1) Mat. xviii. 17, 'If he refuse to hear them, tell it to the Church, and if he refuse to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Gentile and a customs officer.' It is very improbable that this is a genuine utterance of His. (2) Mat. xvi. 18, 'On this rock I will build My Church.' The genuineness of this is often denied, but with much less reason. Our Lord had selected and called a small Body of followers, whom He could speak of as a distinct Body ('Fear not, little flock' Lk. xii. 32), more than five hundred of whom assembled, presumably in Galilee, and apparently expecting Him to come to them (1 Cor. xv. 6)[1]. And He could quite naturally describe them as His 'congregation,' which is the meaning of the Aramaic word *k^e^nishtā* which He probably used. But even if He never used the word 'Church,' His followers did in fact consist of men and women who felt themselves to be a distinct Body, and His Spirit did in fact fill that Body at Pentecost, and every Christian on whom the Apostles subsequently laid their hands. The Spirit of the glorified Christ quite obviously filled and knit together the Body, long before St Paul was converted. His metaphor drawn from the Roman Empire was only his vivid way of describing an actual state of

[1] MacMunn, *Neglected Galilee*, emphasizes the existence of this Galilean *ecclesia*, and thinks that Jerusalemite hostility to it is reflected in St Luke's Gospel.

things already in existence, though, of course, his teaching and activities made great contributions to its development. If the Church was born at Pentecost, it had been coming to birth months before. Or it would be more true to say that it was born during our Lord's earthly ministry, and that Pentecost was its Baptism.

And the Church has her Sacraments. It is claimed that St Paul's sacramental teaching is an entirely new departure, and that our Lord never intended that there should be any Sacraments. As a Hellenist there is no doubt that the Apostle had some acquaintance with the Greek mysteries, and it is from them that he is said to have derived his ideas about Baptism and the Eucharist. He certainly derived some of his *language* from them. The frequent use of the word *μυστήριον* 'mystery,' which occurs some twenty times in his epistles, is an instance. To the Philippians (iv. 12) he says: 'In everything and in all things I have been *initiated* [R.V. learnt the secret] both to be filled,' etc. Those who were initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries were said to have arrived at a condition of *τελετή*, completeness of sacramental knowledge and experience; and in 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7 he writes: 'We speak wisdom among the *τέλειοι*,' those who have reached maturity of Christian knowledge and experience; and the same adjective occurs in other passages with much the same force. The privilege of the pagan worshipper who reached this final and highest condition was *ἐποπτεία*, the face-to-face vision which united him with his God; and St Paul says (1 Cor. xiii. 10): 'When that which is *τέλειον*, "perfect," is come, that which is partial will be done away. Now we see through a mirror, with enigmatic obscurity, but then face to face.' And there are many other cases in which his language is reminiscent of the

primitive rites which survived in the form of the mysteries till a comparatively late date. If he could use metaphors from the Greek games, there is no reason why he should not have borrowed vocabulary from the mysteries.

But some writers think that he did much more than that. The pagan worshipper wanted to unite himself with the life of his God, especially with the God who mythically, died and rose again, and whose death and resurrection are symbolical of the annual death and renewal in the vegetable world, and the perpetual death and reproduction of species in the animal world. By a rite of purification, and by partaking in the life-blood of the God, he attained his object. There, it is maintained, is the source of St Paul's sacramental teaching. To the God who died and rose again we are united by Baptism (Rom. vi. 3, 4), and by partaking of His Body and Blood (1 Cor. x. 16, 17). St Paul's Hellenism occasioned a new departure, completely separate from the teaching of Jesus.

It is true that we do not, in all probability, know anything for certain about our Lord's teaching on Baptism, because it is unsafe to assume that the words of either Mat. xxviii. 19 or John iii. 3, 5 were actually spoken by Him. But it is quite clear that if Christian Baptism was a new departure, not only was it not originated by St Paul, but it was not he who first furnished it with a mystical interpretation. He assumes, for instance, that the Roman Christians, whom he had not visited and taught in person, already knew not only its practice but its meaning: 'Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?' (Rom. vi. 3). And he speaks of it also, not as setting forth something new, but as part of his argument, in 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, which is earlier than *Romans*, and in Gal. iii. 27,

which is perhaps much earlier still, in both cases with the same doctrine. As regards the practice, no one questions the fact that Baptism 'in, *or* into, the name of Jesus' was administered by Jewish Christians from the very day of Pentecost, and, moreover, was clearly understood to be distinct from the rite connected with the name of John the Baptist and from all previous Jewish washings. Some actual history must lie behind Jn iii. 26, iv. 1, 2. If our Lord collected the nucleus of a new 'congregation,' the immediate and universal adoption of Baptism by the Church makes it very probable that He practised or enjoined it as the means of incorporating new members. How much that incorporation involved became clear only after He was glorified. It was realized by everyone who experienced the gift of the Messiah's Spirit; no Greek rite of purification was needed to teach him.

With regard to the Holy Communion, some writers have hardly escaped the circular position: Jesus gave no sacramental teaching, and St Paul's is therefore a new departure; Jesus is reported to have given sacramental teaching in the words 'This is My Body' and 'This is My Blood of the covenant which is being shed for many' (Mk xiv. 22, 24), and this is therefore a Pauline feature introduced into the Gospel. There is somewhat stronger support for the contention that our Lord did not command a continuance of the rite. The words 'This do in remembrance of Me' occur in the ordinary text of Lk. xxii. 19, but not in Cod. Bezae (D) and several Old Latin MSS. It is possible, though the theory is not without its difficulties[1], that material has been imported from 1 Cor. xi. 23–25. But even if it has, the continuance of the rite was not due to St Paul. From the very first all Christians,

[1] See the writer's *St Matthew*, p. 385 f.

having been baptized into Jesus Christ, united frequently and regularly in the breaking of bread as a religious act of fellowship. This act was wholly unaffected by the mysteries; it was a perpetuation of the intercourse at meals which the disciples had enjoyed with their Master, and, in particular, a direct and deliberate imitation of the last and most sacred meal of His life; and to do that without a remembrance of His death was impossible. St Paul cannot be held responsible either for the permanent repetition of the act, or for the sacramental, sacrificial significance attaching to it. The utmost that we can say is that in formulating his Christian doctrine, the mysteries may have helped him to realize more vividly that all the wealth of spiritual blessing at which they aimed was to be reached in the mystery of Christ, and of Christ alone[1].

We are not confronted, then, with the necessity of choosing between two religions—the simple, sane, moral teaching of Jesus, and the amalgamation by St Paul of the best Jewish Messianic hopes with the best doctrine of salvation in the Hellenistic mystery religions. We are confronted with the 'foundation which is laid, even Jesus Christ,' and with the superstructure which was gradually erected upon it by the Church in consequence of the events of Easter and Pentecost; and because St Paul was a great builder at an early and critical stage, he is useful as a norm or measure by which to trace progress. It is absurd to suppose that we must choose between the foundation and the building.

Note on 'Paulinism' in the Gospels

The theory, handed down from the pioneers of the Tübingen school, that the Synoptic Gospels represent a

[1] See *St Paul: his Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine*, pp. 305–7.

precipitate of the Pauline and anti-Pauline elements in the Church, still retains a flickering vitality. English readers can see it maintained by Pfleiderer, *The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the development of Christianity*, and more briefly, but not less confidently, by Bacon, *The Beginnings of the Gospel Story*, p. xxvii f.

1. *St Mark*, or (Bacon) the redactor of the book, was a thorough-going Paulinist, who was opposed to the first apostles, and expressed his opinion of them by relating their dullness of apprehension when Jesus foretold His Death and Resurrection (ix. 30–32). In spite of their long intimacy with Him they had not 'faith' enough to expel demons in His name, while one outside their company could do so (ix. 38 f.); 'thus the Pauline evangelist makes Jesus Himself the apologist of the greatly reviled Apostle Paul.' The thought of predestination (x. 40, iv. 11 f.) is derived from St Paul; see Rom. ix. 23, xi. 8. The story of the Transfiguration is allegorical, and reflects the truth of the greater glory of Christ than Moses, on which St Paul dwells in 2 Cor. iii. 7–iv. 6. The theory of Israel's rejection, put in the form of the reason given by Jesus for the use of parables, is the Pauline theory enunciated in 1 Cor. xiv. 21 f. and Rom. ix. 18–29, x. 16–21, xi. 8–10. (Moffatt, who denies that St Mark was a Paulinist, accepts this instance 'in spite of all that may be urged to the contrary.') One thing that may be urged against it is that the theory is strongly expressed in the 'anti-Pauline' First Gospel (viii. 12, xxi. 43). St Mark 'makes Jesus utter the great sentence, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." *Jesus indeed taught thus*[1], but in proportion as the Jewish spirit of the Church of Palestine failed to appreciate His reformatory opposition

[1] The italics are mine.

to Judaism, was it important that Mark should be imbued with the spirit of Paul, to see what was new in principle in the mission and teaching of Jesus' (Pfleiderer). But to draw from St Mark's insight into what was new the conclusion that the accounts of the miracles and discourses in the Second Gospel which express it are 'Paulinisms' is a strange *non sequitur*.

2. Jewish Christianity made its reply in the *First Gospel*. The writer, occupying the same position as the writer of the Apocalypse, 'urges his dissent from both the Pauline freedom from the Law and the narrow particularism of the Jews.' A few sentences in the Sermon on the Mount (e.g. v. 9) 'contain unmistakeably an allusion to the Apostle Paul.' He is to be 'the least in the Kingdom of Heaven' (v. 19), while St Peter is μέγας (*ib.*), πρῶτος (x. 2). And while St Paul is covertly attacked, Pauline antinomianism is directly repudiated (vii. 21–23). An astonishing instance offered is that while St Paul claimed an immediate revelation from God, the evangelist makes this the preeminent distinction of St Peter (xvi. 17). An immediate revelation was possible for one apostle only, not for two!

3. In the *Third Gospel* Paulinism reappears, rather later. It is on good terms with moderate Jewish Christians, and is directed against unbelieving Judaism. The Jews' anger at our Lord's reference to the preference of Gentiles to Israelites (iv. 16–30) is an anticipation of Israel's offence against the doctrine of grace. To the anti-Pauline Mat. vii. 23 an anti-Judaic turn is given in Lk. xiii. 26 (cf. Gal. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 16). For the anti-Pauline wedding garment (Mat. xxii. 11, derived from Rev. xix. 8; see p. 186) is substituted, 'none of those men who were invited shall taste of My supper' (Lk. xiv. 24). There is 'a series

of parables and narratives, which, whatever foundation they may have had in the traditions used by him, in any case in Luke's version of them plainly give expression to the relation to Judaic Christianity of Paulinism in a later stage,' especially the Pharisee and the Publican, the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan, and the Rich man and Lazarus. The story of Martha and Mary illustrates the truth that the deeper, inward life of faith is better than 'the anxiety and troubles of the piety of works cultivated by Jewish Christians.' In the Emmaus story, since the two disciples were not of the Twelve, they must have been of the Seventy (!). The appearance of Jesus on the road is parallel to the appearance to Saul by Damascus; as in the breaking of bread, 'the Pauline Christian recognizes Christ as the living Lord and quickening Spirit, not merely from the testimony of Scripture, but also from the immediate mystical and experimental evidence of the Lord's Supper.' But St Luke is conciliatory to the first apostles; for example he omits (with Mk) the glorification of St Peter, though, on the other hand, he represses our Lord's censure upon him, recorded in the other two Synoptists. The mission of the Seventy is a mission to the heathen. The disciples are to eat anything that they are given; this presupposes heathen cities, and is connected verbally with St Paul's 'eat whatever is set before you.' Their success is described as greater than that of the Twelve; Jesus is made to say 'I beheld Satan fall from heaven as lightning,' which describes Christ's victory over the demonic empire of heathenism. But He turns to the disciples especially (*κατ' ἰδίαν*), and congratulates them on having seen Him personally.

These specimens illustrate the nature of the Tübingen theory. But the idea that the evangelists sat down to

their work with a definite polemical or apologetic purpose, and constructed their narratives accordingly, has now been mostly given up. Every historian, indeed, who writes history and not a bare chronicle, reveals his own presuppositions. And it may well be that these presuppositions owed much to St Paul's master influence. But it cannot be too clearly recognized that the primitive Church contained good Christians before St Paul, who were able to appreciate, in the light of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, much of the true inwardness of our Lord's words and deeds. Further, whatever instances of Pauline influence can be found, the large facts studied in the foregoing pages remain as a witness to the substantial faithfulness with which the evangelists recorded the traditions which reached them. And finally, their point of view is sometimes markedly different from that of the apostle. He never, for instance, alludes to our Lord's miracles, while for all three evangelists they form an important part of the proof of what He was. St Matthew, with all his Judaistic, 'anti-Pauline,' proclivities, is at least as catholic as St Luke, and the Church, as a Church, with its world-wide mission, meant more to him than to the other two. He and St Luke alike conceived of it as the Jewish Church which has reached its ideal; Christianity is Judaism 'fulfilled,'—a thought on which, as we shall see, great emphasis is laid in *Acts*, I *Peter*, and *Hebrews*, but was not one on which St Paul laid any stress. And St Luke, as modern writers are coming increasingly to recognize, is remarkably free from Paulinism. It is probable that he had read none of St Paul's epistles, but at any rate neither Gospel nor *Acts* (see ch. III) is coloured by the doctrinal views which are distinctive of the apostle. So, for example, Loisy (quoted by Moffatt): 'The author

...is not interested in the distinctive theology of St Paul; one might almost say that he is ignorant of it....In certain very characteristic passages he neglects the Pauline additions of Mark, in order to adhere to the primitive *data*.' P. W. Schmiedel (*Enc. Biblica*, 1841); 'A careful survey of all the passages cited does not show that Luke has appropriated any specific doctrine of Paul, but only that he has made his own in all their generality the gains of the great apostle's lifework—freedom from the law, and the assurance that salvation is open to all.'

CHAPTER II

THE EPISTLE OF ST JAMES

The foundation having been laid, we turn to examine the superstructure. And first as it appears in the Epistle of St James, which we study at this point, not from any theory as to its date but, because the writer makes no movement along the line of development on which St Paul stood. It is the most completely non-Pauline writing in the New Testament. That does not necessarily mean anti-Pauline, but denotes an entire absence of the doctrinal element which forms the bulk of Pauline work. The author is concerned almost wholly with conduct, and apparently bases his appeal upon traditions as to our Lord's moral teaching.

§ 1. The Nature of the Epistle

The Epistle is still a crux of literary criticism. It is not a letter written to be sent to any particular destination. The opening formula 'James...to the twelve tribes which are in the dispersion greeting' is clearly a literary

convention. In the opening of 1 *Peter* a 'dispersion' is mentioned, but it is a dispersion in a definite geographical area. The objective of our epistle is all Israelites everywhere. It is an open letter to the people of God. It contains moral maxims, addressed to its readers in the second person, as they would be in a letter or sermon. Sometimes they take the form of proverbial sentences after the style of *Proverbs* or *Ecclesiasticus*, but more often of brief, hortatory—and in some cases quite unrelated—paragraphs, occasionally strung together by a verbal link.

The book is so strikingly Jewish in tone that some have taken it to be a Jewish work with Christian interpolations. Its moral teaching is on the level of that of an earnestly pious Jew, the best type of Scribe or Pharisee, with a love for God's law and a deep appreciation of its spiritual value. But it is a Jew of the dispersion. He seems to have been influenced by Alexandrian Jewish thought; and the vocabulary and style, in spite of some Hebraic constructions reminiscent of the LXX., are for the most part literary and Hellenistic. There is even a Greek hexameter, *πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον* (i. 17), which can hardly be accidental, and is probably a quotation[1]. But he was not only a Hellenistic Jew; he was a Christian. This is clear (apart from the use of the name Jesus Christ in i. 1, ii. 1, in which it is possibly an interpolation) from the recurrence of echoes from our Lord's teaching. Some writers have exaggerated their number, but there are two or three fairly clear parallels; cf. especially v. 12 with Mat. v. 34–37. The writer seems to have moved in circles in which our Lord's utterances were becoming traditional, and were influencing religious language. There are indica-

[1] Possibly also an iambic line is adapted in i. 20, by the substitution of *δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ* for another word, e.g. *χρηστόν*.

tions also which point to his knowledge of 1 *Peter*, though it is impossible to be confident as to which epistle had the priority. Much less certain is a literary connexion with *Romans*; see Sanday-Headlam, p. lxxvii f. The nature of the contents of the epistle probably point to the conclusion that it was a Jewish-Christian imitation of the Greek diatribe[1], which gained a wide popularity after its employment by the Cynics. But if so, the author can hardly have been St James, the Lord's brother, who became Bishop of Jerusalem, even though he was brought up in bilingual Galilee, where Greek influence was stronger than in the capital.

For the understanding of the writer's religious teaching the question of authorship is less important than that of the readers whom he aimed at influencing. If they were Christians they lived at a date when the condition of the Church was very different from that of the early decades of its life. There were rich members as well as poor (i. 9–11, ii. 15). There was religiousness together with social snobbery (ii. 1–3); a desire to be thought religious, and to be teachers, together with an inability to control the tongue (i. 26, iii. 1–12; cf. iv. 11); and the ambition to be esteemed wise and understanding led to jealousy and a factious spirit (iii. 13–16; cf. v. 7); and there was not only jealousy but bitter fightings and even murder (iv. 1, 2), together with worldliness and pride (*vv.* 4–6), filthiness and overflowing of wickedness (i. 21). The religious community of whose members such things could be said must have gravely deteriorated from the spiritual condition of enthusiasm and communal charity depicted (if to some extent idealized) in the *Acts*. And the question arises whether the author was addressing

[1] So Ropes, *St James* (Intern. Crit. Comm.).

Christians alone. This is not clear, for instance, in ii. 6, 7: 'Do not the rich tyrannize over you, and is it not they who drag you to the judgment seats? Is it not they who blaspheme the noble name that was called upon you?' This may describe the hostility of Jews to Christians; but it may equally well refer to the tyrannies of wealthy pagans from which pious Jews and Christians might alike suffer the trials and persecutions in which the readers are exhorted to patient endurance (i. 2–4, v. 7–11). And it is difficult to think that Christians are addressed in the two sections beginning ἄγε νῦν (iv. 13–17, v. 1–6). The wealthy traders may be either Jews or pagans, whose unabashed confidence, arrogant boastings, and refusal to pay hired servants their wages, call for the sternest warnings of the ruin and destruction that are close upon them at the Last Day. The whole work assumes a different aspect if we can regard it as not confined to the instruction of Christians. There is little doubt that the writer is himself a Christian, but in his desire to reach the widest possible public he studiously selects language acceptable to Jew and Christian alike. This note of comprehension is struck in the opening verse. 'The twelve tribes that are in the dispersion' denotes the Israel of God as an ideal community. But this could be regarded according to either the Jewish or the Christian ideal. In the latter case the thought is parallel to that of 1 Pet. i. 1; and cf Hermas, *Simil.* ix. 17. 1, 'the twelve tribes which inhabit the whole world.' Apart from i. 1 and ii. 1 Jesus Christ is not mentioned. With these exceptions, which will be referred to later, (ὁ) κύριος, 'the Lord,' could in every case (i. 8, iii. 9, iv. 10, 15, v. 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15) be understood by Jews as denoting not Christ but God, Yahweh. (In iii. 9, according to the true reading, 'the Lord and

Father,' *τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα*, and in v. 4, no other meaning is possible.) The words 'Of His own will begat He us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures' (i. 18) might refer to Christian regeneration (cf. 1 Pet. i. 3), and doubtless many Christian readers would so interpret them; but, in their close connexion with 'the Father of lights[1],' they might quite as justly be taken to refer to the creation of man (cf. iii. 9 'men who are made after the likeness of God'). 'The perfect law, the law of liberty' (i. 25) would mean for Christians the moral ideal as contained in the principles laid down by Christ; but it could also express the estimation in which pious Jews held the Mosaic law. The writer of Ps. cxix. could have prefixed the words as its title; cf. *v.* 45 'I will walk at liberty, for I have sought Thy precepts.' Similarly in the case of 'the royal law, according to the Scripture Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (ii. 8), a good many Christians who had had the opportunity of learning that the 'Scripture' was endorsed by Jesus Christ (Mk xii. 31), would understand 'royal' to connote His Messianic authority; but the command had been 'royal' from the first, having been laid down in Lev. xix. 18 by God the King. Some have thought that 'the crown of life' (i. 12) was adopted into Christian language (cf. Rev. ii. 10) from an unrecorded saying of our Lord. But if it was, there was nothing in it to which Jews would object. The sentence 'the crown of life which He promised to them that love Him,' and the parallel 'the kingdom which He promised to them that love Him' (ii. 5) were entirely in line with the best Jewish hopes. Cf. Wisd. v. 15, 16: 'The righteous live for ever.... They shall receive

[1] Cf. Job. xxxviii. 7, *ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν ἄστρα*, 'when the stars were born.'

the kingdom of splendour and the diadem of beauty from the hand of the Lord.' In the passage referred to above, 'Is it not they who blaspheme the noble (*καλόν*) name which was called upon you' (ii. 7), Christians could see a clear allusion to their baptism in the name of Jesus. But Jews could understand it as an echo of a familiar thought expressed several times in the Old Testament, that Yahweh's name was 'called upon' men as the Owner and Protector of His people; e.g. Amos ix. 12 (quoted by St James in Acts xv. 17), 'all the nations upon whom My name was called'; 2 Chr. vii. 14; Is. lxiii. 19; Jer. xiv. 9, xv. 16; Dan. ix. 19[1].

'The elders of the *ecclesia*' (v. 14) sounds Christian only when *ecclesia* is translated 'Church.' Even if (as Hort[2] says) we are wholly in the dark as to 'what and how much the term *ἐκκλησία* meant to Jews of the Dispersion at the time of the Christian era,' we can hardly suppose that it had ceased to have any meaning for them. The old LXX. meaning is still preserved in St Stephen's speech (Acts vii. 38), and the words 'tell it unto the *ecclesia*, and if he refuse to hear the *ecclesia*,' etc., are ascribed to our Lord (Mat. xviii. 17). On the latter passage Hort[3] says, 'The actual precept is hardly intelligible if the *ἐκκλησία* meant is not the Jewish community, apparently the local Jewish community, to which the injured person and the offender both belonged.' The passage can hardly be genuine, and what is meant is the Christian Church, not the Jewish community; but at least a first century writer thought it was not incongruous to place it in the mouth

[1] Similarly 'And they shall put My name upon the children of Israel' (Num. vi. 27): 'Thou didst place Thy name upon us, O Lord' (Ps. Sol. ix. 18).

[2] *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 7.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

of a Jew speaking to Jews. And 'the elders of the Church,' in our epistle, could certainly mean for Jews the elders of the Jewish religious community.

The eschatological passages contain nothing distinctively Christian, 'The Parousia of the Lord' (v. 7, 8) is either Jewish or Christian according to the meaning given to 'the Lord'; and 'the Judge standeth before the doors' (*v.* 9) is similarly ambiguous.

The word 'synagogue' (ii. 2), if the writer meant a sacred building, might be reckoned as another instance of language intended to be acceptable to Jews as well as Christians[1]. But it probably means only 'assembly,' 'congregation[2].'

The use of the word 'brother' (i. 9, ii. 15, iv. 11), common among Christians, can be paralleled by its frequent use in *Deuteronomy* (xv. 3, 7, 9, etc.) in the sense of 'fellow-Hebrew'; and 'my brethren' (i. 2 + 10 times) as a mode of address is found in Gen. xxix. 4; Jud. xix. 23; 1 Sam. xxx. 23; 1 Chr. xxviii. 2; 'my beloved brethren' (i. 16, 19, ii. 5) has a more Christian ring, but no Jew could object to it.

Two doubtful passages remain to be considered. 'Ye condemned, ye murdered the righteous man; doth he not resist you?' (v. 6). The *prima facie* meaning is no doubt that which they would bear for Jewish readers. 'The righteous man' is a collective singular denoting the persecuted poor, wronged by the worldly rich, the type that is the subject of our Lord's beatitudes. 'Doth he not resist you?' (if the interrogation is right) is in that case a prophetic present, pointing to the immediate approach

[1] The word is found in early days for a Christian church; see *Enc. Bibl.* s. v. 4833.

[2] Cf. ἐπισυναγωγή, Heb. x. 25.

of the Last Day, when the cries of the wronged, which have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth will witness against the oppressors. But Christian readers could easily understand 'the righteous man' as a veiled allusion to Jesus, whom the Jews condemned and murdered. Compare the use of ὁ δίκαιος in Acts iii. 14, vii. 52, xxii. 14 (see p. 132); and see 1 Pet. iii. 18. His 'resistance' would thus be parallel with God's, who 'resisteth the proud' (iv. 6).

The other passage is ii. 1: 'My brethren, hold not with acts of partiality (ἐν προσωποληψίαις) the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ of glory [*or* the glory].' The awkwardness of this, in a writing in which the construction of the sentences is uniformly smooth and clear, is so great that even if, as Ropes claims, it is 'not intolerable,' it is difficult to think that it can have been the original form of the sentence. If ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is the insertion of a later hand, there remains 'the Lord of glory,' which Christian readers could apply to Jesus Christ, as St Paul does in 1 Cor. ii. 8. But Jews would feel no difficulty in applying it to God. Though it is not an Old Testament expression, it is used of God in Enoch xxv. 3, xxvii. 3. Compare 'the God of glory' (Acts vii. 2; Ps. xxix. (xxviii.), 3); 'the Father of glory' (Eph. i. 17); 'the King of glory' (Ps. xxiv. (xxiii.), 8, 10).

Beside the many expressions which appear to be purposely ambiguous, the writer's use of the Old Testament is to be noted. He never refers to it for the purpose of anti-Jewish polemic or apologetic. There are incidental echoes of its language, it is quoted to support the author's moral exhortations, and Old Testament characters are adduced as illustrations or examples—Abraham and Rahab of those justified by works (ii. 20–25), the prophets

and Job of patience (v. 10, 11), Elijah of the power of prayer (v. 17, 18). For Christians a reference to Jesus as the supreme example of patience would have been natural. But the writer's object is to hold up a moral ideal before Jews as well as Christians; he desires to prove nothing doctrinal, and to 'proselytize' no one, but to shew that the highest standard of ethics for Jew and for Christian could be one and the same. If this was his aim, it could be better attained by declaring himself at the outset a Christian than by concealing the fact. (Thus there is no reason for deleting the words 'and of the Lord Jesus Christ' in i. 1 as a Christian interpolation.) And he prefixed the name of one who was well known to have been respected and loved by both Jews and Christians in Palestine, who was known as 'the righteous one,' *integer vitae scelerisque purus*—James the brother of the Lord and head of the primitive Church in Jerusalem[1].

§ 2. The Teaching of the Epistle

It was pointed out in the Introduction that St Paul, and after him Augustine and Luther his chief exponents, reached their Christian doctrine through the gate of a spiritual crisis. The sense of sin, the groaning under a sore burden too heavy for them to bear, the vision of the depravity and helplessness of human nature, made Christianity for them primarily a religion of salvation. God, in His uncalled for mercy or 'grace,' by means of the death of Christ lifted them out of the pit, out of the mire and clay, and set their feet upon a rock, and ordered their goings, and put a new song in their mouths, even

[1] Much in the epistle might be well explained if the writer had sat at his feet in earlier years, and received from him his first impetus towards the highest ideals.

a thanksgiving unto their God. At a definite place and moment, which they could name and date with precision, the miracle took place. After that it was 'newness of life.' 'How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein?' And multitudes, at the time that St Paul wrote, were feeling the same sore need. Mysteries of Greece, Egypt, and the East, theosophies and mythologies, were grasped indiscriminately with outstretched hands by thousands who believed that they were means of salvation. We need not, indeed, doubt that many of them gained it. What they could not know was that they gained it because one Man died in behalf of all. The God whom they worshipped without knowing Him left not Himself without witness in the spiritual aspirations of paganism, in which there was something akin to 'faith' in the Pauline sense.

But of all this stress and longing, this agony of slavery to sin and this exultant translation to newness of life, our epistle shews not one trace. There were many in the first century, and there have been many to this day, of a different temperament, and shaped by different environments. If Christianity is the world-religion it must meet the needs of those in whom the thrill of St Paul's crisis of conversion finds little response. The 'Pauline' Christian is like one who wants to climb to a glittering summit, but finds himself at the bottom of a crevasse. But through the Crucified, God has pulled him out with 'the cords of a Man, the cords of love.' And henceforth he climbs towards the goal with a new and springing hope, living, walking, in the exhilarating air of the Spirit, and always looking back in thought to the moment, and the means, of his merciful deliverance. The 'Jacobean' Christian has the same summit before his eyes. He knows that it is

far above him, and that if he is to reach it God must give him 'more grace' (iv. 6); he knows that he constantly slips and falls, that 'in many things we all stumble' (iii. 2). But he looks back at no deep and fatal crevasse, no definite moment of miraculous rescue which divided his life into two parts. He can understand that those who have been in the crevasse can never forget it; but for himself the one thing that matters is to go on climbing.

What, then, is the message of St James (as we may, for convenience, call our author)? In effect he says to his readers, 'You profess a faith in the Lord of glory. Does this religion of yours work? Is it alive or dead? Is it effectual or useless?' He wrote at a time when, among Christians as well as Jews, those could be found with whom religion was conventional, formal, and forceless. St Paul wrote too early for that deadening paralysis to have crept upon the Church. Everything is to him either black or white; hypocrisy and deceit are deliberate (Rom. xii. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Thes. ii. 5), and sin is sin, by which men become reprobate (1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6). St James writes as though he were confronted, for example, by the worldly British business man, who may or may not attend divine service on Sunday, but is assumed to be Christian because he is British. Does your religion work? is the central message of our epistle. 'The tested worth of your faith worketh endurance; but let endurance have a perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking nothing' (i. 3, 4). Such words as *δοκίμιον*, *κατεργάζεται*, *ἔργον*, *τέλειος*, shew the direction of the writer's thoughts at the outset. Religion, in all its aspects, is a means designed for bringing about certain results. When a man has endured, and become *δόκιμος* (i. 12), it shews that the testing has worked; it has pro-

duced the result proper to it, which is the τέλος κυρίου, 'the end of the Lord' (v. 11), the aim, for instance, that God had in view in allowing Job to suffer. The results of religion are the 'end' at which it aims, the 'works' which it is designed to perform. If it fails to perform them, if the work is not τέλειον, and he who professes the religion is not τέλειος, his religion is obviously worthless. For St Paul τέλειος connotes ripeness of spiritual experience and growth. The adjective is always masculine (except in 1 Cor. xiii. 10, 'when τὸ τέλειον, that which is perfect, has come'), and is an echo from the vocabulary of the Greek mysteries. Similarly the verb τελειόω in Phil. iii. 12, 'not that I have already . . . been perfected.' In St James we have to do with the straightforward, common-sense notion that what is inefficient is useless. He enjoys using the word τέλειος. 'If anyone stumble not in word, he is a perfect man' (iii. 2), he adequately fulfils the function for which God made him. 'Every good gift, and every perfect boon' (i. 17). 'The perfect law' (i. 25). 'As a result of his works his faith was perfected' (ii. 22), brought to the τέλος that it was intended to reach.

And the same thought is expressed in other ways. A prayer for wisdom, or for anything else, must be offered in faith, because a double-minded man, divided within himself as to what he really wants, or why he wants it, or whether prayer can be answered, is not likely to receive anything from the Lord (i. 6), since a prayer of that sort is of the half-and-half kind that does not work. On the other hand the prayer of a righteous man does; πολὺ ἰσχύει, since it is energized or inspired within him by God (v. 16). And with a fine irony the writer says that sin also is efficient, in producing, 'giving birth to,' its proper results (i. 15). Hence the

wrath of man cannot produce divine results, it cannot work out the ideal of righteousness for which God looks (i. 20).

Beside such passages as these, the message of the epistle is delivered more explicitly in five successive paragraphs. Does your religion work? It obviously does not, (*a*) if you are merely a hearer of the word and not a doer (i. 21–25), (*b*) if your religion does not result in unworldly conduct, especially in social relationships (i. 26 f., ii. 1–13), (*c*) if your faith is confined to the form of mere intellectual assent to religious propositions with no results in conduct (ii. 14–26), (*d*) if you cannot control the tongue (iii. 1–12), (*e*) if the wisdom that you claim to get from your religion results in jealousy, factiousness, boasting, and false ideas, instead of the purity, peace, etc., which heavenly wisdom ought to bring (iii. 13–18). The first three of these must be examined more fully.

i. 21–25. This recalls Rom. ii. 13, 'for it is not the hearers of law who are right with God, but it is the doers of law who will be justified.' Whether St Paul's language is actually borrowed by our author is uncertain. In Jewish circles the antithesis of hearing and doing would in any case be natural (cf. Mat. vii. 24, 26). But the two writers are moving on quite different planes of thought. St Paul means that 'on paper,' theoretically, the doers of law will be justified; but in fact no one can be justified in that way, because no one can do the law *perfectly*, and a self-acquired rightness with God can mean nothing less than that. St James, the 'plain man,' makes no approach to the inwardness of such an argument. He says that the 'inborn word' is—or rather can be (*τὸν δυνάμενον*)—a means of salvation, but only to those who receive it with humble seriousness, and make earnest

use of it. No one, of course, keeps the law without a single stumble (ii. 10, 11, iii. 2). At the same time those who are to be judged by the law of liberty are faced with more serious liabilities than others (ii. 12), and moral responsibilities entail severer judgment for failure (iii. 1); so that all need divine mercy (ii. 13) from the Lord who is abundant in compassion and pitiful (v. 11).

With this there is a corresponding difference in the writers' conceptions of salvation. For St James it retains its Hebrew connotation of victory, successful struggle, attainment; he thinks only of reaching the summit, while St Paul never forgets the crevasse. The 'inborn word' by the moral ideal which it holds up instils the longing to reach it; 'we needs must love the highest when we see it.' But this highest ideal is not something foreign to us; it is as 'natural' to man as his *πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως*. God begat us with the Word—the expression of the Ideal; and in that Word man can see the realized ideal of himself, as he can see his natural face in a mirror. In virtue of this creation, man's nature is such that the Word can be received by him as the 'inborn,' vital principle of his spiritual being[1]. And its fruition, the realization of the ideal, is salvation. The 'Word which is able to save the soul' and 'the perfect law, the law of liberty' are parallel expressions; salvation is liberty to walk freely on the summit. This is very different from St Paul's soteriology, but equally removed from 'salvation by works' in the Pauline controversial sense.

ii. 14–26. The contrast between hearing and doing is followed, in the next section but one, by that between believing and doing, which forms the centre of the much

[1] Cf. the parable of the Sower, where the seed is the Word, but having been sown it becomes *persons*, characters.

discussed problem of the relation of St James to St Paul. Some of those who date the epistle early, think that it is the object of direct attack in the Epistle to the Romans. Some who date it later, take it to be an attack on St Paul. The temperament and mentality of the writer were such that St Paul's Christian philosophy did not appeal to him. It is even doubtful if he really understood it. And if he found many who were employing the apostle's language, unintelligently or maliciously, to support antinomian and libertine views, it is not unnatural that he should write what appears to be in direct opposition to him. If St Paul says, 'By grace ye have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works lest anyone should boast' (Eph. ii. 8), St James asks, of one who says he has faith and not works, 'Can faith save him?' (ii. 14). When St Paul speaks of a man being 'justified by faith' (Rom. iii. 28, v. 1; Gal. ii. 16), and repudiates the possibility of being 'justified by works' (Rom. iii. 20; Gal. ii. 16), adducing Abraham as an instance of justification by faith (Rom. iv. 2), St James asks 'Was not Abraham—and Rahab—justified by works?' (ii. 21, 25), and draws the inference, 'Ye see that by works a man is justified and not by faith alone' (*v.* 24). But in actual fact their respective meanings of 'faith,' and 'justify,' and 'works,' are widely different. To pursue our former illustration, St Paul sees a man in the crevasse, trying in vain to climb out. An expert Guide comes to him with ropes, and says to him, If you could climb out successfully you would be saved (justified): 'if a law had been given which could have given life, verily by law there would have been righteousness' (Gal. iii. 21). But as you cannot, you must cease from your own unaided efforts, and entrust yourself to My power to pull you out,

at the same time actively co-operating in My scheme for saving you[1]. St James, who is not thinking of any crevasse, sees a man at the bottom of the mountain, who states his belief in some proposition, e.g. that there is a good path to the top, or that the summit has been reached by someone else. And he expresses what is obvious when he asks, Can this man's intellectual acceptance of any proposition whatever ('faith alone,' ii. 24) take him to the top, unless he acts on it and climbs? To accept the central doctrine of Israel's creed, that 'God is one,' will not make him a good man; it has not made the demons good. He seems purposely to frame a truism: 'Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is work-less (ἀργή, ἀ-εργη)?' A faith that is without results is without results!

It may be noted here that the adjective 'righteous' is found with differences of meaning corresponding to those of 'justify.' In v. 6, 16, as in the Gospels, it has the plain and simple meaning which *ẓaddīq* has in the Old Testament, 'one who leads a good life in accordance with the law of God.' St Paul once uses it in something approaching this sense: 'For scarcely on behalf of a righteous man will one die; for in behalf of a good man one perhaps even dares to die' (Rom. v. 7). But there is a touch of disparagement; it seems to denote a somewhat stern and unloveable rectitude in distinction from ἀγαθός. Elsewhere, apart from the quotations in Rom. i. 17 (= Gal. iii. 11), iii. 10, he applies it to persons twice only (Rom. ii. 13, v. 19), in each case in his special sense of those who have received justification, and once (Rom. iii. 26) of Jesus Christ who can justify.

[1] St Paul is far from suggesting that the climber once rescued need do no more climbing, but is carried to the top by an automatic process like that of a funicular railway. He must climb, but with the supporting help of the Guide who rescued him.

i. 26–ii. 13. Beside the hearing of God's moral commands, and assent to religious propositions, St James deals with a third important point—the performance of religious acts (θρησκεία). If it has no corresponding effects in daily life, if it does not *work*, it is vain and useless. St Paul attacked ἐθελοθρησκεία, a self-imposed affectation of religiousness, and θρησκεία in the form of the worship of angels, together with ascetic hard treatment of the body, as being of no value to remedy indulgence of the flesh (Col. ii. 18, 23). But he was dealing with particular ways in which the Colossian Christians were in danger of succumbing to the pagan influences which surrounded them. It was left to St James to raise his voice against one of the most inveterate weaknesses of human nature—a weakness which dates from primitive ages when men thought of God, or the gods, as non-moral, and requiring only to be kept propitious by the regular performance of ceremonial acts. His protest is, in essence, the protest of the Hebrew prophets; and it will be of value so long as there are human beings primitive enough to be religious without moral rectitude and love to their fellow men. The particular aspect here singled out is considerateness to the poor.

In the next section (iii. 1–12) it is the guarding of the tongue. The θρησκεία of the readers though it took them to Church to bless God, did not keep them from cursing men (iii. 9 f.).

During St Paul's life not many Christians were of the upper classes (1 Cor. i. 26); he speaks of the Corinthians as poor (2 Cor. vi. 10); and the Christians in Jerusalem were so poor that he had to collect alms for them (Gal. ii. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3; 2 Cor. ix. 1–5; Rom. xv. 26). He had no occasion, therefore, to treat of rich and poor as two

classes among his readers. (The mutual behaviour of masters and slaves was another matter.) But St James had to deal with the social problem, which had confronted ethical reformers in Israel from Amos onwards, and in particular after the Exile[1]. 'Rich' and 'worldly' were almost interchangeable terms, and conversely 'poor' and 'pious[2].' It is this state of things which explains the words in ii. 5: 'Did not God choose the poor as regards the world as rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to them that love Him?' In Christian countries to-day the rich as a class do not oppress the poor as a class; nor are the poor as a class Christian while the rich are anti-Christian who blaspheme the holy Name called upon the poor. The complaint is more often the reverse, that religion is a monopoly of the well-to-do—a condition of things that the poor could alter in a moment if they wished, as they are altering a good many other things[3]. In interpreting St James the fact must be recognized that 'poor' and 'rich' have not to-day a trace of the religious connotation which they had in his time. Nevertheless Christians to-day who fail to apply the principle of brotherly love to the social problem condemn themselves as hearers of the word and not doers, deceiving their own selves. One instance of this failure, common in the writer's day is given in v. 4,—failure to pay wages due to workers. And no one conversant with the

[1] See Driver's article 'Poor' in Hastings' *D.B.* vol. iv.

[2] Thus our Lord said 'Blessed are ye poor' (Lk. vi. 20), but St Matthew was not mistaken in interpreting the words to mean 'Blessed are the poor in spirit' (Mat. v. 3). See p. 7.

[3] An appearance of it still continues in parish churches where St James' exhortation in ii. 2–4 is still flouted, always with the best of reasons. Because the doing of the Word is difficult, many incumbents, in the matter of pew rents and appropriation of seats, remain hearers only.

ways of 'Society' will maintain that the warning is antiquated.

All St James' teaching on the relationships and behaviour of human beings to one another is based on the principle of the dignity of man as man, which is capable of endless application. God begat him with the Word of truth to be, so to speak, the firstfruit of His creatures (i. 18); he is made in the likeness of God (iii. 9). And therefore every man is equally entitled to justice, and to the opportunity of living his fullest life for the common good[1]. St Paul says that *in Christ* distinctions between Jew and Greek, bond and free, etc., vanish (Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11). But St James, appealing to Jews as well as Christians, goes behind that in teaching that all are one because all are *human*. 'Made in the likeness of God' (iii. 9) is natural and universal; 'renewed unto knowledge in the image of Him that created him' (Col. iii. 10) is spiritual and Christian. And the humble brother and the rich are called upon alike to exult in their equality (Jam. i. 9, 10). It is strange that Christian nations were so long in learning the truth. St Paul's letter to Philemon, and his words about the oneness of bond and free in Christ Jesus, logically involved the abolition of slavery; but so did the story of the creation of man. And yet it was less than a century ago that hearers of the word began to be doers.

But man's dignity as man calls for doctrinal as well as ethical consideration. The divine begetting of man by the Word of truth constitutes a correspondence, a natural kinship, between the soul and the 'inborn Word,' between man and God in whose likeness he was made. Sonship, though the word is not used, is clearly

[1] See Rashdall, *The Theory of Good and Evil*, vol. i. ch. 8.

expressed; and God is called 'the Lord and Father' (iii. 9) in immediate connexion with 'made in the image of God.' And yet, in itself, it is only a potentiality of sonship. The derivation of man's being from God by creation does not at once give him a sonship more real and actual than that of the 'lights,' the heavenly bodies, of which God is called the Father (i. 17). 'God begat us deliberately (*v.* 18) for the purpose of being (εἰς τὸ εἶναι) the firstfruit of His creatures,' that is for the purpose of being the offspring of God in a higher sense than the lights and other created things. And man must make the potentiality of his sonship a real thing; his begetting must have its perfect work, as St James might have said. It is precisely the teaching of our Lord on man's sonship (see p. 10 f.): God's Fatherhood is a universal fact, but each man must make it real for himself; a natural sonship that is not realized, made real, in life is a potentiality and nothing more[1].

St Paul is not content with expressing the truth in this simple though fundamental way. His mind is bent upon that which prevents every man from realizing his sonship, the hereditary and universal reign of sin, and the divine method of salvation which that necessitates. The first creation must be supplemented by the second. There must be a regeneration, a new potentiality of divine sonship in and through Jesus Christ. St James teaches an antecedent *fiat* of God's will (βουληθείς), a predestination to sonship, as St Paul does (Rom. viii. 29 f.; Eph. i. 5, 11), but for the latter it was impossible of realization without the saving grace of God.

Further, the context in which St James' passage stands is significant. In the preceding verses (i. 12–15) he offers

[1] See Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 42 ff.

a psychological view of sin. In begetting man, God gave him the dignity of responsibility. 'Let no one say, I am tempted of God.' The wish to throw that responsibility upon Him is a wish to escape from the freedom of the will with all that it involves. The writer uses current religious language when he says 'Resist the devil' (iv. 7); but when speaking more philosophically he teaches that temptation comes from within, from man's desire (ἐπιθυμία). When it is a desire which it would be wrong to gratify, its pressure is termed 'trial' or 'temptation' (πειρασμός), and man may be affected by it, as though he were being 'drawn and deluded' by a woman's solicitations. When he yields to the solicitation the desire 'conceives and gives birth to sin.' Desire is not in itself sin; it is prior to sin. And that teaching finds full support in the modern study of instincts. In four passages (Lk. xxii. 15; 1 Thes. ii. 17; Phil. i. 23; Rev. xviii. 14) it is desire for something not essentially wrong. But elsewhere in the New Testament ἐπιθυμία is always wrong in itself, it is desire which has 'conceived.' There is no parallel to St James' careful analysis. It may be noted also that St Paul, while he can speak of the 'approved worth' (δοκιμή) which emerges, e.g., from endurance of affliction (see espec. Rom. v. 4), never uses πειράζειν or πειρασμός, as St James does (i. 2)[1], as something which is to be rejoiced in as good because capable of producing good results.

A further contrast with St Paul is seen in St James' teaching on the Nature of God. Sometimes, of course, he uses language reminiscent of the Old Testament, as St Paul does, speaking of God as a Jew would speak to

[1] Cf. 1 Pet. i. 6, iv. 12. An approach to it is seen in 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 'Test yourselves whether ye be in the faith.'

Jews. But he also reveals the influence of Greek thought. 'He begat us' (i. 18) recalls τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμεν, i.e. we are by nature related to Him, a quotation from a Greek philosopher which St Luke ascribes to the apostle when speaking to Greeks (Acts xvii. 28). And 'the Father of lights' implies the thought that the life of the universe is not simply the result of a creative act, but of generation from His own Being. The idea of God as the Father of the universe is frequent in Philo. (See Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, ii. 63.) And other points of affinity with Philo are seen in the same passage. Drummond (p. 50) says, 'It is a part of God's perfection that He has no participation in evil; and it follows from this that He cannot be the source of evil.... With God are the treasures of good alone; all His gifts are entire and complete.' St James' teaching is very similar: 'God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth He any man.' 'Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above' (i. 13, 17). And the thought of Him as He 'with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning'[1] (*v.* 17) in contrast with the mutability of man (i. 10, 11, iv. 14) is parallel with Philo's insistence on the immutability of God. It is not suggested that St James borrowed directly from Philo, but he was one of the many thinkers of his day whose minds tended to move on Alexandrian lines.

Such teaching on the Nature of God lay outside St Paul's line of thought. He was too much concerned with the plan of salvation. God's attitude to sinful man, and His relations with him in Christ, to deal philosophically with His Nature and attributes.

There are many other matters of interest in this epistle

[1] Whatever be the exact force of τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα, it carries on the thought of variableness.

of sanctified common sense. But only one can be noticed here—its teaching on Prayer, which differs, not in substance but, in expression and emphasis from that of other writers. St James says in effect, If your prayer is to *work*, it must have certain characteristics.

1. CORPORATE PRAYER IS OF GREAT VALUE. St Paul's thought of the Church as a unit, a living Body, underlies our author's teaching on this subject. The apostle tried to regulate public worship, but in the early days of enthusiasm he had no need to inculcate the practice[1]. When St James says, 'Is anyone among you in trouble? let him pray. Is anyone glad? let him sing psalms' (v. 13), he seems clearly to imply public worship by the next words, 'Is anyone among you sick? let him call for the elders of the ecclesia, and let them pray over him,' i.e. if anyone cannot go to Church let the Church, by its representatives, come to him. Comfort and inspiration, spiritual and physical healing, can be gained by congregational prayer, such as can be gained in no other way. The whole Church takes part in the prayer over the sick man, and in the healing which is the physical expression of divine absolution, when he has confessed his sins. (See note on p. 111 ff.)

2. PRAYER WITH FAITH. This faith is quite different from the intellectual assent of which St James has already spoken: and it has not the full mystical content which St Paul usually puts into the word (see p. 152). It is an attitude of trustfulness towards God, that He is able and willing to grant the petition. This places a man in touch with, and in command of, the divine power. The

[1] The only other New Testament writer who found it necessary to do so was the author of *Hebrews*: 'not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is' (x. 25).

need of such faith in the case of an individual is insisted on in i. 5, 6: 'If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God...but let him ask in faith.' But the faith of an individual can be reinforced by the faith of the community. 'The prayer of faith' (i.e. of the elders who represent the community) 'shall save [heal] him, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, he shall have forgiveness.' The passage recalls the story of the paralytic (Mat. ix. 1–8): 'Jesus seeing their faith' (i.e. the faith of the sick man reinforced by the faith of those who brought him) both healed him, and assured him of the forgiveness of his sins.

3. 'THE INSPIRED[1] PRAYER OF A RIGHTEOUS MAN HATH GREAT POTENCY' (v. 17). If this means anything, it means that the more righteous a man is, the more potent is his prayer. If prayer involves man's co-operation with God to produce results which God Himself wants, then it is obvious that the closer the unity between man and God, the harmony between the human will and the divine, the more completely will man be able to appropriate the divine power, and bring it to bear. No genuine prayer of any sinner is without some potency; its very genuineness means that he is to some extent in union with God. And the potency of the prayer of the perfectly Righteous One is the ground of the Christian's trust in His intercession. One of the strongest motives for growth in holiness is the certainty of a corresponding growth in the potency of prayer.

[1] So recent commentators insist. The prayer is 'inwrought' by God, or perhaps 'set in operation.' But ἐνεργουμένη may, after all, be middle: 'in its effectual working.'

Note on James v. 14–16

1. Human life could not be carried on without the principle of representation. There are countless acts which a body of persons can perform only through accredited representatives; and such were the presbyters, Jewish or Christian. If St James' words are to be normative for the Christian Church, the visitation of the sick is not an 'extra' in parochial work, undertaken by an earnest presbyter in a spirit of compassion. It is not less official than any of his other duties. In his person the whole Church visits the sick man and prays over him. And beside offering him religious comfort and human sympathy, and exhorting to patient endurance, he ought, far more often than he does, to pray that the sick person may be healed, and his sins forgiven. In *v.* 16 the writer again couples the thought of sin and sickness, referring to the representative work of the presbyters by *οὖν*, 'therefore,' 'so then[1].' If the whole Church must pray for the healing of all its members in body and soul, the whole Church must also hear the confessions of all its members. The confessions, that is, and the prayers, must be offices mutually performed by its members. But if representation is not only admissible but necessary in the one case, it cannot be less necessary in the other. The late Prof. J. H. Moulton, in his note on the passage in Peake's *Commentary* (p. 907) wrote, 'A primary condition of this mutual help was a frank and free confession of faults "one to another" (not to one superior individual), that prayer might be definite and intelligent.' But it is not a question of a superior individual. The time has, fortunately, long passed, in the Anglican communion at least, when presbyters were thought of in that light. It is a question of representa-

[1] This is frequently lost sight of in discussions on the subject.

tives. If a presbyter's prayer over a sick man is to be definite and intelligent, a primary condition is that he should hear a frank and full confession of faults.

2. St James speaks not only of Prayer but of Unction. It is needless to waste time in insisting that that is not 'extreme unction,' administered when the patient is not expected to recover. That is opposed alike to the spirit and the letter of the words. The unction is quite clearly part of the means of healing. Similarly the Twelve, when they went out on their preaching tour 'anointed with oil many sick persons and healed them' (Mk vi. 13). And our Lord Himself is reported to have made clay and anointed the eyes of a blind man whom He wished to heal, the cure being completed when he washed in the pool of Siloam (Jn ix. 6, 7). There are thus three factors in the case, prayer, faith, and the use of material means.

Now, Jews of the first century accepted almost as an axiom the view that illness was as a general rule a direct divine punishment for sin[1]. Two centuries earlier the belief was voiced by Ben Sira: 'My son, in thy sickness be not negligent; but pray unto the Lord, and He shall heal thee. Put away wrong doing, and order thy hands aright, and cleanse thy heart from all manner of sin. Give a sweet savour, and a memorial of fine flour; and make fat thine offering [as one that is not[2]]. Then give place to the physician, for verily the Lord hath created him; and let him not go from thee, for thou hast need of him. There is a time when in their very hands is the issue for good. For they also shall beseech the Lord, that He may prosper

[1] No doubt it often is, if punishment lies in the physical effects which sin produces. The thought underlies Mat. ix. 1–8; but that suffering is invariably a punishment is denied in Jn ix. 3.

[2] The Greek *ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχων* is corrupt. The Hebrew is not easy, but appears to mean 'to the utmost of thy wealth.'

them in giving relief and in healing for the maintenance of life. He that sinneth against his Maker, let him fall into the hands of[1] the physician' (Eccles. xxxviii. 9–15, R.V.). In Old Testament days healing was generally the function of religious persons—priests or prophets—to whom St James' 'elders' correspond. He takes precisely the attitude of Ben Sira, apart from the mention of the offering to be made by the patient. On the one hand he enjoins confession of sins and prayer—the prayer of the community's representatives, who are also the physicians, as well as (*v.* 16) those offered by its members in general—and on the other hand the application of oil.

In recent years 'spiritual healing' has begun to claim a good deal of attention, together with healings of other kinds with which religious ideas are not specifically connected. In most of them 'faith' plays a large part. Our Lord Himself could not heal where there was no faith on the part of the patient (Mk vi. 6); and He taught also that faith (Mat. xvii. 20), or prayer (Mk ix. 29), in which faith is necessarily involved, were essential on the part of the healer. It is now well established that the 'unconscious' mind possesses powers the limits of which are at present quite unknown, and among them the power of recuperative action on the body. It is known also that 'faith,' whether it is understood as a confident expectation of cure or relief, or as a response to suggestion or auto-suggestion, has the effect of promoting, or allowing unfettered play to, the action of the unconscious. And there are, broadly speaking, three different conditions under which the required 'faith' can be instilled

[1] I.e. let him fall back upon the skill of the physician. It is not a malediction, annulling all that is said of the physician's function in the preceding verses.

or quickened. *Firstly*, there is the condition of the primitive mind which has not had the opportunity, or lacks the ability, to understand that the world is a world of order, and is therefore ready to believe in the direct action of magic, charms, spells, and so forth. The agent who exercises the requisite power is a god, or numen, or demon, and the magic persuades or forces him to exercise it. There is no manner of doubt that the magic, charm, or spell, is often followed by the desired result, good or bad, because the person who is to benefit or suffer believes that the deity has the power, and the magical act makes him confidently expect that the result will be produced. If it is a matter of healing his faith has made him whole. Were this not constantly the case, the prestige of the savage medicine man would be gone. *Secondly*, there is the condition of the more educated mind in a civilized community, which accepts without question the order of nature, and knows that medical science and psychological science are daily leading men to understand that order better. The patient may use the word 'Nature' in preference to 'God'; but he is firmly convinced that it, if not He, is orderly. But the more conversant he is with modern research, the less readily does he suppose that a medicine is a magic with direct action. We learn increasingly to realize that anything which will induce in the patient the required psychological condition is more likely to succeed than the whole pharmacopoeia to an unbeliever. In all ordinary medical treatment, and in psychotherapy, it is probably impossible to exaggerate the part played by 'faith,' though it may be in no sense religious. *Thirdly*, there is the condition of mind which has a firm, working belief in the power of God to heal. The same principles are at work here as in the preceding cases. As

the medicine man is understood to be able to apply the power of supernatural beings, and the physician or psychotherapist or quack the power of Nature, so the agent of 'spiritual healing' is understood to be able to apply the power of God. This was true, first and foremost, of our Lord. His nature and personality were such that He was a perfect transmitter of that power. St Luke (v. 17) introduces the account of the paralytic by saying that 'the power of the Lord was that He should heal[1].' 'All the multitudes sought to touch Him, because power used to go forth from Him and He [*or* it] healed them all' (vi. 19). And He said Himself, 'I perceive that power has gone forth from Me' (viii. 46). But though He transmitted it perfectly, it effected nothing unless the patients were convinced that He did, and their faith was thereby excited into action and co-operation (Mk vi. 6). It was not magic; it was not His own inherent divinity 'interrupting' the order of Nature. It was God working through His Son, who was in perfect union with Him, and producing results when the patients co-operated—all strictly in accordance with the natural laws of His own making. And God made use, in a similar way, of the apostles (Mat. x. 1, 8; Mk vi. 13), especially after the Resurrection when they were swept with the divine power of the Spirit (Acts iii. 1–8, iv. 30, v. 15 f., viii. 7, ix. 34, xiv. 9 f., xxviii. 8), and also of other spirit-filled Christians who were endowed with the 'gifts of healing' (1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30). Finally, St James held that God would use presbyters for the same purpose. The transmitting of the healing power was no longer thought to be a *charisma* bestowed upon certain individuals, but one with which

[1] *ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν* [*v.l.* *αὐτούς*], was ready for, and directed towards, an act of healing.

the community as a body was endowed, and which could therefore be administered by its representatives. And they must help the patient by the outward act of anointing with oil, in which he normally placed a strong belief. It would be entirely in keeping with the spirit of the words if, instead of anointing, some other outward and visible act[1] were performed which would intensify the patient's faith; but it is probable that in those days no other would have done this so effectually. But to-day, the spirit of the words is equally preserved if the outward act be the professional act of physician or surgeon or psycho-therapist. Whoever the agent, and whatever the means, healing is of God.

CHAPTER III

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

When we pass from the teaching of our Lord, and the moral appeal of St James, we find ourselves for the first time in what may be called the atmosphere of Christian dogmatics. A general agreement has been reached that the Third Gospel and the *Acts* are from the same pen. But controversy still rages as to whether the author, in accordance with early tradition, was St Luke, or a later writer who made use of earlier documents, including the 'we'-sections in the *Acts*, not incorporating them as they were, but writing his whole narrative in such a way that his own literary style and vocabulary prevail almost uniformly throughout. The case for and against the Lucan

[1] 'Let them pray *over* him' possibly, but not necessarily, implies the laying on of hands, another outward act well understood by Jews and Christians alike.

authorship has been stated with admirable fairness by Emmet and Windisch respectively, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*[1], vol. ii. The arguments of the latter, and of the editors, cannot be said to be conclusive; and so long as a bristling array of evidence can be marshalled on either side, the time has not come to abandon the traditional view, although we must recognize that it is not free from difficulties. But what we are now concerned with is not problems of authorship but the place occupied by the several writings in the line of development of Christian thought. The Christian doctrine of the *Acts*, or of any book, can be studied quite independently of the question who wrote it.

The doctrinal standpoint of the author is seen, to some extent, in the general purpose of his writing. Opinions differ as to whether 'his Excellency' Theophilus was a Christian to whom he offered instruction or a Roman official to whom he offered an apologia. In either case he desired to make it clear to him that though the Christian Church was a Body distinct from the Jewish Church, yet Christianity was not an entirely new religion; it was the true consummation of Judaism,—a thought that we shall meet more than once in the New Testament. 'The Lucan writings stand out as the earliest documents which represent the self-consciousness of the Church and the belief that its history was the final development of the divine promise that the true Israel should be God's own people[2].' Christians called themselves by the old LXX. title, the *Ecclesia*. Their God was the God of Israel, whom they taught Gentiles to worship and obey. The Hebrew prophecies pointed to Christianity; Jesus Christ

[1] Edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 187.

was the Jewish Messiah, who had come, and worked and taught on earth, and was continuing to work and teach by filling the Church with the divine Spirit which had been promised in the Old Testament to Israel. If the Third Gospel and *Acts* are a two-volumed apologia to a Roman official, the claim implied in all this was that the religion of the Christian Church ought to be recognized by Rome as a permissible religion no less than Judaism, of which it was the culmination. And St Luke takes care to relate with some frequency that Roman officials in the early days did, in fact, so treat it.

Because St Luke was a close friend and companion of St Paul it has often been assumed that he must have been a 'Paulinist.' But this does not necessarily follow, and a study of the *Acts* does not support it. 'Luke may have admired the Apostle without really understanding him or accepting his full system, and there is certainly no reason to expect the whole of the Acts, or the Third Gospel, to be impregnated with more than a mild solution of Paulinism' (Emmet). 'Luke, though a friend of Paul, was no "Paulinist," and was hardly able to conceive sympathetically and to the full the true nature of the apostle' (Windisch[1]). If this could be true of St Luke, it could certainly be true of large numbers, probably the great majority, of the first Christians, even those who had been converted by St Paul. They were converted by his mission preaching, not by his controversial epistles in which he expressed the maturer convictions arrived at by meditation and experience. It is unlikely that the doctrinal position of the author of the Acts, whether St Luke or not, differed very widely from that of the first mission preachers. He relates certain speeches as

[1] And see above, pp. 84–7.

having been delivered by St Peter (i. 16–22, ii. 14–40, iii. 12–26, iv. 9–12, x. 34–43, xi. 5–17); and it is probable that while revealing in them his own personal convictions, he does in fact present, with some degree of accuracy, the ideas of St Peter and the other leaders of the infant Church. That he preserves his *ipsissima verba* is, of course, impossible. In half-a-dozen speeches there are less than 80 verses all told. And there is no reason to suppose that anyone took notes at the time. But in whatever way the speeches reached their present form, we may accept them as supplying the means of approaching pretty closely to the earliest apostolic teaching.

Whether the speeches ascribed to St Paul (xiii. 16–41, xiv. 15–17, xvii. 22–31, xx. 18–35, xxii. 1–21, xxiv. 10–21, xxvi. 2–23) contain a true representation of his teaching is more doubtful. His mission preaching must, indeed, have differed in many respects from the arguments and instruction which he gives in his controversial epistles, but it cannot have differed in warmth and intensity of feeling. The Galatians 'before whose eyes Christ was displayed—placarded—as crucified,' must have received (as said above, p. 74 f.) vivid and heart-stirring pictures of the scene of the Crucifixion. 'We preach Christ crucified,' says the apostle himself (1 Cor. i. 23). 'When I came among you...I determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified' (ii. 2). To the Thessalonians he had taught that idols were dead and unreal things from which they must turn to God, 'a God who is living and real, and to await His Son from Heaven, whom He raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the coming wrath' (1 Th. i. 9 f.). We cannot imagine St Paul preaching a mission sermon to Jews or pagans without the fire of appeal to the Cross and of warning of the Judgment

to come. The latter appears once (xvii. 31; cf. xxiv. 25), but the former never. In the matter of foods and manner of life he could be all things to all men, in order to save some (1 Cor. ix. 19–22), but that cannot mean that he tried to make his appeals in language pleasant and acceptable to his audiences, as the speeches seem designed to be. They contain echoes of Pauline phrases: 'from all things from which ye could not be justified in the law of Moses, in Him everyone that believeth is justified' (xiii. 39)[1]; 'faith in our Lord Jesus' (xx. 21); 'the Gospel of the grace of God' (xx. 24); 'the word of His grace' (*v.* 32); 'faith in Me' (xxvi. 18). But they also contain expressions which St Paul never uses in his epistles: 'a Saviour Jesus' (xiii. 23); 'purchased' (*περιεποιήσατο*) by Christ's Blood (xx. 28); 'subjected to sufferings' (*παθητός*) in connexion with His death (xxvi. 23); 'sanctified by faith' (*v.* 18). To these may be added 'remission (*ἄφεσις*) of sins,' which occurs in Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14, but is a word characteristic of the Lucan writings. Further, although the Resurrection of Christ, and that of Christians which it ensures, lie at the heart of St Paul's Christianity, there are in his speeches two ideas with regard to each which are not found in his epistles: (1) By Christ's Resurrection God 'afforded a credible proof' (*πίστιν παρασχών*) that He would judge the world through a Man whom He had appointed (xvii. 31). (2) By His Resurrection Christ would 'proclaim light' to Jews and Gentiles (xxvi. 23). (3) 'There is about to be a resurrection both of righteous and unrighteous' (xxiv. 15). This is contrary to St Paul's usual teaching (see pp. 187 ff., 198). (4) The resurrection of the dead was the hope of Israel, in accordance with the promise made to the fathers (xiii.

[1] *δικαιωθῆναι ἀπό* recurs only in Rom. vi. 7.

32, xxvi. 6–8). And other differences will be mentioned below. We are forced to the conclusion that the writer expresses his own ideas rather than those which are distinctive of St Paul.

Apostolic doctrine as it is presented in the Petrine speeches may be summarized as follows:

(*a*) *The Life of Jesus.* Jesus the Nazarene was a man through whom God wrought wonders and signs in the midst of you (ii. 22). God raised Him up [on the stage of history], and sent Him to you [Jews] first, blessing you in turning each of you from your wickednesses (iii. 26). He 'went about doing good, and healing all who were tyrannized by the devil, because God was with Him' (x. 38).

(*b*) *His Death.* He was betrayed by the hands of wicked men, and ye hanged and destroyed Him (ii. 23). 'Whom ye crucified' (ii. 36, iv. 10). Whom ye delivered up, and denied before Pontius Pilate, when he had delivered judgment that He ought to be released; ye denied Him, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and ye killed Him (iii. 13, 14). In accordance with Ps. ii. 1, 2, 'Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered in this city against Thy holy servant Jesus' (iv. 25 ff.). 'Whom ye condemned —whom they destroyed—hanging Him on a tree' (v. 30, x. 39; cf. Deut. xxi. 23).

(*c*) *His Resurrection.* God raised Him from the dead, having loosed the pangs of death[1] (ii. 24). This Jesus did God raise up, of which we all are witnesses (ii. 32, iii. 15;

[1] A LXX. expression arising from a misunderstanding of חֶבְלֵי מָוֶת 'the cords of death' (e.g. Ps. xvii. 5 [xviii. 4]) similarly in Ep. Polyc. i. 2 'whom God raised having loosed the *ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου*' (as in Ps. xvii. 6).

cf. iv. 10). 'Him God raised up on the third day, and shewed Him openly, not to all the people but to witnesses chosen before by God, even to us, who ate and drank with Him after He rose from the dead' (x. 40, 41).

(*d*) *His Exaltation.* He was exalted to God's right hand (ii. 33, v. 31), in accordance with Ps. cx. 1 (ii. 34 f.). God 'glorified His servant Jesus' (iii. 13). 'Whom the heavens must receive' (iii. 21).

(*e*) *Predetermination.* All this, the death, resurrection, and exaltation, was a fulfilment of God's predetermined purpose, and choice (ii. 23, iii. 18, 20, iv. 28). God meant Jesus to be the Messiah: 'Thy holy servant Jesus whom Thou didst anoint' (iv. 27). The whole of the Old Testament pointed to the fact; every detail of it was foretold by the prophets, by David and by God's words to him in the Psalms, and by Moses. And when Jesus was on earth He was 'pointed out,' 'demonstrated' (ii. 22) as the destined Messiah by the miracles that God wrought through Him.

(*f*) *Messianic Office.* Thus, by death, resurrection, and exaltation Jesus entered upon His destined office. 'Both Lord and Christ did God make Him' (ii. 36). 'This is He who was set apart by God (to be) Judge of living and dead' (x. 42).

(*g*) *The Spirit.* The Spirit which we have received is God's Spirit, foretold by Joel as an accompaniment of the last days (ii. 16–21). But it is the exalted Jesus who, having 'received the promise of the Holy Spirit[1],' hath poured it out upon us (ii. 33).

(*h*) *The Name.* Hence the Name—the Person, power,

[1] This appears to mean that the Holy Spirit became His to dispense, so that He could bring about the fulfilment of the promise. Cf. i. 4.

and authority—of Jesus is that in virtue of which miracles of healing are performed (iii. 6, 16, iv. 10, 30), in, or on the ground of (ἐπί)[1] which men are baptized (ii. 38), and through which they receive remission of sins (x. 43).

(*i*) *The Last Days.* Since Christ has entered upon His Messianic office, and the divine Spirit, the accompaniment of the last days, has been poured out by Him, it is clear that the last days are now dawning. Immediate repentance is, therefore, imperative. Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins, that you may receive the gift of the Spirit (ii. 38). 'Repent and turn for the wiping out of your sins' (iii. 19). 'That everyone that believeth on Him should receive remission of sins through His name' (x. 43). To those whose sins are wiped out the days foretold by all the prophets, when God sends Jesus the Messiah at the times of the restoration of all things[2], will not be seasons of terror and destruction but of 'refreshment,' 'respite' (iii. 20, 21).

(*a*) St Paul's attitude towards the first of these has been discussed on p. 72 ff. To our Lord's miracles he never alludes. But to St Peter they were important. They were evidence that God had 'anointed Him with holy Spirit and power' (x. 38); they were God's 'demonstration' (ii. 22)—if those who witnessed them had had eyes to

[1] W.H. ἐν with BCD. See the writer's note on Mat. xxviii. 19.

[2] If this is an allusion to Mal. iv. 5 (LXX.), 'He shall turn (ἀποκαταστήσει) the heart of father to son, and the heart of a man to his neighbour,' ἀποκατάστασις has no reference to the renewal of nature, or to a new heaven and a new earth, but only to a renewal of moral relationships. A wider interpretation, however, is seen in Mk ix. 12 (Mat. xvii. 11). Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 178) will not connect St Peter's words with the passage in Malachi; he thinks that ἀποκατάστασις means simply the establishment, fulfilment, of all things spoken by the prophets. So the Syriac, 'until the fulness of the times, touching all that God hath spoken.'

see it—that the Man Jesus was the pre-ordained Messiah. Not even the Twelve had had eyes to see it; but the Resurrection made the truth clear to them.

(*b*) All the references which St Peter makes to the Crucifixion are in the form of a rebuke to those who committed, or aided, the deed. There are indications, however, of a recognition that the Death, as well as the Resurrection, had a meaning. The fact that it was a fulfilment (iv. 25 ff.) of Ps. ii. 1, 2, and the allusion to Deut. xxi. 23 in the expression 'hanged on a tree' (v. 30, x. 39), imply that it was part of the predetermined counsel of God, and more than a mere murder. And this thought is explicit in iii. 18: 'what God pre-declared through the mouth of all the prophets that the Messiah should suffer, He thus fulfilled.' Prof. Menzies (Peake's *Commentary*, p. 780) offers no grounds for saying, on this verse, 'it is Pauline doctrine,' meaning, probably, derived from St Paul. Why is it necessary to assume that he must have been the first to conceive the idea of a suffering Messiah? Again, if the word *παῖς*, 'Servant,' which is applied to Christ five times (iii. 13, 26, iv. 25, 27, 30), is an allusion to Is. lii. 13–liii. 12[1], it implies a belief that His sufferings were in some sense vicarious.

There is nothing, on the other hand, to shew that in the earliest days Baptism 'in the name of Jesus Christ

[1] Compare *ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ* (iii. 13) with *ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου, καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα* (Is. lii. 13).

In Acts viii. 32 there is an explicit quotation from the prophecy, which Philip expounds with reference to Jesus. Foakes Jackson and Lake (*Beginnings of Christianity*, I. i. 39) think that there is a slight probability that while Acts iii., iv. represent a Jerusalem tradition, Acts viii. 'is connected with Caesarea and the Hellenistic circle to which Philip belonged.' But there is no reason to suppose that in either of them the thought of Christ's death as a fulfilment of prophecy was derived from St Paul. And see above, p. 40 ff.

for the remission of sins' (ii. 38; cf. x. 43) was thought of in any close connexion with His death. 'In the name of Jesus Christ' introduces, indeed, a factor which differentiates it from John's baptism, which had the same object—remission of sins in view of the near approach of the Kingdom of Heaven; Jesus Christ is recognized as having a special relation to the remission of sins. But that this was through His death is not stated. Exactly how much significance the earliest Christians attached to the death of Christ we cannot say. A doctrine of Atonement was not yet defined or grasped; it was the Resurrection that was the immediate, gigantic truth which filled their minds. The references to the meaning of Christ's death would have been much more explicit had St Luke allowed Pauline influence to colour the speeches. But they contain fertile seeds of future development.

(*c*)–(*f*). To St Paul as to St Peter the Resurrection is the supreme event in the Messianic drama. To be a witness of it was a primary function of an apostle. 'Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?' (1 Cor. ix. 1; cf. xv. 5–9). He refers only twice to the Exaltation, using the word ὑπερύψωσεν 'highly exalted' in Phil. ii. 9, and dealing with the subject in Eph. iv. 8–10[1]. He may very likely never have heard an account of it such as that in Acts i. 9–11. But for himself his vision on the Damascus road made it self-evident. The Exaltation and the Resurrection were scarcely separated in early Christian thought. Together they were the road to the attainment to the Messianic office.

This attainment is one of the seed-thoughts out of which grew the Pauline and subsequent developments of Christology. There can be no question as to the meaning

[1] It appears later in credal form in 1 Tim. iii. 16.

of 'God hath made Him both Lord and Christ' (ii. 36), i.e. God caused Him to attain to that *status*. (Cf. Heb. iii. 1, 2: 'Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus, who was faithful to Him that made Him [such].') But what is the *status*? Some writers have used unfortunate language in speaking of the 'apotheosis,' the 'deification' of Jesus. The words represent (as said on p. 33 f.) ideas connected with pagan thought which the first Christians, who were all Jews, thought of very differently, and from which they would have shrunk as from blasphemy. The Christian watchword, 'Jesus is Lord,' did not mean that Jesus is a God, any more than Lordship meant Godship in the Jewish apocalypses. Whatever its origin, χριστὸς Κύριος seems to have been a recognized Jewish Messianic expression; cf. Lam. iv. 20; Pss. Sol. xvii. 36, xviii. *title*, and *v.* 8; Lk. ii. 11 (see Plummer). The application of the title 'Lord' to the Messianic King was easy and natural, as Ps. cx. 1 shews.

What the title Christ, Messiah, meant to the first Jewish Christians no doubt varied in different minds. Some of them were probably influenced by the apocalyptic speculations as to the ideal, quasi-'objective,' pre-existence of the heavenly Man, the *Urmensch*[1]. But there is nothing in St Peter's speeches which clearly expresses that thought. He does not say that God predetermined the existence of a Messiah, so that the Messiah ideally pre-existed in the divine mind. He simply says—and it is this which marked out the Christian belief from all previous Jewish thought—that God predetermined that Jesus should be Messiah,

[1] See Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 174 ff. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 354. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp. 215–19.

and that by His Resurrection and Exaltation this eternal purpose was fulfilled. The Messiahship that he thought of was rather nationalistic than apocalyptic and transcendent. Jesus, like Saul, had been anointed proleptically, and had not yet attained to His Kingship. He was 'made' Messiah, as God had always intended that He should be. The question whether this constituted 'divinity' was altogether outside St Peter's horizon. It was because it came within St Paul's that his doctrine was epoch-making in Christian thought.

The difficulty of the subject is partly due, of course, to the difficulty of language. What do we mean by 'objective' and 'pre-existence'? Writers in the first century had not begun to feel the need of definitions. One thing can be said with certainty, they shew no shadow of the idea that the *human soul* of Jesus was pre-existent; Origen's speculations on pre-existence cannot be traced to any hint in the New Testament. Nor had they arrived at the thought, rightly insisted on in modern times, that all men are in varying degrees 'incarnations' or individual human expressions of God. Though St Paul did not use words like 'incarnation' in speaking of Jesus Christ, he went a long way, as we have seen (p. 33 f.), towards the Logos conception of St John. But he reached it, not by the road of metaphysics but, by meditating on Christ's meaning for men. His own spiritual experience, helped by his familiarity with the Greek thought of divine immanence, made him certain that Christ lived *in* him; that the Spirit which filled him and other Christians was Christ's Spirit. His mystical indwelling involved the truth that His death, and passage from death unto life, His glorification after suffering, and His possession of the Spirit, are all ideally and spiritually reproduced in the

Christian. Christ is not merely a superhuman Individual in heaven; He is in the Church, which is His embodiment, His Body. St Paul thought of Him not only in terms of Individuality but of self-imparting Personality. It is that which, first and foremost, differentiates his Christology from anything that went before him. But this experienced 'fact of Christ' determined his conception of the nature of Christ. He was not only superhuman but supernatural. That which is immanent and universal is eternal. πρωτότοκος, 'the Firstborn among many brethren' (Rom. viii. 29), 'the Firstborn of all creation' (Col. i. 15), connoted for him pre-eminence in nature as well as pre-existence in time.

(*e*) The thought of the 'fulfilment' of Scripture, that the life and death and resurrection of Jesus were, so to speak, inevitable because they were foretold in words of the Old Testament which must be fulfilled, is found frequently in the Third Gospel, and is ascribed to St Paul in xiii. 27, but is absent from his writings. He makes large use of Scripture in argument; he tries to prove things (as St Luke relates in xvii. 2, xviii. 28), sometimes in thoroughly Rabbinic style, by means of Old Testament passages; and in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4 he says that Christ died and rose on the third day 'according to the Scriptures.' But this is not quite the same as the thought in the Third Gospel and the Acts, not only that the events are *true* because they were foretold, but that they *occurred* because they were foretold.

(*g*) With the difference between St Luke's and St Paul's Christology corresponds a difference in their idea of the Spirit. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the Third Person in the divine Trinity may no doubt be thought of as implicit in the New Testament; but it was possible for

Gregory of Nazianzus in the latter half of the 4th century to say (*de Spir. Sanct.* xxxi.) that some people in his day were uncertain what opinion to adopt as to the nature of the Holy Spirit because the sacred Scriptures did not teach anything definite on the subject. St Paul[1] thought of the Spirit of Christ, which was the Spirit of God, as a power, an energy, a life, an indwelling presence of God, a *Pneuma* which the Christian received as his own and thereby became *pneumatikos*, 'spirit-filled,' 'spiritual.' Thus the whole Church was the Body of Christ, the embodiment of His Spirit. If, for purposes of exact treatment, he had tried to separate the Spirit and God, we must suppose that he would have thought of the former as It, and not as He. But he, and certainly anyone else, had not advanced to the point of precise definition. He could say, for example, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God' (Eph. iv. 30; cf. Is. lxiii. 10); 'the Spirit maketh intercession for us' (Rom. viii. 26); 'all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, distributing severally to each as It [*or* He] wills' (1 Cor. xii. 11). And expressions in line with these occur in the Acts: 'to lie against the Holy Spirit' (v. 3); 'to tempt the Spirit of the Lord' (*v.* 9); 'to resist the Holy Spirit' (vii. 51); 'the flock over which the Holy Spirit placed you as overseers' (xx. 28); and even 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us' (xv. 28). But none of these necessarily implies a 'Person' in the sense of the Athanasian symbol. Mystical union with the in-dwelling God through Christ was the intensely charged medium in which the apostle lived and thought, and he had no use for the theological exactitudes afterwards employed to combat Sabellians, Arians, and Macedonians in turn. His doctrine of the Spirit was mainly

[1] See the writer's *St Paul*, pp. 275, 279 f., 282–6.

the expression of his own experience. That he, with other Christians, had been 'baptized in one Spirit,' and 'and made to drink one Spirit' (1 Cor. xii. 13), was for him a vivid fact and a driving motive.

In the Acts this plane is never reached. The writer remains at the Old Testament standpoint in thinking of the Spirit as an effluence, an *afflatus*, from God which 'comes upon' men (i. 8, xix. 6); it is 'poured out' upon them by Christ (ii. 33); it 'falls upon' them (x. 44, xi. 15); they are given it (v. 32, viii. 18, x. 45, xv. 8); they 'receive' it (ii. 38, viii. 15, 17, 19, x. 47, xix. 2); they are 'full of' or 'filled with' it (ii. 4, iv. 8, 31, vi. 5, vii. 55, ix. 17, xi. 24, xiii. 9, 52); and God 'anointed' Jesus of Nazareth 'with holy Spirit and power' (x. 38). In descriptions of the inspiration of prophecy, or of an inspired impulse to action, the Spirit is personified, a usage which begins to be met with in the later writings of the Old Testament (see p. 54 f.): 'The Scripture which the Holy Spirit spake before through the mouth of David' (i. 16); 'as the Spirit gave them utterance' (ii. 4); 'the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip[1]' (viii. 39); 'the Spirit said' (viii. 29, x. 19, xi. 12, xiii. 2, xxi. 11); 'he was forbidden by the Holy Spirit' (xvi. 6); 'the Spirit of Jesus did not allow them' (*v.* 7); 'the Spirit witnesseth' (xx. 23); 'the Holy Spirit spake through Isaiah' (xxviii. 25). But St Paul's thought of the Spirit as an immanent power, the highest element in the Christian's personality, because it is the divine atmosphere in which his whole being lives, never finds expression.

(*i*) And this has an immediate bearing upon the eschatology of the two writers. In the Petrine speeches the last days are immediately imminent; and the Baptist's call

[1] Cf. Ezek. ii. 12, viii. 3, xi. 1, xliii. 5.

to repentance is repeated. He had predicted the baptism with the Spirit as an event in the near future, but the first Christians, when St Peter spoke, had already received it; the End, therefore, was incalculably close. When St Luke wrote, the End had not yet come, but he was certain that the destruction of Jerusalem pointed to it (Lk. xxi. 20–28). His ideas, in fact, remained where St Paul's began. There are occasions when the apostle spoke similarly of the End as an event in time, in the near future. But it not infrequently happens that when a man has learnt a new truth, greater than that which he has received in tradition, even if it be incompatible with it, he does not at once perceive it to be so, but continues to maintain both the old and the new, until the latter gradually gains the supremacy, and the former is nigh unto vanishing away. For the Thessalonians and Corinthians he could still draw pictures of the scenic details of the Last Day as dramatic and catastrophic as those of any Jewish apocalypse. But, as we have seen, his interest in this traditional time view of the End lessened with his developing thought. The possession of Christians by the Spirit, or of the Spirit by Christians, was not merely a sign that the Kingdom was near, it was in itself the actual inauguration of the Kingdom. 'The Kingdom of God is...righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit' (Rom. xiv. 17). And into that Kingdom Christians have already been translated (Col. i. 13). They are already, in potentiality, that for which they were foreordained and called, i.e. they are already justified and glorified (Rom. viii. 30).

This explains why St Paul in his epistles says so little about repentance. *μετάνοια*[1] was the change of mind and

[1] He uses the word in Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vii. 9 f. only.

outlook, the alteration in the way of thinking about things, which took place when a non-Christian was led to become a Christian. That to which the Baptist, our Lord, and the first disciples called men was the essential preliminary. And St Paul no doubt taught its necessity with no less urgency in his mission preaching; see, e.g., 1 Thes. i. 9. St Luke, in fact, relates that he did (Acts xx. 21, xxvi. 20), as he relates that St Peter did. But in writing to Christians, the apostle exhorts them to make increasingly real, by sanctification, what their *μετάνοια* and Baptism had made them potentially.

Two expressions will further illustrate the Hebraic cast of thought in the Acts:

1. 'The way' for the Christian manner of life (ix. 2, xix. 9, 23, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14, 22); see also 'the way of salvation' (xvi. 17), 'the way of the Lord' (xviii. 25), 'the way of God' (*v.* 26). This moral connotation of the word is very frequent in the Old Testament. In xxii. 4, xxiv. 14 the expression is put into St Paul's mouth; but it is hardly probable that he was accustomed to use it in speaking when he never used it in writing. There is no instance in his epistles, except in the quotation from the Old Testament in Rom. iii. 16, 17.

2. 'The Righteous One' applied to Jesus Christ (iii. 14, vii. 52, xxii. 14), in speeches of St Peter, St Stephen, and St Paul respectively (cf. Jam. v. 6, p. 94). The epithet was probably current in Jewish-Christian circles. But St Paul uses 'righteous' only once of Christ (Rom. iii. 26), not with any conventional usage, but putting into the word the whole content of his doctrine of justification by faith.

It is thus evident that the author of the Acts, whether St Luke or another, was not a Gentile but a Hellenist.

Gospel and Acts alike, witness in thought and style to his Hebrew origin. That the Preface (Lk. i. 1–4) was his natural language, and that in the rest of his two-volumed work he adapted himself to the language of his sources, is quite impossible. The language throughout the work is his own, while the Preface is a literary effort in the ornate and somewhat florid style in which such dedicatory prologues were often written[1].

But though of Hebrew origin, he lived in a larger world than Palestine, and was 'a universalist of a gentle and kindly nature[2].' That was enough to make St Paul his hero, and to lead him to relate the anticipation of the apostle's work for the Gentiles in that of St Peter and St Stephen. In his Gospel his large-heartedness shews itself chiefly in his selection of incidents which illustrate the gentle and kindly universalism of our Lord, His compassion for the poor and outcast, His treatment of women, children, and Samaritans. In the Acts it is expressed in the speeches attributed to St Paul at Lystra (xiv. 15–18), and at Athens (xvii. 22–31).

In the Lystran speech, or outline sketch of a speech, the following thoughts are summarized: (1) God is the Creator, but (2) also the bountiful Creator; (3) His bounty in Nature was His means of Self-revelation; (4) the nations of the earth are not said to have rejected this divine witness but only (5) to have failed to understand the right way of worshipping the God who gave it; (6) and God in His compassion allowed them all to worship in the wrong way, until now, (7) when Christian preachers are bringing the good tidings of the right way.

The Athens speech is constructed on exactly similar

[1] See Cadbury in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 489 ff.
[2] P. Gardner, *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 400.

lines, but with a flavouring of Stoic language: (1) God made the world and all men; (2) He gives to all men life and breath and all things, and shewed His care over every nation by arranging fixed seasons and periods, and determining the boundaries of their respective abodes; (3) the object of all this bounty and providence was that they might seek Him if perchance they might touch[1] Him and find Him; (4) and so far from rejecting this natural revelation, some of your own poets have shewn that they recognize Him as the Source and immanent Principle of all life. (5) But you have not understood the right way of worshipping Him; you admit Him to be 'an unknown God,' so I declare Him unto you; being the Source and immanent Principle of all life He is not such that He can be represented in gold, silver, or stone. (6) 'But the times of ignorance God overlooked,' until now, (7) when He sends to men the Christian message of repentance, and of Christ's Resurrection and coming Judgment.

St Paul in his epistles does not shew himself to be a universalist of this type. He recognizes that the heathen have been given some revelation of God: 'For God's wrath is revealed from heaven upon every impiety and unrighteousness of men who hinder the truth in unrighteousness; because that which is known of God is manifest among them, for God hath manifested it to them. For His invisible attributes are beheld from the creation of the world, being perceived by the things that He has made, both His everlasting power and divinity' (Rom. i. 18–20). But he arrives only at the conclusion that this natural revelation was given them 'in order that

[1] This is better than 'feel after' (A.V., R.V.), which is only a form of seeking. ψηλαφήσειαν and *attrectent* (Vulg.) can have either meaning.

they might be without excuse' (*v.* 21). Because in idolatry and other iniquities they sinned against the light that they possessed, God 'gave them up' to their sins (*vv.* 24, 26, 28), from which they can be delivered only in and through Christ. This is notably different from the speeches, where they are thought of as worshipping God according to their lights, seeking Him if they might touch Him and find Him, but because they *had an excuse*, the good excuse of ignorance, God 'allowed' them to go on as they were, and 'overlooked' their mistakes. The utmost that St Paul admits is that God has mercifully 'withheld His hand' (ἀνοχή), and 'passed by former sins,' in view of His coming vindication of His righteousness in the death of Christ (iii. 25 f.). Thus St Paul teaches that the heathen are sinful, and need salvation in Christ; according to St Luke he thinks of them as good-hearted but ignorant, and in need of the glad tidings of Christ.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST PETER

St Peter's epistle brings us a step nearer to St Paul, but not by any means the whole way. For our present purpose it is not of great moment to decide whether the author was St Peter or not. Bishop Chase, in his article on the epistle in Hastings' *D.B.* iii., has given a strong defence of the traditional view, to which the reader may be referred. Some of the problems will perhaps always remain unsolved; but the probability rests on the side of St Peter. This does not necessarily mean that he actually wrote the pages before us. It is far from improbable that

one whose preaching was in Aramaic which afterwards needed an 'interpreter' when it was put into writing for Gentiles enlisted the services of a companion in the composition of his epistle. Bishop Chase says (p. 782): 'The vocabulary, then, of the writer is a full one, including as it does words representing several strata of the language. The proportion of classical words is large; so, too, is the list of words of which there is little or no independent attestation. None, however, of those which come under the last head strikes the reader as affected or odd. Each is correctly formed. The meaning of all but a very few words (*e.g.* ἐπερώτημα, ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος[1]) is at once clear.' 'The general style, like the vocabulary, shows that the writer within certain limits had a very considerable appreciation of, and power over, the characteristic usages of Greek.' A Jewish fisherman brought up in bilingual Galilee, who had travelled and worked among Hellenists, could no doubt speak Greek with comparative ease and naturalness. But it is open to question whether he could have acquired the literary ability evidenced in the epistle. Nevertheless the voice may well be Peter's voice, though the literary hand may have been the hand of Silvanus.

Bishop Chase, Moffatt, and others, have made it clear that the references to the sufferings to which the readers were from time to time subjected do not necessarily point to a date when official persecution was persecution of the name 'Christian' as such. To suffer 'in the name of Christ' (iv. 14), 'as a Christian' (*v.* 16), need mean no more than 'to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ,' which St Peter himself, for example, had done in the first days in Jerusalem (Acts iv. 3, 21, v. 18, 40, 41, xii. 3, 4);

[1] For a new suggestion as to the latter word by Erbes see *Z.N.T.* 1919, 20. p. 39.

and all Christians were liable to the same, wherever they were confronted with Jewish opposition. Cf. Mat. v. 11.

It has been thought that the writing is so Pauline that St Peter cannot have written it. But at least the author, if pseudonymous, did not anticipate the objection. He would hardly have used the name Peter in preference to that of Paul if his epistle had not contained elements sufficiently un-Pauline to justify him. The Pauline colouring is, indeed, unmistakeable; but the more clearly it is recognized the more striking become the differences. It is important to remember that an agreement with St Paul does not necessarily imply a borrowing from him. In describing his own movements St Paul says that when he went to Jerusalem he put before 'them of repute' the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and they 'added nothing' to him (Gal. ii. 1 f., 6). All that was essential in his evangelistic preaching and theirs was practically the same. The background of all the apostolic doctrine and literature was the Old Testament with its age-long traditions of a sacred people, chosen of old by God, and its expectations of an ideal age to come; then the primary facts of Christ's death, resurrection, exaltation, and the gift of His Spirit to the members of the Christian fellowship; and finally the expectation of the near approach of the End. It is not surprising that there was much on which the two apostles expressed themselves similarly. But as regards details of language it is quite open to doubt whether St Peter was indebted to any of St Paul's epistles with the exception of *Romans* and *Ephesians*. Those who deny *Ephesians* to St Paul would prefer to say that its author was indebted to St Peter. That the latter should have read *Romans* is natural if he lived for a time in Rome; and his parallels to that epistle are fairly numerous and close.

With regard to *Ephesians*, 'The connexion, though very close, does not lie on the surface. It is shewn more by identities of thought and similarity in the structure of the two Epistles as wholes than by identities of phrase[1].' 'The affinities between the two, not only in phraseology but in structure and conception, involve a literary relationship which implies that the one drew upon the other[2].' Some writers are not convinced even of this; for example H. A. A. Kennedy[3] says, 'While there are a few vague parallels, it is hard to trace any close inter-relation of ideas.' Bishop Chase gives only six coincidences with Pauline epistles other than *Romans*, *Ephesians*, and the Pastorals, none of which are particularly striking. The question, however, is of no intrinsic importance. Whatever was the extent of St Peter's indebtedness, his borrowings were more of language than of distinctive ideas. His epistle breathes, for the most part, the spirit of the earliest Christianity which we have seen reflected in his speeches, before much advance had been made in the development of the Church's thought. St Paul's influence scarcely carried him appreciably forward. But the utter sincerity and simple beauty of his writing make it of unique value and attractiveness. To compare 1 *Peter* with the Pauline epistles is like comparing Schubert with Beethoven.

The contents of the epistle can be briefly summarized as follows: You Gentiles have become Christians through the preaching of the Gospel, emancipated from your paganism, as Israel was emancipated from Egypt, in virtue of the death of Him who is now the exalted Messiah, and through baptism. A glorious Hereafter, foretold in

[1] Hort, *The First Ep. of St Peter, i. 1–ii. 17*, p. 5.
[2] Moffatt, *Introd. to the Literature of the N.T.*, p. 338.
[3] *Expos. Times*, xxvii. 264.

the Old Testament, is ready waiting for you in the near future. Look forward to that with a hope and confidence unquenched by any sufferings you may be called upon at present to undergo on account of your Christianity, remembering that the Old Testament predicted that Christ also must reach His glory through suffering. In the meantime live the true Christian life, in your behaviour both towards your fellow-Christians and towards non-Christians.

It is probable that this accurately reflects the general mind of the early Church as represented in the teaching of the first apostles, 'the common practical consciousness pervading the Churches,—a consciousness which was prior to Paul, and in which Paulinism, for the most part, operated merely as a ferment.'[1] Whether the leaven would radically have effected St Peter if he had been for a longer time, and earlier in life, under St Paul's influence we cannot say. But as it is, though his language is sometimes borrowed, and his attitude towards the fundamental facts of Christianity is, in its main features, the same as St Paul's, yet he shews virtually no traces of the conceptions which stand out as distinctively Pauline. 'He has only two distinctive "theological" ideas (i. 10 f., iii. 19 f.), and each is used practically[1].' 'Peter's nature was not speculative. He was much more receptive and much less original than Paul. Hence his untheological temperament would naturally lead him to use phrases like ἐν Χριστῷ (iii. 16, v. 10, 14), and conceptions such as that of regeneration, for his own purposes of practical exhortation[1].'

His teaching must now be studied more in detail.

1. *The doctrine of God.* Jews had begun to think of God as 'Father,' not only of Israel as a whole but, of the individual; and our Lord had taught men to live per-

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 331.

manently in the attitude of sons to a Father (see above, p. 10 f.). St Peter also speaks of God as 'Father'; it had become for him a recognized title, 'God the Father,' θεοῦ πατρός (i. 1). But it remained a relationship which primarily involved obedience and fear; 'if ye invoke as Father Him who judges impartially according to each man's work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear' (i. 17). The attitude is rather Jewish than Christian. The word lacks the warm and loving intimacy which it expresses on our Lord's lips. And St Paul, in his triumphant joy in God's saving grace, finds fresh fulness of meaning in the Christian's sonship, a spiritual relationship originating in God's free kindness, and realized through mystical union with Christ. 'Ye are all God's sons through faith in Christ Jesus' (Gal. iii. 26); 'heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ' (Rom. viii. 17). And that means living under the influence of the Spirit of God; 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God' (*v.* 14); a sonship the full consummation of which will one day be revealed (*v.* 19). And behind all the mystical oneness of Christians in Christ, the ultimate bond of union is 'one God and Father of all' (Eph. iv. 6). St Peter shews no sign of the intensity with which St Paul felt it to be a burning and flaming fact, experienced only by those who are of the 'new creation' in Christ Jesus.

Again, St Peter never speaks of love to God (contrast Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. ii. 9, viii. 3; Eph. i. 4; 2 Thes. iii. 5), but only of love to Jesus Christ (i. 8); nor of God's love to men (contrast Rom. v. 5, 8, viii. 39, ix. 25; 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 13; Eph. ii. 4; Col. iii. 12; 1 Thes. i. 4; 2 Thes. ii. 13, 16), but of His election of Christians in His foreknowledge (i. 1), His great mercy (*v.* 3), His guarding power (*v.* 5), His holiness (*vv.* 15, 16), His impartial judgment which

inspires fear (*v.* 17); He is the object of the Christian's faith and hope (*v.* 21); He begets them through His Word (*v.* 23), and through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (*v.* 3); spiritual sacrifices are acceptable to Him through Jesus Christ (ii. 5); He called Gentiles out of darkness into light, so that they became His sacred people (*vv.* 9, 10); He expresses His Will with regard to their moral conduct (ii. 15, iv. 2), and their sufferings (iii. 17, iv. 19); they are His slaves (ii. 16), who must obey (i. 2, 14) and fear Him (ii. 17); His eyes are open unto the righteous, but His face is against them that do evil (iii. 12, LXX.); Christ died 'that He might lead you to God' (iii. 18); God will judge living and dead (iv. 5); His manifold grace supplies gifts for service (*vv.* 9, 10), that He may be glorified (*v.* 11); the Spirit of glory and of God rests upon suffering Christians (*v.* 14); His judgment will be terrible to the righteous, and how much more to the ungodly (*vv.* 17, 18); He is also the faithful Creator to whom men can entrust their lives in well doing (*v.* 19); the sufferings of Christians are a due to be rendered (ἐπιτελεῖσθαι) to Him (v. 9); and He is the God of all grace, who called us to His eternal glory in Christ Jesus, and after Christians have suffered He will perfect, stablish, strengthen them (*v.* 10).

Thus St Peter says much about God, but in his conception of His Being and Nature he does not go beyond the Old Testament. He is 'a Christian who lived in the Old Testament.'[1]

2. *The New Israel.* The relationship of God to the new Israel is the culmination and consummation of His relationship to the old Israel. His nature and properties remain the same—the transcendent Being, just, powerful, holy,

[1] Kennedy, *op. cit.*

terrible to sinners, merciful and the source of grace to His faithful people; the difference is that it is Christians whom He has 'elected' and 'called' to be His faithful people, and has done for them, through Jesus Christ, all that He purposed to do for the old Israel had they not sinned against Him. There is no immanence of God in His people, no mystical oneness with Him as members of a Body indwelt by the Spirit, a Body of which Christ is the ἀρχή[1] (Col. i. 18), the beginning, foundation, nucleus, in whom actually, and therefore in whose Body ideally, dwells all the *pleroma* of the Godhead. For St Peter God is 'the object of Christian thought, aspiration, worship, rather than of experience, possession, inner realisation. The experimental side is not absent—"if ye have tasted[2]," etc. (ii. 3)—but his view is predominantly objective' (Bigg).

The continuity which he sees between Christians and Israel finds little place in St Paul's thoughts. But St Paul, though a Hebrew of Hebrews, who loved his nation and gloried in the thought of their covenant privileges (Rom. ix. 1–4), mourned over their failure to realize their destiny, though with the hope of their final salvation (Rom. ix.–xi.). They were branches broken off, though they might be grafted in again. There were moments when he indulged in the thought of individual Christians as true Israelites. 'They who are of faith are Abraham's sons.' In them is fulfilled the promise 'all nations shall be blessed in thee.' 'If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise' (Gal. iii. 7–9, 26–29); 'that he might be the father of all them that believe who are uncircumcised' (Rom. iv. 11); 'the Israel of God' (Gal. vi. 16). But

[1] The reading ἀπαρχή of B 47 67** is to be rejected.

[2] Even this is borrowed from the Old Testament, Ps. xxxiv (xxxiii.), 8.

these give the impression of being only figures of speech. His struggle for the freedom of Gentiles from the obligations of Judaism resulted, for his mind, in a volcanic eruption which clave asunder the realm of law and the realm of grace[1]. There was a spiritual 'wall of partition' no less real than the wall of stone which excluded Gentiles from the temple court. This was broken down so that Jew and Gentile became one in Christ Jesus (Eph. ii. 14 ff.).

But St Peter much more clearly conceives of Christians corporately as Israel—Israel as it was intended to be. His thought is an application to the people of God of the words 'I came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil,' which sum up the principle of continuity as our Lord taught it in the Sermon on the Mount. Christians are Israel 'fulfilled.' There may have been some Jewish Christians in the communities of Asia Minor for whom the letter was written; but he wrote primarily for Gentiles[2], which makes the thought of continuity the more striking. He calls them 'sojourners of the Dispersion' (i. 1), i.e. the Dispersion of the true Israel.

We can consider (*a*) the status and functions of Christians, (*b*) their salvation.

(*a*) They are, according to God's foreknowledge, 'elect' or 'select,' ἐκλεκτοί (i. 1), i.e. peculiarly precious, as Israel is described in post-exilic passages, e.g. Ps. lxxxix. (lxxxviii.), 3, cv. (civ.), 6, 43, cvi. (cv.), 5; Is. lxv. 9, 15,

[1] It was this that made his epistles so congenial to Marcion.

[2] The agreement arrived at, as described in Gal. ii. 9, that Paul and Barnabas should go to the Gentiles, and James, Cephas, and John to the Circumcision, can have been only a *modus vivendi* for the immediate future, 'a vague working agreement' (Emmet in Foakes Jackson and Lake's *The Beg. of Christianity*, I. ii. 292). It did not prevent St Paul, on his missionary journeys, from preaching to 'Jews first'; and it would not prevent St Peter, years afterwards, from writing an open letter to Asiatic Christians.

23; Wisd. iii. 9, iv. 15; Sir. xlvi. 1; an 'elect race' (ii. 9) as in Is. xliii. 20; cf. Est. xvi. [E], 21. In the Messiah is fulfilled (ii. 4, 6) the description in Is. xxviii. 16 of Israel as an 'elect [choice] corner-stone.' God's words to Israel at Sinai (Ex. xix. 6), 'ye shall be to Me a royal priestly body (*βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα*) and an holy nation,' are true in the persons of Christians (ii. 9). As Israel was God's son (Ex. iv. 22; Hos. xi. 1) so they are 'begotten anew' (i. 3, 23), i.e. made His sons in a fresh and truer sense in the form of Christians. (There is nothing mystical in this, as in St Paul's 'new creation' (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15). They are begotten anew by the Word of God, i.e. His call to them in the Gospel message to become His sons, which they had accepted.) Israel was the sacred people (λαός) of God (ii. 9). And God said, through Hosea, that as a punishment for their sins they would be 'not My people' (Lo-ammi), but that on repentance they would again become His people; they would be 'not-pitied' (or 'loved,' Lo-ruḥāmah), but that afterwards they would again be 'pitied' (Hos. ii. 23). This restoration, says St Peter, is fulfilled in Christians (ii. 10)[1]. He tells them that 'the Spirit of God resteth upon you' (iv. 14), as it was foretold that it should rest upon the Shoot from the root of Jesse (Is. xi. 2). He calls them 'the house of God[2]' (iv. 17), as Israel was called in Ez. ix. 6 (from which he quotes) and elsewhere. And quite simply and practically he says that Christian women are the true children of Sarah, if they obey their husbands as she obeyed hers (iii. 6).

[1] St Paul quotes the same passage, with others about the Remnant, in Rom. ix. 25 ff. But it is difficult not to think that he uses the words merely as Biblical words which he can employ, *more Rabbinico*, for his own purpose, applying them expressly to Christian Jews and Gentiles alike. For St Peter they more clearly contribute to his theory of continuity.

[2] Cf. Heb. iii. 2–6.

(*b*) This being the status of Christians their spiritual history is the fulfilment of the history of God's ancient people. In much of what St Peter says about salvation and the Christian life he has before his mind the events of the Exodus. The sacred people, God's sons, foreknown, elect, and called, were in slavery in Egypt. But God had prepared and reserved for them an inheritance[1]. All their journeyings towards it were full of trials and troubled by foes, and until they reached it they were 'strangers and sojourners,' and had not yet arrived at their salvation. The first step was their emancipation from bondage by means of the Passover and the sprinkling of the blood.

That picture supplies St Peter with nearly the whole of his simple soteriology. Gentiles had formerly lived in lusts in their ignorance (i. 14); they had inherited from their fathers a vain manner of life, from which they were redeemed, emancipated (*v.* 18). The time past sufficed for them to take part in all the abominable sins of the Gentiles (iv. 3). God had called them out of darkness into His marvellous light (ii. 9). And it was through the blood of Christ that this emancipation was effected; they were 'elect...unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ' (i. 2); they were 'redeemed with precious blood as of a lamb without blemish and spot, even Christ' (*vv.* 18, 19), a clear reference to the Passover (Exod. xii. 5). Having been redeemed they had before them a time of sojourning which they must pass in fear (i. 17); they were 'sojourners' (*v.* 1), 'strangers and sojourners' (ii. 11); they must spend the remainder of their time in the flesh to the will of God (iv. 2); and they must resist their spiritual enemy, firm as an army with a united

[1] The substantive κληρονομία or the verb -μεῖν occurs at least 120 times in the Old Testament of Israel's possession of Canaan.

front (*στερεοί*) in their confident belief (*τῇ πίστει*) that they would reach their inheritance (v. 9). At present they were subjected to trial (i. 6 f., iii. 14, 17, iv. 1. 12–16, 19, v. 10), Christian slaves in particular (ii. 19–21). But an inheritance awaits them (such as the land of Canaan ought to have been, if Israel had not sinned) 'unravaged, undefiled, and unwithering' (i. 4), reserved in heaven till you (*εἰς ὑμᾶς*), so that God's people waited for it until it was consummated in Christianity[1]. Christians were called to inherit blessing (iii. 9); God has called them unto His eternal glory (v. 10). And the attainment of that is salvation (i. 5, 9 f., ii. 2), for which they were guarded in the power of God, and which is ready to be revealed at the last time (i. 5). Therefore they must endure their trials, and live through their short sojourning, upheld by hope (i. 3, 13, 21, iii. 5, 15) and faith (i. 5, 7, 9, 21, v. 9).

There is little reason for thinking that it was Pauline influence which led St Peter to grasp the emancipating efficacy of Christ's death. St Paul, it is true, says 'Christ our Paschal Victim was sacrificed on our behalf' (1 Cor. v. 8); but St Peter, though not using the word *πάσχα*, which he might have borrowed from St Paul, gives the type a more central position in his thoughts[2]. But he

[1] Exactly as in Heb. xi. 39, 40. The same thought underlies 1 Pet. i. 10–12.

[2] A different meaning is contained in 'the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ' (i. 2) if it refers, as Hort held, to the covenant ceremony at Mt Sinai, when the people promised obedience to the Law, and Moses sprinkled them with sacrificial blood (Exod. xxiv. 7, 8). The collocation of 'obedience' and 'sprinkling' is striking. But if the reference is to that incident, and not to the sprinkling of the blood upon the door-posts, by which they were protected from death, and which was the beginning of their emancipation, St Peter suggests a conception of

makes large use also of the 'lamb,' 'the sheep,' of Is. liii. 7, a chapter which we have already seen referred to in our Lord's teaching (p. 41 f.) and in the Petrine speeches (p. 124). He speaks of Christ 'who did no sin neither was guile found in His mouth' (ii. 22; Is. liii. 9); 'by whose stripes ye were healed' (ii. 24; Is. *v.* 5); 'who Himself bare our sins' (ii. 24; Is. *v.* 11). He died once for all περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, as an offering for sins (iii. 18; Is. *v.* 10). And the 'wandering sheep' (ii. 25) is a reminiscence of Is. *v.* 6. It is probable that through the use of *testimonia* the passage in *Isaiah* became widely used in the Church. Yet it is noteworthy that, though we may suppose the chapter to have been frequently at the back of his mind, St Paul makes only one (possible) allusion (Rom. iv. 25) to its language: 'who was delivered up on account of our transgressions' (παραπτώματα).

St Peter, however, does not offer any reasoned theory of the Atonement. His words about Christ's sufferings are 'the unrestrained expansion of the exhortation to endure' (Kennedy). The death of the Paschal Lamb was the means of our emancipation, and Christ is an example to Christians in His humility (ii. 21–23) and His sufferings (iv. 1)[1]. So that Christians are partakers of those sufferings (iv. 13), and thereby die to sins (ii. 24, iv. 2). It is noticeable, however, that the language is wholly different from

the Atonement different from that in i. 18, and one which approaches the sacrificial aspect in the stricter sense that is found in *Hebrews*. But if he had arrived at that truth, he would probably not have contented himself with a single incidental reference to it. The sprinkling of the Paschal blood at the moment of the deliverance accounts well enough for his language, and is more in keeping with the rest of the epistle. Cf. Heb. xi. 28, 'By faith he kept the Passover and the sprinkling of the blood.'

[1] Cf. the teaching of the Apocalypse (p. 168 ff.).

St Paul's, who in similar expressions uses 'sin' in the singular not the plural[1].

St Paul with his fuller theory of Atonement also gives to the word 'salvation' a more complex meaning. It is a spiritual state or condition which can be considered from three points of view.

1. Salvation is something due to God's undeserved grace, and must be appropriated by faith. 'By grace ye have been saved' (Eph. ii. 5); 'by grace ye have been saved through faith' (*v.* 8). 'In hope (*sc.* of a future consummation not yet realized) we were saved' (Rom. viii. 24). 'If thou shalt confess...thou shalt be saved' (Rom. x. 9), i.e. placed in the condition which must afterwards be progressively realized. 'It pleased God through the foolishness of the message preached to save those who believed' (1 Cor. i. 21). 'The Gospel...through which also ye are saved' (xv. 2). 'The Gospel of your salvation' (Eph. i. 13). 'Forbidding to preach to the Gentiles that they may be saved' (1 Thes. ii. 16). 'They received not the love of the truth that they might be saved' (2 Thes. ii. 10).

2. Those who have appropriated it are realizing it progressively. They are 'being saved' (1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15). 'Work out your own salvation' (Phil. ii. 12).

3. The final realization. 'We shall be saved through Him from the wrath' (Rom. v. 9), i.e. the final doom. 'God appointed us not for wrath but for the obtaining of salvation' (1 Thes. v. 9). 'God chose you from the beginning unto salvation...unto which condition (εἰς ὅ) He called you through our gospel' (2 Thes. ii. 14). 'Now

[1] Contrast *ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι* and *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίαις* (*ἁμαρτίας*, however, is a *v.l.*) with the expressions in Rom. vi. 2, 7, 10, 11, 18, 22.

is our salvation nearer than when we [first] believed' (Rom. xiii. 11).

But St Peter always (with one exception) has his eyes fixed on the end of the journeyings. Salvation is something 'ready to be revealed at the last time' (i. 5). 'The end [the aim, goal, τέλος] of your confident trust is the salvation of your souls' (*v.* 9), a salvation which the prophets foretold by divine inspiration without understanding its meaning (*v.* 10). Christians just converted from paganism are as new-born babes, and must 'grow unto salvation' (ii. 2). It is the living hope unto which they were begotten as God's sons (i. 3); the blessedness of those who reach the inheritance reserved for them in heaven (*v.* 4); the grace that is being brought to them for which they must hope (*v.* 13); the 'grace of life,' an inheritance of which husbands and wives are fellow-heirs (iii. 7); 'the glory about to be revealed' (v. 1); 'the unfading crown of glory' (*v.* 4): God's eternal glory to which He called them (*v.* 10). It is not without cause that the epistle has been called the epistle of hope. The actual word is not very frequent (substantive, i. 3, 21, iii. 15; verb, i. 13, iii. 5), but the whole epistle is one confident gaze forwards.

In one difficult passage, in which the influence of St Paul is probably to be seen, the thought is expressed of a present, potential, salvation: 'Baptism doth now save us' (iii. 21). (It is surprising that, with the history of the Exodus before his mind, St Peter does not utilize the crossing of the sea as a type of baptism, as St Paul does in 1 Cor. x. 2. The outward and visible act of release from Egypt set the Israelites at the beginning of their journey, with the final salvation still to be reached, which is exactly in accordance with St Peter's thought. His preference for the Flood as his type, in which eight souls were 'saved

by water,' is due to the preceding context.) But he shews that baptismal salvation is potential and not final by the parenthesis which follows, 'not the putting off of the grossness of the (material) flesh, but the appeal of a good conscience towards God[1].'

Further, God will not bring us to final salvation in spite of ourselves. In iv. 1–6 it is taught that Christ's work for us, as for the spirits in prison, was consequent upon His death; and we must similarly suffer if we are to be freed from sins. The bold phrase 'he that hath suffered in the

[1] I follow the explanation of Archbishop Bernard, now Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, in his *Studia Sacra*, pp. 44–47. The whole of chaps. i., ii. should be read.

In connexion with his teaching on baptism and suffering (iii. 18–iv. 6) St Peter alludes to the doctrine of Christ's descent into Hades, often called at a later time the 'harrowing of hell,' which appears prominently in the patristic age. 'We acquiesce,' as Dr Bernard says (p. 16), 'in this article of the Creed, as expressing that our Lord was truly man in His death as in His life, and that His spirit underwent experiences after death like to those which we shall share. He "went" to the place of departed souls. But of any mission which He fulfilled there, we think but little.' St Paul is the earliest writer known to us who alludes to this belief, and connects it with baptism. But he does not formulate the doctrine; and his words 'Are ye ignorant that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? etc.' (Rom. vi. 3–5) seem to imply that his readers were not, in fact, ignorant of it, though they were in danger of allowing the truth to have no influence on their lives. If so, Christians had already begun to work out the parallel; and the belief of the descent into Hades must have been current earlier still. In the first days of the Church's life some must have asked themselves, What did the soul of Jesus do, and where did it go, between His death and resurrection? And the doctrine of the Descent was their attempt at an answer. It did not, then, originate either with St Paul or with our epistle. But it may well be that St Peter was one who contributed in early days to its formation.

The suggestion, revived by Rendel Harris, that ἐν ᾧ καὶ (1 Pet. iii. 19) should be read Ἐνώχ (Enoch), or, as he prefers, ἐν ᾧ καὶ Ἐνώχ, is ingenious but hardly probable. See Peake's note in brackets in his *Commentary on the Bible*, p. 911.

flesh hath ceased unto sins' (*v.* 1) is similar only in appearance to St Paul's words, 'He that has died has been justified from sin' (Rom. vi. 7). But his baptismal doctrine is akin to St Paul's. It is as if he said 'Work out your own salvation—make real the symbolical descent into Hades and rising again in baptism—for it is Christ who worketh in you by His death and rising again.'

3. Other points of importance in St Peter's teaching can best be studied by examining a few notable words which illustrate the contrast between the comparative simplicity of his thoughts and the complexity of St Paul's.

(*a*) *Faith.* The whole epistle, as has been said, is one confident gaze forwards. This confidence is described not only as 'hope' but also as 'faith.' The two words are almost synonymous. See, e.g., i. 21: 'that your faith and hope might be towards God.' Hope is buoyant expectancy; faith is the unshakeable confidence of mind which accompanies it both as cause and effect. Christians are guarded in the power of God by faith (i. 5), the approved worth of which is shewn by fiery testing (*v.* 7), and its goal is the salvation of their souls (*v.* 9); by its inspiration they can stand firm against the devil (v. 9). The verb 'believe' is once used absolutely, of Christians as 'believers' (ii. 7)[1]; and once of placing confident trust in Christ (εἰς ὃν...πιστεύοντες, i. 8); cf. πιστεύειν ἐπί in the quotation (ii. 6) from the LXX. St Peter's meaning of 'faith' is well illustrated by the speech attributed to him at the Council: 'We confidently expect to be saved (πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι) even as they' (Acts xv. 11). In *Hebrews* also this is the principal aspect of it (p. 254 ff.). It is quite different from the intellectual assent of which St James speaks (p. 102), and only one factor in the great thing taught

[1] Cf. Acts ii. 44, iv. 32.

by St Paul. 'We are not translated from the old condition into the new against our will. Our whole being must co-operate by desiring and accepting the transference, thus being united with Christ and obtaining all the blessings which that involves. This desire and acceptance with the whole being St Paul calls πίστις, *Faith.* It is far from being a mere intellectual acceptance of facts about Christ. It is that condition or attitude of our being which performs our necessary part in making real the transference already ideally enacted. It includes a trust in God, a self-delivery, a self-abandonment to God for Him to do what we cannot do for ourselves. It is a living, experimental acceptance of oneness with Christ, which, from the nature of the case, springs from repentance (Rom. ii. 4), and issues in a life of sanctification by which the potential becomes actual[1].'

(*b*) *Grace.* The same simple conception of the relation between the personal God and the individual Christian is seen in St Peter's use of the word 'grace,' χάρις, which falls short of the range of meaning which St Paul finds in it. There is something joyful and happy in the word, as though he never forgot that χάρις and χαίρειν were closely allied.

Firstly, it is a kindly disposition which enjoys conferring favours. It is God's disposition towards His people. He is 'the God of all grace' (v. 10). His is the manifold (ποικίλη) grace from which flow the *charismata* to be administered by men for the advantage of others (iv. 10). St Peter prays that this kindly favour of God may be multiplied to his readers (i. 2); and he quotes from Prov. iii. 34 that God bestows it upon the humble (v. 5).

Secondly, it is the delightful and enjoyable result which

[1] *St Paul: His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine*, p. 294 f. See also W. H. P. Hatch, *The Pauline idea of Faith in its relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion* (Camb. Mass. 1916).

accrues to man, equivalent to *εὐλογία* (iii. 9). But with his forward gaze St Peter uses it mainly of the final result, the inheritance which Gentiles will share, the joyful life in the Land of promise. The prophets 'prophesied of the grace destined for you' (*τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος*, i. 10). 'Set your hope upon the grace that is being brought to you in the revelation of Jesus Christ' (*v.* 13). Husband and wife are 'joint-heirs of the grace [consisting] of life' (iii. 7), i.e. all that Christianity means and will mean.

Both aspects of its meaning, the divine kindness which blesses, and the blessing which ensues, seem to be contained in v. 12: 'testifying that this is the true grace of God,' this is the right way of regarding all that you have been taught about God's favour to Christians and its results now and in the future[1].

St Paul adds something to both aspects. Firstly, on God's side he emphasizes the sheer undeserved, gratuitous nature of the kindness. The meaning of 'grace' thus approaches that of *ἔλεος*, 'mercy,' 'compassionate pity.' 'To him that worketh, the reward is reckoned not as a matter of grace but of debt' (Rom. iv. 4); cf. *v.* 16, v. 15, 17, 20, xi. 6, etc.[2] And this gratuitous kindness is for the most part conceived of as exercised with a particular end in view; it is a disposition and design to effect sinful man's salvation by means which God alone can provide. But further, it reveals itself in a divine power or influence imparted to man, which also is called 'grace.' 'By the grace of God I am what I am,' etc. (1 Cor. xv. 10). 'My grace is sufficient for thee' (2 Cor. xii. 9).

[1] In ii. 19 f. *χάρις* is a right disposition on man's part which gives pleasure to God.

[2] In v. 15, 16 *χάρισμα*, the concrete expression of *χάρις*, has the same connotation.

Secondly, on man's side the apostle's mystical apprehension of the divine indwelling leads him to use the same word to express the results which God's grace produces in him, e.g. power and equipment for work. 'Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we received grace and apostleship' (Rom. i. 5); 'the grace given to me' (Rom. xii. 3, 6, xv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Gal. ii. 9); 'to each one of us was given grace' (Eph. iv. 7). Or, more generally, it is the spiritual condition of those in whom God's grace is found. 'This grace wherein ye stand' (Rom. v. 2); 'Ye have fallen from grace' (Gal. v. 4). Finally, it is the thankfulness produced in man (Rom. vi. 17, etc.)[1].

(*c*) *Holiness.* The Hebrew idea of Israel as one whole, 'sacred,' 'consecrated,' appears in the quotation in ii. 9, 'a sacred race.' Israel's national relation of privilege to God is perpetuated in the Christian relation. They are a spiritual house 'for the performance of a sacred sacerdotal function' (εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, ii. 5). But this, of course, implies and demands an ethical quality, a saintliness or holiness to which Christians must progressively attain by 'sanctification of spirit' (i. 2). 'Become ye—shew yourselves to be (γενήθητε)—holy in all manner of life' (*v.* 15), because it has been written 'Be ye holy because I am holy' (*v.* 16). And the 'holy women' (iii. 5) were those who not merely belonged to the sacred nation but were also of this moral character.

St Paul with his great love for his nation makes use explicitly of the Hebrew idea. 'If the firstfruit be sacred (ἁγία), the lump is also; and if the root be sacred, the branches are also' (Rom. xi. 16); i.e. as the patriarchs, who were the firstfruit and the root, were in a national

[1] It is used even of actions which are evidence of the reception of grace, such as almsgiving (1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 6, 19).

sense sacred, so their descendants, Jews at the present day, still retain that sacredness, and can be brought in to share with Christians the new, real sacredness of God's people. A non-Christian husband shares in the sacredness of his Christian wife (*ἡγίασται ἐν τῇ γυναικί*) and *vice versa* (*ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ*) (1 Cor. vii. 14). St Paul preaches the Gospel of God as a priestly act (*ἱερουγοῦντα*), 'that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, consecrated (*ἡγιασμένη*) in [the] holy spirit' (Rom. xv. 16). This, as in 1 *Peter*, demands the ethical quality of holiness. In Eph. i. 4, ii. 21, v. 27 it is spoken of in its final completeness as an end to be attained, and attained by a process (1 Thes. v. 23) which is described by the word *ἁγιασμός* (Rom. vi. 19, 22; 1 Thes. iv. 3, 4, 7). But those who are thus progressing can be called, even now, 'holy' (1 Cor. vii. 34), and their spiritual condition is *ἁγιωσύνη* (Rom. i. 4; 2 Cor. vii. 1).

But where St Paul differs, as usual, from St Peter is in his conception of the mystical oneness of Christians with Christ, which leads him to carry the meaning of the word yet further back. 'In Christ' holiness has already been potentially, ideally, reached, and can be reached by no other means. 'From Him [God] are ye in Christ Jesus, who became unto us wisdom from God, and both righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption' (1 Cor. i. 30). Thus not only is the whole Christian Body holy, as one temple (1 Cor. iii. 17); not only did Christ die that He might make it holy, as a bride, whom He might finally present unto Himself spotlessly holy (Eph. v. 25–27); but individual Christians can be thought of as already 'sanctified in Christ Jesus' (1 Cor. i. 2), and at the moment that they became Christians they could be spoken of as having been washed, sanctified, and justified (vi. 11). All these

aspects are contained in the word ἅγιοι, 'saints,' which the apostle normally applies to Christians.

(*d*) *Righteousness.* Exactly the same difference is seen here. To be righteous is, for St Peter, simply to be *ẓaddīq*, to shew a good moral character. 'The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous' (iii. 12, from Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 16). 'If the righteous man is barely saved, where will the impious and the sinner appear?' (iv. 18, from Prov. xi. 31, LXX.). 'Christ died...a righteous man in behalf of unrighteous men' (iii. 18). 'That having died to sins we might live to righteousness' (ii. 24). The language of this clause is reminiscent of St Paul's; but 'righteousness' in opposition to 'sins' (plural) is only practical morality. 'If ye should suffer on account of righteousness'—i.e. on account of your practical morality—'happy are ye' (iii. 14). There is not a trace of the distinctively Pauline doctrine, i.e. that morality, obedience to the moral law, could put man 'in the right' in God's sight if—and only if—that obedience were quite perfect; but that being impossible for fallen human nature, it is useless and fatal for man to attempt to 'establish his own righteousness' (Rom. x. 3); he must accept 'God's righteousness,' which means that plunged by faith into mystical union with Christ who died for him, he attains, potentially and ideally, to the status of being 'in the right' in God's sight, and God treats him accordingly.

(*e*) *Sin.* From the universal incapacity to obtain righteousness by obedience to moral law follows one of St Paul's most characteristic conceptions. In 1 *Peter*, as in the Synoptic Gospels and *Acts*[1], ἁμαρτία is '*a* sin,' a

[1] Where the singular is found only in Mat. xii. 31, 'every sin and blasphemy,' and Acts vii. 60, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.'

concrete act, equivalent to ἁμάρτημα, which St Peter does not use. It is plural throughout the epistle[1], except in ii. 22 'who did not commit (any) sin.' But in the Pauline epistles the plural is rare, and Sin (in the singular) looms in the *Romans* like some gigantic nightmare shape. It is a deadly and universal *power*, which is virtually personified as a master, a sovereign. 'Both Jews and Gentiles are all under sin' (Rom. iii. 9); it 'entered into the world' (v. 12), and 'was in the world' during the time before the law was given (*v.* 13); it 'reigned in [the realm of] death' (*v.* 21). 'Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal bodies' (vi. 12). It holds men as slaves (vi. 6, 20); it 'lords it' over them (*v.* 14); they need to be freed from it (*vv.* 18, 22); and it gives death as its 'wages' (*v.* 23). It uses law as the handle or occasion for its baneful activity (vii. 8, 11); men are 'sold under it' (*v.* 14); and it 'dwells in' a man (*vv.* 17, 20). But through the Incarnation and Death of His Son God 'condemned (i.e. doomed) sin in the flesh' (viii. 3).

(*f*) *Flesh and Spirit.* 'Flesh' has no moral connotation in 1 *Peter* such as St Paul often gives to it. As in the Old Testament it is simply equivalent to 'body,' the material frame. Baptism is stated to be 'not the putting off of the grossness of the flesh[2]' (iii. 21). 'Christ suffered, and those who imitate Him suffer, in the flesh' (iv. 1). 'Human life is the passing of a period of time in the flesh' (*v.* 2). In a quotation from the Old Testament (i. 24), 'all flesh is as grass,' it connotes frailty and transience. Twice (iii. 18, iv. 6) it is used in contradistinction to 'spirit,' the non-

[1] Unless iv. 1 is an exception. Intrinsic probability is in favour of ἁμαρτίαις (ℵ^c^B), which is supported by ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι in ii. 24. But if ἁμαρτίας (ℵ*AC, etc.) is correct, it has the abstract sense of a condition of sinfulness, which it bears (e.g.) in Jam. i. 15

[2] See p. 150.

material condition in which a human being is held to exist after the death of the flesh or body. St Paul has a similar contrast in 1 Cor. v. 5: 'to deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord'; and he contrasts his own human spirit with his material body or flesh in *v.* 3, Col. ii. 5. But this cannot be called a Paulinism[1]; a similar distinction is found, for example, in Is. xxxi. 3, 'their horses are flesh and not spirit.' The true Pauline distinction is very different. St Paul, whose temperament led him to feel things more acutely than most people, felt intensely the corruption of sin. 'When the meaning of "spirit" is raised by St Paul to a higher plane, that of "flesh" is thrust to a lower one. His own bitter experience of the internal war involved in living the spiritual life, owing to the fact that the hostile force of sin employed as its handle and instrument the body which is made of flesh, led him for the most part to prefer "flesh" to "body" as the right word to express a moral contrast with "spirit" (Rom. vii. 5, 18, 25, viii. 3–13, xiii. 14; Gal. v. 16, 17, 19, 24, vi. 8). And as he uses ψυχικός "psychic," so he could use σαρκικός, "fleshly," and σαρκινός, "made of flesh," in the sense of non-spiritual (Rom. vii. 14, xv. 27; 1 Cor. iii. 1, 3, ix. 11; 2 Cor. i. 12, x. 4), which sometimes, from the nature of the case, verges on "unspiritual" or "sinful"'[2].

St Paul raised the meaning of 'spirit' to a higher plane by giving it a moral connotation. For St Peter 'spirit' is either divine or human. (1) It is the Spirit of Christ that inspired the Old Testament prophets (i. 11); the 'holy Spirit sent down from heaven' on the first preachers of

[1] As by H. A. A. Kennedy, *Exp. Times*, xxvii. 268 f.
[2] *St Paul; his Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine*, p. 281 f.

the Gospel (*v.* 12); 'the Spirit of glory and of God' which 'rests upon' Christians (iv. 14). These are in each case in accord with Old Testament conceptions of the divine Spirit. (2) In man it is, as said above, the non-material, non-bodily condition after death (iii. 18, iv. 6). In iii. 19 this usage is extended, as in the apocryphal and other late Jewish writings, to denote the actual persons who were in this condition,—'the spirits.' But also, as frequently in the Old Testament, the word stands for the seat of man's moral life; Christian progress consists in 'sanctification of spirit[1]' (i. 2); and 'a meek and quiet spirit' is commended (iii. 4).

But in St Paul's teaching on the Spirit, all his mystical grasp of the relation between God and the Christian finds its clearest expression. 'When the ordinary, natural man becomes a Christian, translated (potentially) into the Messianic kingdom, he is at once (potentially) immersed in, filled, permeated, with the divine Spirit. He is not a being composed of body, soul, and spirit[2], but of body and soul plunged into a new world of being, a spiritual atmosphere, a spiritual ocean; he is in possession of an all-pervading divine force. See Rom. viii.; 1 Cor. ii., xii.' 'Occasionally St Paul uses *pneuma*, "spirit," loosely of the mind and feelings, much in the sense of "heart" (e.g. 1 Cor. ii. 11, v. 3, xvi. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 13; Col. ii. 5); but in the great mass of passages the Christian's "spirit" is that which he possesses, or in which he lives, in virtue of his

[1] *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος.* The A.V. and R.V. have 'the Spirit,' giving the impression that the passage contains the names of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity. But is almost certainly incorrect.

[2] In a single passage, 1 Thes. v. 23, they are mentioned in a way that might suggest that. And this has led some writers to use the word 'trichotomy' in dealing with St Paul's ideas on psychology.

having been transferred into the new condition of existence in the Spirit of God. Thus there are passages in which the Christian's spirit and God's Spirit are not strictly distinguishable[1].'

CHAPTER V

THE BOOK OF THE REVELATION

Nothing can be gained for our purpose by discussing the identity of the writer of this unique work, who calls himself 'John.' It is here simply taken for granted that he is not the author of the Fourth Gospel or of the Johannine epistles (*pace* Dr Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 149). If this epistle to the seven Churches (for that is what the whole book is) did not bear the name John, identity of authorship would never have crossed the mind of any reader. The language—vocabulary and grammar—forbids it; and the similarities of thought which exist are far outweighed by the differences. The book in its present form belongs to the last years of the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81–96), as early patristic authorities state, though it contains material which appears to be drawn from earlier sources presupposing events under Nero and Vespasian. Except in his teaching on the transcendent glory of the exalted Christ the writer does not attain to St Paul's level. This is due to his intensely Jewish cast of thought, and to the apocalyptic nature of the writing. 'The chief theme of the Apocalypse is not what God in Christ has done for the world' [which is St Paul's chief theme], 'but what He will yet do, and what the assured

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 279 f.

consummation will be[1].' The seer proclaims unceasingly to the persecuted and oppressed the certainty of final victory, the great end to which the Jewish apocalyptists also strained their eyes, but, unlike them, he declares that the consummation will be reached through Christ. Since this was his object in writing, and not the teaching of theology, his references to the Being and Nature of God are incidental, but they help to an understanding of his general religious outlook, and may be studied first.

1. *The Nature of God.* On this subject the writer's thoughts can be described as 'pre-Pauline.' His express statements do not advance beyond the best Old Testament ideas, and in some respects even fall short of them.

(*a*) *He is Everlasting.* The author asserts this more clearly than any other New Testament writer. 'Which is, and which was, and which is to come' (i. 4, iv. 8); 'which is and which was' (xi. 17, xvi. 5); 'which liveth for ever and ever' (iv. 9, 10, x. 6, xv. 7). 'The Alpha and Omega' (i. 8); 'the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End' (xxi. 6), i.e. the first and the final Cause of all things. 'The King of the ages' (xv. 3).

(*b*) His power is universal and supreme. He created all things (iv. 11, x. 6, xiv. 7). He is the Master, δεσπότης,—a word used elsewhere in the New Testament of God in Lk. ii. 29, Acts iv. 24 only, and, in simile, in 2 Tim. ii. 21, but fairly common in the Old Testament. He is '[the] Lord' (xv. 4, xxii. 6), 'our Lord' (xi. 15), 'Lord God' (xviii. 8, xxii. 5), 'our Lord and God' (iv. 11), 'the Lord of the earth' (xi. 4). The word 'Lord' is used of God in the synoptic Gospels, *Hebrews*, *James*, 1, 2 *Peter*, *Jude*, but never with certainty by St Paul or St John except in Old Testament quotations where it stands in the LXX.

[1] Charles, *Revelation*, i. p. cix.

as the equivalent for Yahweh. Especially, He is 'God all-sovereign,' ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ (xvi. 14, xix. 15), the LXX. rendering of 'God of Hosts'; or 'Lord God all-sovereign' (i. 8, iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 6, xxi. 22). St Paul has κύριος παντοκράτωρ once (2 Cor. vi. 18) in a quotation, but it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. Cf. κύριος σαβαώθ (Rom. ix. 29, a quotation, and James v. 4).

(*c*) His character is described in terms strictly in accord with the Old Testament ideas of holiness and righteousness. God is 'holy': ὅσιος (xvi. 5); μόνος ὅσιος (xv. 4); and ἅγιος (iv. 8, vi. 10). The former word is used of God occasionally in the LXX., but not elsewhere in the New Testament. God is 'righteous' (xvi. 5), and His judgments are righteous (xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 2). With the latter cf. Rom. ii. 5; 2 Thes. i. 5; but though St Paul often speaks of His 'righteousness,' mostly with his own special connotation, he never applies the adjective to Him. And the Apocalypse stands alone in the New Testament in the use, borrowed from the LXX., of the word ἀληθινός, in the sense of ἀληθής, 'true,' 'trustworthy,' 'without falsity *or* error.' It is used of God (vi. 10), and of His ways (xv. 3), judgments (xvi. 7, xix. 2), and words (xix. 9, xxi. 5, xxii. 6); also of Christ (iii. 7, 14, xix. 11). This is different from the meaning which it bears in 1 Thes. i. 9, 'the living and true (*or* real) God' as opposed to idols. The latter force is found in Lk. xvi. 11, and is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, *Hebrews*, and 1 *John*.

(*d*) The outcome of God's supreme power and righteous character is seen in His judgments upon the wicked and upon the cosmic powers of evil. The writer pictures, with a revelry of word-painting, on a scale gigantic and terrific,

the woes, plagues, tortures, and world horrors that are heaped upon the foes of God,—with whom, inseparably associated in the vast triumph, is the Lamb. Dr Charles[1] writes: 'Many scholars have emphasized this peculiarity of the Apocalypse, and insisted accordingly on the Jewish character of its doctrine of God. But to draw such a conclusion betrays a total misapprehension of the question at issue. The Christian elements are not dwelt upon because they can all be inferred from what the Book teaches regarding the Son; for all that the Son has and is is derived from the Father.' But the misapprehension is not really so complete. What the Book teaches regarding the Son, all that He has and is, while Christologically correct from the Pauline standpoint, is presented almost exclusively from the eschatological point of view of triumph and vindication. And this leaves upon the mind an impression of the divine character which is not very different from that of the God of the Old Testament. All that Christ has done and will do for Christians is that which procures for them ultimate victory, and exultation in the raptures of heavenly bliss when their sufferings are avenged. This kind of apocalyptic expectation appears in certain passages of St Paul (e.g. 1 Thes. v. 2 f.; 2 Thes. i. 5–10, ii. 8–12; 1 Cor. xv. 25); but in the writing before us the author dwells on that plane throughout. It is that which tends to obscure the gracious attributes of God. Of His 'mercy,' 'grace' or 'love' there is not a word, though there are three passages in which Christ's love is mentioned, i. 5, iii. 9, 19. In the first He is spoken of as loving (ἀγαπῶντι) Christians whom He has loosed from their sins with His blood. In the second, where the language is reminiscent

[1] *Revelation*, i. p. cix f.

of II Isaiah[1], He shews His love to them in making their Jewish opponents, the synagogue of Satan, come and do obeisance before their feet. In the third, drawn from Prov. iii. 12[2], He says 'As many as I love (φιλῶ) I rebuke and chasten.'

(*e*) His Fatherhood. Five times (i. 6, ii. 27, iii. 5, 21, xiv. 1) God is spoken of as the Father of Jesus Christ; and in ii. 18 the seer says 'Thus saith the Son of God.' But he does not indicate what he thought was doctrinally involved; he cannot be said to give any teaching on God's Fatherhood in relation to Christ. He shews no trace of a metaphysical explanation, and never uses the terms 'the Father' or 'the Son' absolutely. In relation to men, the divine Fatherhood is referred to only once, and in Old Testament language: 'He that conquereth shall inherit these things, and I will be to Him God, and he shall be to Me son[3]' (xxi. 7); i.e. the Christian who wins the victory shall share in the sonship promised to the chosen people in the person of the Davidic King. But this makes no approach to St Paul's teaching on sonship possessed in virtue of mystical union with the Son (see p. 30 f.). Sonship is not said to be received as a gift of grace, but it is to be *won* by victory; and therefore it is described not as a blessed prerogative enjoyed now, but as a blessed consummation to be reached as a future reward. The writer may have conceived of that as the consummation of a sonship possessed now; but the nature of his thoughts,

[1] Cf. Is. xliii. 4. 'Because thou wast precious in My sight, thou wast glorified, and I loved thee' (ἠγάπησα). And for the obeisance of enemies, xlv. 14, xlix. 23.

[2] ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ κύριος ἐλέγχει (*v.l.* παιδεύει). It looks as if there were duplicate versions, from which our author built up his sentence.

[3] Cf. 2 Sam. vii. 14, quoted accurately in Heb. i. 5.

and his consistently apocalyptic outlook, did not lead him to say so.

2. *The Nature of Christ.* The Christology of the Apocalypse does not differ essentially from St Paul's. It can be summed up under (*a*) the Eternity of Christ, (*b*) His human life and death, (*c*) His exaltation. But the emphasis is on the first and third, while St Paul lays it on the redeeming death. But the writer does not aim at teaching a Christology; he wishes only to present Christ's supremacy and triumph for the encouragement of his readers, as an assurance of their ultimate triumph; his descriptions of all that Christ was and is are only the basis of his eschatology.

(*a*) Nothing could exceed the boldness and freedom with which he applies to Christ expressions used of God (see below), ascribing to Him a cosmic value, as St Paul does in *Colossians* and *Ephesians*. He is 'the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End' (xxii. 13). Each expression, with solemn insistence, declares the same truth, that Christ is the active principle in creation, both as first and as final Cause; 'the First and the Last' (i. 17, ii. 8); 'the Beginning[1] of the creation of God' (iii. 14). In spite of the death that He died, He is 'the living One,' and 'liveth for ever and ever' (i. 18), as God is 'the living God' (vii. 2), and 'liveth for ever and ever' (iv. 9, 10, x. 6, xv. 7).

And He is 'the Logos of God' (xix. 13). What this meant to the writer is not clearly stated; but it certainly implies pre-existence, in the closest conceivable association with the Being of God. The clause is thought by several writers to be an interpolation; but Charles is probably right in regarding it as genuine, and, suitably to the context, he

[1] ἀρχή must have the same force as in xxii. 13.

refers to Wisd. xviii. 14–25, where God's 'all-powerful Logos' is 'a stern Warrior' (*v.* 15). This is not the Logos of Alexandrian theology, but the Jewish 'Word,' God in self-manifestation.

(*b*) Of our Lord's humanity as such the writer takes no more account than St Paul. But the fact is there. He speaks of Him frequently by the human name Jesus, and Jesus Christ. He claims Him (if that is the true interpretation of the passage) to have been born of the Jewish Church, as a sun-child is born of a sun-goddess (xii. 1 ff.). And, as proper to the Messiah, He is of Davidic descent: 'the Lion that is of the tribe of Judah, the root of David' (v. 5). His twelve apostles are spoken of (xxi. 14). And, lastly, His death (i. 7, 18), by crucifixion at Jerusalem (xi. 8), with the shedding of His blood (i. 5, v. 9, vii. 14, xii. 11). The significance that this had for the writer will be studied below.

(*c*) As said above, his thoughts are chiefly directed to the supreme power and glory of the exalted Christ, for the encouragement of suffering Christians. He is 'the first-begotten of the dead' (i. 5); 'I am . . . the living One, and I became dead and behold I am alive unto all ages' (*v.* 18). And 'He was caught up to God and to His throne' (xii. 5). The pre-existent and ever-living Christ always possessed this supreme power and glory; but as Incarnate He had to win it. And though He is 'to all intents and purposes God,' yet His subordination is never lost sight of. On the one hand He is 'Lord of lords and King of kings' (xvii. 14, xix. 16), as Yahweh is 'Lord of lords' in Deut. x. 17. And several other things are said of Him that are said of God in the Old Testament: e.g. the description in i. 14 (Dan. vii. 9); 'I am He that searcheth reins and hearts, and I will give to each of you according

to your works' (ii. 23; Jer. xvii. 10); The Lamb has 'seven eyes' (v. 6; Zach. iv. 10); and 'His garment is sprinkled with blood,' 'and He treadeth the wine-press of the anger of the wrath of God all-Sovereign' (xix. 13, 15; Is. lxiii. 1–6). He is 'Ruler of the kings of the earth' (i. 5). He has 'the keys of death and of Hades' (*v.* 18). 'He is the Supreme Head of the Church, the Centre of all its life (ἐν μέσῳ τῶν λυχνιῶν, i. 13, ii. 1) and the Master of its destinies (ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἀστέρας ἑπτά, i. 16), chastening its individual members and judging them from love and in love, iii. 19; promising them that conquer in the coming tribulation every blessing of the Kingdom of God, ii. 7, 11, 17, 26–28, iii. 5, 12, 21; embracing them in a perfect fellowship, iii. 20, and glorifying all who depart in this fellowship with the beatitude pronounced by God Himself, xiv. 13.' 'He sits with God on His throne, iii. 21, vii. 17, xii. 5, "the throne of God and the Lamb," xxii. 1, 3. The divine worship offered to Christ in v. 12 is described in the same terms as that offered to God in iv. 10, and the same hymn of praise is sung in honour of both Christ, v. 13, and God, vii. 10[1], and during the Millennial reign the saints minister to Him as God, xx. 6' (Charles, i. p. cxi f.). But, on the other hand, His power and authority are not said to be those of God, but of the Son of God (ii. 18), who receives them from His Father, and wields them for Him (i. 6, ii. 27 f., iii. 5, 21, xiv. 1). He speaks of God as 'my God[2]' (iii. 2, 12). As Incarnate He must win His power and authority through suffering and death (v. 9), and He admits His

[1] 'Our author is deeply conscious of the impassable gulf that separates the creature and the Creator, and the mediating angel sternly refuses such worship on the ground that it is due to God alone, xxii. 9.'

[2] Cf. Mk xv. 34; Rom. xv. 6; Jn xx. 17.

followers to the final blessedness of a share in His royal prerogatives (ii. 26–28, iii. 21, v. 10) after they have been united to Him in patient endurance (ἐν Ἰησοῦ, i. 9), and in death (ἐν κυρίῳ, xiv. 13). But nowhere in the Apocalypse is He called God, as in the Fourth Gospel. God and not Christ is the actual Creator of the world (iv. 11, x. 6, xiv. 7), and the final Judge (xx. 11–15). The divine revelation proceeds from God; Jesus Christ attests, bears witness to it (i. 2, 5, 9, iii. 14, vi. 9, xii. 17, xix. 10, xx. 4), as the martyrs and prophets bear witness to it and to Him (ii. 13, xii. 11, xvii. 6). All this transcendent Christology, which St Paul would have endorsed, is the highest note of uplifted confidence in the glory of the Messiah that apocalyptic literature ever sounded. And yet the writer did not reach it by the same road as St Paul. As a seer, with his ever-forward gaze, he realizes the victorious Warrior-King of whom the persecuted Church stands in need; and he seems to say, in Kantian fashion, I *will* that there be a divine Christ. For him it was a practical demand; for St Paul it was an empirical certainty. The Christ of apocalypse, however exalted and divine, does not make the same appeal to us as the Christ of experience.

3. *The Meaning of Christ's Death.* St Paul's many sided teaching on the Atonement will be reviewed in connexion with *Hebrews* (pp. 230–41). Our author's doctrine falls short of it; it is simpler, and based upon the Old Testament and the Apocalypses, and is more nearly allied to that in 1 *Peter*. He does not teach an 'Atonement' in any strict sense of the word. He nowhere suggests that Christ's death altered God's attitude to us, or brought about any reconciliation with Him, or propitiation or expiation of sins. His outlook is eschatological, and his

references to the death of Christ are made in every case from that point of view.

At the outset, his use of the designation 'the Lamb' must be understood. The ideas that we ordinarily attach to the word were not those of Jewish apocalyptists. They employed it to symbolize a Being of *triumphant might.* 'The term "lamb," or more particularly "horned lamb," was in apocalyptic writings a symbol for the Messiah. In our author the former appears in xvii. 14, the latter in v. 6[1].' The former passage, 'the Lamb shall conquer them[2]' is the ringing note of encouragement that sounds throughout the whole book. Cf. 'Even as I conquered, and sat down with My Father on His throne' (iii. 21). 'The Lion ...hath conquered...to open the book' (v. 5). The word 'salvation,' which occurs only in exclamations of praise (vii. 12, xii. 10, xix. 1), has the same connotation of victory. And the stirring appeal to the readers is that because Christ has conquered, they are to conquer (ii. 7, 11, 17, 26, iii. 5, 12, 21, xii. 11, xv. 2, xxi. 7). The writer calls to them to have victory and to triumph against sin, the world, and the devil.

But if he had said only that, his words would have been merely a rhetorical expression of Jewish optimism. In using the word 'Lamb' his thoughts go behind the apocalypses to Is. liii. (see pp. 40 ff., 124, 147). The Lamb reached His Messianic triumph because He had been the *suffering* Lamb. 'A Lamb standing as slain' (v. 6), who, because He had been slain, was worthy to open the book, i.e. to exercise authority over the destinies of the world

[1] Charles, *op. cit.* i. p. cxiii f. His note should be referred to for the apocalyptic passages.

[2] In the sense of spiritual victory the word 'conquer,' *νικᾶν*, is a link between the Apocalypse and the Johannine writings, and is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

(*v.* 9). 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power,' etc. (*v.* 12). And He was 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world' (xiii. 8), i.e. in the predetermined purpose of God. And the call to the readers is not to conquer only, but to conquer in virtue of His sufferings and by following in His steps. They had to play their part as well as He. His death loosed them from their old pagan sins, and made them a kingdom and priests to God (i. 5 f.), as Israel of old when loosed from Egypt (Exod. xix. 6). He was slain, and He redeemed at the price of His blood men of every tribe and tongue, and made them a kingdom and priests to God (v. 9). The 144,000 were 'redeemed from the earth' (xiv. 3), 'redeemed from men' (*v.* 4). The symbolism underlying these passages is that of the Paschal lamb, the shedding of whose blood was the turning-point in the Israelite deliverance, leading to ultimate triumph over their enemies. Hence the comprehensive saying, 'they conquered him [the Accuser] because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their witness, and they loved not their life even unto death' (xii. 11). That, as has been said, is the writer's doctrine of salvation; it is won in virtue of the sufferings of the Lamb, and by following in His steps.

In accordance with this, the right interpretation of vii. 14 can hardly be doubtful: 'they washed their robes, and made them white through (*or* at the price of) the blood of the Lamb.' The meaning of the white robes is disputed; but whether they denote the righteous acts of the saints (as in xix. 8)[1], or (with Charles) their perfected spiritual bodies, the words 'they washed their robes' sum up the process on earth by which ultimate

[1] Which Charles thinks is an interpolation.

triumph and glory were reached. They had to do their part, but that was possible only because Christ died. The rendering 'made them white *in* the blood of the Lamb' suggests the thought of sacrificial purification which is neither Pauline (see p. 231 f.) nor in keeping with the rest of the Apocalypse. The same thought was introduced by the scribe who wrote λούσαντι, 'washed,' for λύσαντι, 'loosed,' in i. 5.

It will be seen that the writer's soteriology, like that of 1 *Peter*, is simple and undogmatic. It explains neither how Christ's death was necessary for deliverance and triumph, nor how it made Him worthy of the exalted glory which ensures them to men. Closer doctrinal definition was foreign to the scope of his book. The ground of his appeal was the belief, which he accepted as an axiom, that Christ's death was in fact indispensable for His own triumph, and therefore for the triumph of His people. He does not hint at St Paul's doctrine of mystical union with Christ killed and risen, nor at the thought of the representative character of His office, which filled our Lord's mind, and which is emphasized in another form in *Hebrews*.

4. *The Christian Life.* If he offers no theory as to how Christ's death saved us, he also makes comparatively little suggestion as to the Christian life in the present. The method of salvation, which for St Paul revolves round the two *foci* 'justification' and 'sanctification,' is scarcely so much as mentioned. Of justification, in the Pauline sense, there is no trace at all, apart from the metaphors, drawn from the Exodus, of 'loosing' (i. 5) and 'redeeming' (v. 9, xiv. 3, 4) already noticed. Sanctification, in St Paul's teaching, is a process carried on as the result of the possession of the psychic, natural man by the Spirit of

God, so that he alone who is so possessed lives and moves in a condition or atmosphere of 'spirit.' Of this conception also our author shews no trace. With one exception the Spirit is spoken of only in the Old Testament sense, as the source of the inspiration of his message (ii. 7, 11, 17, 29, iii. 6, 13, 22, xiv. 13), and of the prophetic message of the Church (xxii. 17; cf. xix. 10); and the seer describes himself in his prophetic trances as 'in [a condition of] spirit' (i. 10, iv. 2, xvii. 3, xxi. 10). 'The seven spirits of God' (iii. 1, iv. 5, v. 6) are not the Holy Spirit in sevenfold activity, but angelic beings closely conjoined (iii. 1) with the 'stars' or 'angels' of the seven Churches. The single clause 'and from the seven spirits which are before His throne' (i. 4) refers to the Holy Spirit, in conjunction with the Eternal One and Jesus Christ as the source of grace and peace. But if Charles is right in thinking this to be an interpolation, nothing is said in the Apocalypse of the help of the Holy Spirit for holiness of life. At the same time the writer clearly understands that the work of man's salvation is both his own and God's as St Paul teaches in Phil. ii. 12. The mention of 'works,' obedience not to Mosaic ordinances but to the demands of the moral life as a whole, is a marked feature of the messages to the Churches. The works of those who die in the Lord 'follow with them' (xiv. 13), and men are recompensed 'according to their works' (ii. 23, xviii. 6, xx. 12, 13, xxii. 12). Those who reach the final triumph have made their own robes white and clean (vii. 14, xxii. 14). Those who have not defiled them are 'worthy' hereafter to walk with Christ in white garments (iii. 4). On the other hand grace and peace come from God (i. 4). When a man has won his white robe it will after all be the gift of God (vi. 11); and in this life they must be 'bought' from Christ (iii. 18).

From Him also must be 'bought' the eye-salve, i.e. the purging of the conscience which results in spiritual enlightenment (cf. Mat. v. 8), and that which is the ground of both, the refined gold from the fire, i.e. the characters purified by discipline and endurance of trial[1]. And it is Christ who in His affection for His people rebukes and chastens (*v.* 19).

It will thus be seen that not very much is said about the Christian life in the present. It is for the most part taken for granted, as the seer's eyes survey the conflict between the Church and her foes, and her final triumph when she is revealed as the Bride adorned for her Husband.

5. *Eschatology.* When we reach his eschatological expectations, we find ourselves immersed in a mass of scenic detail. We must free ourselves from these, and gain a bird's-eye view of the main ideas. And it is helpful to look at them by means of a comparison with St Paul's. Both writers, and indeed the whole Church in the first century, expected the great End, the cosmic crisis[2]; and they expected it in the near future. Though our book did not reach its final form till the reign of Domitian this expectation had not yet died out. The seer can still hear the angel saying 'the time is near' (xxii. 10), and can still write the Lord's words 'I come quickly,' ταχύ (ii. 5[3], 16, iii. 11, xxii. 7, 12, 20; cf. i. 1, xxii. 6, 'the things that must happen quickly,' ἐν τάχει). St Paul taught the im-

[1] Swete explains the gold as 'faith with its accompanying works.' But it is rather the character which springs from faith; and that is the thought in the references which he gives (Lk. xii. 21; Jam. ii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 7).

[2] The Old Testament terms 'the day of Yahweh' and the like, employed not infrequently by St Paul and other writers, are echoed only twice in the Apocalypse, in the expression 'the (that) great day' (vi. 17, xvi. 14).

[3] W.H. omit ταχύ with ℵACP.

minence of the End down to the time that he wrote to the Romans, 'the night is far spent, the day is at hand' (xiii. 12); 'the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet quickly,' ἐν τάχει (xvi. 20). Later than that, his only reference to the End is 'the day of Christ' (Phil. i. 10), since the expectation of Christ's coming in iii. 20, 21 is part of what was probably a fragment of an earlier epistle.

(1) *Events preceding the End.* A characteristic of Jewish apocalypse was the idea that the time of the End was not arbitrarily fixed by God, but was conditioned by the culmination of evil in the world. E.g. Enoch xci. 7, 'And unrighteousness shall again be consummated on the earth, and all the deeds of unrighteousness and of violence, and transgression shall prevail in a two-fold degree. And when sin and unrighteousness and blasphemy and violence in all kinds of deeds increase, a great chastisement shall come from heaven upon all these, and the holy Lord will come forth with wrath and chastisement to execute judgment on the earth[1].' The final climax of evil had frequently been pictured as embodied in a human being or personification, one who in devilish pride set himself up as a counterpart of the Messiah, hence sometimes called Anti-Christ. Neither our author nor St Paul uses the term, but their expectations about him, with one important exception, are very similar.

(*a*) St Paul thought of him as having a Parousia, an 'arrival,' as though imitating and forestalling the Parousia of Christ (2 Thes. ii. 9). The substantive does not occur in the Apocalypse, but the interpreting angel says 'They that dwell upon the earth shall marvel...when they see the Beast that it was and is not and *shall arrive*' (πάρεσται, xvii. 8).

[1] Cf. Mat. xxiv. 12.

(*b*) Both writers think of him as a personal manifestation of Satan, who endues him with power and authority. 'His Parousia is according to the energy of Satan in all power,' etc. (2 Thes. ii. 9). In the Apocalypse the manifestation is in the form of two Beasts in succession. Of the first it is said 'And the dragon gave him his power and his throne and great authority' (xiii. 2). And of the second 'He exerciseth all the authority of the first Beast before him. . . . And he doeth great signs, so that he maketh fire to come down out of heaven upon the earth before men. And he deceiveth those that dwell on the earth because of the signs which were given him to do before the Beast' (xiii. 12–14).

(*c*) The Beast, or Anti-Christ, does much more than oppose God; he counterfeits His divine supremacy, blaspheming Him and demanding men's worship. 'The Man of lawlessness, the Son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself against every being that is called God, or object of worship, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, giving himself out that he is God' (2 Thes. ii. 4). To this corresponds the description in Rev. xiii. 4–6, 8a of the pride and blasphemy of the Beast, and his worship by men.

(*d*) But finally, Christ will destroy him. He is 'the Son of perdition' (2 Thes. ii. 4), i.e. doomed to destruction. 'The lawless one whom the Lord Jesus will destroy with the breath of His mouth, and bring to nought at the manifestation of His Parousia' (*v.* 8). And in Rev. xvii. 8 he 'goeth to destruction'; and in xix. 11 is described the coming from heaven of Him who is called Faithful and True, seated on a white horse, with His garment sprinkled with the blood of His enemies. And out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword (*v.* 15). The Beast and the kings of the earth are gathered to make war with Him (*v.* 19);

and the Beast and the false prophet are seized and cast into the lake of fire (*v.* 21).

The one important difference between them is in regard to who or what the Man of lawlessness or the Beast would be. For the seer it would be the Roman empire represented in the Emperor[1], who claimed divine worship, his claim being upheld by the priests of the provinces. That is the meaning of the two Beasts, the second of which 'causes the earth and them that dwell in it to worship the first Beast' (xiii. 12). In the picture of the first Beast there is a reference to the horrible fear that Nero after death would return to life endued with demonic powers. This made possible the thought of a hideous caricature of the death and resurrection and 'arrival' of Christ. '[I saw] one of its horns'—i.e. the Emperor—'as it had been slain unto death, and his death-stroke was healed' (xiii. 3); cf. 'a Lamb as it had been slain' (v. 6). And in the passage referred to above, the Beast 'was and is not and will arrive' (xvii. 8). By the time of Domitian it had come about that persecuting Rome, drunk with the blood of the martyrs, blatant in its pride of power, and over-surfeited with barbaric luxury, appeared to the Christians to be the last climax of all evil, which meant the beginning of the end.

But for St Paul, in the middle of the century, Rome was something quite different. It was a power making for law and order. In Rom. xiii. 1 he can still state that its officials are 'ordained by God.' The Man of lawlessness will appear before the end, but for the moment his full activity is kept in check by 'that which restraineth' (τὸ κατέχον), i.e. the Roman government, embodied in the Emperor—'he who restraineth' (ὁ κατέχων, 2 Thes. ii. 6, 7).

[1] According to Wellhausen and Charles the two are fused in ch. xvii. from different sources.

But the restraining power, while it maintained law and order, exercised no control over the increase of godlessness which was soon to reach its culmination in 'the apostasy,' embodied in the mysterious figure of the Man of lawlessness. Opinions differ as to whether St Paul expected him to be of Jewish origin. But he says nothing to suggest it; and it is scarcely possible that any Jewish personage could be imagined as gaining such power in his career of wickedness as to be able to exalt himself against every being that is called God, or object of worship, so that he could sit in the temple of God, giving himself out that he was God. It is true that his appearance is pictured at Jerusalem; but for St Paul, a Jew writing (possibly) to Jews[1], that was only the supreme climax of blasphemy. It is paganism in the form of a super-man, robbing God of His honour. That is probably the thought in the equally mysterious 'abomination of desolation standing (ἑστηκότα, masc.) where he ought not' (Mk xiii. 14), which is interpreted (in Mat. xxiv. 15) as 'in the holy place.' On the other hand, in Lk. xxi. 20, it has assumed, as in the Apocalypse, a political aspect, the evil thing being the Roman empire represented by its armies which surround Jerusalem.

An obscure passage in Rev. xi. presents an idea different from that which the writer's experience burnt in upon his mind, that the supreme embodiment of evil was the Roman empire, and had its evil throne in Rome. The chapter appears to include earlier Jewish material. In *vv.* 1, 2 is described the preservation of the temple, while the court and the holy city are given over to the Gentiles[2];

[1] See the writer's *St Paul*, p. 134.

[2] This points to a time in 70 A.D., before the temple was destroyed.

in *vv.* 3–13 the slaying of the two witnesses (Moses and Elijah) by 'the Beast which cometh up from the deep' (*v.* 7), to the delight of the inhabitants of the land (*v.* 10). They come to life, and are caught up to heaven; an earthquake destroys 7000 persons; and the remainder in terror give glory to the God of heaven. It is very uncertain what this meant in the original source, if such was incorporated by the author, or what meaning he attached to it. It seems to be a picture of the destruction, by the Roman power, of the Law and the Prophets, i.e. the Jewish religion, and their miraculous survival. But for our present purpose it is necessary to note only that the appearance of Anti-Christ *at Jerusalem* indicates a point of view different from that taken elsewhere in the book.

(2) *The Coming of Christ.* The word Parousia, as has been said, does not occur in the Apocalypse, though it is not infrequent in St Paul's eschatological passages, and in Mat. xxiv.[1]; see also Jam. v. 7 f. The meaning 'arrival' seems to have been rare in Jewish writings, which may account for its avoidance by our author[2].

The pictures in the Apocalypse of the moment of the arrival are similar to those of St Paul in 1, 2 *Thessalonians.* It is as the coming of a thief. 'If, then, thou wilt not watch, I will come as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come to thee' (iii. 3); 'behold I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth' (xvi. 15). So 1 Thes. v. 2, 'Ye know that the day of the Lord as a thief in the night so

[1] See the writer's *St Matthew*, p. 344 f.

[2] In its eschatological sense it does not occur in the LXX. Milligan (*Thessalonians*, p. 146) refers to Test. Judah xxii. 3, Levi viii. 15; the former speaks of the 'arrival of the God of righteousness,' the latter of the arrival of John Hyrcanus as a prophet, i.e. as Messiah. And in the Syriac Apoc. Baruch xxx. 1, 'the arrival of the Messiah' suggests that παρουσία stood in the Greek.

it cometh[1].' In both writings it is a stupendous, visible event. Christ will come from heaven in the clouds. In Rev. i. 7, xiv. 14, this is stated in language which echoes Daniel's vision of one like unto a son of man (vii. 13). St Paul states it, with simple assurance, as an event about to occur (1 Thes. i. 10, iv. 16; 2 Thes. i. 7). When He comes it will be in the company of angels to take vengeance on His adversaries (2 Thes. i. 7, 8; Rev. xix. 14). St Paul speaks of the Lord's descent from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel and with the trump of God. The trumpet and (in D and latt.) the voice appear in Mat. xxiv. 31. In the Apocalypse they are heard throughout the eschatological drama; the voices of angels[2], uttering a series of woes and sounding trumpets, mark the course of the final catastrophes.

These catastrophes are pictured as occurring in the physical world, and involving terrific convulsions of Nature. St Paul does no more than allude to them as 'the imminent distress' (1 Cor. vii. 26), and the passing away of the outward fashion of the world (*v.* 32). But in the Apocalypse they occupy a considerable portion of the contents, from the moment when the Lamb takes in hand the book of the world's destinies until the establishment of His millennial reign on earth;—i.e. the catastrophes at the opening of the six seals (ch. vi.), which are similar to those in Mk xiii.; the three woes introduced by the opening of the seventh seal (chs. viii.–xiii.); the seven bowls pouring destruction on the heathen in general (xv. 5–xvi. 21); and the destruction of Rome (xiv. 8–11, xviii.).

[1] In *v.* 4 the *v.l.* κλέπτης, adopted in the A.V. and R.V., continues the thought, but the metaphor is inverted in the less natural κλέπτας (AB copt.) preferred by Westcott-Hort. See Milligan *ad loc.*

[2] Perhaps archangels; see Charles on viii. 2.

These are said to be wrought not by Christ but by God. But on the other hand it is Christ with the armies of heaven who destroys the ten kings in alliance with the Beast (xvii. 14), and the hostile nations with the Beast and the false prophet (xix. 11–21). See also xiv. 14–20, in which Christ is pictured as reaping the harvest and vintage of the earth. All these events are in themselves divine judgments, and are sometimes described as such (xiv. 7, xvii. 1, xviii. 10). But they are not, according to the seer, the final judgment; that does not take place till after the millennial reign of Christ.

(3) *The Millennium.* Before the 1st century B.C. Hebrew and Jewish expectations of a future age of bliss never travelled beyond this earth. Whether they were centred on a dynasty of ideal kings or on a single, supreme Messiah, the Kingdom would be established on earth, with Jerusalem as the sacred seat of government. And it would be permanent. 'Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with judgment and with righteousness from henceforth even for ever' (Is. ix. 7). But when the stress of suffering and other causes gave birth to new ideas, and to the transcendental hope of the golden age as everlasting life in a new sphere of existence, the change of view could not be completed *per saltum.* A compromise was needed which blended the old and the new. And thus arose the notion, which can form no part of our Christian faith to-day, of a Messianic reign or period of bliss which should be on earth, but only temporary, and would last till the final end of the present state of things, and be the transition to unending life in the New Age. This temporary period is found in several of the Jewish apocalypses that we

possess, mostly but not always as a reign of the Messiah[1]. But its duration is seldom stated. In a unique passage, 4 Esd. vii. 28–31, it is said to be 400 years (cf. Gen. xv. 13), at the end of which the Messiah and all men will die, and when the world has been in primaeval silence[2] for seven days, the New Age will dawn. But in Slavonic Enoch[3] (xxxii. 2–xxxiii. 2) it is 1000 years. After the 6000 years of the world's history, there will be a Sabbatic rest during the seventh thousand before that which is everlasting begins. This reckoning is adopted in Ep. Barnabas xv., and the writer speaks of 'the beginning of the eighth day which is the beginning of another world.' The origin of this chiliasm is explained as follows: 'The reckoning of a thousand years was based on a combination of Gen. i. 2 and Ps. xc. 4 = 2 Pet. iii. 8. From this it was concluded that as each day of creation stood for a world-day of a thousand years, so the history of the world would embrace a world-week of seven thousand years, six thousand years till the final judgment and a thousand years of blessedness and rest[4].'

According to Charles the Millennium is described in Rev. xiv. 1–7, xxi. 9–xxii. 2, 14 f., 17, xx. 4–6. Whether his exact arrangement of passages be accepted or not, he has shewn it to be probable that those dealing with the Millennium have been fused with others dealing with the glories of the heavenly life. Satan is bound for a thousand years (xx. 1–3), during which time Christ reigns in 'the holy city Jerusalem,' i.e. not the present earthly city but

[1] See the references given by Charles (ii. p. 184), though he does not distinguish between those which speak of a Messianic reign and those which speak only of a period of bliss.

[2] I.e. the silence from the beginning of creation till the appearance of man with his power of speech, as stated in vi. 39.

[3] ? 1–50 A.D.

[4] Charles, *ibid.*

one which 'comes down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God' (xxi. 10). It is a divinely made city fitted for the Messiah's reign. And He reigns with the martyrs; they alone enjoy the privilege of the 'first Resurrection.' All the rest of the dead, including the faithful who have not been martyred, wait till the 'second Resurrection' at the end of the thousand years (xx. 5), when they all appear for the final heavenly Assize (*vv.* 11–15). The martyrs reign with Christ, and also exercise the office of priests[1] (xx. 6), i.e. they declare the divine message to the heathen. And those who accept it come into the city (xxi. 24–26), and are healed of their sins by the leaves of the tree of life that grows by the water of life (xxii. 1, 2). Those who refuse must remain outside, 'the dogs, and the sorcerers, and the whoremongers, and the murderers, and the idolaters, and everyone that loveth and doeth a lie' (xxii. 15).

Some have thought that St Paul also expected the Millennium, and referred to it in 1 Cor. xv.: 'Then the End, when He delivereth up the kingdom to God even the Father, when He shall have brought to nought all rule and all authority and power, for He must reign till He have put all enemies under His feet[2].' 'And when all things shall have been subjected to Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subjected to Him who subjected all things to Him, that God may be all in all' (*vv.* 24 f., 28).

[1] As all the faithful are priests, and (potentially) reign now (i. 6, v. 10).

[2] This is based on Old Testament thought (Ps. viii. 6 and cx. 1), which, as said above, expected only a *permanent* reign of the Messiah on earth. The latter passage had a large influence on Christian ideas. It is quoted in Mk xii. 36 (Mat. xxii. 44; Lk. xx. 42 f.), Acts ii. 34 f.; Heb. i. 13; and referred to in Mk xiv. 62 (Mat. xxvi. 64), xvi. 19; Rom. viii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12 f., xii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 22.

But if so, his conception of it was different from that in the Apocalypse. He says nothing about martyrs (as was natural, since there had been very few by the time that he wrote), and therefore gives no hint of two Resurrections; and Christ's reign includes the bringing to nought of all (demonic) rule and authority and power (cf. Eph. i. 20 f.). That is to say, the conflict with foes goes on *during* His reign, but in the Apocalypse it goes on not during it but before and after it.

But it is not easy to determine with certainty what his expectations in this chapter were. He was in a state of transition in which he was trying, perhaps unconsciously, to harmonize the mystical conceptions which were moving to the front place in his thoughts with the Jewish eschatological conceptions which were finally to fade out of sight. He had begun to shape the ideas about the divine Kingdom or Sovereignty which have been summarized on p. 21 f., a present, spiritual Sovereignty, 'not in word but in power,' 'not eating and drinking, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit,' a possession or condition of Spirit which the psychic man lacks. And the meaning of 'He must reign' in the passage quoted above depends on whether he thought that this present, spiritual Sovereignty of God through Christ would reach its final and perfect consummation at the Parousia, all who opposed it being then destroyed, or whether something further would be needed to bring it to completion. In the former case 'He must reign' refers to the divine kingdom which has already, in the present, begun to exist mystically in Christians. And 'we must suppose that St Paul thought of death as destroyed when Christians rise at the Parousia. His conceptions need not involve the lapse of time. At the Parousia Christ is King, He puts down all opposing powers

by His coming, and in the same timeless act delivers up the Kingdom to God the Father[1].' If, on the other hand, His coming does not bring the complete consummation of God's Sovereignty, but is only an important step forward in its development, time being still needed for its completion, then the passage teaches a reign of Christ on earth, until He has brought all opposition to an end, when He will yield up the Sovereignty to God. In that case His reign is temporary, though under conditions different from those of the Millennium of the Apocalypse. In favour of this are the statements in 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3: 'the saints shall judge the world,' and 'we shall judge angels.' They are sometimes explained to mean that Christians will be 'assessors' at the judgment which Christ will execute at His coming. But 'judge' may very likely include the wider sense of 'rule'; in which case we have a parallel to the thought of the martyrs reigning with Christ during the Millennium (Rev. xx. 6). 'The world' is the world of men living on the earth. As elsewhere, St Paul does not speak of a resurrection of the wicked; only those who are in Christ attain to that, and they all share with Him in judging or ruling the non-Christians who are on earth when He comes, and the angels,—the latter being included also in the thought of His reigning till He have done away with all (demonic) rule and authority and power.

It remains doubtful, therefore, whether St Paul expected a temporary Messianic reign. But in any case, the passages which can be explained in that sense are confined to 1 *Corinthians*, as is also the idea of the ultimate yielding up of the Sovereignty in subordination to God the Father (cf. xi. 3).

(4) *The Resurrection.* At the end of the thousand years

[1] *St Paul: His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine*, p. 274.

Satan is loosed, and rouses the hostile nations of the world, spoken of as Gog and Magog, to war against the realm in which Christ has been wielding His sovereignty, 'the camp of the saints and the beloved city.' But fire from heaven devours them, and Satan is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone (xx. 7–10). Then all the dead, *bad and good*, appear before the great white throne to be judged (xx. 11–15). This is the 'second Resurrection,' the martyrs alone having attained to the first. St Paul, as said above, has no thought of two Resurrections. But his ideas on Resurrection in general, and on final judgment, invite comparison with those in the Apocalypse.

It is unsafe to insist on pressing the visions of an apocalyptist into a logical mould. But if he is consistent with himself the result, as Dr Charles maintains, is that since the wicked as well as the faithful stand before the great white throne to be judged, a resurrection in some sense of the former as well as of the latter is implied. But not in the same sense; the faithful are clothed in spiritual bodies, the wicked are not. Spiritual bodies are frequently symbolized in this book by 'white robes' or 'white garments,' or '[garments of] fine linen[1].' The writer's conception of them is subtle and beautiful. On the one hand the souls of the martyrs, in the time when they had been still waiting beneath the altar, were given white robes (vi. 11). That, however, did not in itself constitute resurrection; they were told to wait till the full number of martyrs was completed. When it was completed at the Parousia, they 'lived' with Christ (that is the 'first Resurrection') as kings and priests in the millennial Kingdom,

[1] For pagan parallels see Reitzenstein, *Die hellen. Mysterienreligionen*[2], pp. 30–33. And the symbol is not unknown in Jewish thought; see En. xxii. 8, lxii. 15. It is possibly of Persian origin (Brandt, *Prot. Jahrb.* 1892, pp. 437, 575, 580).

clothed in the robes which they had received. On the other hand the robes were to be the possession of all the faithful. There were a few in Sardis who had 'not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with Me in white.... He that overcometh shall in like manner be clothed in white garments' (iii. 4, 5). The elders in heaven are seen 'clothed in white garments' (iv. 4), and the 144,000 (vii. 9, 13), and the heavenly armies (xix. 14); and it was given to the wife of the Lamb 'to be clothed in fine linen, shining, pure' (*v.* 8). All this symbolizes the spiritual bodies as a state of final attainment. But ideally and potentially they are the present possession of every Christian. They are to be acquired, 'bought,' from Christ (iii. 18); they can be defiled (*v.* 4), and conversely 'washed[1]' (xxii. 14), 'washed and made white' (vii. 14), and 'kept' (xvi. 15). Thus the spiritual body is a gift from God, and is at the same time being prepared now by holiness of life; it is a working out of our own salvation for God worketh in us.

It will be seen that this conception is wholly opposed to any crude notions of physical resuscitation such as are found in some of the Jewish apocalypses[2]. It is the expression of a truth much more stirring and vital—the continued life of the soul with a body which is the gift of God, yet the responsibility for which lies with men themselves in their spiritual life on earth. In sharp contrast to this is the first clause of xx. 13: 'the sea gave up the dead that were in it,' i.e. the dead *bodies*. The next clause speaks of departed *souls*: 'and Death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them.' The collocation of clauses

[1] There is nothing to be said for the *v.l.* *ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολάς* in Q, for *πλύνοντες τὰς στολάς*.

[2] E.g. En. li. 1, lxi. 5, lxii. 15 f.; Apoc. Baruch xlix.–li. Sibyl. iv. (quoted in Lake, *The earlier Epistles of St Paul*, p. 217).

conveys the thought of a re-uniting of the soul with the material body. But it is difficult to understand why the sea alone should be named as the resting-place of all dead bodies[1]. Charles thinks that the verse may be corrupt, and the first clause a later addition endorsing the Jewish notion of a re-uniting of soul and body. He suggests that *τὰ ταμεῖα...αὐτοῖς* originally stood for *ἡ θάλασσα... αὐτῇ*, the 'treasuries' being the intermediate state in which the souls of the righteous were guarded, as distinct from Hades, the waiting place of the souls of the wicked. But why *ταμεῖα*? The passages which he quotes from Apoc. Bar. xxi. 23, xxx. 2; Apoc. Ezra iv. 41 have *ōṣre* (=Heb. אוֹצָרִים), to which *θησαυροί* is the more natural equivalent, and might conceivably suggest the substitution of *θάλασσα*. The LXX. never renders אוֹצָר by *ταμεῖον*.

And this view of the white garments as spiritual bodies, which are being made now, finds parallels in the teaching of St Paul. It is important to notice that for him Resurrection is always a spiritual attainment, impossible without the grace of God, but impossible also if man does not play his part in this life. Resurrection by the mere act of God alone, and therefore the resurrection of the wicked, never enters his thoughts. 'In Christ shall all be made alive...Christ the firstfruits, then they that are Christ's at His Parousia' (1 Cor. xv. 22 f.) is an explicit statement of what he always implies. Resurrection is not mere survival of personality; it is its attainment to a particular condition, possessed of that which differentiates the

[1] Apart from the fact, which perhaps must not be too rigorously pressed, that it has been said in *v.* 11, 'earth and heaven,' which obviously includes the sea, 'fled away, and place was not found for them'; and in xxi. 1, it is stated explicitly 'the first heaven and the first earth passed away, and the sea exists no longer.'

Christian from the non-Christian. And this is potentially, germinally, progressively attained to and possessed by the Christian in this life, by his mystical union with Christ. It is wronging St Paul to treat his words on this subject as mere metaphor. See Rom. vi. 4 f., 11, 13; Col. ii. 11–13, iii. 1–3; Eph. ii. 5. All these passages teach that for the Christian Resurrection has taken place, or rather has begun to take place[1]. And the potential attainment must be actualized in final attainment, as is clearly expressed in Phil. iii. 10, 11: 'if by any means I may attain to the Resurrection from the dead. Not that I have already received (it), or have already been perfected, but I pursue if that I may grasp that for which also I was grasped by Christ Jesus.' In this earthly life it was the apostle's priceless gain 'to know Christ and the power of His Resurrection, becoming progressively conformed (*συμμορφιζόμενος*) to His death,' with the ultimate object of attaining to the completion of the process.

And the passage hints at something more. Risen Christians are acquiring in this life a *morphe*, a form, an essence, a spiritual something by which their personality can express itself to, and be recognized by, other risen Christians. They were predestined to be 'conformed (*συμμόρφους*) to the image of God's Son' (Rom. viii. 29). The process of acquiring this is described in 2 Cor. iii. 18: 'we are being transformed (*μεταμορφούμεθα*) into the same image from glory unto glory'; and the completion of the process in Phil. iii. 21: 'who shall change the fashion of the body of our humiliation to be conformed (*σύμμορφον*) to the body of His glory.' This form and image of Christ which are acquired by the Christian are, according to

[1] The error condemned in 2 Tim. ii. 18, that 'the Resurrection has already taken place' was probably a perversion of this teaching.

St Paul, something very different from mere human personality, whether in this life or persisting after death. The ordinary *psyche* of man, as of beasts, is clothed in a material body. But the process in the Christian of his present, resurrection life is producing a spiritual 'clothing' which was 'put on' at baptism, and is being 'put on' continuously (Gal. iii. 27; Col. iii. 10, 12; Eph. iv. 24).

Once more, the process of acquiring this clothing, or form, or image, is described in Rom. viii. 11 as a quickening, vitalizing, spiritualizing, of the mortal body. This verse is often misunderstood. St Paul does not confine God's action to a moment in the future, after death. 'Mortal' is not 'dead'—the two words are always distinct in the New Testament—but 'liable to death.' And its quickening by the Spirit, now as well as after death, is only another way of describing the gradual acquirement, the formation, of the spiritual body of the Resurrection life[1]. The earthly body, from its conception onwards, is like a seed planted in a psychic environment of corruption and weakness, ending with death and burial. But with death and burial all the potentialities of the spiritual body which has been gradually conformed to Christ's image are, like a seed which 'dies' (i.e. its outer husk dies) in the soil, free to spring into expanding activity (1 Cor. xv. 42–49). Flesh and blood, our material body which is dissolved into its chemical constituents, cannot, as St Paul of course readily admits (*φημί*), inherit the Kingdom of God (*v.* 50); this corruptible thing must put on incorruption, and this mortal thing, which is liable to death and finally dies, must put on immortality (*v.* 53), which it is, in fact, gradually putting on before death.

[1] See Storr, *Christianity and Immortality*, p. 67 f., and a sermon by the present writer in the *Guardian*, Oct. 30, 1921.

But though the potentialities of the spiritual body of the Christian spring into expanding activity at the death of the physical body, it does not follow that they at once reach completion. And St Paul does not state that they do. According to the Apocalypse the moment of completion is the moment of the 'second Resurrection' at the end of the Millennium. St Paul places it at the Parousia of Christ. But in the early years of his ministry he expected that to occur so immediately in the future that it was virtually at death for the few who had already fallen asleep. The full possession of the spiritual body at the moment of the Parousia is implied in 1 Thes. iv. 13–17, and stated clearly in 1 Cor. xv. 51 f.: 'We shall not all fall asleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.' And the thought that we have been studying—the process of building up the spiritual body in this life, and its consummation at the Parousia—underlies the difficult passage, 2 Cor. v. 1–10. St Paul had always expected that the Parousia of Christ would take place before his own death. But troubles were coming so thick and fast that he began to realize the possibility of his dying first. But he says in effect, It matters not whether my body dies or not. If it dies I lose nothing, for 'I have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens' (*v.* 1). In my present body I groan, and long for my spiritual clothing. It is not any physical death that I desire (*οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι*); that does not matter one way or the other; what I desire is my heavenly clothing. And if it is to be mine while I am still in the body, all that is mortal in my body will be swallowed up, swamped, in

the spiritual, of which I have already received the pledge (*vv.* 2–5). As long as my body is mortal and I am 'at home' in it, I am away from my true home which is with the Lord, so I would rather leave my body and go home to Him (*vv.* 6–8). To the same period of his life, in all probability, belongs the fragment, Phil. iii. 2–iv. 1. He looks (*v.* 20) to the moment of the coming from heaven of 'a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change the outward fashion of the body of our humiliation to be conformable with the body of His glory.' He does not seem to have thought out logically what the condition of departed Christians was. The only words by which he describes it are 'asleep' (1 Thes. iv. 13–15; 1 Cor. xv. 6, 18, 20, 51), and 'with Christ' (Phil. i. 23). His eyes were fixed simply on the glory of all the faithful *at the Parousia*; and as long as that filled his thoughts, it seems to have left no room for the idea of an intermediate state, a period of growth or probation, e.g. for a life-long sinner who repents on his death bed. He shews no recognition of any need of it. Although he is never tired of urging his readers to a high moral life, and teaches (see p. 195 f.) that each man will be recompensed differently according to his life on earth, yet as regards their resurrection with spiritual bodies at the Parousia he speaks as if all men were either 'in Christ' or not, either spiritual or psychic. The latter do not 'attain to the resurrection,' the former do. When he says 'we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed' he has in mind none but Christians, and they are *all* changed, as though they were spiritually on an equality.

But as time went on his eschatological ideas were fading from him; and he arrived at a thought which, though he does not say so, admits of progress and probation after

death, i.e. that the final consummation is not that of individual Christians in the near future but, of mankind *as one body*. This is implicit in Rom. viii. 18 f.: the divine event to which the whole creation moves, and for which it longs, is not the Parousia of Jewish expectations but 'the revealing of the sons of God'; and this must be their revealing when their whole number is complete. A trace of this idea is seen in the Apocalypse. The martyr souls beneath the altar, though they had received their white robes, were bidden to 'wait a little time until their fellow-servants and their brethren should be fulfilled, who were about to be slain even as they' (vi. 11); the spiritual consummation of each is arrived at only by the completion of their whole number. But St Paul expands it to its full vastness. The goal of Christianity is 'the building up of the Body of Christ, till we *all* attain to the unity of the faith in, and the knowledge of, the Son of God, to a fully developed man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' (Eph. iv. 13). The Church is the fulness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled (i. 23). And this will be complete when God has summed up all things in Christ (*v.* 10), and 'Christ is all and in all' (Col. iii. 11).

(5) *Judgment.* There are three different conceptions of Judgment in the Apocalypse. 1. The first is not eschatological. Some of the churches are warned of the punishment, the physical, material penalties in the present order of things, which will be meted out to them for their sins. Christ says to Ephesus, 'I will remove thy lampstand out of its place' (ii. 5); to Pergamon He says of those who hold the 'teaching of Balaam,' and that of the Nicolaitans, 'I will fight with them by the sword of My mouth' (*v.* 16); to Laodicea, 'I am about to spue thee out of my

mouth[1]' (iii. 16). The fault of Thyatira was the toleration of the woman Jezebel. Her punishment had been postponed to give her time to repent; but because of her refusal to repent 'Behold I cast her into bed (i.e. afflict her with sickness), and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, unless they repent of her works; and her children will I slay with death' (ii. 21 f.). And this is described in terms of judgment: 'And all the churches shall know that I am He that searcheth reins and hearts, and I will give to you to each one according to your works' (*v.* 23).

2. But the writer's thoughts being almost entirely eschatological, he says little about judgment or punishment before the End. The great bulk of the book is concerned with judgment or punishment connected with the Parousia. It is spoken of in general as God's judgment (xiv. 7, xvi. 7, xix. 2 a). The judgment of Rome issues in her destruction (xvi. 5, xvii. 1, xviii. 8, 10, xix. 2 b). The avenging of the faithful is also judgment (vi. 10, xviii. 20). But the whole series of woes, plagues, and terrors from the opening of the first seal and onwards is of the same character. Christ's part also in this is once described as judgment: seated on a white horse 'in righteousness He judgeth and maketh war' (xix. 11).

3. The final Judgment of the dead and living at the end of the Millennium is a great Assize at which God alone is the Judge (xi. 18, xx. 11–15). But Christ pleads as an Advocate for him who conquers: 'I will confess his name before My Father and before His angels' (iii. 5). And this is, in fact, to take part in the judgment. The same thought

[1] Charles refers this to the final Judgment; but it is unnecessary to explain this warning differently from those to the other Churches.

is expressed in His authority to retain names in the Book of Life or to wipe them out (*ib.*). And He claims to be the Rewarder of each man as his work is (xxii. 12). At the Assize there is a double test upon which the judgment is based; men are judged 'according to their works' as written in the books, and according to whether their names are found written in the Book of Life. If the passage is to be interpreted with logical strictness, 'according to their works' cannot imply a gradation of rewards and punishments. Men's names are either in the Book of Life or not. 'Those books and the book of life bore independent witness to the fact of men being or not being among the saved: the one by inference from the works recorded: the other by inscription or non-inscription of the name in the list. So the "books" would be as it were the vouchers for the book of life' (Alford, iv. pt 1, 735). And those whose names are not inscribed in it are cast, all alike, into the lake of fire. The judgment simply divides men into two classes, bad and good. And yet we cannot be quite certain that the writer intended to be consistent. In xi. 18 'the time of the saints is come to be judged, and to give the reward to Thy servants, the prophets and the saints and them that fear Thy name' leaves open the possibility of a variety of reward in accordance with different services rendered (cf. Mat. x. 41). The principle contained in 'according to their works' is demanded by man's ordinary sense of justice in human affairs: and in the Jewish mind the sense of legal justice was particularly strong. We have seen (p. 23 f.) that the two aspects are presented both by our Lord and by St Paul; and it is possible to combine them in our thoughts of God's dealings with man.

In St Paul's conceptions of judgment we find, as before,

a combination of the mystical with the eschatological. We can first compare his teaching with that in the Apocalypse under the above three headings.

1. He occasionally speaks of divine judgment as involving temporal, physical punishment. 'For this cause [because they do not "discern the Body"] many are weak and infirm among you and many sleep' (1 Cor. xi. 30); and he goes on to say that if Christians examined themselves they would not be 'judged'; but this judgment is the Lord's method of disciplinary chastisement, to save them from being 'condemned with the world.' The thought is the same in 1 Cor. v. 5, the delivery of the sinner 'unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.' And cf. 1 Tim. i. 20. Temporal punishment of another kind appears in Rom. xiii. 1–6: the civil authorities are ordained by God, so that 'they who resist shall receive to themselves judgment'; 'he is God's minister, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.'

2. The Judgment at the Parousia in the form of catastrophes and destruction upon the wicked is described in 1 Thes. v. 2 f.; 2 Thes. i. 6–10, ii. 8, and God's judgment in the 'day of wrath' in Rom. ii. 5 ff. 'The wrath' is a recognized eschatological term in 1 Thes. i. 10, ii. 16; Rom. v. 9, xii. 19, xiii. 5.

3. St Paul sometimes expresses the thought of judgment as a judicial decision with due apportionment of reward and punishment. But this is *at the Parousia.* He prays that the Thessalonians may, at the Parousia, prove to have been preserved blameless (1 Thes. iii. 13, v. 23). The Philippians are told to act with forbearance to one another because 'the Lord is at hand' who will put everything right (Phil. iv. 6). The Christian slave, who does the will

of God, and serves whole-heartedly and right-mindedly as to the Lord and not unto men, will receive from the divine Master in exact correspondence with the good that he has done (Eph. vi. 8); he shall receive the reward of the inheritance, and the wrong-doer shall receive the wrong that he has done (Col. iii. 24 f.). 'Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will throw light upon the hidden things of darkness, and will manifest the counsels of the hearts, and then shall each man have his praise from God' (1 Cor. iv. 5); that is to say, the spiritual condition that men's hearts have respectively reached will be revealed in a moment as by a blaze of light. And the blaze of light which reveals is also a fire which tests the work of each. 1 Cor. iii. 12–15 is important. The apostle is speaking of Christian workers, such as Apollos and himself, who build upon the one Foundation: 'each man's work shall become manifest, for the day shall shew it; because it is revealed in fire, and the fire shall test each man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built, he shall receive a reward; if any man's work is burnt up, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, but so as by fire.' That a man can be 'saved,' can attain to the Resurrection life, and yet be in an impoverished condition as compared with those whose work has stood the test, is an illuminating suggestion as to a gradation of rewards. Only in two passages are the testing and the decision pictured under the scenic metaphor of an Assize. 'We shall all stand before the judgment seat (βῆμα) of God. . . . Each of us, then, will give account of himself to God' (Rom. xiv. 10, 12). 'We must all be manifested before the judgment seat of Christ, that each may receive the things [done] in the body according to what he hath wrought, whether good or evil' (2 Cor. v. 10).

But this judgment at the Parousia is, for St Paul, only the public, dramatic expression, so to speak, of a spiritual judgment which has preceded it in men's lifetime. Not only will each man have his praise from God when the Lord comes, but he has it *now*; of him that is a true Jew at heart it is said 'whose praise is not from men but from God' (Rom. ii. 29); God 'judgeth those that are without' (1 Cor. v. 12); He is 'God who testeth our hearts' (1 Thes. ii. 4) *now*. And the whole of the Pauline teaching on the obtaining of God's 'righteousness' by faith in Jesus Christ implies a forensic action which is a present judgment. And for sinners, correspondingly, judgment is a present punishment; it is the inevitable result of sin, the reaping that must follow the sowing (Gal. vi. 7 f.). And this punishment is the act of God while at the same time due to man himself; it is a 'handing over' to the sin that man has chosen (Rom. i. 24, 26, 28), a judicial hardening of the heart (ix. 18, xi. 8), a present 'condemnation' (v. 16, 18, viii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 32). And the final result in every case is death (Rom. v. 12, 14, 17, 21, vi. 16, 21, 23, vii. 5, viii. 2, 6; 2 Cor. vii. 10). 'If anyone destroy the temple of God [corrupt his own body], him will God destroy' (1 Cor. iii. 17). Those, therefore, who bring upon themselves this judgment are 'being destroyed' or 'perishing' (1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3; 2 Thes. ii. 10). And of course, in consequence, they will not inherit the Kingdom of God (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. iv. 30, v. 21; Eph. v. 5). St Paul does not explicitly distinguish the death of the body from that of the soul. Nevertheless he shews that there is a distinction: 'the sting (goad) of death is sin' (1 Cor. xv. 56). For the faithful death has no sting, because they will attain to the resurrection life, but for sinners there is no resurrection. They do not need

to rise again in order to be judged[1]; they are judged and condemned already, and given over to their punishment.

Of this great thought, the present results of sin as the judicial action of God, the writer of the Apocalypse shews no trace, coming in this respect short of the ripeness of St Paul's spiritual apprehension.

CHAPTER VI

THE EPISTLE OF ST JUDE

This little writing does not, in its 25 verses, supply much material for our present purpose. It might have been otherwise if the author had pursued his original intention of writing 'concerning our common salvation[2]' (*v.* 3). Perhaps his fiery pamphlet was of greater use to his readers, but it is difficult for us not to think that we should have gained more if we had possessed, from the hand of a 1st or 2nd century writer, an explicit statement or summary of 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' and the embracing of Jew and Gentile within the merciful purpose of God. If he had expounded Christian doctrine, instead of denouncing heretics, we might have learnt a great deal as to the extent, and possibly the limits, of St Paul's special influence in the Church.

The epistle contains, nevertheless, a combination of

[1] This is contrary to the words ascribed to St Paul in Acts xxiv. 15: 'having a hope in God, to which they [the Jews] also look forward, that there will be a resurrection both of righteous *and of unrighteous*.' The chapter in its present form seems to contain two versions of the same speech (see the writer's *St Paul*, p. 104 f.), and *v.* 21 is probably truer to the apostle's words, which refer to those reported in xxiii. 6.

[2] This probably implies that he is a Jew writing to Gentiles.

elements which makes it an interesting subject for study. The author is Jewish and Christian, but not at all what is usually meant by a Jewish Christian. He is intensely Jewish in his eschatological ideas, and in his use of the Old Testament and apocalyptic writings. He refers to the Exodus, and the death of the Israelites in the desert (*v.* 5), the fall of the angels (*v.* 6), the destruction of the cities of the plain (*v.* 7), Cain, Balaam, and Korah (*v.* 11). The reference in *v.* 9 to the archangel Michael disputing with the devil concerning the body of Moses was derived, according to Clement, Origen, and others, from a Jewish apocalypse of the 1st century A.D. named the *Assumption of Moses*[1]; and in *vv.* 3, 12, 16, 18, 24 there are similarities of thought and language with the Latin fragment which we possess (see iv. 8, vii. 4, 9, 3, i. 10). The similarities are more numerous—in thought rather than language—with the collection of writings known as the book of *Enoch*. In *v.* 14 f. a prophecy is ascribed to 'Enoch the seventh from Adam' which is a quotation from En. i. 9: 'Behold the Lord came with His holy myriads.'

But he is also Christian. He calls himself 'a slave of Jesus Christ' (*v.* 1), and uses His name six times; 'our common salvation' (*v.* 3), 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints' (*ib.*), 'your most holy faith' (*v.* 20), is the language of a Christian believer; and the epistle closes (*vv.* 24, 25) with a passage which, though rhetorical and not written with a doctrinal purpose, implies that Jesus Christ exists eternally. His theology is as Christian as his eschatology is Jewish, the epistle in this respect standing in line with the *Apocalypse*. On the Jewish side it has some affinity with St Paul's expectations in

[1] See Charles' edition, p. 105 ff., and Bp Chase in Hastings' *D.B.* ii. p. 802.

1, 2 *Thessalonians*, while its Christology also is in accord with his. But he shews no clear acquaintance with any words from his pen.

1. There is nothing Christian in his eschatology except the words 'waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ' (*v.* 21). The only reference to a Parousia is in the passage quoted from *Enoch*, in which 'the Lord' means God, Yahweh[1]. All the judgment and destruction are the work of God, as they were in the examples which he quotes from the Old Testament. The Israelites were an example of destruction. The angels suffered 'imprisonment with everlasting chains under darkness' (see En. x. 5 f., 12 f.). Sodom and the other cities were examples of 'eternal fire[2].' St Paul never speaks of unending punishment by fire, but only of 'the day' trying every Christian's work by fire (1 Cor. iii. 13–15), and of the Lord Jesus being 'revealed from heaven in (*or* with) a flame of fire' (2 Thes. i. 8).

2. That which called forth the writer's severe and rhetorical warnings was the danger with which the Church was threatened by certain persons of heretical ideas and immoral life who had managed to make their way in unawares (*v.* 4). His description of them is not such as to enable us to identify them with any particular sect; his

[1] In *v.* 5 Κύριος, if it is the true reading, also means Yahweh. There is another reading Ἰησοῦς, but it is probable that the passage is corrupt, and that neither is the true reading. See Westc. and Hort, *The N.T. in Greek*, Appendix, p. 106.

[2] The rendering 'are set forth as an example, undergoing the vengeance of eternal fire' is perhaps right. With a vivid picture before his eyes of the burning towns full of wicked inhabitants, the writer may have allowed himself the looseness of expression which represented the cities as burning for ever. But the words can also be rendered 'are set forth as an example of eternal fire, suffering vengeance,' and this is supported by the corresponding phrase in 2 Pet. ii. 6: *ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς.*

readers would need no information on that point. He simply utters, as though occupying a position of unquestioned authority, a stern pastoral warning to his flock and denunciations against the sinners. They seem to have introduced errors of an antinomian and Gnostic type, which were the chief peril confronting the Church in the late apostolic and sub-apostolic age. They 'changed the grace of God into lasciviousness' (*v.* 4), i.e. they used Christian doctrine and practices as an opportunity for immorality, e.g. at the *Agape* (*v.* 12). (The same form of antinomianism was seen at a later date in the Carpocratians.) They claimed to be superior to ordinary Christians, calling them 'psychic' and themselves 'spiritual,' thus appropriating the terms which St Paul had used in 1 Cor. ii. 14. Our author does not explain their mistake; he simply meets their claim by retorting with a direct negative: 'these are they that separate themselves [as a superior class], psychic, not having Spirit' (*v.* 19). They neglected 'the Lordship,' i.e. God[1], and spoke evil of 'the Glories,' i.e. (probably) the angelic powers (*v.* 8). They were as wicked as Cain, as covetous of payment in their false prophetic visions as Balaam (cf. Tit. i. 11), and as rebellious against ecclesiastical authority as Korah (*v.* 11). There may be a reference here to an early form of the heresy of the Ophites who are said to have honoured Cain and Korah, and to the Gnosticism taught by the Nicolaitans (Rev. ii. 6), which is probably referred to in *v.* 14 as the teaching of Balaam.

3. This oriental Gnosticism which, when it came into contact with Christianity, sucked a new vitality, and at a later time claimed to be Christian, had just begun in St Paul's lifetime to trouble the Asiatic Churches, and he

[1] Cf. Didache, iv. 1.

deals with it in *Ephesians* and especially *Colossians*. But our author shews no sign of any acquaintance with those epistles. But on the other hand he has a noticeable affinity with the writer of the *Pastoral* epistles. The errorists whom both writers opposed were of a similar type, and both speak of them in the same severe tone of authoritative denunciation without argument, and with the contemptuous οὗτοι (*vv.* 8, 10, 12, 16, 19; cf. 2 Tim. iii. 8, where the reference to the apocryphal story of Jannes and Jambres is in the same vein as our author's references to apocalyptic literature). Both use the epithets μόνος, 'only,' and σωτήρ, 'Saviour,' of God (*v.* 25; see p. 209 f.) to oppose the prevailing dualism, and the claim of the mysteries to lead to salvation. Both speak of 'the faith' as a recognized body of Christian belief (*vv.* 3, 20; cf. 1 Tim. i. 19, iii. 9, iv. 1, 6, v. 8, vi. 10, 21; 2 Tim. iii. 8, iv. 7). And both understand the appearance of heretics to be a sign of the near approach of the End. The writer of the Pastorals, speaking in St Paul's name, expresses this as his own prediction (1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1, iv. 3); our author, who makes no claim to apostleship, gives it as a prediction of the apostles who had previously taught his readers (*vv.* 17 f.). This is in accordance with St Paul's early prediction of the apostasy which must precede the End (2 Thes. ii. 3), and the expectation must have been widely current in the Church (cf. 1 Jo. ii. 18).

If these similarities prove that our author had read the Pastorals, he can hardly have been Judas the Lord's brother. If his grandsons 'who still survived of the Lord's family' were, as Hegesippus pictures them (Eus. *H.E.* iii. 20), grown men when brought before Domitian shortly before 96 A.D., Judas had evidently been dead some time. But it is quite as possible that the author of the Pastorals

had read our epistle. Or, again, they may have been independent. Two writings composed at the close of the Apostolic age, in similar surroundings, and to meet similar dangers, might well approximate in style and language. There are similarities in the doxology added in Rom. xvi. 25–27, and in *Ephesians* and *Colossians*, as has been said, St Paul shews that the same influences were beginning to trouble his readers. For our present purpose it is of no importance to decide the question of the authorship of our epistle. Whoever he was, he clung to the Jewish eschatological expectations which St Paul gradually left behind, but he was loyal to the general body of Christian beliefs which the Church of his day professed. But since he does not explain what this was, we cannot place him with exactness in the line of doctrinal development.

CHAPTER VII

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST PETER

It is unnecessary, as before, to dwell upon the question of authorship. There can be no reasonable doubt that the epistle is pseudonymous. That has been shewn so conclusively by many writers that it may be taken for granted. Mayor's edition and Bishop Chase's article in Hastings' *D.B.* iii. may be referred to; as Moffatt says, they 'throw all previous work into the shade.'

Although it is, in all probability, the latest book in the New Testament, it may be studied at this point on account of its close similarity to Ep. *Jude*. It has the same two characteristics, eschatology and orthodoxy.

1. *Eschatology*. The writer refers to St Paul 'in all his

epistles speaking in them concerning these [eschatological] matters' (iii. 16), claiming his authority for the statement that 'the longsuffering of God is salvation,' i.e. that the reason why the Parousia is delayed is not that 'the Lord is slack about His promise as some men count slackness, but is longsuffering towards you, not wishing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance' (*v.* 9). The Parousia, on which St Paul ceased to lay any stress as a fundamental of the Christian faith, is to this writer a tremendous certainty. It is the establishment of 'the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (i. 11). (Note the absence of the idea of a Millennium.) He declares that 'we,' i.e. the apostles, 'made known to you the power and Parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ' (*v.* 16); and he exhorts his readers to take heed to the prophetic word 'until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts' (*v.* 19). His warning to sinners takes the form, in accordance with many Jewish apocalyptic predictions, of great convulsions of nature, the melting by fiery heat of the heavens, the elements, and the earth, and the creation of new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwelleth (iii. 10–13). As the world was long ago destroyed by the Flood, so the heavens and the earth have been treasured and kept unto a day of judgment for this destruction by fire (*v.* 7).

All this is in answer to the 'scoffers' whose appearance was foretold 'by the holy prophets, and the command of your apostles of the Lord and Saviour'; they would come 'at the end of the days with scoffing, walking according to their own lusts and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for from the days when the fathers fell asleep, all things remain thus (as they were) from the beginning of the creation' (*vv.* 3, 4). It is difficult

for us to realize the doubts and perplexity felt as late as the 2nd century by those for whom the hourly expectation of the Parousia had been the basis of all their thoughts. But our author, possibly trying to still his own doubts, expresses nothing but an invincible certainty, for which he rests on a three-fold authority: (*a*) The teaching of the apostles: '*we* made known unto you' (i. 16); and his claim to St Peter's authority, whose name he assumes, is enforced by recalling the privilege accorded to him in his personal witness of the Transfiguration (*vv.* 17 f.). (*b*) 'As an even surer authority we have the prophetic word' (*v.* 19), i.e. the predictions of the Old Testament writings. (*c*) The teaching of St Paul referred to above (iii. 15). In no writing of St Paul that we possess does he say that the delay of the Parousia was due to God's long-suffering to give sinners the chance of repentance and salvation, though that meaning might be read into such a passage as Rom. ii. 4 f.

2. *Orthodoxy*. Like the writer of *Jude* (*v.* 3; cf. Heb. ii. 3), and followed by a long line of Christian writers, he held apostolic tradition to be a primary test of truth. In the person of St Peter he writes 'to those who have obtained a faith of equal value with us' (i. 1), i.e. identical with ours. And he claims, as has been said, the authority not only of the Old Testament scriptures, but of St Peter (i. 16–18), of 'the apostles of our Lord and Saviour' (iii. 2), and of St Paul (*vv.* 15 f.). He is whole-heartedly Pauline, and quite untouched by the special ideas which appear in *Hebrews* and in the Johannine Gospel and Epistles. His full, orthodox Christology finds expression in language which in i. 1 goes beyond even what St Paul reached: 'our God and Saviour Jesus Christ' (i. 1). He possesses 'divine power' (*v.* 3); He is God's Son, God's

Beloved (*v.* 17); He is 'the Master who bought us' (ii. 1); 'our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (i. 11, ii. 20, iii. 18; see i. 14, 16, iii. 2). And the epistle ends with a doxology addressed to Him.

If the first object of the epistle is to insist on the certainty of the coming Parousia, its other chief object is that in which the writer attaches himself closely to *Jude*. The mockers who scoffed at the delay of the Parousia were heretical and sinful. Oriental Gnosticism was steadily gathering strength in Western Asia and Europe, and Christianity was soon to feel the full weight of its attack. The worst was yet to come, when the Gnostic teachers claimed a secret tradition from Christ and His apostles. But the danger was great enough to call forth from our author an outburst of indignation. He closely follows Jude, *vv.* 4–12, chiefly in ii. 1–17, with increased sternness and scorn, and more violent rhetorical condemnation.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

We have been gradually approaching the standpoint of St Paul, and we now reach an author whose ideas were so far identical with those of the apostle that he was willing to write under his name. The present writer has elsewhere shewn reasons for thinking that 1, 2 *Timothy*, *Titus* were not, in their present form, from the pen of St Paul, but were probably constructed on the basis of some fragments of personal letters by him; 'the three epistles as wholes have probably been built up as general treatises for the guidance of the Church by some devoted disciple of his,

who has breathed in his spirit and teaches his Gospel. The voice is St Paul's voice, but the hand is the hand of a Christian teacher in the generation which followed him[1].' But because he belonged to the next generation he was led by circumstances to enunciate certain truths with a new emphasis.

1. *The Nature of God.* There are no essential differences from St Paul's theology, but new emphasis was needed to meet new dangers. The author wrote for Christians who were liable to be affected by the cults and theosophies which Hellenism was absorbing from the East and from Egypt. In this respect the Pastorals stand close to *Colossians* and *Ephesians*, and, as we have seen (pp. 200–3) to *Jude*. He felt it necessary to lay stress on the Unity of God, as against the dualistic tendencies of rapidly spreading Gnosticism. 'To the only God (*μόνῳ θεῷ*) be honour and glory for ever and ever' (1 Tim. i. 17); 'the blessed and only Potentate' (vi. 15): 'there is one God,' or 'God is one' (ii. 5). This was the first article of the Jewish creed, and St Paul never found it needful even to state the truth. The only exception which can be cited is in Rom. xvi. 27: 'to the only the wise God (*μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ*[2]) through Jesus Christ, [to whom] be the glory for ever.' But the use of the expression there is one of many reasons for thinking that that doxology is not the work of St Paul[3]. The words of Gal. iii. 20, 'a mediator is not (a mediator) of one, but God is one,' are in no way parallel. St Paul wishes to shew that a covenant between

[1] *St Paul*, pp. 241–252. See P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, and a review of it by Brooke, *J.Th.S.* April, 1922; and Cheetham in *Ch. Quarterly*, July, 1922.

[2] Cf. *μόνος ὅσιος*, Rev. xv. 4.

[3] *St Paul*, pp. 184–9.

God and man does not need Moses or any other mediator; God 'by Himself' (εἷς) gives commands and promises. As Lightfoot says, 'this proposition is quite unconnected with the fundamental statement of the Mosaic law, "the Lord thy God is one God," though resembling it in form.' This use of μόνος is found elsewhere only in Rev. xv. 4; Jude 4, 25; Jo. v. 44, xvii. 3.

But if St Paul had no need to emphasize the truth, we are not exempt from the necessity. Many Christians to-day add to the difficulties of the subject a confusion of thought which they make for themselves by forgetting that Jesus Christ is a human Individual, and will remain so for ever. But that must not lead us to think of Him as 'an individual God.' Tritheism is abhorrent to the enlightened conscience of Jew and Christian alike. The three 'Persons' of the Holy Trinity are not three Individuals. It is *God*, 'the only God,' 'the only Potentate,' who exercises His will upon men through Jesus Christ. The New Testament reminders of the Unity of the Godhead are few, but proportionately valuable.

And the error of Tritheism, which is more widely spread than is often realized, leads to another. The Eternal Father and the Eternal Son, being supposed to be two Individuals, are often assigned very different parts in man's salvation. God the Father must punish man for sin, but desired his salvation; God the Son consented to undertake the work, which He performed by Incarnation and Death. This popular notion of consent, implying the separate Wills[1] of two Individuals in the Godhead, is to a great extent responsible for unworthy ideas about the Atonement. It

[1] It is of course taken for granted, by those who hold the notion, that the two Wills always will the same thing. But theoretically they might clash. To deny that is to deny the twoness.

makes the Son to be mainly, if not solely, the actual Saviour of the world. If that had been suggested to St Paul, he would of course have denied it. All that he says, for example, about the 'grace' (Rom. v. 15 and frequently) and 'love' (Rom. v. 8, viii. 39; Eph. ii. 4; 2 Thes. ii. 16) of God in man's salvation, and the reconciling—not of Him to men, but—of men to Him (2 Cor. v. 19; Col. i. 19 f.), shews that he would have rejected the notion. But still, his language is sometimes misunderstood. For instance Gal. i. 4, 'Jesus Christ who gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from the age of the present evil according to the will of our God and Father,' might be interpreted of the 'consent' of God the Son. The idea of consent appears to cause less difficulty to those who hold that St Paul conceived of Christ as the heavenly Man but not a divine Being, or divine but not in the full sense. 'Christ, the divine spiritual Being is sent by the Father from heaven to earth, and of His own free will He obediently takes this mission upon Himself' (Harnack). But still we are left with the difficulty that to God is ascribed only the desire for our salvation, while it is the Messiah who suffers and saves.

It is helpful, therefore, to find in the Pastorals the word *Saviour* used explicitly of God six times (1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10; Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4), as well as four times of Christ (2 Tim. i. 10; Tit. i. 4, ii. 13, iii. 6); and see 2 Tim. i. 9, 'God who saved us'; Tit. iii. 5, 'according to His mercy He saved us.' St Paul never speaks of either God or Christ as 'Saviour.' He uses the verb 'to save' only once where God is clearly the subject: 'It was the good pleasure of God through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe' (1 Cor. i. 21). Reitzenstein[1] is

[1] *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*[2], p. 117.

probably right in thinking that he purposely avoids σωτήρ as a technical term in heathen religions. On the other hand that very reason might lead to its use here and in Jude 25 (μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι).

The importance of the word is not lessened even if the writer of the Pastorals employed it simply as part of the conventional Christian language of his day. And the same must be said of the adjectives noted below. There must have been pressing circumstances which brought them into frequent use. There is hardly one which does not suggest comparison with pagan religious language and ideas, which must have given each of them a profound significance when it was first adopted into the Christian vocabulary. σωτήρ is a word applied to God with some frequency in the Old Testament. In renderings from the Hebrew it almost invariably occurs where the expression in the original is 'the God of my salvation.' But the idea of salvation in the Old Testament fell short of that in the New; it always denoted national or personal deliverance from enemies, oppression, or trouble. The only New Testament parallel is in the Hebraic canticle *Magnificat*: 'My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour' (Lk. i. 47), i.e. my Saviour from the mighty who scorn and oppress the humble and meek. The early Christians, therefore, for whom salvation meant deliverance from sin, did not adopt the word. It was not till Christianity was in contact with pagan cults and mysteries which offered salvation, and in which many of the deities were spoken of as σωτήρ or σώτειρα[1], that it was necessary to insist on the truth that God was σωτήρ.

[1] See the divine epithets in Greek poetry collected by Bruchmann in a supplement to Roscher's *Ausfuhrliches Lexikon d. Griechischen u. Römischen Mythologie.*

μακάριος as applied to God is confined to 1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 15. It is not synonymous with *εὐλογητός* 'blessed,' which St Paul uses in doxologies (Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 31) of a Jewish type. The latter denotes that God is deserving of praise or thanks; the former means 'deserving of congratulation,' 'blest,' 'fortunate,' 'happy.' The Greeks applied the epithet *μάκαρ*[1], *μάκαιρα* to many of their deities, because they possessed such power and peace as man could not attain to. Strictly speaking it is an epithet which falls short of the Christian conception of God, but among those who were in contact with pagan life it would not be difficult for it to slip into common use.

ἄφθαρτος (1 Tim. i. 17[2]) is 'imperishable,' 'immortal' (a Hellenistic meaning) as contrasted with all that is created and transitory; cf. Rom. i. 23. Greek writers mostly use *ἄφθιτος* and *ἀθάνατος* of their Gods; but *ἄφθαρτος* occurs of Poseidon in Apoll. Rhod. fragm. ep. p. 66 (Duentzer). Cf. 1 Tim. vi. 16, 'Who only hath immortality' (*ἀθανασίαν*).

ἀόρατος 'invisible' (1 Tim. i. 17). Cf. vi. 16, 'dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no human being hath seen or can see.' Pagan literature has, of course, no parallel. As an epithet of God it is opposed to paganism. Cf. Col. i. 15. St Paul uses both this and the preceding word, not, however, as conventional or rhetorical epithets, but as essential to his argument.

τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα 'who quickeneth, *or* endueth with life, all things' (vi. 13). This stands at the beginning of a passage which contains several epithets. It is not essential to the meaning of the verse, but simply helps to enhance the solemnity of the exhortation. Strictly

[1] The Biblical form *μακάριος* is very rare in pagan literature.
[2] D*df vg aeth Tert *ἀθανάτῳ*.

interpreted, the verb means 'to give life by generation.' The Greeks could use *ζωογόνος* of deities such as Zeus, Apollo, Helios, Dionysus, as they could use *ζωοτόκος* of Demeter. It is alien from Hebrew thought; in the LXX. *ζωογονεῖν* means, without exception, 'to keep alive,' 'save' (cf. Lk. xvii. 33; Acts vii. 19). But to a Greek Christian, more ready than the Hebrew to grasp the truth of God's immanental power in Nature, it would cause no difficulty; he was glad to appropriate for Him the language of pantheism. The Hebrew point of view is seen in Neh. ix. 16, *ζωοποιεῖς τὰ πάντα*, which may have been the source of the *v.l.* here *ζωοποιοῦντος*. That was a word which St Paul could use of the giving of spiritual life (2 Cor. iii. 6; Gal. iii. 21), and of resurrection life (Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 36, 45); but he never adopted *ζωογονεῖν*.

μέγας 'great' is applied to God in Tit. ii. 13 only[1]. This conventional use was appropriated from pagans, who applied it to many deities (e.g. Artemis, Acts xix. 27 f., 34) who were assigned a high position in their Pantheon. The same thing is seen in the Old Testament. As a mere epithet it does not occur until the Babylonian period: Jer. xxxix. [Heb. xxxii.] 18; Deut. x. 17; all other instances belong to the Persian and Greek periods: 2 Esd. v. 8; Neh. iv. 14 [Heb. 8], viii. 6, ix. 32; Dan. ii. 45, iv. 20, 31, 34[2], ix. 4; and Is xxvi. 4 (LXX. not Heb.).

ζῶν 'living' (1 Tim. iii. 15, iv. 10). St Paul's mind was so full of the evangelical truths of God's action in behalf of sinful men that he has little room for words which describe the divine Being and Nature as such. But

[1] It occurs in the T.R. of Rev. xix. 17 ('the supper of the great God,' A.V.), from some minuscules but no uncials.

[2] These are in the LXX. only.

he does use ζῶν simply as an epithet (Rom. ix. 26 [LXX.]; 2 Cor. iii. 3), because the usage had passed into the Christian vocabulary from the Old Testament.

ἀψευδής 'without deceit,' 'that lieth not' (Tit. i. 2). This is not a mere epithet, since it strengthens the assurance contained in 'promised'; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 13; Heb. vi. 18. But it stands alone in the New Testament, and probably had a pagan origin. It was applied to the oracles, and occasionally to deities, e.g. Nereus (Hes. Th. 233).

2. *The Mediator.* Another product of conflict with paganism is seen in 1 Tim. ii. 5: 'There is one Mediator between God and men, [being Himself] Man, Christ Jesus.' The absence of the article points to His nature as human, not to Him as an individual. His uniqueness as Mediator bears out the preceding words, 'God, who willeth all men to be saved'; as human He sums up all men, so that all can be saved. The expression is without parallel in the New Testament. If the truth is implied in St Paul's Christology, he nowhere states it. Indeed, as far as language goes, he denies it in Gal. iii. 20, referred to above. He says that God gave the law 'in the hand of a mediator,' i.e. Moses; but in the New Dispensation no mediator is needed; God is One. The word 'mediator' occurs also in Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, in each case of Jesus as 'Mediator of a new covenant,' Him of whom Moses was a type, and who therefore transcends Moses as the New transcends the Old. But the writer of 1 *Timothy* is not thinking of Law or covenant. Christ, in His own Person, in virtue of His Nature, is the one and only Mediator between God and man. Both St Paul and the writer of *Hebrews* directed their thoughts mainly to the death of Christ. But here, though the writer goes on to speak of His death, we are carried first to the truth of

the Incarnation. There can be little doubt that this sentence, which contains a Christian philosophy *in nuce*, was occasioned by the need of contradicting theosophical speculations as to emanations or mediating powers by which the transcendent God could be brought into relation with evil matter. Christ, then, is the Equivalent of God, and the Equivalent of men. The former involves the pre-existence of an eternal Being; in virtue of the latter He could give Himself as a Ransom for all.

3. *The pre-existent Christ.* He who is the Equivalent of God did not begin to be so at His human birth, but His eternal Being then became clear and manifest. The use of the word ἐπιφάνεια in this connexion is unique. St Paul uses it once (2 Thes. ii. 8) of the final appearance of Christ, who will bring to nought the Lawless One 'by (*or* at) the *epiphany* of His Parousia.' And it has that force in 1 Tim. vi. 14, 'that thou keep the commandment spotless, blameless, until the *epiphany* of our Lord Jesus Christ.' In 2 Tim. iv. 1 'His *epiphany* and His kingdom' are connected with His coming Judgment. And in Tit. ii. 13 the writer speaks of 'waiting for the blessed hope and *epiphany* of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.' That is to say, the glorified Christ who now exists invisible to men, shall one day become visible. ἀποκαλυφθῆναι (Lk. xvii. 30), -ψις (1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thes. i. 7), φανερωθῆναι (Col. iii. 4; 1 Pet. v. 4) all express the same thought. But the writer holds also that what is true of the glorified Christ was true of the pre-existent Christ. He existed invisible to men, but at a certain moment of time became visible. God's purpose and grace were 'given to us in Christ Jesus before times eternal, but have now been manifested to us through the *epiphany* of our Saviour

Christ Jesus' (2 Tim. i. 10). Possibly the meaning is the same in iv. 8, 'the crown of life, which the Lord will award me in that day, the righteous Judge; and not only to me but also to all those who have loved His *epiphany*,' i.e. all who in their earthly life loved His revealed presence among men. It is from 2 *Timothy* alone that the Church has adopted the word Epiphany to express the first, rather than the second, appearing of Christ on earth. The same thought underlies the use of the verb ἐπεφάνη in Tit. ii. 11, 'the saving grace of God appeared,' and iii. 4, 'when the goodness and love to men of our Saviour God appeared.' That this thought was widely accepted in the Church by the date of the Pastorals is probable from its appearance in the portion of a liturgical hymn quoted in 1 Tim. iii. 16: 'Who was manifested (ἐφανερώθη) in the flesh.' St Paul uses the verb (see above) only of the Parousia at the last Day. But here we are in the circle of Johannine ideas.

4. *Salvation.* He who was the Equivalent of man could save man. In view of the claims of the Greek mysteries the Pastoral Epistles are full of the thought of the Christian salvation. The actual word σώζειν and its cognates occur no less than 20 times. It is here that the writer stands nearest to St Paul. The apostle's doctrine of salvation will be studied in connexion with *Hebrews* (ch. IX. and see p. 148), and a reference to those pages will shew that the author preserves some of the most characteristic features of his master's thought: (*a*) the 'annulling' or destroying of death (καταργήσαντος, 2 Tim. i. 10); (*b*) the cleansing by water (Tit. iii. 5); (*c*) the redeeming of men (1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14); (*d*) the mystical union with Christ in His Death and Life and Sovereignty: 'if we died with Him we shall also live with Him;

if we endure we shall also reign with Him' (2 Tim. ii. 11 f.)[1].

5. *Law.* The insidious advance of Gnosticism, which was beginning to be felt when St Paul wrote to Colossae, and the antinomianism which made capital out of his teaching on freedom, are combatted in the Pastorals as in *Jude* and 2 *Peter*. Our author says nothing in opposition to the apostle's view of the Law, but he writes from a different point of view. For St Paul the Law, in its essential nature, is holy and just and good (Rom. vii. 12). But since no one can keep it perfectly, it pronounces condemnation on all alike. Salvation, therefore, cannot be gained by works of the Law, as it would be if they were perfect. Even in writing to Colossae, where the conditions were different, and where his readers were converted heathen (i. 21, ii. 13, iii. 7), he still carries on his opposition to 'ordinances,' in matters of eating and drinking, feasts, new moons, and Sabbaths. The danger was not the pure Judaism which he fights in *Romans*, 1 *Corinthians*, *Galatians* and *Philippians* (iii. 2–iv. 1), but the principle is the same—salvation by God's grace through union with Christ, not by obedience to 'the law of commands in ordinances' (Eph. ii. 15).

[1] This passage, expressing the truth which lies at the heart of St Paul's Christianity, is introduced by the formula πιστὸς ὁ λογός, 'faithful *or* trustworthy is the saying,' which occurs five times (1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8), twice with the addition 'and worthy of all acceptation.' It is not impossible that this introduces, in each case, a saying quoted more or less accurately from St Paul, which was current in the Church, either as having come from his lips, or occurring in an epistle. The present passage, perhaps part of a hymn, seems clearly to come from Rom. vi. 8, viii. 17; the others are not in any epistle that we possess. Notice also the words 'Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my Gospel' (2 Tim. ii. 8). 'Of the seed of David' occurs in Rom. i. 3, immediately followed by a reference to the Resurrection.

The writer of the Pastorals, on the other hand, is concerned not with a mistaken trust in the Law but with the gross *abuse* of it by those who tried to combine a profession of Judaism with paganism. They gave themselves out to be teachers of the Law, but the teaching that they gave was so obscure and bizarre that they did not even understand it themselves (1 Tim. i. 7); they used it as a basis for barren speculations and fancies, 'myths' (1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4), 'Jewish myths' (Tit. i. 14), and 'endless genealogies' (1 Tim. i. 4). Exactly what these were we cannot tell; but they were probably Gnostic, theosophical ideas built from Jewish material. That alone would have been harmful enough; but there was worse. In making this use of the Law they divorced it from its true use—that of inculcating morality of life. Their misplaced ingenuities left them free to indulge in all the prevailing sins of the surrounding paganism. The writer says that the law is good if a man use it 'lawfully' (νομίμως), i.e. according to its true nature as consisting of injunctions for morals, and not as verbal material for undisciplined speculations. 'A righteous man,' one who is already leading a moral life, needs no such written injunctions; they are not intended for him but for the 'lawless and insubordinate,' etc. This is a view of the Law which has nothing to do with St Paul's dogmatic treatment of it.

CHAPTER IX

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

1. The Literary Problem

'That the thoughts of the Epistle are wonderful, and not second to those of the acknowledged apostolic writings, this also anyone would agree to be true who takes heed to the reading of the apostolic literature.' So Origen (Eus. *H.E.* vi. 25), who suggests, however, as his own opinion that the thoughts are those of St Paul, but the style of expression is different from his, and the composition is 'more Greek,' so that it may have been written by someone who preserved reminiscences of what the apostle had said, and wrote them up at leisure. Some have thought of St Luke as the writer, and some of Clement of Rome; but the work of neither of these shews a similarity of style marked enough to support a unity of authorship, while the doctrinal ideas of St Luke (see ch. III.) shew no trace of what is distinctive of *Hebrews*. Other names, Barnabas, Apollos, Prisca[1], are mere guesswork, the first and third being very unlikely. We shall see abundant reason for concluding that St Paul himself was not the author. Some parallelisms of language can be discovered, and one or two common references to the Old Testament. But the similarity to 1 *Peter* is more noticeable than to St Paul.

An explanation which accounts for many of the facts is worked out by Perdelwitz, in *Z.N.W.* 1910, p. 59 ff., 105 ff. He holds that the writing, as far as xiii. 21, was

[1] On the last suggestion, which is that of Harnack (in spite of the masc. *διηγούμενον* in xi. 32), Hausrath remarks, 'Nowhere is there any hint that Aquila was afflicted (*gestraft*) with a learned wife.'

not an epistle but a sermon preached to a Christian congregation at a Church in (probably) Asia Minor, by someone of an Alexandrine cast of mind who was visiting the place, very likely a wandering 'prophet.' Either he, or someone else, sent the sermon to Italy, probably Rome, with a brief covering letter (xiii. 22–25), writing news of Timothy, expressing the intention of visiting with him the recipients of the letter, greeting the Church leaders and all the Christians, and sending greeting from the Italians who were with him. Moffatt so far agrees that he thinks that *Hebrews* 'probably represents a homily or sermon written out (like 2 *Clement*) by its author'; but he refuses to 'treat the epistolary conclusion as irrelevant to the main purpose of the writing.'

2. The Occasion of Writing

For our present purpose, however, the literary problem matters little. Much more important is the question as to the spiritual needs of those to whom it was preached or written. It is not a theological treatise, but a message of warning and encouragement to those in immediate danger[1]. The danger was one which is indicated in such words as 'lest we drift away' (ii. 1); 'how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?' (*v.* 2). 'Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from (ἀποστῆναι ἀπό) the living God' (iii. 12). 'Lest any fall after the same example of disobedience' (iv. 11). 'Do not cast away your confidence' (x. 35). 'Shrinking back, unto perdition' (*v.* 39). 'Refuse not Him that speaketh; for if they escaped not who refused him that warned them on earth, much more

[1] See B. Weiss, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, 1910, *Der Hebräerbrief in zeitgeschichtlicher Bedeutung.*

shall not we escape who turn away from Him that is (*or* that warneth) from heaven' (xii. 25). There are stern reminders of the impossibility of repentance and renewal for those who have fallen away (vi. 6), for anyone who has 'trampled on the Son of God, and counted the Blood of the Covenant with which he was sanctified a common thing, and insulted the Spirit of grace' (x. 29), and for those who are polluted, fornicators, or profane as Esau (xii. 16). And with these warnings there are recurring exhortations to hold fast (iii. 6, 14, iv. 14, x. 23). The danger was clearly that of apostasy from Christianity, which would mean a hopeless loss of all true religion; 'to renounce God, or at least to hesitate and retreat, to relax the fibre of loyal faith, as if God were too difficult to follow in the new hard situation[1].' Further, the malign influences of Jewish and pagan syncretism, which formed the intellectual atmosphere surrounding the readers or hearers, were reinforced by actual persecution. It had not yet reached the point of martyrdom (xii. 4), but some of them had undergone sufferings and indignities, being imprisoned, and robbed of their property (x. 31–34, xiii. 3). And though the author uses gentle persuasion in saying that he cannot bring himself to believe that they will apostatize (vi. 9–12), yet the peril is clearly imminent.

The theory that it was a warning to Jewish Christians not to relapse into Judaism is untenable. It cannot, for example, be supported by xiii. 13, 'Let us therefore come out to Him outside the camp, bearing His reproach,' for the next words, 'for we have not here an abiding city, but we seek that which is to come,' shew that 'the camp' means not Judaism but the world, the things of earth, transitory and profitless. And x. 23–25 contains no indica-

[1] Moffatt, *Expos. Times*, xxix. p. 27.

tion, as Pfleiderer thinks[1], of being addressed to a Jewish Christian minority which had 'begun to waver in its Christian profession, and to look back to the religious services of the synagogues.' The epistle contains no attack on Jewish ordinances as a rule of life. Law did not mean to the writer what it meant to St Paul, i.e. the commands on which Rabbinism was built, but the commands on which the ancient Levitical system was built; its opposite was not 'grace' but a better and more perfect priestly system, the effect of which was not 'justification' but τελείωσις 'perfecting' (vii. 11 f., 18 f.). The writer indeed was steeped in the Old Testament, and expected those whom he addressed to understand his allusions; but the Old Testament was not a monopoly of Jewish Christians; it was the Bible for all Christians, and arguments deduced from it would be as authoritative for the Gentiles in the Church as for the Jews. Many have thought that the danger of apostasy was due to the downfall of the temple and the Levitical system, either recent or imminent. And that the foundation of their religion having collapsed, his Jewish Christian readers or hearers were inclined to let all religion go. But there is no evidence that anyone was thus affected. The Jews themselves shewed no tendency to apostasize when Jerusalem fell; their religion was mainly Rabbinism, to which the destruction of the temple and removal of the priesthood only gave new life and vigour. 'The Priesthood, the Sacrifice, the Temple, as they all went down at one sudden blow, seemed scarcely to leave a gap in the religious life of the nation. The Pharisees had long before undermined these things, or rather transplanted them into the people's

[1] *The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the development of Christianity*, ch. v.

homes and hearts....Long before the Temple fell, it had been virtually superseded by hundreds of synagogues, schools, and colleges, where laymen read and expounded the Law and the Prophets[1].' The temple and its priesthood are never mentioned by the writer; they meant nothing at all to him. His argument is not from existing, or recently existing, institutions; it is a dialectic based on the ancient Biblical accounts of the Tabernacle, and Levitical regulations connected with it. St Paul's method of using the Greek text of the Old Testament is sometimes similar, but the argument of our epistle is unlike anything to be found in the Pauline writings. Up to this point in our study we have been able to distinguish only doctrine that is Pauline from that which is less than Pauline, more primitive, more Hebraic. But now, together with much that is in line with the apostle's teaching, we meet with elements that are wholly new.

3. The Argument

Its basis is the Platonic theory of Ideas, which was largely reflected earlier in the century by Philo. The *real* sanctuary, priesthood, sacrifice, exist eternally 'in the heavens' (ix. 23), i.e., as we should say, in the mind of God. Of these the Hebrew system in all its details was the 'copy' (*ὑπόδειγμα*, ix. 23), the 'shadow' (*σκιά*, x. 1), the 'copy and shadow' (viii. 5), the 'figure' (*παραβολή*, ix. 9), the 'type' (*ἀντίτυπον*, ix. 24). The real Sanctuary is 'the greater and more perfect Tabernacle' (ix. 11), 'the real Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man' (viii. 2), 'the pattern shewed in the Mount' (*v.* 5); its sacrifices are 'better sacrifices' (ix. 23). The following words should be noted in the working out of this main theme of the

[1] E. Deutsch, *Literary Remains*, p. 139 (quoted by Moffatt).

epistle: *μέγας* 'great' (iv. 14, x. 21, xiii. 20), *μείζων* and *τελειότερος* 'greater and more perfect' (ix. 11), *πλείων* 'more,' 'greater' (iii. 3), *κρείττων* 'greater,' 'better,' 'superior' (i. 4, vii. 19, 22, viii. 6, ix. 23, x. 34, xi. 16, 35, 40), *διαφορώτερος* 'more excellent' (i. 4, viii. 6), *τηλικοῦτος* 'so great' (ii. 3), *ἀληθινός* 'real' (viii. 2, ix. 24)[1]. The Real is permanent, the earthly copy is transitory (xii. 27). By its very nature, therefore, the Hebrew system was bound to pass away. But—and this is the centre and heart of the argument, by which the Platonic Ideas are brought into relation with living facts—it passed away not by being simply destroyed on the substitution of a new one but, by being transcended. By a divine process of creative evolution it was so changed and perfected and fulfilled that the heavenly Idea was actually realized on earth. It was to appear in the form of 'the good things to come' (*μελλόντων*, x. 1), and has in fact appeared in 'the good things which *have come*' (*γενομένων*[2], ix. 11). Christianity is the Hebrew system raised to the *n*th (see pp. 117 f., 142 f.). It is the Hebrew method of *τελείωσις* so transmuted as to be made successful, as God intended. Under the old system the shedding of blood was indispensable for remission (ix. 22). It is still, but in the Ideal made real on earth it is not the blood of goats and bulls, but Christ's own blood (*v.* 12) which 'speaketh better things than Abel did' with his sacrifice (xii. 24)[3]; and that not *qua* bloodshed, but as the expression of perfect oneness of will with God (x. 1–10). See below, p. 238 f. The Ideal Victim is also the Ideal Priest,

[1] See an article by the present writer in the *Interpreter*, July, 1922.

[2] If this is the right reading found in BD* de syr. *μελλόντων* is the reading of the other uncials and versions.

[3] See the article referred to.

according to the divinely appointed order of Melchizedek, who was greater than Abraham himself, and the whole Levitical line who were in the loins of Abraham (vii. 1–10). And the Ideal Priest, possessor of 'life indissoluble' (vii. 16), who 'has His Priesthood inviolable' (*v.* 24), the 'Son perfected for evermore' (*v.* 28), did not begin to be at the birth of Jesus. That would have meant merely the substitution of a new Priest for the old ones, not the actualizing of a divine Ideal. He has always been Son, appointed Heir of all things from the beginning, through whom also God made the time-world, the eternal Expression of the Glory and Essence of God (i. 2, 3), eternally the Ideal, whose Priesthood was realized on earth.

And this transcending of the earthly copy by the actualizing of the Ideal has been brought about not only in the case of the Israelite priesthood and sacrificial system, but of the whole economy of God's people. They were, in fact His λαός just because they were the copy and shadow of the Ideal λαός actualized in the Christian Church (see iv. 9, viii. 10, xiii. 12). Sinai with its terrors finds its Ideal fulfilled in 'Mount Sion and the city of the living God, heavenly Jerusalem' (xii. 22). The Levitical system was based upon a God-given law or command. This was transmuted into something better, so that the weak and unprofitable Mosaic command was *ipso facto* annulled (vii. 12, 16, 18). The heralds of the Mosaic law were angels; the Herald of the greater law was the Son who is greater than the angels (i. 4–14), and therefore this greater law has greater sanction than the old one (ii. 1–4). The Son who is greater than the heralds of the old law is also greater than Moses its administrator, as a son over his house is greater than a servant in it (iii. 1–6). The 'house' was the community of Israel, privileged to be

under the divine economy; 'whose house are we' (*ib.*), the Ideal house realized on earth. Moses was the shepherd of the sheep (cf. Is. lxiii. 11); Jesus 'the *great* Shepherd of the sheep' (xiii. 20)[1]. The promise of Sabbath rest for ancient Israel was forfeited by their unbelief and disobedience; but the promise still holds good, as indicated by the word 'To-day' in Ps. xcv., uttered long after Moses and Joshua. This promise is of the Real Sabbath rest, of which the earthly rest in Canaan was but the type and shadow, and it is for us if we do not prove unfaithful (iii. 7–iv. 11). Similarly the promise made to Abraham that he should be blessed and multiplied, which he potentially 'obtained,' was an immutable promise, and God went further and confirmed it by an oath; and its actual realization is seen in us, the Christian Church (vi. 13–18). And the promises on which the Sinai covenant was framed only pointed to an Ideal, which is realized in the 'better promises' of the New Covenant (viii. 6). This new, perfect Covenant was foretold long ago by Jeremiah. Obviously there would have been no need of a new covenant if the old one had been faultless; but it was not, for it was when God was blaming Israel that He foretold the new; the old was only the imperfect shadow of the new. By Jeremiah's use, or rather God's use, of the word 'new,' the old was pronounced obsolete, and that moment it was well on the way to being 'antiquated' and 'aged,' and was 'nigh unto disappearance' (viii. 6–13). Pfleiderer (*op. cit.*, p. 206) sums it up well: 'Everything possessed by Judaism reappears in Christianity—the priesthood, the sanctuary, sacrifices, a covenant, the holy people of God, promises, blessings, Sabbath rest. But Christianity

[1] 'The work of Moses was a shadow of that of Christ' (Westcott, *ad loc.*).

possesses all these things in a much higher form than Judaism.'

The author thus says in effect, I am not asking you to accept something quite new, but something which is eternal and perfect, and which materialized 'at the end of these days,' necessarily annulling its imperfect earthly copy, the Hebrew system, which was merely 'imposed until the time when everything was to be put right' (ix. 10). It is the principle expressed in Goethe's 'Alles vergängliches ist Gleichnis' exemplified in Judaism, but with the addition that Christianity is the eternal Ideal made real.

4. The Person of Christ

Every detail in this depends upon the fact of Christ, the Ideal made real, not only in His office, as greater than the angels or Moses or Aaron, but in His Person. This is stated without argument in the sonorous opening of the homily: He is God's 'Son, whom He appointed Heir of all things, through whom also He made the time-world; Who being the Effulgence of His glory, and the express Image of His Essence, and bearing along all things by the utterance of His power,' etc. And His eternal pre-existence is spoken of in vii. 3: Melchizedek was 'made like unto the Son of God,' i.e. was a true type of Him, in that he was without earthly parents or descent, 'having neither beginning of days nor end of life.' And it is implied in πεφανέρωται 'hath been manifested' (ix. 26; see p. 214 f.). Christ, then, is the eternal Expression of God. This differs only in language from the conception which St Paul reached, and from the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel. But in maintaining that the Ideal has been made real in human life the method which our author adopts is unique. If St Paul made any attempt to *explain*

the oneness of the eternal Christ and the human Jesus, it is in Phil. ii. 5 ff. (see pp. 63–7). The fourth Evangelist made another attempt. The writer of *Hebrews* made a third, to which the nearest approach is the word Mediator in 1 Tim. ii. 5 (see p. 213 f.). He makes it by laying an emphasis, without parallel in the New Testament, on the Humanity of our Lord.

A priest must always be taken from among men, and appointed on behalf of men in God-ward matters (v. 1). While the Son of God is the eternal Ideal, that is also the Ideal for which man is destined. And He both represented the actual man, and represents the ideal man. This conception of *Representation* is our author's special contribution to Christian theology; it is his method of explaining the oneness of God and man in Christ: (*a*) On the one hand He was of the same human ancestry or race[1] as other men (ii. 11), for which reason He is not ashamed to call them brethren. He took a share (μέτεσχεν) in the same blood and flesh[2] (*v.* 14). 'He was bound in all respects to be made like unto His brethren' if He was to represent them (*v.* 17). He suffered being tempted, as they do (*v.* 18, iv. 15). He passed through an agony of mind 'in the days of His flesh,' as any other man might pass through it (v. 7), and learnt obedience by the discipline of real human suffering (ii. 10, v. 8). An important

[1] ἐξ ἑνός. The pronoun may be either masculine or neuter. But it introduces a thought less suitable to the context to understand it as referring to God. Men, indeed, as well as Christ, derive their being from God; but that does not help to make clear Christ's true humanity. Cf. Acts xvii. 26 (W.H.).

[2] 'Blood and flesh' is the true reading; cf. Eph. vi. 12: 'our wrestling is not against blood and flesh.' The more usual order is 'flesh and blood,' a double expression, found in Jewish writings, for human nature, mortal men (Mat. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16).

word in this connexion is τελειοῦν 'to perfect,' to bring persons or things to their true τέλος. It will come before us again, with its cognates, as used of men (p. 250 ff.); but as used of Christ's attainment to the condition necessary for a perfect Priesthood, it emphasizes the reality of His Humanity. As a completed result it is employed in vii. 28: the law of the divine oath appoints as High priest 'a Son who has been perfected for evermore.' But in two passages the process is described. ii. 10: it was fitting for God 'in leading many sons unto glory to perfect the ἀρχηγόν of their salvation through sufferings.' The sentence is pregnant with meaning. The language, like that in 1 *Peter* (p. 145 f.), is based on the thought of the Israelites being led to the Promised Land. 'Salvation' is the victory over, and triumphant emergence out of, difficulties and opposition; glory is the perfect condition for which they were destined. All the 'many sons' have not yet reached that salvation and glory; but One has; He is the Beginning, the First Instalment (ἀρχή) of men to attain to it, and by doing so can lead (ἡγεῖσθαι) the rest thither. 'Forerunner' (πρόδρομος, vi. 20) expresses the same thought. And v. 8 f. : 'Although He was a Son, He learnt obedience from the things which He suffered; and having been perfected, He became to all who obey Him the cause[1] of eternal salvation.' It is not suggested that His obedience ever failed, but it was relative; at the age of twelve it was a greater thing than at the age of two; when He emerged from home to begin His ministry it had grown far greater and deeper; but it did not reach its full depth and height till He had become, as St Paul says, 'obedient to the extent of death, the death of the Cross.' That was His perfecting. The rest of the sentence

[1] αἴτιος, an adjective; lit. 'causal.'

repeats the thought of the former verse. (*b*) Jesus, then, represented man as he actually is, apart from sin. But He also represents him in the ideal condition for which he was destined, which has already been described as glory and salvation. In ii. 7, 8a it is described as sovereignty: 'Thou didst make him [man] a little lower than angels, Thou didst crown him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands, Thou didst subject all things under his feet. For in subjecting all things to him He left nothing unsubjected to him.' This divinely appointed condition of sovereignty is not yet actualized in the case of mankind: 'we see not yet all things subjected to him' (*v.* 8b). But it is in the case of the one Representative Man: 'but we see Him who was made a little lower than angels, Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour' (*v.* 9).

Thus, as Representative of actual man He is Priest; and the new and living way through the veil, which He has consecrated for us, is the way of His flesh (x. 20). As Representative of ideal man He is King, seated at God's right hand (i. 3, 13, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2), triumphing over His foes (i. 13), and worshipped by the angels (*v.* 6). (The writer in this way preserves, side by side with his main thesis, the eschatological thought of the Messiah attaining to the full exercise of His power as the divine Son. The same thought is seen in the etymological explanation 'King of righteousness' and 'King of peace' (vii. 2).)

St Paul reaches the same point, the Session at the Right Hand (Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1), but his thoughts travel along a different route. The Son of God came to redeem man. In order to do that, He must undergo, and thereby conquer, everything from which man is to be redeemed. He must be born under the Law to redeem

them that are under the Law (Gal. iv. 5). To be under the Law is to be under a curse (iii. 10), and so 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law by becoming a curse (i.e. accursed) on our behalf' (*v.* 13). He must empty Himself, taking the form of a slave, becoming in the likeness of men, and must humble Himself, becoming obedient even to the extent of death, the death of the Cross (Phil. ii. 7 f.). He must become poor, that we through His poverty might be rich (2 Cor. viii. 9). His ascent to triumph necessarily involved a descent (Eph. iv. 9). But in all this the central thought is not that Christ *qua* Man represents mankind, but that the pre-existent Son of God condescends to share in man's fallen nature and his ruin, in order to rescue him out of it. To our author, Christ according to the flesh, the man Jesus who can sympathize with human frailty, who was limited and tempted and troubled and disciplined, was a matter of absorbing interest and central importance; to St Paul this aspect was of no doctrinal interest at all. He expressly contrasts the union of men in Christ with the union of men in Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45–47). Christ is the Head and Fount of a new spiritual race (Rom. v. 12–21), the Agent of a new creation (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15). In St Paul the foreground of the picture is occupied by the mystical oneness of the exalted Christ with the Christian; in *Hebrews* by the natural oneness of the human Jesus with humanity.

5. The Death of Christ

In the light of this difference we can compare the conceptions of the two writers regarding the significance of Christ's death. St Paul, guided by his own spiritual experience of sinfulness and rescue, thought of salvation as a sheer gift from above. To man hopelessly fallen and

helplessly lost God gave His Son to save him. In *Hebrews*, man obtains propitiation and access to God, he realizes his destiny, because one Man has done so by His death. St Paul and our author look at Christ crucified; the former says, This is the Son of God dying for me; the latter says, This is the First Instalment of mankind—and therefore the means and pledge of all—reaching τελείωσις and salvation by the perfect sacrifice of completed obedience. There are points in which they closely approach each other; but this represents in the main the difference between them.

In accordance with the burden of the whole epistle, the writer thinks of the death of Christ as a Sacrifice, the realization of the heavenly Ideal of which the Old Testament sacrifices were the shadow and type. It is very instructive to study the difference of emphasis which he and St Paul lay on the several conceptions of the Atonement.

1. *Cleansing*. In Israelite law, for cleansing from various kinds of ceremonial uncleanness water was sometimes necessary. Cf. Heb. x. 22, 'our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' But that which was always necessary was a sin-offering. St Paul once speaks of a spiritual washing with water (Eph. v. 26; cf. Tit. iii. 5), but never of Christ's death as a means of cleansing. Baptism is for him our sacramental plunge into mystical union with Christ in His death and Resurrection; but that is not the same as the cleansing brought about by a sin-offering. He once says 'Let us cleanse ourselves from all pollution of flesh and spirit' (2 Cor. vii. 1), but that means simply 'Let us have nothing to do with anything unclean.' In modern devotional language, such expressions as 'washed in,' 'cleansed by,'

'sprinkled with,' Christ's Blood are frequent, but they are all derived from writings other than St Paul's[1]. But in *Hebrews* the thought of Christ as the cleansing Sin-Offering[2] plays an important part. In ix. 22 the general statement is made, 'It may almost be said that it is in blood that all things are cleansed according to the law, and apart from blood-shedding there is no remission.' In i. 3 the entire saving work of Christ on earth is summed up in the phrase 'having wrought purification of sins,' i.e. having by His death provided a sacrificial means of purification. In three passages he finds in the cleansing of the conscience a counterpart to the Israelite ceremonial cleansing. ix. 13 f.: 'For if the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the defiled sanctifieth to the cleansing of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ...cleanse our conscience from dead works to serve the living God?' Two typical examples of the purificatory Levitical sacrifices are taken in illustration: the yearly sacrifices 'of goats and bulls' on the day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.), and the occasional sacrifice of the red heifer (Num. xix.) 'The first regarded the impurity contracted from daily action, the second the impurity contracted from contact with death' (Westcott). x. 2: The annual sacrifices could not perfect the worshippers; if they had there would have been no need for their repetition, 'because the worshippers once cleansed would have had no more conscience (i.e. consciousness) of sins.' x. 22: 'Let us draw near...our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.' In ix. 21, 23 he finds yet another analogy.

[1] I.e. Hebrews and 1 Jo. i. 7, 9; cf. Tit. ii. 14 where cleansing is placed in juxtaposition with redemption by Christ's death.

[2] Cf. 4 Mac. i. 11 on the death of the martyrs: 'so that through them their fatherland was cleansed.'

The passage is difficult because it combines the idea of sprinkling for cleansing with that of sprinkling for the establishment of a covenant (which will be considered below). After relating that Moses sprinkled the book and all the people, the writer continues 'he also similarly sprinkled the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry with the blood.' This is not recorded in the Old Testament at the time of the covenant ceremony, for the tabernacle was not yet built. It is derived from the ceremony of the day of Atonement. Josephus, however, knew the tradition (*Ant.* III. viii. 6). The place of worship is ceremonially defiled by the sins of the worshippers which are, so to speak, carried in thither in order to be expiated. And the writer thinks of the real place of worship, of which the tabernacle was a copy, the spiritual sphere into which Christ passed, 'the heavenlies[1] themselves' as being also in need of cleansing, for the same reason. If that heavenly sphere was to be freed from defilement in preparation for use, it must be cleansed once for all by the blood of Christ.

2. *Propitiation.* In cleansing the action of the blood of the sin-offering is directed towards man; in propitiation it is directed towards God. It is frequently supposed that the idea of Christ's death as sacrificial[2] was a creation of St Paul, and that whenever it occurs in other writings, even in the Gospels, it is due to his influence. But it is more naturally accounted for by supposing that our Lord really did apply to Himself the words about the suffering Servant

[1] *τὰ ἐπουράνια.* Cf. Eph. i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, and especially vi. 12.

[2] The thought of martyrdom as propitiatory is found in contemporary Jewish thought. See 4 Macc. i. 11, vi. 28 f., ix. 24, xii. 18, xvii. 20 ff., xviii. 4, where the ideas of the martyrs' death as purification, propitiation, and redemption are all found.

in Is. liii. (see p. 40 ff.), and that this application was understood by the Church independently of St Paul. In his writings we find, in fact, much less support for the doctrine than might have been expected. His thoughts were juridical rather than sacrificial. As Rashdall[1] says: 'The Jewish sacrifices did not play a large part in the religious ideas of Rabbinism—least of all probably among the Jews of the Dispersion. It is otherwise with the juridical language. That is vital to his whole doctrine. St Paul naturally thought in terms of law.' That Christ died to save us is his thankful and frequent boast. But the general statements that He died, or was delivered up, or gave Himself, on our behalf or for our sins (e.g. Rom. viii. 32, xiv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 11, xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 14; Gal. i. 4, ii. 20; 1 Thes. v. 10), or even, more precisely, that we are justified by His blood (Rom. v. 9), reconciled to God by His death (*v.* 10), do not express any particular theory as to how His death secured these results.

There are passages, though they are rare, which represent the value of His death as that of an atoning *sacrifice* analogous to Old Testament animal sacrifices. 'Whom God set forth as propitiatory—through faith—in His blood'[2] (Rom. iii. 25). 'He gave Himself up for you, an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet odour' (Eph. v. 2). 'God having sent His Son in the likeness of flesh of sin and *for sin*,' etc. (Rom. viii. 3). περὶ ἁμαρτίας, which is here used, is the LXX. equivalent for the substantive 'sin-offering' (see the quotation in Heb. x. 5). 'Christ our Passover victim hath been sacrificed' (1 Cor. v. 7). No

[1] *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, p. 99 f.

[2] Not 'faith in His blood,' as suggested by the lack of commas in the A.V.

stress, however, can be laid on this passage. The addition περὶ ἡμῶν 'for us' has no good authority; and St Paul is not treating of Christ's death in his argument, but uses the words only to introduce figuratively the idea of keeping perpetual feast free from the leaven of sin.

But that which plays a minor part in St Paul's thoughts looms large for the writer of *Hebrews*. He sums it up in a general expression 'the putting away of sin by His sacrifice' (ix. 26). In *v.* 28 he alludes to Is. liii.: 'having been once offered to bear the sins of many.' And he speaks of Christ as 'sanctifying the [sacred] people by His own blood' (xiii. 12). But in working out the thought of the atoning value of Christ's death, he makes use chiefly of the dramatic moment when the Israelite high priest obtained access, alone, once a year on the day of Atonement, to the innermost sanctuary. He obtained this access because he carried in thither the blood of the sin-offering, a bullock for his own offences and a goat for those of the people (Lev. xvi. 14–16). This was a shadow of the divine Ideal, and by its obvious inadequacy condemned itself as transitory; for the high priest's access to God did not carry with it the access of the people (ix. 7), who were expressly excluded, and did not make atonement permanently, since annual repetition was necessary (*v.* 25). It is here that the author's allegorical imagination reaches its height, in his treatment of the thought of Christ as Priest and Victim.

Three points call for consideration, the meaning (*a*) of His Blood, (*b*) of His Priesthood, (*c*) of His Sacrifice. This division, of course, can be made only for the purpose of study, since the three coalesce.

(*a*) *The Blood is the Life*, available for use because it has been drained from the victim by the act of slaughter.

Christ is Priest 'according to (i.e. in virtue of possessing) the power of indissoluble Life' (vii. 16); 'He is witnessed to that He liveth' (*v.* 8); 'He ever liveth' (*v.* 25). And this Life is His because His blood was, in death, set free for use. As the high priest in the tabernacle was obliged to carry blood to obtain access to the Holy of holies ('not apart from blood,' ix. 7; 'by means of the blood of goats and calves,' *v.* 12; 'in blood not his own,' *v.* 25), so Christ by means of His own blood (*v.* 12) entered into the heavenly Sanctuary (*vv.* 12, 24, vi. 20).

(*b*) *Christ's Priestly Work.* The nature of His work is liable to be obscured by the pains which the writer takes to prove that He was greater than the Aaronic high priest. The allegorical use of the story of Melchizedek, and of the words addressed to the priest-king in Ps. cx., is directed not to explaining the nature of Christ's priestly work, but to proving that a priesthood other than the Aaronic was thinkable, and that such a priesthood was in fact contemplated and purposed in the mind of God. But through the whole Melchizedek argument one thought stands out —'a Priest *for ever*' (vii. 3, 17, 21, 24, 25, 28). The moment when the Aaronic high priest annually performed his function in the inner sanctuary was an instantaneous photograph, a shadow, a copy of the real eternal High Priest's function.

What, then, is that function, which is not confined to a moment of time, and not repeated but continuous? For the Aaronic high priest it was enjoined that after obtaining access to the Holy of holies in virtue of carrying the blood, 'he shall take of the blood of the bullock and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy-seat on the East; and before the mercy-seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times'; and similarly with the

goat for the people (Lev. xvi. 14 f.). 'And so shall he do with the tent of meeting' (*v.* 16), i.e. the first part of the tabernacle, the Holy place. 'And he shall go out unto the altar that is before Yahweh [i.e. outside in the court] and make atonement for it' (*v.* 18). The entire scene of Israelite worship in its three parts or grades must be atoned for because of the sins of himself and the people. And atonement is wrought *by applying the blood*, by bringing the sacrificial life, set free by death, to bear upon the defilement proceeding from man.

And the eternal Ideal of which that is the shadow is that Christ brings His sacrificial Life to bear upon our sins. That is described as follows: 'He ever liveth to intercede on their behalf' (vii. 25). 'He is a Minister (λειτουργός) of the real Tabernacle' (viii. 2). 'Every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is necessary that This one also should have somewhat to offer' (*v.* 3). 'He offered Himself to God in a condition of eternal Spirit' (διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου[1], ix. 14). 'It was necessary, therefore, that the patterns of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ entered not into holy places made with hands, which are types of the Real, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God on our behalf' (ix. 23 f.). As regards the act of dying, the offering occurred only once (vii. 27, ix. 26, 28, x. 10, 12); but the application of the blood, i.e. the Life set free, is His

[1] Thus forming a double contrast with earthly sacrifices, which are flesh not spirit, and temporal not eternal. Or the meaning may be that 'in the case of Christ's sacrifice, although the Victim died He yet survived death, in virtue of the "eternal spirit" which constituted His nature' (E. F. Scott in Peake's *Comm. ad loc.*).

eternal Self-presentation before God on our behalf, which is in itself an eternal Intercession[1].

But with all this idealism the author, more than any other New Testament writer, lays stress, as said above, on the Lord's true Humanity. If He were not a Man He could not be a Priest. Therefore His Priestly function of Self-presentation, or Intercession, on man's behalf is performed representatively. It is not merely His own entry into the heavenly sanctuary, but His entry as our Forerunner (vi. 20), *Archēgos* (ii. 10, xii. 2); for us He has consecrated a new and living way through the veil, the way of His flesh (x. 20); His Humanity is our road into the Eternal, our means of access to the presence of God. And thus, since we have already 'tasted...of the powers of the coming age' (vi. 5), we have already that free approach, that face to face intercourse with God (x. 19–22, iv. 16, vii. 19; cf. ix. 8).

St Paul speaks of our 'access' to God and to the grace of God in and through Christ (Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12), but, as always, it is by our mystical union with His divine and glorified Being, while in *Hebrews* it is by His natural union with our humanity.

(*c*) *The meaning of His Sacrifice* is consonant with this insistence on His Humanity. Fleshly sacrifices are a mere shadow of the real spiritual Sacrifice, which was ultimately and fundamentally Christ's sacrifice of His Will. 'When He cometh into the world He saith'—i.e. His attitude during His earthly life can be expressed in the words of the Psalm—'Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared for Me: in whole burnt

[1] This is wholly different from the idea of verbal intercession offered, according to Jewish thought by angels (e.g. En. xxxix. 5) or saints in heaven (e.g. *ib.* xlvii. 2).

offerings and sin-offerings Thou didst take no pleasure. Then I said, Behold I am come . . . to do, O God, Thy Will' (x. 5–7). 'Though He was a Son, He learnt obedience from the things that He suffered; and having been perfected He became to all who obey Him the cause of eternal salvation' (v. 8 f.). It was fitting that God should 'perfect the Pioneer of their salvation through sufferings' (ii. 10). The suffering of death was not an isolated act of sacrifice; it was the climax and completion of His obedience whereby He was perfected. He learnt all there was to know about obedience by suffering all there was to suffer. And because without that climax, He would not have been perfected, and become the cause of salvation to men, His death had more than a subjective value as an inspiring example of heroic martyrdom for God's cause. Had it been only that, mankind could—theoretically at least—have been saved without it. Its objective value, for the author of *Hebrews*, lies primarily in the fact that it was the necessary consummation of obedience by which an at-one-ment of His Will with God's Will was completed, which is representative of, and therefore potentially secures, the at-one-ment of the will of all mankind with God's Will. 'In which Will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all' (x. 10). 'By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that [all down the ages] are being sanctified' (*v.* 14). Both passages express alike the representativeness and the potentiality.

3. *Redemption.* In the Old Testament the thought of redemption was quite distinct from that of a propitiatory sin-offering. It is laid down in Ex. xiii. 13 = xxxiv. 20, 'Every firstling of an ox shalt thou redeem with a lamb, and if thou wilt not redeem it then shalt thou break its

neck.'[1] But except in this single instance redemption by means of the death of an animal is never found in the Old Testament[2]. In Num. iii. 12 the Levites are accepted for ministry as an equivalent for the firstborn. But in every other passage in the Hebrew Bible where the means of redemption is stated it is a payment of money[3]. When St Paul, therefore, speaks of man's redemption through Christ he means that because of sin man deserved the punishment of death, but was released from it by the payment of an equivalent 'price,' i.e. the death of Christ. It is a 'buying' *ἀγοράζειν* (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23), a 'buying back' *ἐξαγοράζειν* (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), a 'redemption' or 'ransom' *ἀπολύτρωσις* (Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14). The thought of the satisfaction of God's justice plays a part in the metaphor, which is therefore clearly juridical rather than sacrificial. It is true that while redemption meant strictly deliverance by the substitution of an equivalent, it tended, in the Old Testament, to lose its precision of meaning[4], and to denote deliverance in general (and cf. Lk. xxiv. 21). But it is probable that St Paul never uses the word in this modified sense; he writes 'redeem' and 'redemption' as a metaphor in every case pregnant with meaning. On the other hand where the primary force is preserved in the Old Testament there is a significant contrast with St Paul's thought. In Israelite life redemption money was paid in order to deliver persons

[1] In the LXX. פדה, 'redeem,' is rendered by *ἀλλάξεις* 'exchange'; and וְעָרַפְתּוֹ 'break its neck' by *λυτρώσῃ* 'redeem' in ch. xiii. and by *τιμὴν δώσεις* 'pay the price' in ch. xxxiv. (? = וְיַעֲרֹכְתּוֹ).

[2] Unless an instance is to be seen in the divinely provided lamb as a substitute for Isaac (Gen. xxii. 13); but the writer does not there employ the metaphor of redemption.

[3] See the writer's *St Matthew*, note on xx. 28.

[4] See Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 295.

or things from dedication and permanent consecration to God either by death or perpetual service; in other words to save them from being the sole property of God. St Paul reverses the thought. Man is delivered from the bondage of sin, from the power of the devil, from the curse of the law, from death, because Christ his more than Equivalent died, so that he is bought *into* God's service, and becomes God's sole property, as a purchased slave.

The writer of *Hebrews* thinks in terms that are sacrificial rather than juridical. But he twice employs the metaphor of redemption. In ix. 12 he sums up Christ's saving work on earth in the general expression 'having obtained eternal redemption' (ἀπολύτρωσιν). And in *v.* 15 he writes 'a death having taken place for the redemption of the *transgressions* that were (committed) under the first covenant.' The only Biblical parallel to this is in Dan. iv. 27 (24) (LXX. and Theodotion) where Daniel urges the king, 'Entreat Him concerning thy sins, and redeem all thine unrighteousnesses with almsgivings.' Almsgiving was to be an equivalent which could commute the punishment due for his sins. In *Hebrews* the death of Christ is declared to be adequate for such commutation, which all the Old Testament machinery had been powerless to effect.

4. *A Covenant.* Many words have more than one meaning; and few words in any language coincide in all meanings with words offered as their equivalent in another. The Biblical words represented by 'covenant' are a striking instance of this. 1. The Hebrew word *b^erīth*, according to its probable derivation, denotes a binding arrangement or obligation. (*a*) A man may lay it upon himself, and God can be thought of as doing the same. It is then an 'undertaking' or 'promise.' (*b*) If imposed upon another it is a binding 'ordinance' or

'command.' (*c*) When an undertaking is mutually entered into by two parties, it is a 'covenant,' 'pact,' 'treaty.' And when a divine command, or body of commands, is thought of as willingly accepted by Israel, God at the same time promising blessing in the event of obedience, it can also, though with less strictness, be called a 'covenant' between God and man[1]. 2. While *b^e^rīth* contains the root force of *binding*, the Greek διαθήκη (*diathēkē*) denotes an *arrangement* or disposition of a binding character. Thus it was employed in the LXX. to represent *b^e^rīth* in all its meanings. It is used once in the sense of 'covenant' or 'compact' in Aristophanes[2], but the regular word for that in non-Biblical Greek was συνθήκη, while the regular meaning of διαθήκη was one which does not occur in the Old Testament, a 'will,' 'testament,' which, as Milligan[3] says, was 'simply the most conspicuous example' of a binding arrangement. 3. In the Greek of the New Testament, the LXX. meanings of διαθήκη are adopted, and two others are added: viz. (*d*) a 'Dispensation.' The whole Hebrew economy was a system of life lived under the divine arrangements, commands, and promises. But when Christ came there was a new economy, a system of life lived under new divine arrangements, commands, and promises. These were called the 'Old *diathēkē*' and the 'New *diathēkē*.' (*e*) The word occurs in the strict meaning which it bears in non-Biblical Greek, of a 'will,' 'testament.' This is as regularly the force of the Latin *testamentum*, apart from the Bible and writings dependent upon it. But in the New Testament it is the invariable rendering of

[1] The meanings are more fully given in the writer's *Exodus*, p. 150 ff.
[2] *Birds*, 439.
[3] *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, s.v. διαθήκη.

διαθήκη in all its meanings[1]. It will thus be seen how unsafe it is to be over rigid in interpreting the word in one passage in accordance with its meaning in another.

Of the five meanings of διαθήκη, 'promise,' 'command,' 'compact,' 'dispensation,' 'will,' St Paul uses the first and fourth in connexion with God, and refers to the fifth by way of human illustration. But he never deals with the thought of a compact between God and man. True to his experience he insists that God gratuitously *dispenses* undeserved blessings.

The promise made to Abraham was a *diathēkē*, a gracious disposition made by God for the future, confirmed and made binding upon Himself, and therefore one which the Law, 430 years later, was quite incapable of annulling (Gal. iii. 16, 17). This is illustrated by reference to a human *diathēkē*, a man's last will and testament; when it is once confirmed no one can cancel it or add clauses to it (*v.* 15). The Messianic promises made to Israel are described as '*diathēkai* of promise' (Eph. ii. 12; cf. Lk. i. 72 f.). The word is used in a wide sense, embracing all God's commands and promises to Israel, in Rom. ix. 4, where 'the *diathēkai*' are among the peculiar privileges of the nation. But also quite clearly it has the force of dispensation, economy, *régime*. There were two eras in the world's history, in which there were two *diathēkai*, the one involving slavery, the other freedom (Gal. iv. 24–26). The conditions and rules of the former ('the old *diathēkē*,'

[1] In the Old Testament many occurrences of it are probably due to Jerome's adoption of an earlier Latin rendering of διαθήκη. It is found in the Psalms, mostly in Ecclus., Wisd., and 1, 2 Macc., sporadically in the prophets, and only three times in the Pentateuch. Occasionally words like *juramentum, mandatum, lex* occur; but elsewhere the normal renderings are *foedus* and *pactum* used quite indiscriminately.

τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης) were written on tablets of stone and read throughout the ages of Israelite life. The rigidity of law, which no one could perfectly obey, only led to death; and yet the giving of that law was accompanied by divine glory. How much more glorious must be the conditions of the new spiritual dispensation (2 Cor. iii. 4–11). And the latter is spoken of in St Paul's record of the Lord's words at the Last Supper which he had received in Christian tradition: 'This cup is the new *diathēkē* in My blood' (1 Cor. xi. 25). This is the only passage in which he connects the word with the shedding of blood. But his object is not to discuss the doctrine of the efficacy of Christ's death, but simply to warn against abuses at the Eucharistic services. He is not maintaining any doctrine, but simply quoting the account of the Last Supper as he had given it to the Corinthians before, to remind them of the sacredness of the Cup, and the reverence with which it and the Bread should be received.

But in *Hebrews* the implications of the Lord's words, whether in the Marcan form 'This is My Blood of the *diathēkē*' (Mk xiv. 24) or in St Paul's, are drawn out and emphasized. The divine Ideal realized in Christianity is greater than its Hebrew shadow or type. And the author is at no loss for Scripture proof that God foresaw and purposed the realization. In Jer. xxxi. 31–34 it was predicted that 'after those days,' in the perfect age to come, God would make a 'new Covenant,' written not on stones but on the heart (viii. 8–13). See p. 225. This Scripture proof, however, does not by itself imply any connexion of a Covenant with sacrifice. As in 2 Cor. iii. 4–11 it is a system or dispensation of commands and promises. 'Thus the expression in viii. 13 (the old covenant ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ) means simply that the old *régime,*

superseded by Jesus, was decaying even in Jeremiah's age' (Moffatt[1]). At the same time the emphasis in *Hebrews* is different from St Paul's. For the latter it lies on the inwardness of the Spirit as opposed to the external commands of the old *régime*; in the former it lies on the forgiveness of sins, with which the quotation from Jeremiah ends.

But our author goes much further when he thinks of the circumstances in which the Covenant is made. Unlike St Paul he delights in drawing out the sacrificial aspect. As his thoughts, in the case of Propitiation, centre round the ceremony of the day of Atonement, so here they centre round the ceremony at the giving of the Law at Mt Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 3–8), the latter being, as Kennedy says[2], the inauguration, the former the maintenance, of the covenant. The *diathēkē* was made of force by the death of a victim and the application of its blood. This is drawn out in ix. 15–17, which cannot be translated into natural English, because the word is made to do double work[3]. As St Paul in Gal. iii. 15, 17 illustrates the immutability of God's promise (διαθήκη) to Abraham by the binding validity of a human will and testament (διαθήκη), so our author, but with a more obscure and artificial play on words, uses a human will and testament to illustrate the divine Covenant or Dispensation granted at Sinai. As a testament becomes valid only on the testator's death, so the divine Covenant became valid

[1] *Introd. to Lit. of N.T.* p. 452.

[2] *Expositor*, 8th series, x. p. 385 ff.

[3] Deissmann's claim that the Hellenistic meaning 'testament' must always be preserved in the New Testament cannot be allowed. The LXX. had a sacred value both for St Paul and our author; it is natural, therefore, that they should follow it, and at the same time illustrate its truth by contemporary ideas expressed by current, non-Biblical Greek.

only when the death of a victim had taken place. The victim having been killed, the inauguration of the *diathēkē* is completed by the application of the blood, as was the expiatory ceremony on the day of Atonement (see p. 235 ff.), which the author fuses with this in the next verses, thereby rendering the passage still more obscure. In *v.* 20 a free citation is given of the words of Moses, in the form 'This is the blood of the covenant which God hath commanded for you[1].' Hence Christ's blood can be called 'the blood of the covenant' (x. 29), and 'the blood of an eternal covenant' (xiii. 20). 'Eternal' is one of the words by which the writer draws out the thesis of the whole epistle. The new Covenant is the eternal Ideal made real, of which the old was a temporary shadow and type. The sin-offering which ratifies the new Covenant need never be repeated, because its effects are permanent, as shewn in the fact that God's promise of the new Covenant in Jeremiah ends with the words 'And their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more' (Heb. x. 17[2]). The new Covenant is superior to the old (vii. 22, viii. 6); and the application of the blood which ratifies it 'speaketh better than Abel' (*παρὰ τὸν* Ἄβελ, xii. 24), i.e. it is more efficacious than Abel's animal sacrifice, it *means* more than Abel did. This looks back to xi. 4: Abel's sacrifice of animals was better than Cain's offering of vegetables, and consequently 'he, though dead, still speaketh.' His sacrifice still *means* something, because it has always been the type and shadow of the Real Sacrifice[3].

[1] *τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός.* Ex. xxiv. 8, LLX.: *ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο* Κύριος *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, 'Behold the blood of the covenant which God hath covenanted for you.'

[2] See p. 245.

[3] See an article by the present writer in the *Interpreter*, July, 1922.

Finally, as we have already seen symbolized in the combination of the Sinai ceremony with that of the day of Atonement, the thought of the Covenant, ratified by the application of the blood is brought into connexion with Christ's Priesthood. 'In the New Covenant inauguration and maintenance are often merged in one. For the one sacrifice of Christ avails perfectly for both' (Kennedy, *op. cit.*). Unlike the Levitical priests, Christ received His office with an oath, and He is the 'Surety of a better covenant' (vii. 22), i.e. He ensures permanently that it shall remain valid. And as Moses, who sprinkled the blood at Sinai, was the 'mediator' of the old covenant (cf. Gal. iii. 19; see p. 213) so Christ is 'the Mediator of a new, better, covenant' (viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24).

6. The Resurrection of Christ

Nothing can exaggerate the importance which Christ's Resurrection has for St Paul. He was marked out by it as Son of God with power (Rom. i. 4), and by Death and Resurrection He became Lord of dead and living (xiv. 9). Belief in it is necessary for salvation (x. 9). The evidence for the fact is the experience of those who saw Him after He rose (1 Cor. xv. 5–8). The proof of it is the pragmatic proof in *vv.* 14–18, 29–32: if the Resurrection is not true our faith and preaching are vain, and we have spoken falsely against God in witnessing against Him that He raised up Jesus; ye are yet in your sins, and those who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. In vain also is the practice of baptizing living persons in behalf of the dead, and all my daily sufferings for the cause of Christianity. This proof rests upon the two-fold value which Christ's Resurrection has for St Paul. Firstly, it is the pledge of the actual rising again of Christians in

the future, after the death of the body (Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14, xv. 20–23, 45–57; 1 Thes. iv. 14–17, v. 10). Secondly, it is the pledge of it because it is mystically, spiritually, the means of the Christian's resurrection *now*. Christ rose to a life that we can share; we die and rise *in* Him (Eph. ii. 5 f.; Rom. vi. 8–11, vii. 4; 2 Cor. xiii. 4), and this took place in baptism (Rom. vi. 4 f.; Col. ii. 12 f.). Thus He can be said to have risen for our justification (Rom. iv. 25). Sin is left behind, and is now unthinkable in the Christian,—a thought running through Rom. vi., vii. 1–6. And the life of Christ can be manifested in our suffering bodies (2 Cor. iv. 10 f.).

Of all this, the author of *Hebrews* shews not one trace. His mind is concentrated on the thought, not that we share in divine Life, because the Son of God lives, but that we share in free access to the innermost Sanctuary of God's presence, in propitiation, and cleansing, and priestly intercession, because *a Man*, in whom the eternal Ideal has been realized on earth, was exalted to God's presence as High Priest. The Resurrection is, of course, assumed, and in one sentence referred to, but it is the entrance into the Holy of holies that the writer feels to be the primary fact.

The one sentence plays no part in the doctrinal theme, but occurs in the solemn and beautiful prayer which closes the homily (xiii. 20 f.): 'And the God of peace, who brought up the Great Shepherd of the sheep in the blood of the eternal covenant,' etc.—an allusion to Is. lxiii. 11, the bringing up of Moses and the people from the waters of the Red Sea. But even here, it is not the fact of Christ passing from death to life that he is thinking about, but of the Shepherd, who has Himself been the Sheep slain for the inauguration of the new Covenant, passing with His own blood into the Sanctuary.

7. The Christian Life

This is an immediate deduction of all that has been said about Christ. St Paul rejoices in his oneness with Christ, because it means to him *Life*, upspringing out of death, revelling, expanding, intensifying, in the exhilarating power of Christ's immanent Spirit. Our author, on the other hand, watches, so to speak, with reverent thankfulness, a perpetual liturgical act, performed now and always in the presence of God by man in the Person of Christ his Representative. And even in their use of common terms the difference can be felt.

(*a*) *Holiness, Sanctification.* St Paul's use of this group of words has been studied in connexion with 1 *Peter* (p. 154 f.). The strictly Jewish sense of the corporate sacredness of Israel does not occur in *Hebrews*. And the writer seldom uses the word in connexion with the moral growth of individuals. He says that God disciplines us for our profit, that we may partake in His holiness (ἁγιότης, xii. 10), i.e. gain a moral likeness to Himself. Sanctification (ἁγιασμός) without which no one shall see the Lord, is to be 'pursued' (διώκετε)[1], as is peace with all men (*v.* 14). But normally he thinks of the ideal condition or status belonging to Christians as such. Christians are ἅγιοι, 'saints' (vi. 10, xiii. 24), a term which probably owed its currency to St Paul; and he addresses his readers or hearers as 'holy brethren' (iii. 1). But while, for St Paul, this is due to their mystical union with the divine Christ, for our author it is due to the priestly work of their human Representative. 'He that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one' (ii. 11; see

[1] Or this possibly refers to the Christian duty of furthering the holiness of others. Cf. Rom. xiv. 19, 'Let us pursue the things that make for peace, and the things that make for the edifying of one another.'

p. 227). 'He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified' (x. 14). (In both these passages the present participle ἁγιαζόμενοι is used; but it does not imply a process, a growth in holiness, but points to the succession of Christians who are severally brought into the status of ἁγιασμός as time goes on.) And it is a status acquired by Christ's Sacrifice,—by 'the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all' (x. 10), the 'one offering' (*v.* 14), 'the blood of the Covenant' (*v.* 29), 'His own blood' (xiii. 12). It is the realized Ideal of which Levitical sacredness was the shadow and type. But for St Paul 'such hallowing has no necessary connexion with purification from sins, but only with the realization of the possibilities of devotion to God's will in love. It was here that St Paul felt himself not yet to have attained or to have been brought to perfection[1].'

(*b*) *Perfecting.* Levitical 'holiness,' which constitutes a right condition for approach to God, is expressed also by another word, which emphasizes the completeness with which this condition must be acquired, i.e. τελείωσις, -οῦν. It is found in the LXX. in the expression τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας (Heb. 'to fill the hands'), i.e. to instal in the priestly office. And τελείωσις is used with the corresponding force. See Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 63. In our epistle 'perfecting' and 'sanctifying' are practically synonymous as regards the status of the Christian, 'as regards the conscience' as the author puts it (ix. 9). Christ's perfecting, or complete consecration, was achieved through the suffering which obedience involved (v. 9, vii. 28), its climax and consummation being the shedding of His blood and the offering of Himself (see p. 238 f.). Our perfecting cannot be achieved in that way, because our obedience is never

[1] Bartlett, in Hastings' *D.B.* iv. p. 393.

complete. It is the status which we acquire through His representative offering, the ideal status which the Levitical sacrifices were powerless to confer. If they could have conferred it, another, non-Aaronic Priest would not have been needed (vii. 11). 'The [Levitical] law perfected nothing, but the bringing in of a better hope did, through which we draw nigh to God,' *sc.* to make our offering (*v.* 19). Gifts and sacrifices offered in the tabernacle, which was a mere figure of the Ideal to come, 'could not as regards the conscience perfect the worshipper' (ix. 9). Similarly x. 1. And as a contrast with all this, Christ 'by one offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified' (x. 14). And departed saints can be called 'the spirits of righteous men who have been perfected' (xii. 23).

'He who is τέλειος has reached the end which is in each case set before him, maturity of growth, complete development of powers, full enjoyment of privileges, perfect possession of knowledge' (Westcott, *op. cit.*). The last but one of these is the principal thought in *Hebrews*. The last appears in two passages. Mature Christians (τέλειος) need stronger intellectual food than babes (v. 14). And the writer exhorts his readers to be carried on from the elements of Christian teaching to τελειότης, the ripe perfectness of Christian knowledge (vi. 1). The only other passage in which this group of words is represented is xii. 2, where Christ is called the Perfecter (τελειώτης) of our faith (see p. 256).

But in *Hebrews* it is never employed to express the idea of moral perfectness or of the growth towards it. St Paul, on the other hand never uses it in the sense specially characteristic of *Hebrews*. Sometimes it connotes for him maturity of Christian knowledge, an idea common also among pagans in connexion with the mysteries. It is

a maturity which can be reached in the present, and which he assumes in many of his readers. 'We speak wisdom among the perfect' (1 Cor. ii. 6). 'In wickedness be as babes, but in your minds shew yourselves perfect' (xiv. 20). 'As many of us, then, as are perfect, let us be thus minded' (Phil. iii. 15). But at other times he looks beyond the present to the final goal, which no one but Christ has reached, of complete moral and spiritual development. He knew that he had not reached it himself: 'not that I have already attained or have already been perfected' (Phil. iii. 11). But he tried to help his Christian converts to reach it: 'admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ; to which end I labour,' etc. (Col. i. 28 f.). And a still larger thought is that the perfectness of the individual can be truly consummated only in the perfectness of the whole Body. 'Over and above all these [virtues] put on love, which is the bond of perfectness' (Col. iii. 14). The virtues of each individual must not be isolated, but bound together by that which produces the perfect wholeness of the whole. It is the supreme conception of the growth of the whole 'towards a perfect man' (*εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον*), which is described with a wealth of language in Eph. iv. 13–16.

(*c*) *The Spirit.* The Christian life, then, according to the author of *Hebrews*, is primarily an ideal status of privilege, the Real status of which everything in the life of Israel was the shadow and type. It is, in fact, static. But for St Paul it is dynamic. It meant first a new creation—that is the ideal status; but then follows the necessary growth of the new creature, everything that is included in the great word Life; and that Life is the divine Life of the glorified, immanent Christ. But life

requires air, motion requires a driving force. And this, for the apostle, was the meaning of the Spirit. His conception of it has already been studied on pp. 128 ff., 159 ff. For our author the Spirit is only a privilege belonging to the Christian status. The words 'we have become partakers of the Christ' (iii. 14) cannot be interpreted as describing the Pauline mystical union; it means only 'we have received the privilege of being made sharers in the blessings of the Messiah for which Israel hoped.' In vi. 4 Christians are spoken of as 'those who once for all have been illuminated, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of holy Spirit (*πνεύματος ἁγιόυ*).' But the writer does not go beyond the common experience of the Church from the earliest days, the pouring out of the Spirit which Old Testament prophets had expected in the perfect age to come, with the resultant supernatural signs of the divine activity, ecstasy and charismata, various 'powers of the coming age' which had already begun to be tasted, the Source of which is 'the Spirit of grace' (x. 29). The thought is the same in ii. 4: 'signs and portents and manifold powers and distributions of holy Spirit according to His[1] [God's] will.'

The prophetic predictions had been fulfilled in the privileged possession of spiritual gifts by all Christians. But in Old Testament times this privilege was already accorded to particular persons in the form of the inspiration of Scripture. Here the article is used (*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*) with the same force as in the *Acts* (p. 130): 'as saith the holy Spirit' (iii. 7); 'the holy Spirit shewing this' (ix. 8); 'the holy Spirit witnesseth' (x. 15).

(*d*) *Faith.* If the Spirit was the atmosphere which St

[1] Probably not 'His own [the Holy Spirit's] will' echoing the thought of 1 Cor. xii. 11.

Paul, as a Christian, breathed, and the vital force which carried him towards his goal, Faith placed him at the starting point. It made real for him the ideal status of the new creation already wrought by Christ, and put him and kept him in such abiding union with Him that the process of spiritual sanctification and growth could go on. This rich, mystical connotation which the word had for him has been described on p. 152 in connexion with 1 *Peter*, with which in this, as in some other respects, *Hebrews* is akin. But while Faith does not mean for our author what it meant for St Paul, he gives it a wider range of meaning than that in 1 *Peter*, and much wider than the mere intellectual assent spoken of in *James* (p. 102). His conception of it is summed up in the definition, 'Faith is the substantial (*or* virtual) possession (ὑπόστασις) of things hoped for, the convincing proof (ἔλεγχος) of things not seen' (xi. 1). The two halves of the definition are far from being identical in meaning. The former refers to the future; the latter is more complex and looks also at the past and the present.

1. The former can be paraphrased as a confident expectation that what is hoped for will come to pass—so confident that the hope may, to all intents and purposes, be considered to be already realized. But though the writer gives this as an abstract definition, he assumes, in practice, that the confident expectation is due to confident trust in a Person. One of the elementary but fundamental essentials of Christianity is πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν, 'faith in (set upon) God' (vi. 1). And the attitude of mind of those 'who have become believers' (πιστεύσαντες, iv. 3) is the same confidence in Jesus Christ. This confidence, as applied to the future, is a feeling of trustful certainty that God will do things hoped for. The Israelites who failed

to enter into God's rest failed because they lacked it (iv. 2). Conversely, we who have become believers are entering into the rest (*v.* 3); the readers are exhorted to imitate the faith and longsuffering of those who inherit the promises (vi. 12). Because we have a great High Priest 'let us approach...in fullness of confidence' (x. 22). It is the opposite of *ὑποστολή*, 'a frightened shrinking back' (x. 39). And that explains the sense in which the author, in the preceding verse, understood the words in Hab. ii. 4, which he quotes in the form *ὁ δὲ δίκαιός [μου] ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.* Whatever the true reading or meaning may be in *Habakkuk* (Hebrew or Greek), his interpretation is that God's [*or* the] righteous man shall live as a result of his confident trust,—a continuation of the thought in *v.* 35 f.: boldness has great reward, for by doing the will of God with patient endurance ye shall receive the promise given through the prophet[1]. (It is significant that St Paul quotes the sentence *ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται* (Rom. i. 17), and reads into it his own conception of Faith, that mystical and wonderful thing in virtue of which a man becomes *δίκαιος*.) And in the roll of honour in ch. xi. the former half of the definition of Faith finds ample illustration.

2. But the aspects contained in the latter half also appear. (*a*) Faith is a conviction—the sort of certainty ordinarily produced by proof—that something in the past has taken place, although by its nature unprovable by the evidence of human eyesight. This is the meaning in *v.* 3: 'we grasp with our mind (*νοοῦμεν*), as certainly as if we had seen it with our eyes, the truth that by the utterance of God the world in all the ages of its time career was made and carried out' (*κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς*

[1] In the opening phrase *ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον* the last three words are a reminiscence of Is. xxvi. 20.

αἰῶνας). (*b*) It is a convinced certainty of, and an attitude towards, something that exists in the present, though equally unprovable by the senses. 'He that approaches God'—for acceptable worship and intercourse —'must believe that He exists, and shews Himself a rewarder to them that seek Him' (*v.* 6). And Moses' faith, which gave him the inflexible perseverance till the exodus, was 'seeing the Invisible One' (*v.* 27). (*c*) Only in reference to the future do the two halves of the definition become identified. The faith of those mentioned in the chapter was both the virtual possession of things hoped for, and the positive conviction that things not seen will take place.

But, after all, the faith of every one of them was imperfect. 'Let us,' says the writer, 'turn our eyes from them and look at the Pioneer and Perfecter of faith, Jesus' (xii. 2). Since He is our representative Man, faith was necessary for Him as for us; He led the way in the great venture, so that we can follow Him; and He won through triumphantly, He perfected faith,—His faith and therefore ours.

8. Eschatology

The writer's idealism is deep and far-reaching. But in studying his treatment of the theme it is impossible not to be struck with the vein of Jewish eschatology running through it—and foreign to it. The eternal Ideal, of which Judaism was a type, finds its real *εἰκών* (x. 1) in Christianity. That is the lofty theory. But in actual fact Christians do not *in themselves* bear it out; they do so only in the Person of their Representative. Through Him alone they have priestly access to God, and gain the royal position for which they are destined. This status of the Christian is the author's special conception which

for him takes the place of St Paul's mystical union with Christ, and a conception which, no less than St Paul's, empties eschatology of all idea of time (see p. 22 f.). But the writer was a Jew, and traditional ideas clung too fast to be entirely stripped off. The more the epistle is studied the more clearly can be felt the stress and strain within his thoughts, caused by the eschatological element.

On the one hand the realizing of the Ideal is the true meaning of the ideal age or world for which Israel hoped: the time of the putting right of everything (ix. 10); the world that was destined to come (*μέλλουσα*), which is the subject of the writer's theme (ii. 5); the age that was destined to come, whose powers have already been tasted (vi. 5); the good things that were destined to come, of which the law contained only a shadow (x. 1); the good things which have in fact come into being (see p. 223), of which Christ came as High Priest (ix. 11). And having accomplished this realization, the Son of God sat down as triumphant Victor and King at the right hand of God (i. 3, 13, viii. 1, x. 12 f., xii. 2); His throne is for ever and ever (i. 8); He is crowned with glory and honour (ii. 9). By taking a share in blood and flesh He fulfilled through death the Messianic function of destroying him that had the power of death, that is the devil (ii. 14). He is the true Melchizedek, King of righteousness, King of peace (vii. 2). In receiving the divine *diathēkē* Christians have come to Mt Sion, the heavenly Jerusalem, with all its blessed inhabitants (xii. 22 f.). The old things have been shaken and removed, and we receive a Kingdom that is unshakeable (*v.* 27 f.). The Ideal has been realized.

On the other hand notes are heard in another key. In this transitory world we have no abiding city; we seek one that is destined still to come (xiii. 14). Although

Christ is already the triumphant King, yet there is to be another divine Coming: ἐρχόμενος ἥξει (x. 37). As man dies once for all, and then awaits judgment, so Christ died to work atonement once for all. 'By the death of Christ His redeeming work was definitely brought to an end. His next appearance on earth will have no reference to the work of atonement, but will have for its sole purpose the reception into eternal life of those whom He has redeemed[1]' (ix. 27 f.). There is to be an eternal judgment (vi. 2), and for those who refuse to listen to Christ's message, there will be judgment, and vengeance, and burning fire far worse than the punishment suffered by those who rejected the law of Moses (x. 26–31).

We can understand, as in St Paul, that the blessings of the ideal age are thought of only as potentially realized. But that logically requires that man shall gradually make the potentiality actual throughout the limitless ages of the future. (As St Paul says (Eph. iv. 13), 'till we all come...unto a perfect man.') But a sudden ending of the world's history in the near future (ἔτι μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον), a sudden Advent at which only those ready for it will be saved, and a judgment of fire and vengeance for those who are not, are conceptions on a wholly different plane of thought. We can give to these eschatological ideas a rich spiritual meaning; we know that the Lord is not slack concerning His promise as some men count slackness. But the lapse of nineteen centuries has taught us that He does not intend us to give to His promise the same interpretation as that given by Jews and Christians in the first century.

[1] Scott, in Peake's *Commentary, ad loc.*, p. 896.

CHAPTER X

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN

St Paul's Christian doctrine was a growth, starting from the fact of the Resurrection, and fostered by his own spiritual experience and reflexion which enabled him to realize that Christ comprised and transcended all that was best in Jewish and Greek thought. In the author of the Fourth Gospel we have one who wrote some years later than the apostle. He too was a Jew, well acquainted with Hellenistic thought, who shared St Paul's mystical experience of Christ, and in certain directions carried forward his ideas to a further point. In his Gospel, therefore, we reach the last stage in the development of Christian doctrine in the New Testament. What he actually taught is in no way affected by the vexed question who he was, on which volumes have been written, or his date. If it was written later than the synoptic Gospels it cannot be dated earlier than c. 80. The fact that Clement of Rome (c. 96) shews no knowledge of it can hardly count as evidence. A book written a few years earlier in Asia or Syria would not necessarily be known to him, or necessarily used by him if he knew it. Dr Burney[1] has made it very probable that Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (c. 110), used it. And if he is right in claiming that he knew the *Odes of Solomon*, written as Drs Rendel Harris and Mingana think, at Antioch in the 1st century, and also that the *Odes* shew a knowledge of the Gospel, then the latter cannot be dated later than about 95. And internal evidence is in keeping with a date c. 90–95. This makes it very improbable that the author

[1] *The Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 152–9.

was John the son of Zebedee. Dr Burney holds that, 'all the early Asiatic evidence, i.e. all the external evidence that matters, unites in indicating that the only John of Ephesus was John the presbyter, and that he wrote the Fourth Gospel[1].' In view of the well-known ambiguities in the language of Papias and Irenaeus, this is too confidently expressed. But most of the evidence can be interpreted as pointing to this conclusion. And there is some evidence that the son of Zebedee was martyred at an early date[2], which Mk x. 39 (Mat. xx. 23) makes independently probable. This is not the place to discuss Dr Burney's proposition that the whole Gospel (including ch. xxi.) is a translation from an Aramaic original. At least he has made it clear how Semitic it is, and that it must be studied as the work of one who thought, if he did not write, in Aramaic. But no one who accepts his linguistic theory is committed to his suggestion that the author, John of Ephesus, was 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' a young man, almost a boy, at the time of the Crucifixion, in close connexion with priestly circles, too young to be allowed to join our Lord's band of followers, but not too young to grasp, as no one else could, the inner meaning of the discussions with the Rabbinists, 'keenly following the debates which his scholastic training so well enabled him to appreciate, drinking in every word of the subtle arguments of which the Galilean Apostles could make nothing.' Such a youth, nearly half a century later in Antioch, might no doubt write his account in his native Aramaic. But the language affords no proof of the authorship. Nor, indeed, of locality. If the author had recently come from Palestine or Syria to Ephesus, and was not

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 134–42.
[2] See Moffatt, *Introd. Lit. N.T.*[2,3], p. 601 ff.

sufficiently in command of Greek to use it for so important a literary purpose, he might write the Gospel in Aramaic to send to Palestine, but cause it at once to be translated for use in Asia. Dr Burney's suggestions regarding both the Gospel and the Apocalypse have added to the complexity of the already difficult Johannine problem. But we are here concerned only with the Christian doctrine contained in the Fourth Gospel as it stands.

It is a truism of modern literary study that in the interpretation of any writing the first necessity is to ascertain the meaning which the author intended it to convey to his contemporaries. Its nature and purpose must be such as the men of his generation would understand. In the case of a doctrinal work we expect to find in it answers to questions and problems which exercised the minds of his day. If this criterion be applied to the Fourth Gospel, much is explained. By the year 90 St Paul's epistles were in circulation, though probably not yet in a defined *corpus*. His influence must have been wide and deep, but St John makes extraordinarily few references to his words. Alike in language and thought he is independent, and to a large extent original. Christianity had to hold its own against the mystery religions and Oriental Gnosticism with elements drawn from many different quarters. And the great need of his readers was a restatement of Christian doctrine of such a kind as would convince them that Christianity was a reasoned system adequate to their intellectual demands. He was, for those days, what we might now call a modernist. And he had a difficult task. The synoptic tradition[1] (out of which the first three Gospels had recently been

[1] On the question whether St John made use of any or all of the synoptic Gospels see Moffatt, *Introd. Lit. N.T.* p. 533 ff.

constructed) was as widespread as the teaching of St Paul; and on that twofold basis he had to commend his own convictions to the thinkers of his day.

1. His attitude to Judaism

(*a*) *His attitude to the Jews.* St Paul fought Judaism on a particular issue, and the fight occupied the best part of his life as a Christian. In *Colossians* and *Ephesians* he is still glorying in the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ as a truth of splendid and burning importance. But while he broke with the old religion, and championed the freedom of Gentile Christians, he felt no hostility to Jews as such. On the contrary he loved them as his own nation, and longed to see them grafted in. But when the Fourth Gospel was written St Paul's fight was a thing of the past. Many could remember the *furore* that it created in their boyhood, but it was no longer a matter to which there was the least occasion to refer. On the other hand, to 'the Jews' as such St John is in open and intense hostility, as is shewn on almost every page of his Gospel, which reveals the nature of their opposition to Christianity towards the end of the century, their questions and difficulties, accusations and jibes. See E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 70–74. That Jesus is represented as speaking of 'your law' (viii. 17, x. 34) is enough to shew the evangelist's point of view. Yet he held the opinion, which we have already seen in 1 *Peter*, and in a special form in *Hebrews*, that Christianity is Judaism as it was intended to be. St Paul with his love for his nation said some things which first pointed in that direction (see p. 142), but here the continuity between Israel and the Christian Church is bound up with the conception of Christ as the eternal Word, who was as present and active in Old Testament

times as now. It was He 'of whom Moses in the Law did write, and the prophets' (i. 45). The Scriptures, Christ says, 'are they which witness concerning Me' (v. 39). 'Concerning Me he [Moses] wrote' (v. 46). Regarding the true Israel in this way he could use language which appears to contradict his usual hostility: 'Behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile' (i. 47), i.e. a true Israelite in whom Jacob's guile found no place. 'Salvation is from the Jews' (iv. 22), i.e. from the Jewish race, which failed in its destiny, has emerged the true Judaism which is the religion of salvation. Some have thought that the mother of the Lord is in this Gospel symbolic of the same truth, i.e. that the ancient Israelite religion was that which gave birth to Christianity. She says of the eternal Christ 'Whatsoever He saith unto you do it' (ii. 5), and He commends her on the Cross to the beloved disciple (xix. 26). 'What was valuable and permanent in Judaism has now passed over to Christianity: the "mother of Jesus" dwells in the house of His disciple' (Scott).

(*b*) *His use of the Old Testament.* It follows that for St John, as for all other Christians, the Old Testament is sacred. But there is little of St Paul's Rabbinic use of the wording, or of the allegorical exegesis of which *Hebrews* is full. The standpoint is much the same as in the synoptic Gospels, both in the allusions and quotations attributed to our Lord and to others (see i. 23, 51, iii. 14, vi. 31, 45, vii. 22 f., 38 (see Burney, *op. cit.* p. 109 ff.), viii. 17, x. 34, xii. 13), and also in the attitude expressed by ἵνα πληρωθῇ and the like[1].

[1] With one exception references to the Old Testament as pointing to events in the Lord's life are confined to the final period, after the time that He 'departed and hid Himself' from the Jews (xii. 15, 38, *vv.* 39 f. ('therefore they could not believe, because Isaiah said,' etc., a stronger statement than is found

(*c*) *The Messiah.* The Messiahship of Jesus is accepted by His followers from the first: 'We have found the Messiah' (i. 41); 'Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel' (*v.* 49); 'I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, who was to come into the world' (xi. 27). And guesses were made by the people (iv. 29, vii. 31, 41 f.). The evangelist states that the object of his writing is to help people to believe 'that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God' (xx. 31); and the Lord Himself claims it, 'I that speak to thee am He' (iv. 26). He accepts also the synoptic eschatological title 'the Son of Man.' But while in the synoptists it is almost certain that our Lord did not apply it to Himself until after St Peter's confession at Philippi, and then only of the office upon which He would enter after death (see p. 48 f.), in the Fourth Gospel Christ is the Son of Man alike in the past, the present, and the future. 'He that came down from heaven, the Son of Man [who is in heaven[1]]' (iii. 13). 'The hour is coming that the Son of Man should be glorified' (xii. 23); 'now is the Son of Man glorified,' i.e. His heavenly glory

anywhere else), xiii. 18, xv. 25, xvii. 12, xix. 24, 28, 36 f., xx. 9). The exception is in ii. 17, 'the zeal of Thine house hath eaten Me up'; but that belongs to an incident which the synoptists place in Passion week. 'The disciples remembered' afterwards (cf. ii. 22, xii. 16) the passage from the Psalm which found fulfilment. That interpretation was probably current among those who had learnt in the synoptic tradition that the cleansing of the temple took place at the end of His life, though St John for his own purposes places it at the earlier date. It is probable that all the fulfilments (except xii. 38, 40) which the evangelist finds were already found by Christians before he wrote; most of them may have been embodied in collections of *testimonia*, and he made use, or perhaps possessed, a collection which contained only those connected with the final week. Faure (*Z.N.W.*, 1922, p. 99 ff.) thinks that the different formulas of reference to the Old Testament in this Gospel point to a variety of sources.

[1] There is some good authority for these words.

is imminent (εὐθύς) and certain, because the first step in the final Passion has been taken by which God is glorified (xiii. 31 f.). The crucifixion and exaltation of the Son of Man were alike a 'lifting up' (iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 34); He would ascend where He was before (vi. 62). And hereafter heaven would be opened for free fellowship and intercommunication between God and man; the dream of Jacob the representative of Israel would come true in the case of the Son of Man, the Representative of the true Israel (i. 51; see Burney, *op. cit.* p. 115 ff.). This is the doctrine of the heavenly Man, similar to that in 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47. Before the world was, He existed with the Father in glory, with which He would again be glorified (xvii. 5). This is on a higher level than the popular Messianism represented in i. 25, iv. 25, 29, vi. 14 f., vii. 26 f., 42, x. 24, xii. 34. But St John, like St Paul (see p. 51 f.), felt that the best Jewish thought about the Son of Man did not fully meet the case. Fellowship with God is 'Life,' by means of 'food which abideth unto eternal life' to be obtained from the Son of Man (vi. 27), by partaking of Him (vi. 35, 48–51, 53–58). This Life, available for all who, though previously dead in sin, hear the voice of the Son of God, is a Life which the Son has in Himself, and because He is the Son of Man He can judge, sift, those who have it and those who have it not (v. 25–27). Thus the Messianic force of the term Son of Man at its best and highest is insignificant compared with the truth that the Son of Man is the Means of Life, obtained by partaking of Him.

(*d*) *Eschatology*. Together with the thought of the Messiah, the evangelist, in nearly every instance in which he echoes eschatological language, transmutes the Jewish expectations into spiritual facts and conditions.

i. There is not a trace of the scenic accompaniments of a great final event. Christ speaks of 'coming' in the future (xiv. 3, 18, 28) and seeing the disciples again (xvi. 22), in the sense of the coming of the Holy Spirit (see p. 298 ff.); and He says 'If anyone love Me he will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and We will come and make Our abode with him' (xiv. 23), a verse in which eschatology entirely disappears. And there is no other hint in the Gospel of a future Advent.

ii. 'Judgment' κρίσις is one of the important words in the Gospel. It is almost wholly free from the Jewish, forensic ideas which usually attach to it. Its meaning is well illustrated by the English use of such words as 'crisis,' 'critical.' A crisis is a sifting, a separation into two classes; a period of crisis is one which divides men into strong and weak, brave and cowardly, wise and foolish, and so on. The critical faculty is that which can sift evidence, and separate true from untrue, probable from improbable. It is the Jewish, legal mind which tends to introduce the notion of formal proceedings, law court, judgment seat. For St John 'judgment' is a sifting. He thinks of two categories—on the one hand 'not-the-world,' freedom, light, truth (*or* reality), life, love; on the other the world, slavery, darkness, untruth, death, hate. And something is needed to act as a criterion, a means of critical decision, as to which category each man belongs. Even more than St Paul (see pp. 97, 191) he thought of everyone as belonging wholly to the one or the other. And the means of judgment is the presence of Christ in the world. It was not the *object* for which He was sent. Christ does not pass formal judgment on men, as, according to eschatological expectations, He would at some future date. 'God sent not His Son into the world to judge the world, but that

the world may be saved through Him' (iii. 17). 'If anyone hear My words and keep them not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world but to save the world' (xii. 47). The object for which He was sent was to give life. But judgment is an inevitable, 'automatic' effect of His coming. 'He that believeth on Him is not judged; he that believeth not, hath already (*ipso facto*) been judged....And this is the judgment, that the light hath come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light, for their deeds were evil' (iii. 18 f.). 'He that heareth My word and believeth on Him that sent Me hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment but hath passed from death into life' (v. 24). And the Spirit, when He comes, will, in the character of Christians indwelt by Christ, convince the unbelieving world of judgment, because Christ's continual presence is itself a judgment on the prince of this world (xvi. 11).

iii. Hence there is no hint (except in v. 28; see below) of future rewards and punishments. God's 'wrath[1]' will not be executed at a future Parousia; it 'abideth' now upon everyone who 'hath' not eternal life, nor 'seeth[2]' life (iii. 36). 'The work of Christ was to sift out, as by a magnet, the purer element in mankind from the lower or grosser' (Scott). 'Death' or 'perishing' is a present condition of those whom the sifting has excluded from the category of life (iii. 16, x. 28, xii. 25, xvii. 12). Those whom it has included are safe; Christ will not cast them out (vi. 38), or allow them to be lost or perish (*v.* 39), or to be snatched out of His hand or the Father's (x. 28 f.).

[1] This eschatological term occurs nowhere else in the Gospel; contrast St Paul (p. 195).

[2] The future ὄψεται is not eschatological; each human being in the future, throughout the world's history, who does not obey the Son, will not see life.

iv. Since Life is eternal, and therefore present, something which is possessed 'abundantly' (x. 10) in union with Christ, Resurrection also can be thought of in the same way. Martha spoke of it eschatologically, 'I know that he shall rise in the resurrection at the last day' (xi. 24), but Christ tacitly corrected her: 'I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth on Me though he have died shall live, and everyone who liveth and believeth on Me shall not die for ever' (*v.* 25 f.). That is not essentially different from the teaching in v. 24.

v. And yet, as in *Hebrews* (p. 257 f.) eschatological statements are found which cannot really be harmonized with the main thesis; and the divergence here is sharper than elsewhere. The question has, in fact, been raised, whether the Gospel has not suffered from an editor or editors. In one instance, at least, noted above in paragraph iii as an exception, that appears probable. In v. 24–27 teaching is given on *present* Life and Judgment. 'The hour cometh, and now is, when the [spiritually] dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.' To the Son is given the function of sifting between the 'dead' and those who 'come not into judgment but have passed from death into life.' But in *v.* 28 f. there follows a realistic prediction of the resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous, the latter to life, the former to judgment. The 'dead' of *v.* 25 are spiritually dead; but here we read 'they who are in the tombs.' The meaning of 'hear the voice' and 'they who hear' in *v.* 25 is a spiritual hearkening and obedience; but for that is substituted 'shall [physically] hear His voice and shall come forth.' St Paul found no room for a resurrection of the wicked in his doctrine as set forth in his epistles (p. 187 f.). Apart from the present passage it is found only in the

Apocalypse (xx. 11–15), and in a duplicate, and probably unauthentic, version of a speech of St Paul in the Acts (xxiv. 15; p. 198 n.). It is very difficult to think that St John wrote *v.* 28 f.

The question of interpolation arises also in the case of xii. 48 b, 'The word which I spake that will judge him at the last day.' If that clause is interpolated, *τὸν κρίνοντα* (*v.* 48 a) meant 'Him who judgeth him' referring originally not to 'the word' but to the Father; and Christ says that He came to save the world, not to judge it; it was the Father that commanded Him what to say, and therefore the Father was the Judge. The question to be decided is whether St John in spite of his usual teaching would have spoken of 'the last day.' With this passage, however, must be considered the series in vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; four times in the discourse on the Bread of Life occur the words 'I will raise him up at the last day,' although, as said above, Christ tacitly corrects Martha when she uses similar eschatological language (xi. 24 f.). The question is complicated by the presence of an eschatological element in 1 *John* (ii. 18, 28, iii. 2, iv. 3, 17). At the present stage of the literary study of the Gospel it cannot be answered with certainty. But on the whole it seems probable that the traditional eschatology retained so firm a hold on Jewish minds that St John could not, as St Paul succeeded in doing, throw it off or at least disregard it. Numerous attempts have been made to distinguish a *Grundschrift* of the Gospel from later material, which might solve the problem; but nothing really convincing has yet been suggested.

(*e*) *Demonology.* On this subject St John's attitude to contemporary Judaism—and Hellenism also—is strikingly illustrated, and he offers a strong contrast with St Paul.

The latter inherited the late Jewish belief in demons which was hardly distinguishable from that held by pagans[1]. Beside the usual term 'demons' (δαιμόνια) he called them also 'the princes (ἄρχοντες) of this age' (1 Cor. ii. 6, 8), 'the world-rulers of this darkness' (Eph. vi. 12). And the words 'authorities,' 'principalities,' 'powers,' 'lordship' (Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 21, ii. 2, iii. 10, vi. 12; Col. i. 13, ii. 10, 15[2]) and 'elements' (Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 8, 20) all imply the same idea. St John never mentions them or hints at their existence. They were wholly alien to his developed Christian conception of God and the Son of God. On the other hand he retained from the Old Testament a belief in the existence of the devil. (St Paul uses the word only in Eph. iv. 27, vi. 11.) Christ says 'Ye are from your father the devil (cf. 1 Jn iii. 8, 10), and the lusts of your father ye willingly do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and stood not in the truth. When he speaketh that which is false, he speaketh from what is his own, because he is a liar and the father of it' (viii. 44 f.)[3]. And He calls him 'the prince of this world' (xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11). St Paul, as has been said, uses ἄρχοντες in the plural, and in the synoptists we read of 'the prince of the demons' (Mk iii. 22 (Mat. xii. 24, Lk. xi. 15); Mat. ix. 34); but St John keeps strictly to the singular.

A further contrast is suggested by xii. 31, 'Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world

[1] See Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St Paul*, p. 192 ff.

[2] Notice αὐτούς.

[3] 'Many commentators insist that 44 b must be translated, "For a liar is also his father," and suggest a reference to the father of the devil, or alter the beginning of the verse into "Ye are of your father Cain," cf. 1 Jn iii. 12. Neither expedient is satisfactory.' Brooke in Peake's *Commentary*, *ad loc.*

be cast out.' St John does not follow the eschatological view found in the synoptists, that the casting out of the devil is a sign of the near approach of the End. The judgment is a present one, and the devil is (ideally) to be cast down immediately by the 'lifting up' of Christ, who will thereby, throughout the ages, draw all men unto Him. St Paul has the same thought in Col. ii. 15, 'having stripped off the principalities and authorities, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them on it [the Cross].' But earlier, he expresses the eschatological idea; the triumph over the Man of lawlessness (2 Thes. ii. 8), and the powers of evil and death (1 Cor. ii. 6, xv. 24–26) is about to take place at the Parousia.

Possibly there is a reference to the devil in xvii. 15, 'that Thou mayest keep them ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.' But it is uncertain whether this is masculine or neuter; similarly in Mat. vi. 13; 2 Thes. iii. 3 (ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ). It is masculine, 'the evil one,' in 1 Jn ii. 13 f., iii. 12, v. 18 (in *v.* 19 it is ambiguous). But the preposition ἐκ 'out of' (contrast the meaning in 1 Jn iii. 12) makes the neuter here more probable.

2. The Person of Christ

We have seen that the Messianic title 'the Son of Man' is used in connexion with ideas which are quite outside the range of Judaism. He is the Means of Life, which is obtained by partaking of Him. But it is said also of the Son 'as the Father hath Life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself' (v. 26). The designation 'the Son' occurs 14 times in the Gospel; the longer form 'the Son of God' 7 times; 'His *or* Thy Son' twice; and, apart from the Prologue, 'His only-begotten Son' (iii. 16), and 'the only-begotten Son of God' (*v.* 18). And

to these must be added the many occasions on which Christ speaks of God as His Father. In determining the relationship between Father and Son as taught in the Fourth Gospel it is important to recall that taught in the synoptic Gospels and St Paul respectively (see pp. 25–35). St John stands on St Paul's plane in teaching a Sonship that is pre-temporal, but he has gained from the synoptic tradition a clearer grasp of the true inwardness of the relationship. In the mouth of the Baptist (i. 34), Nathaniel (i. 49), and Martha (xi. 27) 'Son' is a Messianic title. For the evangelist it meant that and more. The words Father and Son do not connote for him a metaphysical relationship—there is not a single instance in which either word requires that interpretation—but a personal and moral relationship so close that language fails to describe the completeness of the unity. 'I am in the Father and the Father in Me' (xiv. 10 f.) describes a unity with which our mystical oneness with Christ is analogous. 'As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth Me he also shall live because of Me' (vi. 57). 'In that day ye shall know that I am in My Father and ye in Me and I in you' (xiv. 20), 'That all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us' (xvii. 21); 'that they may be one as We are one, I in them and Thou in Me' (*v.* 23). It is a unity of mutual love (iii. 35, v. 20, x. 17, xiv. 31, xv. 9 f., xvii. 26), and knowledge (x. 15), and glorifying (viii. 54, xi. 4, xii. 28, xiv. 13, xvii. 1, 4); and great emphasis is laid on unity in *work*, the Son being the perfect Representative of the Father in His personal activity: 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work' (v. 17). 'The works which the Father hath given Me to accomplish the very works which I do bear witness of Me

that the Father hath sent Me' (*v.* 36). 'I am come in My Father's name' (*v.* 43). 'As the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, so also the Son quickeneth whom He will' (*v.* 21). 'I and My Father are one' (x. 30), *sc.* in work, as the context shews. 'Whom the Father hath consecrated (*sc.* for a sacred work) and sent into the world' (*v.* 36). His self-defence for saying 'I am the Son of God' is 'If I do not the works of My Father believe Me not; but if I do, though ye believe not Me believe the works, that ye may know and recognize that the Father is in Me and I in the Father' (*v.* 37 f.). Christ repeatedly says that He is wholly dependent upon the Father for His words and works (vii. 16, viii. 26, 28, xii. 49, xiv. 10, 24, 31, xv. 15). But being so He has all the resources of the Father at His command: 'The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand' (iii. 35). 'All things that the Father hath are Mine' (xvi. 15). Hence a prayer for anything can be addressed in His name to the Father (xv. 16, xvi. 23). His function, therefore, of representing the Father, is so completely fulfilled that He can say 'He that seeth Me seeth Him that sent Me' (xii. 45); 'he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father' (xiv. 9); 'if ye had known Me ye would have known My Father also' (viii. 19, xiv. 7); 'he that hateth Me hateth My Father also' (xv. 23).

Thus the words 'Father' and 'Son' do not in themselves necessitate the idea of an essential, metaphysical relationship. And even the expression 'Only-begotten' (iii. 16, 18) need not imply more than a personal, moral unity. It may only 'designate Jesus as the One on whom God concentrates His special love and favor, as an earthly Father would concentrate His love upon an only son[1].'

[1] Stevens, *The Johannine Theology*, p. 106.

On the use of the word in the Prologue see below. And the words 'that which I have seen with the Father I speak' (viii. 38), while they could be understood as teaching an eternal, essential, union, may denote only a permanent spiritual condition (as Christians can even now be in heaven with God).

All this is said of the Son in His life mission on earth. But many passages go behind that, and teach, more or less explicitly, His pre-existence. For example, those in which Christ speaks of His 'coming,' 'coming down from heaven,' 'being sent.' 'He who is from (παρά) the Father' (vi. 46); 'I am from Him, and He sent Me' (vii. 29). And He is Son before He is sent (iii. 16 f.). He came forth from (ἐκ) God (viii. 42, xvi. 28), ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (viii. 47). Pre-existence is clearly stated in the words 'Before Abraham was I am' (viii. 58). But the form of the words seems to express more—an absolute, eternal existence. And finally this pre-existence was a condition of pre-temporal glory with (παρά) the Father (xvii. 5). If these two passages contain the thought of an eternal, essential unity with God[1], all the others that bear upon the pre-existence must be read in the light of them.

Yet it remains true that the Fourth Gospel, though it supplied the basis for further developments, nowhere quite clearly teaches (apart from the Prologue) an eternal oneness of essence between the Father and the Son. St John's Christology cannot with certainty be said to go beyond that which St Paul reached. Where he differed from St Paul was in his attempt to portray the Divinity by a narrative of the Humanity. St Paul wrote in an earlier and wholly different situation. He felt no need to insist on the historical facts of the real Humanity; he

[1] See the discussion of the passages by Stevens, pp. 118–22.

plainly stated that his authority as an apostle did not depend upon a knowledge of Christ according to the flesh (see p. 72f.). The Christ who was the heavenly Son of God was sent by the Father to die for our sins and to rise again for our justification. To preach that was his main object, and it would have interfered with it to enquire precisely what He was like when He was on earth. In so far as he touched the problem at all, he was content to speak of a self-emptying, or a becoming poor (see pp. 61–8). It was not the nature, or natures, of our Lord on earth which occupied his thoughts, but the way of salvation. But for St John the former is the burden of his Gospel. The amalgam of heterogeneous ideas from the East and Egypt, which was beginning to envelope the Empire as in a cloud, was a growing danger to the Church. A tendency was shewing itself for Christianity to become merely one of the many varieties of speculative and metaphysical thought, severed from its foundation in concrete, historical fact. Judaism was open to the same danger. For Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, the Old Testament had practically lost all meaning as concrete history; 'no historical event seems to have any importance as such[1]'; every detail was diligently allegorized. And if the Christian records had met the same fate, the Church would have had no *raison d'être* sufficient to keep her alive through more than two centuries of persecution. She would not, in fact, have been persecuted; the Christian religion would have been painlessly merged in the cosmopolitan eclecticism of the Empire. The Fourth Gospel helped to save the situation. The writer, thoroughly Pauline, and a keen Churchman, had to guard the faith against the disintegrating effects of Hellenistic thought, and yet appeal to those who lived

[1] Dean Inge, in Hastings' *Enc. Rel. Eth.*, art. 'Logos.'

in its atmosphere. He had to present to them afresh the fundamental truth that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and he had to insist on the historical foundation of concrete fact in His human life, for which purpose he presented his *apologia* in the form of a Gospel narrative. The historical Jesus was a real Man, who lived and died in Palestine.

A real Man. But what, after all, must He have been like—the heavenly Son of God come down from heaven? And the answer is given by the portrayal of a Man who was openly and visibly radiant with Divinity, a Man serene, aloof, sinless, of superhuman knowledge (see e.g. i. 48, ii. 24 f., v. 6, vi. 15, 64, 71, xiii. 11, xviii. 4), self-possessed, manifesting His glory (ii. 11), performing miracles—not primarily as works of mercy and sympathy, but—as σημεῖα, 'signs' (ii. 11 and frequently), indications of what He really was; openly conscious of His own pre-existence and Divinity, and openly teaching these truths to all hearers from first to last; possessed of superhuman power and authority which awed and baffled, by which He avoided or withheld from Him at will all opposition and hindrance until His own appointed 'hour' had come (v. 13, vi. 15, vii. 10, 30, 44–46, viii. 20, 59, x. 30 ff., 39, xviii. 6); acting, with hardly an exception, on His own supreme initiative, unforced and unpersuaded by others or by circumstances (ii. 4, vi. 6, vii. 6, xi. 6, 8 f.); even undergoing death by His own voluntary determination (x. 18, xix. 30).

And yet, on the other hand, had that been all, He might have been only a Theophany in human shape, a God come down to us in the likeness of a man, a docetic Christ who was little more than a symbol of the heavenly Being. That, of course, was one of the very dangers against which

the Gospel was aimed. Christ displayed His Divinity, but His Humanity was real; His bodily movements in space and time are the same in kind as those in the synoptic tradition; He was weary with His journey (iv. 6); He felt real emotion at the sorrows of others (xi. 33, 35, 38), and at the thought of the sufferings that He was Himself to undergo (xii. 27, xiii. 21; and this although the agony in Gethsemane is omitted); and when the spear pierced His side there came out blood and water, which is solemnly attested on the evidence of an eye-witness (xix. 34)[1]. Further, the avoidance of violence, in the instances mentioned above, was itself a necessary human precaution (see also xi. 54, xii. 36). And although possessed of superhuman knowledge, He sometimes acted not from omniscience but as the result of receiving information: 'When the Lord knew' (iv. 1): 'Jesus heard' (ix. 35, xi. 4, 6); and He asked the question 'Where have ye laid him?' (xi. 34).

The insoluble Paradox which St John tries to portray is stated in all simplicity in the Prologue to his Gospel (i. 1–18), and summed up in the sentence 'The Word became Flesh.' A new interest has been added to the Prologue by Dr Burney's book already referred to. He maintains, with great probability, that it is a poem interspersed with prose comments[2], and that both the poem and the comments were written in Aramaic, of which he gives a suggested reproduction and translation (pp. 40–2). The prose comments arrest attention. Is it conceivable that a poet would write a hymn and with his own pen destroy its balance and swing by introducing comments?

[1] See, however, p. 294 footnote.

[2] This was suggested to me by Dr Charles before Dr Burney's book appeared, and independently of the Aramaic theory.

There seem to be only two alternatives: either the evangelist wrote the poem himself, and the comments are the work of another, or he added the comments himself to a poem that he found already in existence. The latter is the more probable; for (1) the comments, if they were in Aramaic[1], cannot have been the work of the translator or of the editors after St John's death. (2) If the evangelist had composed the poem he would have been very likely to introduce the thought of the 'Word' into his narrative or discourses. (3) No reference is made in the Gospel (as in i. 3, 10) to Christ as the Agent of Creation, which we have seen both in St Paul and *Hebrews*. (4) The πρός of i. 1, 2 = 'with' is never repeated. We can only indulge in guesswork; but it is not impossible that St John was prompted to write the Gospel by reading the hymn. The similarities of vocabulary may be partly due to the translator, if the whole Gospel was written in Aramaic, but partly also to the deep influence which the hymn exercised on St John's own thoughts. And he prefixed it to his narrative as expressing *in nuce* all that he wanted to say. But whether he adopted the hymn or wrote it, he intended it to express his own view of the eternal Nature of the Christ whom his Gospel describes.

And this will guide us in determining his conception of the *Logos*. The Greek word had long been in use to express a variety of philosophical theories about God. To Herakleitus the Logos was God as the immanent Reason of the Universe. To the Stoics it represented Him materialistically as the organic Principle of the Universe, either

[1] The plural *αἱμάτων* (*v.* 13), however, raises a difficulty. In Aramaic the plural can mean only *shed* blood, and Dr Burney without comment writes the singular דְּמָא. Would any translator go out of his way to render דְּמָא by *αἱμάτων* (whatever its meaning) instead of *αἵματος*?

as a potentiality (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) or realized in action (λόγος προφορικός). Allied to this is the thought of the book of *Wisdom*, where Wisdom, scarcely distinguishable from the Spirit of God, is hypostasized as His intermediary in the ordering and sustaining of the world. But the idea of realization in action could be regarded from another point of view. To the Hebrew mind the conception of abstract Reason was quite foreign. If thought was realized it was in the form of 'Word,' its outward expression. Philo tried to form a synthesis of the Stoic and Hebrew conceptions, which was at the same time coloured by Plato's theory of Ideas. Thus the term Logos had a complex history.

But St John had no use for the thought of immanent Reason or organic Principle, and his conception of the ideal Man was Jewish not Platonic. He was wholly concerned with the *activity* of a transcendent, personal God; and that activity was the saving of men by bringing to them Life, Light, Love, Grace, Truth. And therefore, in spite of some similarities of language with Philo ('first-born Son' for example), there is no need to go beyond Jewish thought for the basis of his conception. The process of hypostasizing the 'Word' of God had begun in the Old Testament. In so far, indeed, as Greek thought contributed to this, it was not purely Hebrew. But it was Jewish, without anything distinctively Platonic, Stoic, or Alexandrian. Dr Moore (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, Jan. 1922) has made it clear that support for this cannot be drawn from the use of *Memrā* in the Targums, which means little more than 'edict,' an expression of God's will, or 'oracle,' a revelation of it, and is often a mere 'buffer-word,' 'to keep God from coming to too close quarters with men and things.' But whatever was the thought of the writer of the Prologue, if he was not the evangelist himself, the

rest of the Gospel is not the work of one who accepted the Greek or the Philonic meanings *Logos*.

The essential, eternal unity of the Word with God is stated at the outset: 'The Word was God.' And the thought is carried on in *v.* 18: 'God only-begotten who is in the bosom of the Father He hath declared Him.' 'Declared' exactly describes the Expression of God by the Word. The reading is doubtful. The group of MSS. to which Westcott and Hort give the highest value read *μονογενὴς θεός*; but the Old Latin and Syr. cur. (sin. is wanting) support *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός* which is found in some uncials. If, however, the latter, 'the only-begotten Son' is the true reading, it cannot be interpreted in a sense which militates against the doctrine of the Word. 'Only-begotten' can express, as in the Gospel, the love of Father and Son; but the Son not only in His Incarnate life but eternally in the bosom of the Father is, in the writer's view, God with God. And the same is true of the expression in *v.* 14, though it is thrown into the form of a simile: 'the glory as of an only-begotten Son of a Father.'

3. Salvation

How completely St Paul secured his victory for Gentiles can be seen in the universalism of St John. There is not a hint that the stormy winds through which the apostle had fought his way had left a ripple on the life of the Church. The Gospel teaches clearly and repeatedly that the objective of Christ's work is the saving of the whole world (see i. 29, iii. 16, 17, iv. 42, vi. 33, 51, viii. 12, ix. 5, x. 16, xi. 52, xii. 32, 47). The world, indeed, as a whole rejected and would always reject Him. It was a hostile power or principle set over against those who received Him. The Church was intended ideally to embrace the whole

world in a spiritual unity; but in fact they were two incompatible entities: 'The world cannot hate you, but Me it hateth' (vii. 7). 'Ye are of this world, I am not of this world' (viii. 23). 'The Spirit of truth, which the world cannot receive because it seeth It not neither knoweth It' (xiv. 17). The same view of the world is seen throughout the last discourses; see especially xvii. 9, 'Not for the world do I pray, but for them whom Thou hast given Me.' St Paul once speaks of the world in a similar manner: 'But we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God' (1 Cor. ii. 12). But he mostly says 'this world' from an eschatological point of view, which is quite different.

If, then, Christ came that the world through Him might be saved, what is the nature of Salvation? What it meant for St Paul has been often before us. St John looks at it from his own point of view of ethical dualism. To be saved is to pass out of death into life, out of darkness into light, out of the hostile category into the divine; it is to be reborn. Since a Gospel is not a personal letter into which the man himself with all his emotions can be poured, he does not, for the most part, reveal the tense personal longings and gratitude for salvation which St Paul expresses. In its main purpose his Gospel is a treatise, setting forth in due order his soteriological doctrine in terms which aimed at being consonant with the trend of thought of his day. But in essence he is one with St Paul in teaching that the aim and end of the whole divine economy is man's oneness with God through Christ. He is the first writer in the New Testament to shew a really sympathetic grasp of the apostle's conception of the mystical union.

And yet a difference at once presents itself. St Paul's

thoughts on salvation were deeply influenced by eschatology, St John's hardly if at all. For the former, Christ who had died for him had risen and returned to heaven; He was personally absent, but would come again. In the meantime, though 'the Lord is the Spirit' (2 Cor. iii. 17), yet as regards His work in man that is true only in the sense that union with Christ is provided potentially by the Spirit, a union which can be progressively realized and deepened in the sanctification of the individual. A Christian can be ideally described as 'in Christ' and Christ is 'in him' because he is immersed in His Spirit and His Spirit in him. But the full consummation of the union was still in the future. This double thought of potentiality and consummation is seen when '(eternal) life' is spoken of. On the one hand the Spirit which we now possess is the 'Spirit of life' (Rom. viii. 2); its φρόνημα is life and peace (*v.* 6); 'the Spirit is life' (*v.* 10); it is Christ's life in us (Col. iii. 4). But on the other, eternal life is the final aim of our deliverance and sanctification (Rom. vi. 22); it will be the reward in the day of wrath (ii. 5–7); it will be 'reaped' at the harvest (Gal. vi. 8); it will swallow up that which is mortal in man (2 Cor. v. 4). Both thoughts are combined when it is contrasted with death (Rom. v. 18, vi. 23).

But St John, if he occasionally uses eschatological language, does not keep his eyes fixed upon a future consummation. Life, consisting of Truth (or Reality) and Light, the super-earthly, eternal, ideal, divine order of being, as opposed to the earthly, inferior order which is death, untruth, darkness, is a *present* possession into which a man passes as by a re-birth. His nature becomes wholly different in kind; the Life which proceeds from the Logos-Christ is infused into him, and he is transmuted, tran-

substantiated, as water changed to wine, as Lazarus dead changed to Lazarus living. The evangelist 'perceived, as not even Paul had done hitherto, how profound and radical is the "change of mind" involved in Christian discipleship' (Scott). 'That everyone that believeth in Him may have [as a present and permanent possession] eternal life' (iii. 15 f.). 'He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life' (*v.* 36; so vi. 47); 'hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment but hath passed from death into life' (v. 24). 'His commandment is eternal life' (xii. 50). 'That believing ye may have life in His name' (xx. 31).

And Life—this present possession—is available for man because Christ has brought it to him. The Word, in whom was life (i. 4) came as the Son who 'hath life in Himself' (v. 26). By entering into the world He has brought God's own Life within reach of men. The higher, divine order has come into the earthly sphere, so that the passage from the lower to the higher has become possible. 'I am the Door; through Me if anyone enter in he shall be saved' (x. 9). That is to say St John lays the weight of his soteriology not, as St Paul, upon Christ's Death but upon His Incarnation. '*I am come* that they may have life and have it abundantly' (x. 10). 'And *I give* unto them eternal life' (*v.* 28). '*I am* the Way, the Truth, and the Life' (xiv. 6).

The method by which men obtain it is variously conceived. (1) There is no doubt that in ch. vi. the reception is thought of as sacramental. Instead of relating the story of the Last Supper, the writer tries to lead his readers' thoughts to what was of greater importance than the actual rite itself, and to impress upon them its deep spiritual significance. It is possible that those who were well acquainted with the Greek mysteries had begun to

entertain mistaken and superstitious notions about the rite *qua* rite, and that for that reason he omitted the story. But its meaning—the reception of Life, the reception of Him who is Life—is thrown into the highest relief.

(2) But in the mystery religions the *knowledge* of the mysteries was at least as important as sacramental Communion, and the Gnostic type of thought, which was just beginning to react on Christianity when the Gospel was written, exalted *gnosis* into a religion for the higher minds. And this struck a sympathetic chord in St John and found echoes[1] in his restatement of Christianity for the men of his day, though he avoids the use of the word *gnōsis*. Only in xvii. 3 is the knowledge of God and Christ explicitly connected with Life, 'This is eternal life that they should know Thee the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ'; but the Gospel is full of the thought, and of the closely connected Truth, or Reality. Knowledge is a grasp of Reality, ethical and spiritual in its results, but arising from an intellectual acknowledgment and acceptance of the divine order of things which Christ brought and taught. Hence even in the sacramental chapter He can say 'The words which I have spoken unto you are Spirit and Life' (vi. 63).

It is not difficult to see the difference of this from St Paul's conception of the knowledge of God—a knowledge derived from an immediate spiritual experience which brings a man into deep personal intimacy with the things of God by his mystical union with Christ in the Spirit. For St John knowledge results from the will to believe, for St Paul from self-surrender to a divine miracle of grace.

[1] See an instance of this in the group of ideas connected with viii. 12 ff., illustrated in *Z.N.W.*, 1917, p. 52 ff.

(3) Closely bound up, therefore, with Knowledge is the teaching of the Gospel on *Faith.* St John throughout the Gospel never uses the substantive 'faith' πίστις, which is one of St Paul's foundation stones. But the verb πιστεύειν is frequent, with a variety of constructions, especially πιστεύειν εἰς which is rare in St Paul (Rom. x. 14; Gal. ii. 16; Phil. i. 29). But his meaning cannot be determined from his constructions. All alike contribute to the same idea, which is different from St Paul's. For the apostle, as we have seen, 'faith,' 'believing' is a complex spiritual experience, a trust in God, a trust in Christ and His saving work wrought by the Cross and the Resurrection, leading to a self-surrender and an appropriation of His work which unite the believer in mystical union with Him who is to us from God righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. For St John 'believing' is not strictly an act of spiritual appropriation, but an act of intellectual assent to all that makes for Life. At the same time not bare assent; real belief, though intellectual, is also spiritual, and must be spiritually arrived at. Those who believed on the name of Him who is the Word were those who 'received' Him, and they became sons of God by a re-birth from Him (i. 12 f.). Christ asks, How can you arrive at belief if you refuse to take the necessary steps towards it? (v. 44). To believe on Him whom God has sent is to do the work of God, to arrive at the spiritual result which God aims at producing (vi. 29). It is closely joined with 'coming' to Christ to eat the Bread of Life (vi. 35), and to drink living Water (vii. 37 f.). To believe is the result of being of the number of Christ's sheep (x. 26). 'Everyone that *liveth* and *believeth* on Me shall never die' (xi. 26). The order of the two words is significant, and not less so because in the former half of

the verse they are transposed: 'he that believeth on Me though he die shall live,' where an eschatological force is contained in 'live' which is absent from the second clause. In *v.* 26 a the meaning is 'he that arrives at belief in Me, though he die physically shall live after death with a resurrection life'; but in *v.* 26 b it is 'everyone that partakes of Life, the higher order of being which I bring, and by that experience arrives at belief in Me, shall not spiritually die for ever.'

(4) But of all the causes which might make a man surrender himself to the higher life, and arrive at belief, that which is paramount to St John is the *proof* afforded to the intellect by Christ's miraculous power, by His superhuman knowledge, and above all by His words. (*a*) It is, indeed, taught that the highest reason for belief is not the sight of the performance of miracles (iv. 48, x. 38, xiv. 11, xx. 29; and see vi. 30 ff.). Yet in xx. 30 f. it is stated that the selection from the mass of the σημεῖα of Jesus, which would fill a world-full of books, has been made 'that ye may believe,' etc. The evangelist evidently realized that many of his readers would not believe without the record of signs and wonders. And in his narratives he relates that many believed because of them. They were a valid proof, though the Christian ought not to need them. (*b*) Exhibitions of the Lord's superhuman knowledge did not differ in character essentially from His miracles; they are not called σημεῖα, but they are of the same nature. Nathaniel (i. 50) and the Samaritans (iv. 39) believed because of them. It was His knowledge of the thoughts and needs of men's minds as exhibited in the plain and open statement in xvi. 25–28 which drew forth the disciples' reply, 'Now we know that Thou knowest all things, and hast no need that anyone should ask

Thee; hereby we believe that Thou camest forth from God' (*v.* 30 f.). It included also prediction, the fulfilment of which would produce belief (ii. 22, xiii. 19, xiv. 29). But the highest and best reason for believing was the compelling force of His words. The words which He spoke were Spirit and Life, and yet there were some who did not believe (vi. 63 f.). Simon Peter said 'Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and know,' etc. (*v.* 68 f.). The Samaritans believed, no longer because of the woman's account of His miraculous knowledge, but because they themselves had heard Him speak (iv. 41 f.). And see v. 24, 47, viii. 46, xvii. 8. And because He would be in the disciples after He had departed and was glorified, His words would be their words, and others would believe because of them; and their unity in the Father and the Son would convince the world (xvii. 20 f.).

When we enquire what is the message of Christ's words which leads men to believe, we find ourselves for the most part in a different world of thought from St Paul's. He too said 'How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher?' (Rom. x. 14). 'God determined through the foolishness of the message preached to save those who believe' (1 Cor. i. 21). Paul and Apollos were ministers through whom they believed (iii. 5). 'So we preach and so ye believed' (xv. 11). And to believe was to 'believe the truth' (2 Thes. ii. 12). But the truth which he preached was Christ crucified (1 Cor. i. 23), Christ risen (xv. 11 f.), Christ exalted as Lord (2 Cor. iv. 5). What he preached was always 'the Gospel' (Gal. ii. 2; 1 Thes. ii. 9), the good news of salvation, righteousness, sanctification, redemption. And by believing, men gained the blessings which were preached. But in the Fourth Gospel the words of

Christ are almost uniformly concerned with His own divine Nature and claims, His relations with the Father. By their spiritual experience of what the Son of God meant to them, and by His continual preaching on the subject, the disciples arrived at belief in Him; they received, and thus believed in, the Light and Truth and Love which constituted the higher Life which He brought them, which He Himself was.

Belief, then, for St John is not a condition for gaining salvation but its *result*, with its consequent state of knowledge.

4. The Death of Christ

But if so, and if salvation is such as has been described, the passage from a lower to a higher sphere of being and thought, we are led to the question what part the Death of Christ played in St John's conception of Christianity. It was not, according to him, the subject of the Lord's preaching, nor was the message of it entrusted to the disciples[1]. St John's teaching remains firmly rooted in the basal conception of the higher Life brought to men by the coming of the Son into the world. The σὰρξ ἐγένετο of the Prologue is an almost exhaustive statement of the Lord's saving work. It was His life—what He was on earth—that saved men. 'The life, which to St Paul was meaningless except as a necessary stage towards the Cross, has become all in all to the mind of John' (Scott). And that not in the sense in which the author of *Hebrews* understood it (see p. 238 f.), the life of human obedience perfected through suffering with death as its consummation. Such a thought is remote from the evangelist's way

[1] Nor again were they told, as in the synoptic accounts, to proclaim the Kingdom of God, or any aspect of the eschatological message connected with it.

of thinking. It was a life which was the Life, heavenly, divine, visiting the earth that man might share in it.

But that man might share in it, it was essential that the Word should become really Flesh, that the Life should come into real contact with human beings. And therefore, as said above, the reality of the Manhood is emphasized, with the consequent limitations of time and space. This was not a *kenōsis*. Christ did not empty Himself of divine glory. On the contrary He 'manifested' it throughout His ministry by word and deed. And yet, after all, real humanity involved some limitation. The glory was limited in its activity; time and space were hampering restrictions which robbed it of its universality of range and power. And voluntarily to accept the limitations and to subject Himself to the restrictions was in itself a sacrifice. The free Self-giving of God which for St Paul found its expression in the Cross had for St John already found it in the Incarnation.

But Death was a breaking of the bonds; it set free the Word become flesh so that His presence and work among men might be universal. The suffering involved in it, on which we have seen particular stress laid in 1 *Peter* and *Hebrews*, plays no essential part in the doctrine of this Gospel. It was simply the necessary gate from limited to universal activity. The words 'Glorify Thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was' (xvii. 5) do not imply a different kind of glory from that which He always manifested on earth, but a glory which would transcend its present limits. His human nature, with which the Word had for ever identified Himself, would receive the limitless power and range of activity by which the glory of the Life could do its work in the whole world. The saying in xii. 24, though expressed in

the form of a general principle, applies primarily to Himself: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth itself alone,' which immediately follows 'The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified.' And the same thought in a different form is contained in xiv. 28: 'If ye loved Me ye would rejoice because I go unto the Father, because the Father is greater than I'; that is, My Father is subject to no limitations, and when I am freed from the trammels of earth and go to Him, I shall be able, in union with Him, to do immeasurably more than I can do now. As the serpent in the wilderness was lifted up to be visible to all as a means of healing, so must the Son of Man be 'lifted up,' exalted through death that everyone who believeth in Him may have eternal life (iii. 14 f.).

But limitations which had been voluntarily assumed could be as voluntarily discarded. He acted, as said above, nearly always on His own supreme initiative. He had determined His own 'hour,' before which neither persuasion, violence, or other circumstances could force Him to act. 'Therefore My Father loveth Me because I lay down My life that I may take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it again. This commandment I received from My Father' (x. 17 f.). And He said to Pilate, 'Thou hadst no authority against Me except it were given thee from above' (xix. 11).

Of the results which would follow the laying aside of limitations by death first and foremost would be His return to His followers, not bodily-wise but as the Spirit. St John's doctrine of the Spirit will be studied later, but it lies at the heart of all the divine activities which Christ would exercise when set free by death. The thought

is thrown into the form of the sharpest paradox. Although 'God is Spirit' (iv. 24), yet '(the) Spirit did not yet exist[1], because Jesus was not yet glorified' (vii. 39); that is, the activity of Christ's *Alter Ego* could not begin till Christ had reached His glory through death. 'It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Paraclete will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send Him unto you' (xvi. 7). And directly after His freedom by death He fulfilled His promise (xx. 22).

And the results would be extensive and intensive.

(1) They would be extensive because He, His Life, His Spirit, His Glory, would become universally available for men. It was not till the temple of His physical body was destroyed that He could raise up the temple of His Church[2] (ii. 19–22). When the Jews had lifted up the Son of Man, His power and presence would be such that even those who killed Him would learn that He was what He was (ἐγώ εἰμι, viii. 28). When He had laid down His life for the sheep, then He must bring other sheep which are not of this fold to join the one universal flock under the one universal Shepherd (x. 16). Caiaphas, being high priest in that most fateful year of the world's history, said more than he knew; 'he prophesied that Jesus was destined to die in behalf of the nation, and not in behalf of the nation only, but that He might gather into one the children

[1] οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, 'the Spirit was not yet.' The reading is not quite certain, since the authorities are divided in an unusual manner. The chief variants are 'the Spirit (*or* the Holy Spirit) was not yet given,' and 'the Holy Spirit was not yet upon them.' But scribes would be so easily led to remove the paradox by such glosses that the text is probably right because of its difficulty. See Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 82.

[2] There is a complex play such as St John loved, on the thoughts of the material temple, Christ's physical body, His Resurrection body, and His universal body.

of God who were scattered abroad' (xi. 51 f.). Christ drew to Him a select few on earth, but 'I if I be lifted up from the earth will draw *all* men unto Me' (xii. 32).

(2) But beside the universality of His influence there would be an intensifying of His power on His own disciples. His miracle of knowledge in seeing Nathaniel under the fig tree was as nothing compared with the spiritual marvel that would be witnessed when the Son of Man was present in the world in such a way that heaven would stand open for perfect and uninterrupted communion between God and men (i. 51[1]). Many of His disciples murmured at His hard saying about eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood. But He replied, 'Doth that cause you to stumble? What, then, if ye behold the Son of Man ascending up where He was before?'—Will not that explain it? It will make the eating of My Flesh and the drinking of My Blood a spiritual possibility, which at present it is not, while I am limited by this material body (vi. 61–63)[2]. When men's life could be thus permeated through and through with the Life of the Son, the communion with the Father, which would then be expressed by prayer in Christ's name, would enable them to perform not only the miracles which He performed on earth, but 'greater works than these shall ye do, because I go to the Father' (xiv. 12). And when they could pray in Christ's name, they would not need Him to pray for them; they would be one with Him, and in virtue of that, His prayer would

[1] See Burney's interesting note, p. 115 ff.

[2] Brooke (Peake's *Comm.* p. 752) gives an alternative explanation of *v.* 62: 'In place of their material expectations He offered them a spiritual conception of the kingdom. It proved a stumbling-block. What would their feelings be when He left them, His life ended without the establishment of the Messianic kingdom?'

be their prayer for themselves (xvi. 23, 26–28). Cf. St Paul's words about the intercession of the Spirit that is in us (Rom. viii. 26 f.). Even the Lord's teaching which had meant so much to them was necessarily confined within the limitations of human language and thought. Human ears could not bear (xvi. 12) more than human lips could teach. But when the teaching was imparted by the indwelling Christ through His Spirit, it would be very different. 'These things I spake not unto you from the beginning, because I was with you. But now I go My way to Him that sent Me' (xvi. 4 f.). The teaching would be greater because it would be gradual and progressive (*v.* 12 ff.). And finally the Spirit would not only teach the disciples, but would do what the human Christ on earth could not do—plead the divine cause against the world, and 'convince the world of sin,' etc. (*vv.* 8–12).

This aspect of Christ's death, the freeing of His Life to be available for the whole world, though it formed no part of St Paul's teaching, finds a parallel in *Hebrews* in the conception of the Blood, which is the Life, set free by death to be available for use (see p. 235 ff.). But so far the sacrificial value of the death, which is there prominent, has not appeared in our Gospel. Yet it is not absent. There appear from time to time traces of the conviction that the Death itself was an essential means of salvation from sin. They are only traces, but the evangelist's deepest personal experience made him unable to omit them. First and foremost he relates that the Baptist said 'Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin[1] of the world' (i. 29); 'Behold the Lamb of God' (*v.* 36).

[1] *τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*, singular, as in the Hebrew of Is. liii. 12, 'He bare the sin of many.' The LXX. and Vulg. have the plural; hence the plural *peccata* in the Clem. Vulg. of the present passage, and so in the Anglican Prayer Book 'the sins of the world.'

The former sentence cannot without violence be emptied of the thought of an atoning death. And this remains true if Dr Burney's suggestion (p. 107 f.) is correct that there is a word-play on the meanings 'Lamb' and 'Servant' or 'Child' (= *παῖς*, Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30), both of which the Aramaic טַלְיָא *ṭalyā* can bear. 'It was the coming of the ideal Servant of Yahweh that the Baptist believed himself to be heralding,' a reference to Is. liii. And the word 'Lamb' suggests, not a sacrifice but, 'the *lamb-like* or sinless character of the ideal Servant.' At the same time[1] 'The Lamb *of God*' suggests the sense, 'the Lamb *provided by God*' as a fitting offering, which reminds us of Gen. xxii. 8, 'God shall provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering.' But whether the word 'Lamb' suggests the thought of sacrifice or not, the Servant of Yahweh 'bare the sin of many' by dying for them.

A sacrificial thought is clearly contained in xix. 31–37, where Christ is pictured as the true Paschal Lamb by whose death men receive the cleansing by water and the sprinkling of blood. And the very date of the Crucifixion, on which the Paschal lambs were killed (in disagreement with the synoptic date) teaches the same lesson. The connexion of baptism with Christ's death is an echo of the thoughts which we have studied in St Paul and 1 *Peter*[2]. The redeeming value of His death is hinted at

[1] As Dr Burney allows to be possible.

[2] Some, however, think that the words 'and straightway there came out blood and water' are due to a later hand. 'For these things were done' (*v.* 36) refers not to the effusion of blood and water but to the two things that were done in fulfilment of the Old Testament predictions 'a bone of Him shall not be broken' and 'they shall look on Him whom they pierced.' Whether the attestation 'And he that hath seen it hath borne witness,' etc. (*v.* 35) refers to the effusion, or to the two-fold fulfilment, or to all, is not clear.

also in the words 'I lay down My life in behalf of the sheep' (x. 15); 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life on behalf of his friends' (xv. 13); and in the unwitting utterance of Caiaphas (xi. 51). And in xvii. 17–19 there is a subtle combination of the thought of sacrifice with other ideas: 'Sanctify them in the Truth,' i.e. Consecrate them to Thy service in the sphere of Reality, the true Life. 'Thy word is Truth,' i.e. the teaching which I give them from Thee is Reality (cf. vi. 63). But in order that they may gain this consecration, 'I consecrate Myself.' The word here acquires a different force; the consecration of Himself is by an act of self-sacrifice, so that He is both Priest and Victim; and in Him, their Representative, His disciples can be consecrated,—another striking point of contact with *Hebrews*.

Thus the sacrificial value of Christ's death formed a real part of St John's Christian belief, although logically it lay outside his Christian philosophy.

5. The Resurrection and Ascension

And the same must be said of the Resurrection, as he received it in tradition. If death was the casting off of limitations, the moment of death set Him free; death was His return to the Father, His attainment to the unimpeded and universal activity involved in being glorified with the glory which He had with Him before the world was. But this was not the conception which had from the beginning been the inspiration of the Church. It was too theoretical for simple Jewish minds. 'Infallible proofs' that Christ was alive were afforded by His appearances to one and another of them, and a Resurrection was the event in time and space which these appearances

presupposed. No one saw Him rise, but they saw *Him*, and so He must have risen. Moreover it was a necessary fulfilment of Scripture that He must rise from the dead (xx. 9). And it took place on the third day, that is to say the first appearances were on the third day. This was the unvarying tradition which St John followed (xx. 1).

Of the Ascension he gives no record. In the sense of exaltation through death and return to the Father, into which the categories of time and space do not enter, it is included in the comprehensive ὑψωθῆναι 'be lifted up.' But the one explicit reference to it is very difficult: 'Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to the Father; but go to My disciples and say unto them, I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God' (xx. 17). In these words it is spoken of as an event later in time not only than death but also than resurrection. And the difficulty is increased by the fact that though the Lord did not allow Mary to touch Him, He invited Thomas to do so (xx. 25). The former was before, the latter after, His Spirit had been breathed forth; and *v.* 17 perhaps means 'that the old relations are no longer possible, and the time for the newer and more spiritual communion is not yet' (Brooke). In view of the place which the Ascension holds in St Paul's thought, and far more in *Hebrews*, we can understand that it became deeply rooted in the Church's tradition, in which it was recounted as an event in space. But in this form it was even more difficult than the Resurrection to place in line with St John's Christian philosophy.

6. The Spirit

In the teaching of the Gospel on this subject we perceive once again a tension between the writer's religious philo-

sophy and the Church's tradition and experience which he inherited. He uses the word Spirit in three different ways.

(*a*) In the Old Testament, as we have seen, the Spirit of Yahweh was a divine *afflatus* which roused men to unwonted energy in special ways at particular moments. In the earliest days any abnormal state of mind was thought to be caused supernaturally; even Saul's attacks of melancholia for example: 'an evil Spirit from Yahweh troubled him' (1 Sam. xvi. 14). In later times, with more worthy ideas of God higher conceptions were reached. The highest is seen in passages which predicted that the Spirit would be given to the Messianic Prophet and Servant for His work (Is. xlii. 1–4, lxi. 1–3). And in words which had a profound influence on Christian thought Joel predicted that in the perfect age to come all God's servants would be similarly endued with the Spirit (Joel ii. 28 f. [Heb. iii. 1 f.]). This view of the Spirit is found in the Fourth Gospel. The descent of the Spirit upon the Son of God, the Messiah, is recorded in the synoptic account of the Baptism; and St John, without relating the Baptism, refers to it in i. 32 f.: 'John bore witness saying, I have seen the Spirit coming down as a dove out of heaven, and it abode upon Him. And I knew Him not, but He that sent me to baptize with water He said unto me, On whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit coming down and abiding upon Him, this is He who baptizeth with holy Spirit.' And the Spirit as equivalent to Inspiration is recognized in iii. 34: 'He whom God sent speaketh the words of God, for without measure He giveth the Spirit.' This point of view has already been studied in relation to St Paul's in the *Acts* (p. 128 ff.), 1 *Peter* (p. 158 ff.), and *Hebrews* (p. 252 f.).

(*b*) But in other passages the evangelist speaks of the Spirit in terms of his religious philosophy. He is the only writer in the Bible who provides for us an explicit statement of the great truth, 'God is Spirit[1]' (iv. 24), His Being is spiritual not material. It is in line with St John's doctrine of the two categories, the higher and the lower life, light and darkness, truth and untruth. And those who pass into the higher Life, who enter into the Kingdom of God, the realm of Spirit, are those who are 'born of the Spirit' through the sacrament of water (iii. 5); and 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit' (*v.* 6). (This is a philosophical re-statement of St Paul's moral contrast between flesh and spirit (see p. 158).) This is no doubt the meaning which the evangelist saw in the Baptist's words, 'This is He who baptizeth with holy Spirit'; He plunges men into the higher Life. St Paul's contrast is echoed again in vi. 63, with the same new force: the Spirit of the higher Life is in the words which Christ spoke, 'they are Spirit and Life.' Everything that belongs to the opposite, non-spirit category is included in the word 'flesh': 'the Spirit is that which quickeneth (cf. v. 21), the flesh profiteth nothing.' And therefore non-spiritual rules as to the geographical spot where men ought to worship profit nothing; those who are re-born into the Spirit-life will worship God anywhere 'in spirit and in truth' (iv. 23 f.).

(*c*) But in spite of all this, St John can write 'The Spirit was not yet (see p. 291), because Jesus was not yet glorified' (vii. 39b). It was something which believers would receive at a future date (*v.* 39 a), and which would

[1] It is unfortunate that the R.V. has preserved the wording of the A.V., 'God is *a* Spirit,' relegating the right translation to the margin.

be as a fount of flowing water which Christ would give to those who thirst (*v.* 37 f.). The Spirit in this case is not the spiritual atmosphere of the higher Life, into which men can be here and now immersed. It 'did not yet exist' till Christ had been set free by death to the fulness of His glory.

This is once more in line with the Church's experience and tradition. At Pentecost, and not before, Christians were flooded with the Spirit which they knew to be the Spirit of Christ, which endowed them with all manner of *charismata*. They understood, indeed, that God's energy and quickening life were active in the world before that event, both in the descent of the Spirit upon the Messiah and in His influence upon other human beings[1]. And yet the gift at Pentecost was thought of as something distinct and new; it was sent by Christ Himself. And in the Fourth Gospel the meaning of this is more fully worked out. The Spirit was Christ Himself in the full and free activity into which He entered by the liberation of death. Sometimes, as we have seen, He spoke of His own future work, extensive and intensive, when He had 'gone to the Father,' sometimes of the work of the Spirit. But they are one and the same. He spoke of the Spirit in this way in the final discourses only (see xiv. 16 f., 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7, 13). The word 'Paraclete'—

[1] The synoptists record that our Lord, though seldom, spoke of it: Mk xiii. 11; cf. Mat. x. 20; Lk. xi. 13 (Mat. 'good things'), xii. 12; and all three record His words (see p. 46) about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mk iii. 29; Mat. xii. 31 f.; Lk. xii. 10). St Luke relates the words of the Annunciation (i. 35), St Matthew the message to Joseph (i. 18, 20). And the inspiration of David (Mk xii. 36 = Mat. xxii. 43; Acts i. 16), the Baptist (Lk. i. 15), Zacharias (i. 67), Symeon (ii. 25 ff.), Isaiah (Acts xxviii. 25), the prophets (vii. 51 f.), and of Scripture generally (Heb. iii. 7, x. 15) was recognized.

'one who is called upon to help'—is found in Philo, *Vit. Mos.* iii. 14 and *De Op. Mund.* vi., but in St John its usage is very different. See an explanation of the former passage by E. F. Scott (*The Fourth Gospel*, p. 330 f.), who concludes 'The παράκλητος of the Gospel has nothing in common with that of Philo but the name, and the idea of aid or advocacy implied in it.' Three times in the last discourses the Spirit is 'the Paraclete,' but once 'another Paraclete.' He was other than the Incarnate Christ as limited by human conditions, but not other than the same Christ as set free by death. The Spirit was not, as in St Paul, the potential presence of Christ, the 'pledge' and 'firstfruits' of a consummation to be reached at the Advent, but His actual and universal indwelling which had been impossible before His death. The Lord's prediction of the coming of the Spirit was symbolically fulfilled in His breathing upon the disciples with the words 'Receive the Holy Spirit' (xx. 22). Thomas was absent, but we cannot suppose that the evangelist thought of him as excluded from the gift. The disciples in the room represented the whole Church, and the breathing represented the fact of Pentecost.

It is natural that these passages about the Paraclete became the chief basis of later definitions regarding the doctrine of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, but they are far from being an explicit statement of that doctrine. The Macedonians were not slow to point to the absence of decisive scriptural evidence of the Personality of the Holy Spirit. It needed the genius of Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory of Nazianzus to work out systematically what they were convinced that the scriptural evidence implied.

CHAPTER XI

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST JOHN

The literary problem of the Epistle is bound up with that of the Gospel. Linguistically the two writings are closely similar, though Charles[1] holds that 2, 3 *John* stand nearer in this respect to the Gospel than the First Epistle; and there are differences in the vocabulary[2]. The Epistle, moreover, shews no sign of being a translation. The Greek is very simple and unadorned, such as a Jew might write who made no attempt to imitate the Hellenistic literary style, but it is reasonably correct and not crude translation Greek. If the differences observable in the doctrinal outlook and expression are too great to allow of unity of authorship, the simplest solution would be that the translator of the Gospel was subsequently the author of the Epistle[3]. But perhaps the evangelist, a few years after writing the Gospel, found that a homily was needed with differences of emphasis. This might be delivered in conversation to an amanuensis who wrote the whole in his own Greek.

1. The Purpose of the Epistle

The author, whoever he was, felt sure that his readers knew in their heart of hearts the great Christian truths, but they were denying or doubting or affecting to despise them. So he wrote a direct personal appeal, partly with

[1] *Revelation*, i. p. xxxiv ff., xli f.

[2] See Moffatt, *Intr. Lit. N.T.* p. 590.

[3] The reminder is, perhaps, not out of place that of all the five 'Johannine' writings the Apocalypse alone claims to be the work of a writer named John. For the rest we are dependent upon internal evidence and patristic tradition Brooke (*Johannine Epistles*, p. xviii) holds that there are no adequate reasons for setting aside the traditional view.

the object of exhorting them to be true to what they knew. The two categories—life, love, light, truth, and death, hate, darkness, untruth—are, as in the Gospel, postulates of Christian thought. And he maintains and reiterates that a test of a man's condition, an infallible criterion whether he is in the higher category or the lower, is his acceptance or non-acceptance of the truth that the human Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, come in the flesh. The readers knew the great fact—'Ye all know; I write not unto you because ye know not the truth but because ye know it, and that no untruth is [a product] of the truth' (ii. 21)—but they must confess, acknowledge it. Thus there is a true Christian *gnōsis* in distinction from that of the growing Gnosticism of the day.

Thus half of the author's object was doctrinal, in the face of the prevailing errors. But the other half was ethical, in the face of the antinomianism which Gnosticism tended to produce[1]. And he maintains and reiterates that a true test as to whether a man has passed from death unto life is his spiritual obedience to the divine commands of conduct, which are centred in love to God and to man. From the nature of the case this ethical aspect of the Epistle, which is of primary importance, is largely absent from the Gospel. It is beyond our purpose to analyse the contents of the Epistle in detail. But Dr Brooke's analysis[2], based upon Haering's, shews how the doctrinal test and the moral test form the two *foci* of the appeal.

[1] The writers of the *Apocalypse*, *Jude*, 2 *Peter* and the Pastoral Epistles were all faced with the same danger.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. xxxiv–xxxvii.

2. Eschatology

The teaching of the Epistle stands, generally speaking, so close to that of the Gospel that it will be enough to point out the chief differences between them. The first striking difference that we find is the complete absence from the First Epistle, as indeed from the other two, of quotations or even clear allusions to the Old Testament, except the mention of Cain (iii. 12) who is referred to, as any well-known character in the world's literature might be referred to, for the purpose of illustrating a moral truth. It might almost seem as if the readers were in a state of mind in which Scriptural references and language would carry little weight[1]. *Philemon*, a private letter, is the only other New Testament writing in which no use is made of the Old Testament; but in an avowedly doctrinal writing such as the Epistle it is noteworthy. The readers were losing their hold on the truth of the Incarnation not under Jewish but under pagan influences. It was needful to end the letter with the warning 'Little children, guard yourselves from idols.' Of the hostility to the Jews as such, which is so prominent in the Gospel, there is no trace[2]. Hence the Jewish conception of the Messiah is not combated or mentioned. The truth of the Incarnation is expressed in the formula 'Jesus is the Christ' (ii. 22, v. 1), or 'Jesus Christ is come in the flesh' (iv. 2), or 'Jesus (Christ) is the Son of God' (iv. 15, v. 5). But, as in the Gospel, the titles Christ and the Son of God are used on a higher plane than that of Jewish

[1] This is more probable than that the writer felt that the Christian truths were self-sufficient and required no Scriptural authority. No other early Christian writer, canonical or patristic, felt that.

[2] Unless, as Moffatt suggests, it is to be seen in the claim of Christians to be children of God (iii. 1).

Messianism. They stand for the Word of Life, the Life that was manifested.

Nevertheless the mind of the Church was so permeated with eschatology that, like the Gospel, the Epistle shews marked traces of it. And they more clearly express the mind of the writer than in the Gospel, and cannot be explained by any theory of interpolation. The writer feels that the Last Day is a real truth, and very close at hand: 'Little children, it is the last hour' (a thought different from that of any passage in the Gospel where the word 'hour' is used, except v. 28, which, as we have seen, is probably interpolated). He refers explicitly to a future Parousia of Christ (ii. 28), and in that verse and iii. 2 uses the expression 'when He shall have been manifested' (ἐὰν φανερωθῇ). The Gospel contains nothing like that. And in iv. 17 he writes 'Herein has love been perfected among us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment[1], because as He is [in His exalted condition in Heaven] so are we in this world.' Christ is thought of, as by St Paul, as being personally absent. 'With that difference love makes Him and us akin[2].' Apart from this reference to a future Judgment, and to the Parousia at which we must not be ashamed before Christ, the thought of the test, doctrinal and moral, which is the burden of the Epistle, is more in line with the present, perpetual Judgment or sifting taught in the Gospel.

The Epistle, but not the Gospel, has another reference to eschatological ideas in the use of the word Anti-Christ. But while St Paul, without using the word, followed Jewish tradition in thinking of a malignant Person, the incarnation of evil (2 Thes. ii. 3–12; cf. Mk xiii. 14), our

[1] The only occurrence of the word in the Epistle.
[2] Humphries, in Peake's *Commentary*.

author substitutes 'the *spirit* of Anti-Christ' (iv. 3), the counterpart of the Spirit of Christ, i.e. the general tendency to oppose and rival Christianity, and 'many Anti-Christs' (ii. 18), many persons in whom that spirit finds expression, and whose presence shews that it is the last hour. In each case he speaks of the current apocalyptic expectations: 'the Spirit of Anti-Christ which ye have heard is coming'; 'as ye have heard that Anti-Christ is coming.'

3. The Divine Nature

The teaching on this subject is the same in essentials as in the Gospel. He who was eternally 'with (πρός) God' became Incarnate in a real, historical, human Person, and not the sort of being whom Gnostic docetism pictured. But there are differences in the treatment of it, due to the fact that in the Gospel the evangelist is interested in the metaphysical aspects of it, while in the Epistle the ethical aspect is predominant. The former is seen in the statement 'God is Spirit,' the latter in the two statements 'God is Light' (i. 5) and 'God is Love' (iv. 8, 16). With regard to Christ a corresponding difference is discernible. In the prologue of the Gospel He is the Word, in the prologue of the Epistle He is the Word of Life, and it was the Life that was manifested. It is on what He means for men rather than on His eternal relations with the Father that the stress is laid. 'That which we have heard and seen and beheld and handled concerning the Word of Life' is in apposition to 'that which was from the beginning,' that is to say all that Christ means for men; so that 'the beginning' looks back to the opening of the New Dispensation, not to the eternal past. In the Gospel repeated mention is made of His 'glory,' the attributes and characteristics of Deity; in the Epistle the word does

not occur. Further, it has often been noticed that Christ Himself does not occupy quite the same relative position in the two writings. The Gospel teaches what Christ is, and consequently what He does to unite men with God; the Epistle dwells rather on what God is, and consequently what He does to unite men with Himself through Christ, 'God is Light, and in Him is no darkness at all' (i. 5), while in the Gospel prologue Christ was the Light 'and the darkness overcame (*or* obscured) it not.' 'He [God] is faithful and just to forgive us our sins' (*v.* 9). 'God hath given unto us eternal Life, and this Life is in His Son' (v. 11). 'Herein know we that we are in Him [God]' (ii. 5). Cf. iii. 22–24, iv. 4, 12 f., 15 f. It is 'from God' or 'from the Father' that Christians are spiritually begotten and have their being: iii. 1 f., 9 f., iv. 4, 6 f., v. 1, 4, 18 f. In iii. 22, v. 14 f. God answers prayer; in Jn xiv. 13 f. it is to be prayer offered in Christ's name.

4. Salvation

It is especially here that the ethical colour of the Epistle reveals itself. The thought of re-birth, the passing from darkness to Light, from death to Life, from the lower to the higher plane of being, is still prominent. 'God and the world are still set over against each other as opposing principles (ii. 15 f., iii. 1 b, 13, iv. 4–6, v. 4 f., 19). And those who have passed from the one to the other *do not sin*. 'Everyone that abideth in Him sinneth not; everyone that sinneth hath not seen Him neither known Him' (iii. 6). 'He that doeth sin is of the devil' (*v.* 8). 'Everyone that hath been begotten of God doeth not sin, because His seed abideth in him, and he cannot sin, because he hath been begotten of God. Herein are manifest the children of God and the children of the devil; everyone

that doeth not righteousness is not from God, and he that loveth not his brother' (*v.* 9 f.). Here are the two categories distinguished as sharply as in the Gospel. And salvation from sin is achieved by passing from the lower to the higher.

But at this point the Epistle supplies a volume of truth which goes beyond the Gospel. It explains more clearly than the latter *how* men pass from the one to the other. Not only is there the two-fold test of their passing, the doctrinal test of belief in the truth about Jesus Christ (ii. 22 f., 27, iii. 23 a, iv. 2, 15, v. 1, 4 f., 9–12, 20, 21 a; cf. iv. 6), which coalesces with the moral test of conquering the evil One (ii. 13 f.) or the world (iv. 4 f.), of doing God's will or doing righteousness (ii. 17, 29, iii. 7, 10), of keeping His commandment of love (ii. 9–11, iii. 10 f., 14–18, 23 b, iv. 7 f., 16–21, v. 2 f.), but the *means* of their passing is the saving work of Christ. The traces in the Gospel of the sacrificial value of Christ's death have been noted. In the Epistle they are more than traces. And the need of His salvation is expressed out of an experience as deep and sad as St Paul's. 'If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us' (i. 8). The writer knew only too well the falseness of the claim made by many Gnostics that because they had been re-born into the higher plane of being they were free to act as they chose. The readers were in peril of the libertinism to which philosophical dualism logically leads.

The writer describes the work of Christ under different aspects in several passages.

(1) It is stated in general terms, as in Jn iii. 17: 'We have seen and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world' (iv. 14). (2) The love

of God is manifested in the fact 'that He hath sent His only-begotten Son into the world that we may live through Him' (iv. 9). This has a Pauline ring; but it does not express St Paul's doctrine of Life by mystical union (through faith) with the risen Christ who died for us. It is the Johannine doctrine that by His Incarnation He brought Life to be available for men. Through Him who is the Life we live. (3) iii. 8, however, 'For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil,' is really in line with St Paul's eschatological thought. In four passages the work is wrought through Christ's death. (4) 'Herein we know love, that He laid down His life on our behalf' (iii. 16). This is an echo of Jn xv. 13. (5) And iii. 5, 'He was manifested that He might take away sins' is an echo of Jn i. 29. (6) But that Christ is 'a propitiation for our sins' (ii. 2, iv. 10) is a thought which, though not absent from St Paul's teaching, appears chiefly in *Hebrews*. (7) And that 'the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin' (i. 7) is taught in *Hebrews* but not by St Paul at all. Strong emphasis is laid upon the blood in v. 6 f., though its efficacy is not explained. (8) 'If anyone sin, we have a Paraclete[1] with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.' Once more we are in touch with the thought of *Hebrews*; because Jesus Christ is the righteous One, and because He is 'with (πρός) the Father,' He can plead for us with Him.

In these scattered, incidental statements are gathered up, much more explicitly than in the Gospel, the principal themes of New Testament soteriology. And finally, the result of it all is the forgiveness of sins, of which the Gospel says nothing except what is implied in the references

[1] See below, § 6.

to Christ's saving death. 'If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness' (i. 9). And forgiveness is because of what Christ is and has done: 'I write unto you, little children, because your sins have been forgiven you for His name's sake' (ii. 12).

Whether these differences, and others which will be mentioned, are great enough to prove that the Gospel and Epistle are the work of different authors need not be decided here. It is enough for our purpose to note that the need of salvation from sin, and the means of it in Christ's death, are presented in the personal appeal of the Epistle with a warmth and depth of feeling, derived from experience, which carry us nearer to the heart of St Paul than the high philosophy of the Fourth Gospel.

5. Belief

We have seen that knowledge and belief in the Gospel are different from knowledge and belief in St Paul's writings; the intellectual aspect of them begins to be emphasized. In the Epistle it becomes, perhaps, more prominent. Circumstances were raising to a position of paramount importance a correct grasp and acceptance of fundamental truths. St Paul, in opposition to pagan ideas, had to insist that Christ is He 'in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hid' (Col. ii. 3); but the danger had become so pressing that neither in the Fourth Gospel nor in the Epistle was it safe to use the word *gnōsis*. The verb, on the other hand, is prominent in both, and in the same sense. And 'to believe' is closely akin to it. Real belief implies, indeed, in both writings a spiritual condition. But in the Epistle the word 'to confess,' *ὁμολογεῖν*, begins to appear side by side with

it as the formal expression of belief. 'Everyone that denieth hath not the Father either; he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also' (ii. 23). 'Every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God' (iv. 2 f.). 'Whosoever shall confess that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, God abideth in him and he in God' (*v.* 15); cf. 2 Jn 7. And the belief itself is assent to a doctrine. 'Everyone that believeth that Jesus is the Christ hath been begotten of God' (v. 1). 'Who is he that conquereth the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?' (*v.* 5). This explains the force of 'faith,' πίστις, in its only occurrence in the Epistle: 'this is the victory which hath conquered the world, even our faith' (*v.* 4). It is the point of view from which Christian writers were beginning to speak about '*the* faith,' a body of beliefs, as in *Jude* and the Pastoral Epistles.

6. Spirit

Connected with that is the writer's teaching on the Spirit. 'Spirit' is something from God—an *afflatus*, an influence, an inspiration, an anointing—by which Christians know, believe, and confess the truth. There is not a trace of the thought of the Spirit which we have seen in the Gospel as the *Alter Ego* of Christ, i.e. Christ Himself freed from limitations and doing His spiritual work in the world extensively and intensively. 'Spirit' in the Epistle is never personal. It is an *activity* of God. In iv. 1–6, with a certain degree of personification, it has as its counterpart 'spirits' which are not of God—the spirit of Anti-Christ, the spirit of error. Something of the same kind of personification is seen in 1 Kings xxii. 21 ff. It is an *endowment*. 'Herein

we know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He has given us [a portion] of (ἐκ) His Spirit' (iv. 13). This partitive use of ἐκ with πνεῦμα is not found elsewhere, either in the New Testament or the LXX.; but cf. ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, Acts ii. 17 f., quoted from *Joel*. It is '*that which witnesseth*,' because it is itself *the Truth*, in our hearts (v. 6), and combines with Christ's baptism by water and His bloodshedding in death to give the safe certainty of three witnesses (*v.* 8). The impersonal force which it has in this verse stands out more clearly when the words are compared with the well-known interpolation in the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vulgate by which *v.* 7 f. run 'There are three that bear witness [in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these Three are One. And there are three that bear witness on earth]], the spirit and the water and the blood,' etc.

Since, finally, the Spirit is not a Person, the writer not only refrains from applying to it the word Paraclete, but transfers it to Christ with a meaning different from that in the Gospel (see p. 298 ff.). There the Incarnate Christ on earth is a Paraclete in the general sense of Helper, Encourager, Comforter; and He says that when He departs He will send His *Alter Ego*, 'another Paraclete,' who will fulfil the same function. But here the word has its more classical force of Advocate, Pleader. When we sin, Christ is with the Father as an Advocate, and He is a propitiation for our sins (ii. 1 f.). In other words His advocacy consists in pleading before God His propitiatory death. The Vulgate is fully justified in rendering the word in the Gospel by *Paracletus*, but in the Epistle by *Advocatus*.

INDEX

N.B. *References under St Paul's name are supplementary to those in the rest of the Index*

CAMBRIDGE : PRINTED BY THE SYNDICS OF THE PRESS, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS