

viction of his associates, had boldly asserted his messiahship. It was at this juncture that Jesus withdrew for a time from the scene of his ordinary labors to this distant northern city. Here, for the first time, he spoke freely of his approaching death, and of the sure triumph of his cause. On a cliff at Cæsarea stood the Roman temple which Herod the Great had built in honor of Augustus. The obtrusive worship of Cæsar in a temple built by a Jewish prince can hardly have failed to shock the little company as they entered the city. It is remarkable that their declaration of his sonship to God and his own assurances of triumph should have been spoken in the presence of a shrine where divine honors were offered to the head of the Roman empire.¹

Criticism has, indeed, called in question the genuineness of the passage. In his reconstruction of the Logia, Wendt gives this as the probably original form of the passage: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah; thou art Peter, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against thee."² Weiss is of the opinion that verse 19, which speaks of Jesus giving to Peter the keys of the King-

¹ "These were the two religions which were shortly to contest the world—the marble temple covering the bust of an emperor, the group of exiles round the leader, whom his own people had rejected. . . . He in the temple was only an official, the temporary symbol of a great power, to-day's dispenser of its largess, who to-morrow would be succeeded by another. But the little band of fugitives outside clung to their Leader for his own eternal sake. He was the Kingdom, he was the religion; everything lay forever in his character and his love." George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (1895), p. 478.

² *Lehre Jesu*, p. 180. This condensation of the passage is based upon the fact that it is found in substantially this form in the *Commentary* of Ephraem Syrus on the *Diatessaron* of Tatian (see the translation of the *Diatessaron* by J. Hamlyn Hill (1894), p. 356). But this conclusion is very precarious in view of the facts that the whole passage stands in the versions of the *Diatessaron*, which have thus far been discovered (see *op. cit.*, p. 136), that it is found entire in the Curetonian Syriac, which is believed closely to resemble the Syriac text used by Tatian, and that it was the habit of Ephraem to abbreviate passages. Dr. Briggs thinks that Luke would not have omitted this passage if it had been in the Logia, and that "Matthew must have derived it from a traditional source." He thinks it represents a form of evangelic tradition later than the early chapters of Acts. See *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 189.

dom and of his binding and loosing, was taken by the evangelist from another connection and applied to Peter.¹ In Mt. xviii. 18 the second part of this verse is found, addressed to the disciples in general. The fact that these passages which speak of "the Church" are found only in Matthew is certainly a check to overconfidence in dealing with them, but does not seem to me to warrant Wendt's excision of them without more adequate reasons for so doing than he has given.

Two questions here claim our attention: In what sense can the Church be built upon Peter? and: What is the meaning of binding and loosing? In the first saying addressed to Peter there is in the Greek a play on words whose force is lost in translation: *σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω, κ.τ.λ. (v. 18)*. In the Aramaic, which Jesus doubtless spoke, both Πέτρος and πέτρα would be represented by the same word (כִּפְיָ). It is quite certain, and is now generally admitted, that the words "this rock" refer, not to Christ, nor to Peter's confession or faith, but to Peter himself. It would be quite unwarranted, however, to neglect the context and to suppose that it is altogether apart from his character as the confessor of Jesus' divine sonship that Peter is to be made the foundation of the Church. Not until this moment could Peter have been called the rock-apostle on whom Christ would build his society; now for the first time can it be said that Peter has fully become what his name imports.

The connection appears to me to make it perfectly clear that it is in view of the great significance of his confession that Peter is now described as the foundation-rock of the Church. The name "Peter" had already been given him with prophetic reference to his character (Jn. i. 42); he had now made good the designation. But he had done so not by the aid of "flesh and blood," but by divine guidance and enlightenment. Moreover, Peter here merely voiced

¹ *Life of Christ*, I. 59 (Bk. V. ch. vi.). Wendt thinks that this passage (Mt. xviii. 18) is also an interpretation by the evangelist. *Lehre Jesu*, p. 156.

the common conviction of the other disciples. All three Synoptists imply that they all professed the same faith. Peter, true to his impetuous nature and to the position which he had already acquired as *primus inter pares* among the apostles, responds promptly to the questions of Jesus: "Who say ye that I am?" and in so doing voices the conviction of the whole company.

The circumstances and the language used do not, therefore, favor the idea that Jesus meant here to found an office or to confer upon Peter a special judicial authority, much less to establish a permanent individual primacy in the Church with a perpetual line of succession.¹ There is a strong presumption that Jesus meant Peter to become just what he actually did become, the foremost leader and guide of the early Church, the chief agent in founding and fostering the brotherhood of those who confessed Jesus as Lord. The New Testament does not leave us without information respecting the place and function of Peter in founding the Church; the facts of the case are better than conjectures as showing what his Master meant that Peter should become and do. To a brief consideration of these we now turn.

In immediate connection with the narrative under review stands another in which Jesus severely rebukes Peter for thinking the thoughts of men rather than those of God respecting Messiah's sufferings and death. Somewhat later, it was in answer to a question asked by Peter that Jesus said that the twelve apostles should "sit upon twelve

¹ I find the following admirable statement of what I hold to be the true meaning of the passage in Dr. Hort's *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 16: "St. Peter himself, yet not exclusively St. Peter, but the other disciples of whom he was then the spokesman and interpreter, and should hereafter be the leader, was the rock which Christ had here in view. It was no question here of an authority given to St. Peter; some other image than that of the ground under a foundation must have been chosen if that had been meant. Still less was it a question of an authority which should be transmitted by St. Peter to others. The whole was a matter of personal or individual qualifications and personal or individual work. The outburst of keenly perceptive faith had now at last shown St. Peter, carrying with him the rest, to have the prime qualification for the task which his Lord contemplated for him."

thrones" (Mt. xix. 28) — thus assigning equal honor to all. When the question was raised: "Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of God?" Jesus gives no intimation of Peter's supremacy, but places a little child in the midst of the disciples (Mt. xviii. 1, 2). Peter was one of the "pillars" of the Palestinian Church (Gal. ii. 9), and appears to have had a certain preëminence in personal influence, but it was James, not Peter, who presided at the council at Jerusalem and announced its decision (Acts xv.). The best illustration of Peter's special calling and position is given in his own words at the council just referred to: "Brethren, ye know how a good while ago God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe" (Acts xv. 7). The reference is to the conversion of Cornelius (Acts x.), but when the centurion "fell down at his feet, and worshipped him, Peter raised him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man" (Acts x. 25, 26). Despite this privilege providentially accorded to Peter, and despite his great popular influence, he neither claimed, nor did the other apostles in any case recognize, any special official authority as belonging to him. His fellow Jewish Christians freely criticised his action in eating with the Gentiles (Acts xi. 2, 3), and he met their censure, not by authority, but by argument. In this case Peter was in the right, but on a later occasion at Antioch, true to his impulsive nature, he made the great mistake of withdrawing from fellowship with the Gentile converts — an action for which Paul "resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned" (Gal. ii. 11). Peter's position among the Twelve, so far as the New Testament throws any light upon it, must be understood to consist in the following facts: He is first named in the account of Jesus calling men into companionship with himself (Mk. i. 16; Mt. iv. 18), and his name always heads the list of the apostles (Mk. iii. 15; Mt. x. 2; Lk. vi. 14; Acts i. 13). His personal qualities gave him a certain preëminence in the company; his eager, forthputting nature fitted him for prominence. These qualities found expression in the con-

fession which called out the ascription of eminence to him. It was as the "first Christian," expressing faith in Jesus' messiahship, that he received the assurance of his future function among the first believers. It was Peter, also, who spoke the word of the Spirit at Pentecost, an epoch-making crisis in the establishment of the Church (Acts ii.). The official status which Jesus assigned him consisted in his giving him the precedence in opening "a door of faith unto the Gentiles" (Acts xiv. 27). In this sense he was in fact the chief foundation-stone used in building the Church, although in no exclusive sense (Eph. ii. 20).

In important respects Peter was, in his personal characteristics, what his name signified. But it was only by his Messianic faith that he became the rock-apostle on which the Church could be built. Jesus' thought was that the Church should stand strong and immovable when supported by those who were thus firm in the faith of his sonship to God. It should be more than a match for the "gates of Hades," the portals which effectually close the world of the dead against their escape,—a symbol of the greatest imaginable force. This confident assertion of Jesus concerning his Church certainly rests upon these two ideas as its chief presuppositions: first, that his own person is the main guaranty of its success; and, second, that the Church is to be the principal means whereby the Kingdom of God and his righteousness are to be realized among men.

This second presupposition finds its clearest expression in the words: "I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Mt. xvi. 19). It is evident that the second part of this verse is intended to explain the first part; the power denoted by "the keys" is the same as the power to "bind and loose." We have already observed that the power to bind and loose is elsewhere committed to all Christ's disciples: "What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be

loosed in heaven" (Mt. xviii. 18). Whether we adopt the view of Weiss that this saying belongs in this latter connection and was only applied by the evangelist to Peter, or hold that the saying was uttered in both connections, — in either case, no privilege is assigned by our Lord to Peter which was not given to other believers. It only remains to inquire to what function or work the figures of "the keys" and of "binding and loosing" naturally point.

It is well established that "binding and loosing" was a current Rabbinic term for forbidding and permitting.¹ Discipline and government must be instituted in the community of professed believers, and this duty was committed to the disciples. What was essential to fellowship must be determined and maintained as a safeguard against corruption. Jesus had given a new spiritual law; he had set forth the principles of his Kingdom which were historically connected with the Jewish religion, and yet rose above it. His disciples would have the delicate duty and the heavy responsibility of legislating for the new community to which his movement would soon give rise. Jesus had laid down no explicit code of rules; he left it to those whom he had trained to apply his principles and tests to men, and, under the divine guidance, to determine what was consistent, and what inconsistent, with citizenship in the commonwealth of his followers. His Church was to take its place amidst the prevalent corruptions of heathenism

¹ A large number of examples are given by Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, II. 237-240 (Oxford ed.), who says: "To this, therefore, do these words amount: When the time was come, wherein the Mosaic law, as to some part of it, was to be abolished and left off; and as to another part of it, was to be continued, and to last forever: he granted Peter here, and to the rest of the apostles, ch. xviii. 18, a power to abolish or confirm what they thought good, and as they thought good, being taught this and led by the Holy Spirit, as if he should say: 'Whatsoever ye shall *bind* in the law of Moses, that is, *forbid*, it shall be *forbidden*, the Divine authority confirming it; and whatsoever ye shall *loose*, that is, *permit*, or shall *teach* that it is *permitted* and *lawful*, shall be *lawful* and *permitted*.' Hence they *bound*, that is, *forbade*, circumcision to the believers; eating of things offered to idols, of things strangled, and of blood for a time to the Gentiles. They *loosed*, that is, *allowed*, purification to Paul, and to four other brethren," etc.

and the deadening formalism of Judaism, and to maintain the standards of a purely ethical and spiritual religion. Upon those to whom he spoke in this closing period of his ministry would rest the great responsibility of faithfully maintaining his truth, and of preserving the infant community from the invasions of error and corruption. In a real sense, those who professed adherence to him held the keys of the Kingdom; they possessed the authoritative knowledge of the conditions of participation in it; they must bind and loose, that is, declare what was forbidden and what permitted within the meaning of its heavenly laws.

The second passage in which the *Ecclesia* is mentioned is Mt. xviii. 15-20, where the proper action of the assembly towards a sinning member is described, and the promise of a divine ratification and of the presence of Messiah with them expressed. The genuineness of the passage — at least, in part — has been called in question, on the ground that it presents a more developed plan of Church discipline than we have reason to expect in the teaching of Jesus. Weiss, on the contrary, holds that the passage relates neither to Church discipline nor to excommunication, and defends its genuineness.¹ Wendt admits the genuineness of verses 15 and 16 only, and regards the remainder of the passage as an interpolation either of the evangelist or of a later writer.² It seems to me probable that the passage is composite. Verses 19 and 20, which speak of the agreement of "two" in prayer and of the meeting of "two or three," appear to be coupled with what is said about the offending brother in consequence of an outward resemblance to verse 16, which speaks of "two or three witnesses." Moreover, the passage in Luke (xvii. 3, 4), which is parallel to verses 15 and 16, refers only to private reconciliation, suggesting the question whether the mediation of the congregation was really spoken of in this connection. It is certainly strange that if this passage concerning the Church was in the Logia, Luke should have entirely passed it by. While, therefore,

¹ *Matthäusev.*, p. 418 sq.

² *Lehre Jesu*, p. 156.

we cannot maintain the strict unity of the passage, it may fairly be said, on the other hand, that the extreme simplicity of the rule and of the conditions to which it is to apply favor the primitive character of the saying about the mediation of the Church. "The Church" here appears to denote neither a local church nor an aggregate of local churches, but the congregation of disciples conceived of as one assembly. That Jesus should have spoken of "the Church" in this sense, and should have assigned to it a function in composing differences among brethren, is in no way improbable. His disciples did constitute an *ἐκκλησία*—the usual Septuagint word for the congregation (קְהִלָּה) of Israel; why should he not have spoken of them as an assembly or community, and have recognized the usefulness to the individual believer, in cases of difficulty, of their common social life and relations? The organization here presupposed is the simplest possible. It is a mere community of brethren without an official head. The "binding and loosing" is the function of all the disciples, not of the apostles only. This fact strongly favors the view that Matthew was here following some trustworthy tradition of the Lord's words, and not attributing to him by a historical prolepsis language which reflects later conditions.

In this view the passage begins by directing that in case one disciple shall do another an injustice, the injured party shall privately confer with the offender, and, by seeking to reveal to him the character of his fault, endeavor to effect a reconciliation (*v.* 15). If this purely private conference does not avail, let another be held in the presence of "two or three witnesses," who are competent to attest the reality of the offence, and to show the offender that the injured brother's judgment was not merely subjective (*v.* 16). If, now, the guilty party will not respect the judgment of the "two or three witnesses," let the case be presented to the whole congregation. If they all agree in making the same accusing judgment, already twice made, no room is left for the reply that the accusation was dictated by prejudice or passion. If the offender still re-

fuses to acknowledge his fault, "let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican" (v. 17); that is, let him be regarded as self-excluded, by the very nature of his action, from the fellowship of the disciples. The act of the whole united assembly in so "binding and loosing" — in so upholding the law of its very existence, and determining what is inconsistent with that law — shall be divinely ratified (v. 18). The Messiah himself will spiritually abide with his people, and where they meet and agree in his name — truly preserving his spirit and maintaining inviolate his heavenly law — he will sustain and reward them (vv. 19, 20).

We turn to the "great commission" (Mt. xxviii. 18-20). A parallel, in briefer form, is found in the early, but probably spurious, appendix to Mark's Gospel (xvi. 15, 16). No passage which can strictly be called parallel exists in Luke. It is not strange that, in these circumstances, the genuineness of the passage should be extensively questioned. The principal objections to it are as follows: (1) The difficulty which the primitive apostles found in consenting to the idea of missions to the Gentiles cannot be explained if Jesus had solemnly charged his disciples to preach the gospel to the whole world. (2) Jesus regarded his own mission as limited to Israel (Mt. xv. 24), and in sending out the Twelve, directed them to "go not into the way of the Gentiles, nor into any city of the Samaritans" (Mt. ix. 5). (3) The Trinitarian baptismal formula (v. 19) reflects later ecclesiastical usage since the apostles baptized, as they taught (Acts iv. 18), in the name of Jesus only (Acts ii. 38; viii. 16; x. 48; xix. 5). Weiss regards this "commission" as expressing an assurance spiritually inspired in the hearts of the disciples by the exalted Christ, and thinks that its historical basis is Mt. xviii. 20: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."¹

The first of the objections just enumerated somewhat misstates the case. The primitive apostles were, no doubt, affected by Jewish limitations of view in important re-

¹ *Life of Christ*, III. 421, 422 (Bk. VII. ch. xii.).

spects, but they did not entertain the idea that the gospel was for the Jews alone. At Pentecost Peter saw in the conversion of the multitude the fulfilment of the promise that the Spirit should be poured out on "all flesh" (Acts ii. 17). Early in his work he was taught that "God is no respecter of persons" (Acts x. 34), although he did not always consistently adhere to the principle. Peter was the means of converting the Roman centurion, Cornelius (Acts xi.). The mission at Antioch, which soon extended its scope to the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 12), was supervised by the Jerusalem church (Acts xi. 22 *sq.*). The apostles at Jerusalem rejoiced when they heard that the Gentiles were receiving the gospel (Acts xi. 1, 18). Their scruples concerned the conditions on which they might properly be received into the Christian community, and the adjustment of relations between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. They probably had some sympathy, at first, with the view that the heathen converts must be circumcised and observe the Mosaic law (Acts xv. 1; Gal. ii. 12-14), but, if so, that position was distinctly abandoned at the council (Acts xv. 28; Gal. ii. 6, 9, 10). The apostles did not doubt that the gospel was for the heathen; they were perplexed as to the adjustment of this fact to their inherited conviction that the observance of their law was essential to salvation.

In the light of Jesus' teaching as a whole there is no improbability, as the second objection to the genuineness of the passage alleges, that he should have charged his disciples to carry his gospel to the whole world. The idea of universality was its dominant note. He described his disciples as the salt of the earth and the light of the world (Mt. v. 13, 14). He proposed at the beginning to make his followers "fishers of men" (Mk. i. 17). What he had spoken in darkness they were to speak in the light and to proclaim from the housetops (Mt. x. 27). Although, as the Jewish Messiah, he was specially sent to his own people (Mt. xv. 24), he did not limit his ministry to them. He found and welcomed faith in the Canaanitish woman (Mt. xv. 21 *sq.*), in the Roman centurion (Mt. viii. 5-13; Lk. vii. 1-10), and in the Samaritan lepers (Lk. xvii. 11-19). He

did not confine his ministry strictly to Judaism, but travelled through Samaria (Lk. xvii. 11), to Cæsarea Philippi (Mk. viii. 27; Mt. xvi. 13), and Phœnicia (Mk. vii. 24; Mt. xv. 21), on the north, and eastward into Perea (Mk. x. 1; Mt. xix. 1). He spoke of his gospel as destined to be preached throughout the whole world (Mt. xxiv. 14; xxvi. 13; Mk. xiv. 9), and declared that many should come from the east and from the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of God (Mt. viii. 11; *cf.* Lk. xiii. 28-30). The universality of the "great commission" is in no way inconsistent either with the teaching and work of Jesus during his ministry, or with the apprehension of that teaching in the primitive Church. On the contrary, it is, in fact, a summary of what he taught, and expresses the ideal which the early Church was seeking, with many practical perplexities, to realize, and which was so far realized as to open the way for the work of Paul, the champion of a universal gospel.

The third objection is of minor importance. Since no expression resembling this baptismal formula is elsewhere found in our sources, and in view of the uniform usage of the primitive Church in baptizing in the name of Jesus, the question naturally arises whether this formula does not reflect a later stage of ecclesiastical usage, akin to the Trinitarian benedictions of the apostle Paul. But, if so, it merely follows that we have here a later formulation of the import of baptism and of discipleship, whose elements are already contained in Jesus' teaching. If, therefore, in all the circumstances, we may not insist upon the originality of the *ipsissima verba* of the commission, we may confidently say that, in its substance, it accords with the whole genius of our Lord's teaching and work, and well expresses what we may believe to have been the hope and purpose of Jesus in associating his disciples together for the preservation and propagation of his truth and Kingdom.

The differences which exist among scholars as to the import and purpose of the Lord's supper have already been incidentally considered in another connection. I cannot believe that it is legitimate to conclude from the

silence of Mark and Matthew that the form of tradition which we find in Paul and Luke, which represents Jesus as founding a permanent institution, is without historic foundation. This supposition, gratuitous in itself, leaves the action of Jesus on the solemn occasion described in our sources without an adequate motive. In point of time of writing, Paul's version of the event is the earliest, and was, he says, received from (*ἀπό*) the Lord, probably meaning mediately, through trustworthy tradition. Criticism has not, in my judgment, given sufficient reasons for questioning his confidence in its correctness.

Jesus founded both the rites which he sanctioned — baptism and the supper — upon practices which were in current use. The Jews were accustomed to ceremonial lustrations. In spite of doubts which have been raised, it is well settled that proselytes to the Jewish religion were baptized when they were admitted to participation in the theocratic life.¹ The forerunner had already appropriated this practice as symbolizing the inward purification which God required in preparation for the acceptance of the Messiah. Jesus accordingly made baptism a symbol of spiritual renewal — an outward sign and pledge of forgiveness for all such as repent of their sins and become his disciples. Answering to this initiatory rite is the holy supper, which symbolizes and attests to the believer the divine grace which is conferred through communion with the Saviour. Generically considered, both signify the same thing; they are pictorial words of God addressed to the eye, assuring men of spiritual blessings in Christ upon condition of their willingness to receive them. They are pictures and promises of the divine favor to men — the one portraying that grace in the inception of its work in the soul, the other typifying its continuous and progressive operation.

¹ See Schürer, *Jewish People*, II. 321 (§ 31).

CHAPTER XII

THE PAROUSIA AND THE JUDGMENT

THERE are five passages of special importance with which we have to deal in discussing the teaching of Jesus concerning his parousia. We shall consider them in order. Following the specific instructions given to the Twelve when Jesus sent them out (Mk. vi. 7-11; Mt. x. 1-15; Lk. ix. 1-5), we find in Matthew (x. 16-42) an extended discourse of a more general character. In the midst of that discourse occurs this saying: "Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come" (x. 23). There is no parallel to this passage in Mark or Luke. But a considerable part of the matter which immediately precedes the passage just cited is found in Mark (xiii. 9-13) and Luke (xii. 11, 12; xxi. 12-17); in other words, this paragraph which in Matthew (x. 16-23) ends with the verse in question is found almost entire in Jesus' eschatological discourse as given by Mk. xiii. and Lk. xxi. These facts alone render it impossible to suppose that Jesus really predicted his second coming before the Twelve had finished their mission. This whole discourse (Mt. x. 16-42) is demonstrably a collection of materials derived from various sources, and belonging in various connections, and verse 23, which speaks of the coming of the Son of man, is, in all probability, a reminiscence of the prediction of the parousia in the great eschatological discourse of Mk. xiii., Lk. xxi., and Mt. xxiv., and therefore requires no separate consideration.

The second passage to be noticed is found in all the Synoptics in the same connection, but in slightly varying form. In Mark the passage reads: "And he said unto

them, Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Kingdom of God come with power" (ix. 1). Corresponding to the closing words we have in Luke: "till they see the Kingdom of God" (ix. 27), and in Matthew: "till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom" (xvi. 28). The passage occurs at the end of a discourse following Peter's confession, in which Jesus foretells his death and resurrection. He must suffer and die and his disciples must suffer for his sake. They are required to choose between him and the world, and if they prove steadfast, he will accept them when he comes in his glory. Then he added the saying in question. The first evangelist must have understood the words to refer to the parousia. The language of Mark and Luke is general enough to apply to any crisis in the realization of the Kingdom. The former meaning would connect our passage with the reference to the "coming" in the preceding verse; the latter would connect it quite appropriately with the discourse as a whole, thus: You must suffer in my cause; renounce the world; but this you may well do since thereby you will gain my salvation; if you fail, you will be disapproved at the judgment; to such failure you will be tempted by my death and the apparent defeat of my work, but I tell you that some of you will live to see my Kingdom triumph. Considered from the standpoint of exegesis alone, I should say that the words in the form in which they appear in our sources may naturally refer to the parousia; this is especially clear in the case of Matthew. But considered from the standpoint of criticism and from that of intrinsic probability, the case is quite different. Why should Jesus declare so definitely the time of his second coming in that particular connection? Apart from the difficulty raised by the fact that he elsewhere disclaimed knowing the time of that event (Mk. xiii. 32), there is no particular motive for such a prediction here. It is certainly unwarranted to say that Jesus explicitly predicted an event connected with the consummation of his Kingdom which did not happen, unless the critical and

exegetical grounds for so doing are compelling. In this case, at least, they are not so. The language of Mark and Luke is more naturally explained as referring to some special crisis in his work or to the general triumph of his Kingdom; and this view has the advantage when our passage is considered in its relation to the discourse as a whole. I disclaim making any appeal to dogmatic considerations on such subjects, but I do not think it unwarranted to assume that the words of Jesus in their original form and meaning were probably self-consistent and that there is a strong presumption against supposing that he definitely foretold events which did not happen. My conclusion is that this passage did not refer originally to our Lord's visible return to earth.

The third passage to be considered is the great eschatological discourse (Mk. xiii.; Mt. xxiv.; Lk. xxi.). Taking Mark as a basis, the drift of this discourse is as follows: As Jesus and his disciples come out of the temple one of them calls his attention to the massive structures of the temple-area. He replies that, notwithstanding their strength, they shall be completely thrown down. Later they ask him when this overthrow will occur and what will be the sign of its accomplishment. In reply he describes certain events which they will soon observe: the appearance of pretenders, wars and tumults, earthquakes and famines, persecutions and divisions, — and warns them against supposing that these are signs of the impending catastrophe. The gospel must be preached to all nations before the destruction of the temple occurs (*vv.* 1-13). When, however, the symbols of Roman power are seen in the temple-enclosure,¹ then it will be time to prepare for the great calamities which shall accompany the destruction of the temple and city (*vv.* 14-23.) Following these calamities, portents will appear in the skies and the Son of man will come "in clouds with great power and glory." This event will happen within the lifetime of the present

¹ Such is the obvious meaning of: "the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not" (Mk. xiii. 14). *Cf.* the parallel in Luke: "When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies" (xxi. 20).

generation, although only the Father knows the exact time (*vv.* 24-33).

It is quite clear that according to Mark nothing is said about the parousia in the first part of this discourse. That is a separate event which is to follow the destruction of the temple, but (according to the present form of the discourse) within a comparatively short time. Luke closely follows Mark, but Matthew has a number of distinctive features. He represents the disciples as asking not only about the time of the temple's overthrow, but about "the sign of his coming and of the end of the age" (*xxiv.* 3), as if they were either one event or inseparably connected. The idea that one and the same event, namely, "the end" (*v.* 14), is referred to in the discourse dominates Matthew's version throughout. Accordingly, he does not separate the appearance of the Roman standards from the previous events (*v.* 15), as do Mark and Luke, but connects this event immediately with those which precede it and assigns to the two no different premonitory significance. Throughout this section (*vv.* 15-28), in which the "abomination of desolation" and its attendant evils are described, it is everywhere assumed (see *v.* 27) that it is the sign of Messiah's coming, and not, as in Mark and Luke, the sign of the temple's overthrow. In keeping with this representation the coming of Christ is described as following immediately after the appearance of the Roman signals. It is evident that the difficulties of the passage, which are sufficiently great in its more primitive form, are immensely enhanced in Matthew's re-working of the material. This version of the discourse tells us that Jesus said he would personally and visibly return to earth in immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, but that before this event his gospel should be preached throughout the whole world; but despite this precise prediction as to the time of his coming, that "no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but only the Father," knew the exact time; and that he solemnly added: "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." This construction of the dis-

course involves Jesus in a tissue of contradictions which we must not attribute to him without the most compelling reasons. We are, therefore, justified in using the first Gospel only as a secondary source of Jesus' teaching on this subject, and in employing its version of this discourse only so far as it may be useful in suggesting the motive of variations from his probable meaning.

Criticism has expended a great deal of ingenuity upon the effort to determine the sources of this discourse. By many it is thought to be a combination of genuine words of Jesus, with a short Jewish-Christian apocalypse.¹ Wendt has sought to reconstruct this apocalypse from Mk. xiii. It would read as follows: (*vv.* 7, 8) And when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be not troubled: these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: there shall be earthquakes in divers places; there shall be famines: these things are the beginning of travail. (*vv.* 14-20) But when ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not (let him that readeth understand), then let them that are in Judæa flee unto the mountains: and let him that is on the housetop not go down, nor enter in, to take anything out of his house: and let him that is in the field not return back to take his cloke. But woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days! And pray ye that it be not in the winter. For those days shall be tribulation, such as there hath not been the like from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never shall be. And except the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he chose, he shortened the days.

(*vv.* 24-27) But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her

¹ Among those who have elaborated this theory are Weiffenbach, *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, p. 135 sq. (who used the theory to prove that what Jesus really predicted in the so-called parousia-discourse was his resurrection); Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, pp. 9-21; and Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* I. 327.

light, and the stars shall be falling from heaven, and the powers that are in the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then shall he send forth the angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven. (*vv.* 30, 31) Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

The remainder of the chapter, with a slight change of order, is held to represent the genuine words of Jesus, and would read as follows: (*vv.* 1-6) And as he went forth out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, behold, what manner of stones and what manner of buildings! And Jesus said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down.

And as he sat on the Mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished? And Jesus began to say unto them, Take heed that no man lead you astray. Many shall come in my name, saying, I am he; and shall lead many astray.

(*vv.* 21-23) And then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Christ; or, Lo, there; believe it not: for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew signs and wonders, that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect. But take ye heed: behold, I have told you all things beforehand.

(*v.* 9) But take ye heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in synagogues shall ye be beaten; and before governors and kings shall ye stand for my sake, for a testimony unto them. (*vv.* 11-13) And when they lead you to judgement, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it

is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. And brother shall deliver up brother to death, and the father his child; and children shall rise up against parents, and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved. (*vv.* 28, 29) Now from the fig tree learn her parable: when her branch is now become tender, and putteth forth its leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh; even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that he is nigh, *even* at the doors. (*vv.* 32-36) But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is. It is as when a man, sojourning in another country, having left his house, and given authority to his servants, to each one his work, commanded also the porter to watch. Watch therefore: for ye know not when the lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.

Verse 10: "And the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations," is regarded by Wendt as an addition which did not originally belong to either group.

The grounds on which the division of material is made are, briefly, these: (1) Each group forms a consistent and connected whole. The first passage speaks of the future coming of the Messiah from heaven; the second answers the question of the disciples respecting the time and sign of the temple's destruction. (2) The differences between the two groups show that they were originally separate. The woes or sorrows are different in the two passages. The "little apocalypse" opens with a description of distant wars and natural calamities which threaten to affect the Christian along with the other residents of Judea. They are general and come upon all alike (*vv.* 7, 8). In the genuine passage, however, the sufferings which are to come upon the disciples will come in consequence of their Christian faith, and will proceed from the Jews (*vv.* 9, 11-13).

The salvation to be accomplished is different. That of the apocalypse is salvation from temporal calamity—depending on a mitigation of the severity of the sufferings (*v.* 20); that of the genuine passage is salvation from eternal destruction—depending upon steadfast endurance unto death (*v.* 13). (3) The two passages have a very different value. The apocalypse deals only with external calamities, and presents no general or permanently available truth which can be applied to the Christian life apart from the immediate and special purpose of the passage. The other section is religious and Christian, and it is possible to extract from it a permanent religious significance which is independent of its particular application to the circumstances of its time.¹

To this separation of the material of Mk. xiii. it is objected, that there is no evidence for it; that it is inherently improbable that Mark should take an independent Jewish-Christian writing (commonly supposed to emanate from Jesus), break it into three parts and interpolate them at various points into his genuine source; and that the apocalyptic elements of the discourse are sufficiently explained by the influence of Old Testament apocalyptic and prophecy which furnished the symbols in which Jesus clothed his thought.² It may then be urged that incongruities in the discourse may best be referred to subjective combinations and misapprehensions on the part of the early disciples. Certainly the hypothesis in question cannot be established with certainty. It merits consideration as a somewhat plausible conjecture, but cannot be shown to be

¹ Haupt, *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*, p. 21 sq., expresses his dissatisfaction with the analysis of Wendt *et al.*, and holds that the discourse is a mosaic of small fragments—sayings originating at different times and on various occasions which, just because they were brought together in this way, have, in great part, taken on a sense essentially different from their original and authentic meaning.

² Cf. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* § 33, *b*; Beyschlag, *N. T. Theol.* I. 188 (Bk. I. ch. viii. § 1): "This short apocalypse is a mere production of the critical imagination"; Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 134: "These three sections separated by Weiffenbach are apocalyptic in character . . . because they all depend on the apocalypse of Daniel," etc. Cf. Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 302.

necessary to the explanation of the facts for which it seeks to account.¹

Before considering further the probable original import of this discourse, we must notice our fourth passage, which occurs in connection with the trial of Jesus and appears in all the Synoptics: "And ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven" (Mk. xiv. 62); "Henceforth (*ἀπ' ἄρτι*) ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven" (Mt. xxvi. 64); "But from henceforth (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*) shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (Lk. xxii. 69). This statement is made in answer to the high priest's question: "Art thou the Christ?" Jesus replies that he is, and in language resembling that of Dan. vii. 13, asserts the speedy triumph of his cause. From this very time, he says, — from this moment of apparent defeat, — you will see the tokens of the triumph of my Kingdom. It appears to me impossible to refer this passage to a future advent. We are shut up to one of two suppositions: either that Jesus spoke symbolically of his coming on the clouds, meaning his glorious triumph over all hostile powers, or that tradition has cast his actual thought into that form because it was supposed that he spoke on this occasion of his second advent. It is possible to hold both that Jesus actually used the words in question, referring to the triumph of his Kingdom, and that the early disciples referred them to his parousia. The one thing that is clear is, that they did not actually refer to the parousia, whatever their original form. On this point the limitation of time involved in the words "ye shall see," the idea of a progressive coming, expressed in the phrase, "from now on," the whole situation in which the passage belongs, and the question to which it is an answer, are decisive. From this passage, then, we may confidently draw a conclusion which has already been suggested by an ex-

¹ A judicious article entitled, *The Apocalyptic Teaching of our Lord*, by the Rev. Henry Kingman, in which this theory is carefully considered, may be found in *The Biblical World*, for March, 1897.

amination of Mk. ix. 1, and the parallels, namely, that Jesus sometimes spoke of the coming of his Kingdom or of his coming in his Kingdom (probably using apocalyptic language in so doing) when he referred to the progress or triumph of his cause, and that there was a strong tendency in the minds of the early disciples to apply all such language to his visible return in glory to earth to consummate his Kingdom. This conclusion receives strong confirmation from the fourth Gospel.¹

These considerations will be quite determining for the view which we must take of a fifth passage, Lk. xvii. 20-xviii. 8. It is difficult to suppose that this collection of sayings originally referred to a visible coming of Christ to consummate his Kingdom at the end of the world, because (1) the opening verses (20, 21) express quite a different, that is, a spiritual, idea of the Kingdom and of its coming. (2) Considerable parts of this matter (vv. 23, 24, 26, 27, 34-37) are found in substance in Matthew's version of the eschatological discourse (xxiv. 26, 27, 37, 39, 40, 41, 28), and we have seen that this discourse is evidently made up of diverse elements which are dominated and blended by the current expectation of the Lord's visible return to earth in close connection with the overthrow of the Jewish state. A similar expectation seems to have shaped the composition and form of this discourse. (3) The parable of the Unjust Judge (xviii. 1-8), which expressly purports to teach the certainty that prayer will be answered, is allegorized by Luke and applied to teach watchfulness in view of the Lord's second coming. We therefore see in this discourse traces of the tendency to apply to the idea of a final parousia sayings and parables whose form and content do not naturally yield themselves to such an application. In like manner, I cannot but regard it as improbable that the parable of the Pounds (Lk. xix. 11-27) or Talents (Mt. xxv. 14-29) originally referred to the parousia. It seems to have been applied allegorically to this subject because the parable-story contains the idea of a *lord returning to his servants*. This idea of the "coming" is incidental; it is

¹ See my *Johannine Theology*, pp. 329-340.

not *the point* of the parable. The same remark applies to the application of the figure of the absent householder in Lk. xii. 35-48.

A candid review of the passages appears to me to leave no room for doubt that all three Synoptists have applied to a final coming sayings of Christ which could not have been originally intended to refer to that event. Exegesis must, indeed, maintain that the passages in their present form relate to that subject, but criticism — which is only a name for a more comprehensive estimate of the facts — cannot regard this reference, at any rate in most instances, as the original one. On examination we find that difficulties in the way of this application are not peculiar to the relevant passages outside the great eschatological discourse. If we have sufficient reason for believing that Jesus did not predict his return within the generation living, how can we conceive him as instructing his hearers to watch and be ready for it (Mk. xiii. 37; Mt. xxv. 13)? Would not his “coming” for which they all should be ready, and at which one would be taken and the other left (Mt. xxiv. 40) be more naturally understood as the hour of death?

Such considerations undoubtedly suggest the question: Does anything, then, remain on which we can with any confidence rely as a source of Jesus’ teaching concerning a second advent? May we not reduce this idea of the parousia, as some have sought to do, to that of a process or dispensation? It must be admitted that in the confused state of the materials bearing upon the subject it is possible — not, indeed, by exegesis, but by historical criticism — to maintain, with considerable plausibility, this conclusion. I cannot, however, adopt it. The confusion of our materials does not warrant us in concluding that Jesus said nothing on this subject to which his hearers overdid the application of his language. There is a wide difference between misunderstandings or mistaken combinations of his words and the independent creation by his disciples of a doctrine to which he did not refer. Moreover, his whole conception of the Kingdom of God implies the idea of its consummation, of which he might naturally speak as a

special, final self-manifestation, or parousia. Nor does it seem to me that we could reasonably explain the prominent place which the expectation of the second advent had in the mind of the early Church if Jesus had been wholly silent on the subject. That it should have been over-emphasized, that it should have been regarded as near at hand and surrounded by external signs and wonders, can be historically explained; but that it was created *ex nihilo* is an assumption which would require for its justification something more than an argument derived from the difficulty of finding a clear and consistent explanation of the perplexities connected with the passages in question.

It remains, then, to estimate the probabilities concerning the great eschatological discourse. These appear to me to be as follows:

(1) The first part of the discourse, as we have it, was concerned with the question as to the signs and the time of Jerusalem's overthrow; but with this material is blended a group of sayings, some of which probably referred to the manifestation or parousia of the Son of man at the end of the age. The general division between these two groups of sayings may be traced at Mk. xiii. 24; Mt. xxiv. 29; Lk. xxi. 25. Matthew has indeed obliterated the distinction between the two, and in Mark and Luke it is obscured.

(2) This obscuration or obliteration is due to the persistent expectation of the early disciples that the Kingdom of Christ would be speedily consummated by a great crisis. Under the power of this idea of the Kingdom and its triumph, they were naturally impelled to blend together sayings that belonged apart, and to identify prophecies of the consummation with those of impending calamities. That their conception of the Kingdom was such as to warrant this supposition is abundantly evident from the New Testament (see *e.g.*, Lk. xix. 11; xxiv. 21; Acts i. 6).

(3) Jesus spoke of various "comings," referring, as occasion required, to the progress of his Kingdom, to crises in its advance, or to its consummation. His whole doctrine of the nature of his Kingdom, as well as a critical consideration of the relevant passages, justifies this conclu-

sion. He did not conceive of his Kingdom as triumphing by a sudden and near catastrophe. It was not to come "with observation" (Lk. xvii. 20); it was to be like leaven spreading (Mt. xiii. 33), like seed growing secretly, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear" (Mk. iv. 28). Its coming was conceived of as a great historic world-process (Mt. xxi. 43). In the very midst of words that have been shaped into a prediction of Christ's return within the generation then living, we meet with the declaration that his gospel shall first be proclaimed to the whole world (Mt. xxiv. 14). Jesus spoke of various "days of the Son of man" (Lk. xvii. 22), epochs in a great continuous process, culminating in the final manifestation, with which the first disciples more or less especially identified all others.¹

(4) To determine precisely the form of Jesus' teaching concerning his parousia and the consummation is not possible in the present state of our sources. He probably employed symbolic language similar to that which we find in the apocalyptic parts of the Old Testament. If the first disciples commonly gave a literal interpretation to this language, we shall now do better to follow the example of Peter, who saw Joel's prophecy of dread portents in earth and sky fulfilled in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts ii. 16 *sq.*). It would be only a popular Jewish reading of prophecy which could lead us to suppose that Jesus meant to consummate his Kingdom with an accompaniment of convulsions and catastrophes. The "logic of events," during many centuries, may safely be held to teach us something as to what Jesus meant by coming in his Kingdom. I believe the analogy of his general teaching accords with the historical facts in showing that he anticipated a great process of conquest, marked by special crises, and issuing in a final victory when he should appear as the glorious Leader and King of man-

¹ That Jesus' general doctrine of the nature and progress of his Kingdom should guide us in the effort to determine what he taught concerning its consummation, is one of the leading principles of the excellent discussion of Haupt in his work entitled *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*.

kind—the triumphant Founder and Perfecter of the Kingdom of a redeemed humanity.

The principle of judgment is repeatedly recognized in the teaching of Jesus. But in connection with this subject we encounter a difficulty analogous to that which we found when studying the parousia. The divine judgment is presented now as a process, and now as a final crisis, and it is impossible to determine with confidence to which of these certain passages were intended to refer. We shall find reasons for suspecting that the eschatological conception of this subject (as with respect to the parousia) was so dominant in the minds of the first disciples that some sayings which seem more naturally to express the principle of judgment are treated as if they referred to the “day of judgment” at the end of the present world-period.

In the passage: “Every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment” (Mt. v. 22), the reference is probably to the local court, which here stands as a symbol of temporal divine judgment. The passage beginning: “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord” (Mt. vii. 21–23), is referred to the day of judgment by Matthew—an application which is rendered doubtful both by the context and by the use made of it by Luke (xiii. 25–27). The first evangelist shows the same tendency to connect all references to the principle of judgment with a final “day” as he does to refer all Christ’s “comings” to a crisis at the end of the age. In reporting the discourse upon the responsibility of men for their words and deeds (xii. 33 *sq.*), he adds that for every idle word they shall give account in the day of judgment, and that by their words they shall be justified or condemned (xii. 36, 37). Luke reports the same sayings (vi. 43–45), but without this eschatological application.

Matthew has appended to the parousia-discourse which we have been considering a judgment-programme, in which all the nations are represented as appearing before the Son of man, who separates them into two classes and pronounces their doom (xxv. 31–46). Since this passage is peculiar to Matthew, and in view of his handling of escha-

tological materials which we have already observed, it is difficult to determine the probable import of this highly pictorial description. Accordingly, interpreters are much divided in their judgment of its intention. Some (*e.g.* Meyer and Weiss¹) hold that it is a picture of the judgment of professing Christians, on the ground that those who are gathered before the Judge are spoken of as his "brethren" (*vv.* 40, 45), that is, professed disciples, and that the terms applied to the accepted ones (*vv.* 34, 37) naturally designate Christians. Others (as Bruce and Wendt²) maintain that it is a description of the judgment of the heathen. They understand the phrase "all the nations" (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, *v.* 32), in the specific sense, "the Gentiles," and point out the fact that those who are judged are expressly distinguished from the "brethren" of Jesus, that is, from believers; and also that the significance of their good or evil acts is represented as not known to them when they performed them (*vv.* 37, 44). Those who take this view appeal to passages like Mt. x. 40-42 and Lk. x. 12-16 in confirmation of it, and point out that those who have known Christ are represented as judged by their confession or denial of him (Mt. x. 32, 33). Beyschlag holds that the passage, in its original meaning, was intended to describe a certain aspect of the divine judgment. "It is a peculiarly magnificent expression of the idea more briefly expressed in Mt. x. 42": "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in nowise lose his reward."³

The common view is that the passage describes the general judgment of mankind. The way in which the scene is connected with the coming of the Son of man and the language which is applied to both the accepted and the rejected (34 *b*, 37, 41 *b*), strongly favor this view. Indeed, Weiss, Wendt, and Beyschlag all admit that the passage was understood by the evangelist to describe the general

¹ *Commentary, in loco*, and *Bibl. Theol.* § 33, *d*, note 6.

² *Kingdom of God*, p. 315 *sq.*; *Lehre Jesu*, pp. 186-188.

³ *N. T. Theol.* I. 206 (Bk. I. ch. viii. § 9).

judgment of the world at the end of time. But the difficulties of this view are very great. How can we harmonize with Jesus' general teaching the idea that the eternal destiny of all men is decided by works of charity alone? But the theories which apply the description to the judgment of a special class are hardly more satisfactory. How are the heathen, as such, to be conceived of as having had, in all cases, such relations to Christ's "brethren" as the passage presupposes? Both this explanation and that which applies it to the judgment of Christians only are compelled to suppose that the evangelist has amplified the original sayings of Christ and given them a general, instead of a special, application. In view of all the considerations which bear upon the subject, I regard it as extremely doubtful whether we can legitimately claim that this passage is more than a pictorial exposition of a principle of the divine judgment, namely, that even small deeds of service, done from love, are approved by Christ, while their neglect is condemned. In this view, it would be an impressive picture of man's relation to his deeds, emphasizing the significance of his works as showing the state of his heart and his real relations to God, as elsewhere Jesus declares the decisive import of man's words (Mt. xii. 36, 37), because they are the expression of his inner life (xii. 34, 35).

The conclusion respecting the doctrine of judgment must be similar to that which we reached in regard to that of the parousia. A principle or process of judgment is recognized, but this process is conceived of as culminating in a crisis at the end of the present world-period. This view is strongly confirmed by the representations of the fourth Gospel.¹ But a candid criticism must admit that it is almost as difficult to be sure of the exact words of Jesus respecting the "day of judgment" as it is to determine what he said concerning his second advent.

Respecting the method or issues of judgment, those will be least disposed to dogmatize who have fully considered the perplexities which a critical handling of the sources

¹ See my *Johannine Theology*, pp. 349-354.

involves. The references to the undying worm and the unquenchable fire certainly suggest the finality of the issues of the judgment, provided one feels confident that they were meant to refer to that event (see Mk. ix. 47, 48; *cf.* Mt. v. 29, 30). The most emphatic declaration of such a final issue of judgment is Mt. xxv. 46: "These shall go into eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life." One's view as to the probable originality of this passage will, however, depend upon the theory which he adopts respecting the primary intent of the judgment-scene as a whole.¹

Jesus assured his disciples of a resurrection and of a blessed life in heaven. They shall be, he said, "as angels in heaven" (Mk. xii. 25); "accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead" being "sons of God, sons of the resurrection" (Lk. xx. 35, 36). Their good deeds shall be "recompensed in the resurrection of the just" (Lk. xiv. 14). From these passages many scholars infer that unbelievers are not to share, in any sense, in a resurrection;² but this is a precarious *argumentum e silentio* (*cf.* Mk. xii. 26; John v. 29; Acts xxiv. 15). Jesus did not think of Hades as a realm of unconsciousness, but of activity, and therefore had no special motive to touch upon the question, discussed by the Jews, whether all, or only some, should be awakened from the sleep of death. Moreover, when he speaks of the resurrection of the pious, he lays no special emphasis upon the corporeal aspect of it, but conceives of it as the perfecting of the life in all that concerns its divine destiny (Mk. xii. 24-27). That a resurrection in this sense is promised to the righteous only, does not in the least prove that others continue without bodily form, or that they abide in an unconscious existence, or cease to be.³

¹ Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, p. 188, Weiss, *Matthäusev.*, p. 540, and Holtzmann, *Handcommentar*, *in loco*, regard this verse as an addition by the evangelist. It is held to be an amplification of Mt. xvi. 27, in agreement with the idea of Dan. xii. 2.

² So Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* § 34, *d*; Beyschlag, *N. T. Theol.* I. 211 (Bk. I. ch. viii. § 11).

³ *Cf.* Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 336 *sq.*

PART II

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

WITH respect to the authorship of the fourth Gospel three views are now current. (1) The representatives of the so-called liberal school in Germany hold that it is spurious. It is the product of a Hellenizing type of thought which was rife in the second century. It is a construction of the life and teaching of Jesus in accordance with certain forms of speculative thought, and is therefore untrustworthy as a source of historical information or of doctrinal teaching. It is a species of historical romance dominated by the neo-Platonic idea of the Logos, or Reason, which the author identifies with the preëxistent Christ. "The fourth Gospel is only estimated rightly when it is considered to be a product of philosophical poetizing, with a religious tendency, emanating from the third Christian generation. As a source for the history of Christ in the flesh it is almost worthless."¹

(2) A series of attempts has been made to show that the Gospel, although not written by the apostle John, was mainly composed of genuine Johannine memoranda, in very much the same way as the first Gospel embodied the Logia. Weizsäcker assigned it to a disciple of John who was supposed, however, to have based his work upon apostolic traditions.² To this view Hase, who had long defended

¹ Jülicher, *Einleitung in d. N. T.*, pp. 258, 259.

² *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1864.

the genuineness of the gospel, gave his assent in his *Geschichte Jesu* (Leipzig, 1876). The most conspicuous adherent of this mediating theory at present is Wendt who has elaborated it in detail and in a somewhat different form from his predecessors.¹ He holds that the evangelist possessed and used a series of genuine memoranda of the Lord's words, prefaced by brief historical introductions, which he edited and supplemented. These genuine Logia related mainly to the later period of Jesus' ministry, but were so distributed by the editor as to cover his whole public life. They were preceded by the prologue in substantially the form in which we have it. The principal grounds of this hypothesis are as follows: (a) The natural course of thought is often interrupted by parentheses which are most naturally referred to a redactor; e.g. i. 15 interrupts the connection between vv. 14 and 16; xiii. 18, 19 breaks the connection between xiii. 12-17 and xiii. 20. (b) The discourses and the historical framework of the gospel exhibit a different cast of ideas. The former emphasize Jesus' miracles as the "signs" of his messiahship; the latter his words and works. (c) Certain events are placed in the early part of his ministry which our Synoptic sources refer to its later stages, e.g. the cleansing of the Temple (*cf.* ii. 13 *sq.* with Mk. xi. 15 *sq.*) and the assertion of his Messianic claims. Wendt holds that this Johannine material must be separated from the later additions by a critical process, but that when this is done, it is found to "furnish a subject-matter quite in harmony with the contents of Jesus' teaching as attested by the other sources." The opponents of this view commonly urge against it two principal considerations, first, the testimony of the book itself to its production by an eye-witness (xix. 35; xxi. 24), and, second, the completeness of its literary plan and execution and its marked sameness of style throughout.

(3) The third view is the traditional one that the Gospel was written by the apostle John. I can hardly do

¹ *Die Lehre Jesu*, pp. 215-342; *cf.* *The Teaching of Jesus*, I. 22-28 (orig. pp. 6-10).

more than to indicate the present state of the question. For its discussion in detail I must refer the student to the standard works on New Testament Introduction, and to the many special treatises which the investigation of the problem has called forth.¹ It must suffice to point out that the objections to the genuineness of the fourth Gospel proceed mainly from theoretic and internal considerations, while the opposite view, which also appeals to internal evidence, supports its claim by reference to a line of witnesses which reaches back almost to the very verge of the apostolic age. Those who hold the apostolic authorship urge that the fourth Gospel bears every mark of a historical narrative; it is not merely interested in certain disembodied ideas; it deals in a multitude of facts and detailed narrations. In some details it seems to be more accurate than the Synoptics and to be indirectly confirmed by them. The claim that the book reflects the Gnostic controversies of the second century is not warranted by a sound exegesis of the text. It is from the same hand as 1 John, whose attestation is ample. The twenty-first chapter is probably an addition by a later writer, who in the name of a number of persons strongly attests the genuineness of the Gospel (xxi. 24). The external evidence of the apostolic authorship is abundant, and has been materially increased by the discoveries of recent years. The negative school long disputed certain alleged correspondences between the fourth Gospel and the imperfect text of the *Clementine Homilies*; but when in 1853 Dressel published a complete manuscript of these writings, which had recently been discovered in the Ottonian library in Rome, there was found in the long lost portion an unquestionable reference to the story of the man born blind.² The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which probably dates from the early years of the second century, seems to me to bear traces of the influence of the fourth Gospel. The same may be claimed respecting the

¹ Ample references will be found in Vincent's *Student's New Testament Handbook* (1893), pp. 61-68.

² *Hom. XIX.* ch. xxii.; *cf.* John ix. 2, 3.

so-called *Gospel of Peter*, which was discovered at Akhmîm in Egypt in 1886-87, and is believed to date from about 165 A.D. On this subject one of the most competent specialists who has studied it says: "The unmistakable acquaintance of the author with our four evangelists deserves a special comment. He uses and misuses each in turn. To him they all stand on an equal footing. He lends no support to the attempt which has been made to place a gulf of separation between the fourth Gospel and the rest, as regards the period or area of their acceptance as canonical."¹

But perhaps the most notable addition which has recently been made to the external evidence for the genuineness of the Gospel is that afforded by the discovery of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. This man was an Assyrian by birth and a hearer of Justin Martyr, and flourished about 155-170 A.D. His earlier life was spent in Rome; later, he lived in the East, especially in Syria. In his *Address to the Greeks* there were several apparent verbal coincidences with the fourth Gospel which gave rise to the conjecture that if his lost *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Gospels, could be discovered, it would be found to contain the fourth Gospel. A certain writer of the twelfth century, Dionysius Bar-Silibi, states that the *Diatessaron* began with the words: "In the beginning was the Word." This testimony was rejected by the negative criticism. But when at length in 1886 a complete Arabic manuscript of the *Diatessaron* was brought from Egypt to Rome, it was found that Dionysius was correct, and that the work embodied all four Gospels. This discovery shows that the fourth Gospel was accepted without question as apostolic among the Syrian churches, where Tatian spent his later life, about the year 160 or 165 A.D.² These are but examples of recent additions to the testimony. All things considered, the genuineness of the fourth Gospel is amply

¹ Professor J. Armitage Robinson, in his edition of the *Gospel of Peter*, p. 33.

² The *Diatessaron* is published in English with full introduction and notes by J. Hamlyn Hill. Edinburgh, 1894.

attested, and internal considerations favorable to the Johannine authorship may be adduced which are, to say the least, as strong as the objections which are urged on the other side.¹

But just here there arises for the advocates of the genuineness of the Gospel a very important and difficult question: How far is it historically trustworthy? What is its value as a source of information compared with that of the Synoptic tradition? This question is forced upon us by the formal and material differences which exist between the fourth Gospel and the other three.

The Synoptic discourses are full of vivid popular imagery, striking comparisons, and sententious sayings; those of the fourth Gospel are elaborate, elevated, and subtle in style and tone, often rising to heights of sublime mystery. Nor is this difference merely one of language. There is a difference in emphasis and contents as well. The large place filled by the parables in the Synoptics is but partially taken by the allegories of John. The Christ of the Synoptics speaks less of himself; he offers his truth and Kingdom for men's acceptance. In the fourth Gospel, however, his person is presented as absolutely central; he is the Mediator between God and man, the bond which unites earth and heaven. Instead of the parousia with its accompanying signs and wonders, we read in John of the coming of the Holy Spirit after Jesus' departure from earth. The Kingdom of God is the keynote of the Synoptics; the nature and prerogatives of the Son of God the keynote in John. The first three Gospels speak more of the general fatherhood of God; the fourth speaks more of a special fatherhood, denoting a relation which God sustains to his divine and eternal Son. The thought of the fourth Gospel has, for the most part, left the lower, concrete world of Jewish speech, custom, and tradition and entered the higher world of eternal, spiritual realities.

¹ On the internal evidence, see President Dwight in Godet's *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Am. ed.), Vol. I.; Bishop Lightfoot in *Biblical Essays*, London and New York, 1893, and Dr. A. P. Peabody in the volume entitled *The Fourth Gospel*, New York, 1892.

What are we to make of these differences? How are they to be explained? If what we have seen reason to believe respecting the origin and character of the Synoptic Gospels be true, we cannot suppose that Jesus delivered the Johannine discourses in the form in which they are preserved to us. Jesus cannot have had, at the same time, the style and method of teaching which the Synoptists describe and that which the fourth Gospel reflects. We must, therefore, attribute the language, the color, and the form of these Johannine discourses to the evangelist. The Gospel of John is a distillation of the life and teaching of Jesus from the alembic of the apostle's own mind. It is his interpretation of the meaning of Christ's words, deeds, and person, derived from intimate personal relations with him and colored and shaped by a long life of Christian thought and experience. It is, therefore, less of the nature of a mere report or chronicle than the Synoptic tradition; it is rather a version, a free rendering, a paraphrase of what Christ had imparted to one who had made his teaching so completely his own that it had become fused and blended with his own thought and life.

But it may be asked: If such a subjective element is admitted, does it not impair the historical trustworthiness of the Gospel? To this question we may reply: If it were necessary or possible to recover the very words which Jesus spoke, such an interpretation as the fourth Gospel presents would be subject to some serious disadvantages in comparison with a verbal report. But this is neither necessary nor possible. He spoke a different language from that in which our Gospels are written. We have seen good reasons for believing that the Synoptics also contain very considerable subjective elements and combinations which give rise to many perplexing problems of literary criticism. For years the words of Jesus were written only on the hearts of his disciples. The phenomena of the Synoptics justify the assumption that they have preserved to us his general style of speaking — his method and forms of thought. But the first three Gospels are not reportorial reproductions of his very words. That which our gospel

tradition, in all its forms, reproduces is what Jesus was understood to say. There is a subjective element in all testimony through which the living teacher is interpreted without the intervention of such appliances for the precise reproduction of his words as belong only to modern times.¹ The trustworthiness of testimony depends upon the degree of correctness with which the essential substance of a speaker's real meaning is apprehended.

It does not, therefore, follow that because the fourth Gospel contains a large subjective factor, it is less true or trustworthy than the Synoptics as a source for the knowledge of Christ. The apostle's reflections may have transformed some words of Jesus into something different from what they originally signified,² but so far as we have any means of judging, the fourth Gospel compares favorably with the Synoptics in this respect. The book is, indeed, limited by its plan, but it is penetrated by a keen historic interest, and bears all the marks of a faithful portrayal of the essence and import of our Lord's words and deeds. It does not have the tone of a romance. It is not dominated by an abstract idea of the Logos, but by the historic idea that the true Word of God had appeared among men in the person of Jesus Christ. John's version of the sayings of Christ is doubtless, verbally considered, more remote than that of the Synoptists from their original form, but it is not on that account less true to their real significance. His individuality had colored and shaped, through a long life of reflection, the form of his Master's instructions, but it had not distorted or misapplied them. His mystical and intense nature had penetrated into what was deepest in the gospel, and he presents it not in a stereotyped form, but in a living apprehension of its soul of truth. Many lessons of Christ which the disciples had not understood when they were spoken — such as his teaching concerning the

¹ "No line is possible between what has come to men and their interpretations of what has come to them." F. J. A. Hort, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*, 1894, p. 175.

² In the judgment of many, examples are found in ii. 19-22 and xii. 32, 33.

true nature of the Kingdom, the destination of the gospel, and the obduracy of Israel — had now become plain. The promise of the guiding, interpreting Spirit had been more completely fulfilled than in the earlier days of the apostolic Church. The “things of Christ” had been wonderfully disclosed to the apostle, not in a mere outward way, but by such a spiritual illumination of their meaning that the outer word had become an inner word through a living appropriation. Why may not the mind and meaning of Christ be as faithfully represented by such a man and in such a way as by a formally accurate chronicle of his sayings? This method of reproduction has, of course, its limitations and its liability to errors and omissions. To what extent the apostle sharply distinguished, in his own consciousness, the teaching of Jesus from his own doctrinal reflections it is impossible to say. In any case, the objective was also for him subjective. Jesus’ teaching, as he understood it, was part and parcel of his own faith and life; and thus the fourth Gospel is at once the mind of the apostle and “the heart of Christ.”¹

The problems upon which I have been commenting are questions of historical criticism, rather than of Biblical Theology; but it has been necessary to touch upon them and to indicate my view of them, because they have an important bearing not only upon one’s estimate of the value of the Gospel as a source of the teaching of Jesus, but also upon the way in which its materials are to be distributed and employed in New Testament Theology. For example, Wendt’s mediating view respecting the authorship of the fourth Gospel determines his peculiar use of it.² He regards the substance of the book, especially that of the discourses, as consisting of genuine apostolic memoranda, and therefore as a valuable secondary source for the teaching of Jesus. He accordingly uses such materials as criticism approves, appending to

¹ The view of this subject which I have here presented will be found, with variations in form and emphasis, in the writings of Weiss, Sanday, Beyschlag, Bovon *et al.*

² In *The Teaching of Jesus*.

the Synoptic representation of each doctrine its Johannine counterpart. This use of the materials implies, of course, an attempt at separating the genuine elements from the additions of the supposed editor.

Those who regard the Gospel as "the romance of the Logos," or, at any rate, as a creation of post-apostolic speculation, naturally treat all its contents as a product of the author's own theoretic construction of the life of Christ. On this theory no distinction will be made between the discourses and the doctrinal comments of the evangelist. All is equally the author's own. This method of treating the materials of the book does not, however, necessarily proceed upon the presuppositions which I have just mentioned. It possesses, on its own account, some important advantages and is sometimes followed by those who maintain the genuineness of the Gospel. It was adopted by Weiss,¹ and by Reuss, although the latter also sparingly used materials drawn from the Johannine discourses in his portrayal of the teaching of Jesus.² I pursued the same plan in an earlier treatise.³ This method best enables one to bring out the individuality of the Johannine type of thought, and may be justified by the fact that the teaching of Jesus is so completely cast into the moulds of the writer's own thought that, in one sense, the whole book represents the conceptions of the apostle. The whole Gospel, as truly as the first Epistle, embodies the theology of John and exemplifies the Johannine style, terminology, and mode of conceiving Christian truth. Where the special study of this particular type of thought is the primary concern, this method of treating the Gospel as a whole is the most natural and useful.

The case is quite different, however, when one makes the content of Jesus' teaching his special point of departure and approaches the Gospel with a view to exhibiting, not so much a certain method of apostolic thought in and

¹ In his *Der johanneische Lehrbegriff* and his *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*.

² In his *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*.

³ *The Johannine Theology*, New York, 1894.

for itself, as the teaching of Jesus as a whole and the various types of apostolic doctrine in their genetic connection with that teaching and their successive evolution. For the purposes of the theology of the New Testament in general it is necessary to separate the discourses and sayings of Jesus from the parts which emanate from the author, difficult as it is to do this in any satisfactory manner. This is the method adopted by Beyschlag¹ and by Bovon,² and is that which will be followed in this volume. For reasons which have already been stated, I shall not deem it necessary — as, indeed, I do not think it practicable — to try to separate completely the objective from the subjective in the fourth Gospel. The discourses, for example, may with perfect propriety be used as secondary sources for illustrating the Johannine theology, while, primarily, they will be treated as a source of the teaching of Jesus.

¹ In his *New Testament Theology*.

² In his *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*.

CHAPTER II

THE IDEA OF GOD

THE doctrine of God which the fourth Gospel ascribes to Jesus is in no essential respect different from that which we have found in the Synoptics. It is, indeed, expressed to a considerable extent in different words and phrases; Jesus speaks more of the special relation and intimacy between God and himself; several statements concerning God's nature and action are found which are more abstract than any which we meet with in the first three Gospels; yet even in these respects the difference is one of form and emphasis rather than of substance. In general, God is represented in John's report of our Lord's teaching, just as he is by the Synoptics, as the heavenly Father who loves and blesses all, but who confers special spiritual benefits upon the fulfilment of appropriate spiritual conditions.

The clearest reference in our source to what moderns would call the metaphysical nature of God is that word of Jesus to the Samaritan woman: "God is spirit" (*πνεῦμα ὁ θεός*, iv. 24). The emphatic position of *πνεῦμα* and the course of thought in the context show that the passage should be thus rendered, and not, as in both our English versions: "God is *a* Spirit." It is not the personality so much as the nature of God which the saying is intended to emphasize. The disputes between the Samaritans and the Jews as to the place where God ought to be worshipped proceeded as if he were a local divinity; as if his presence and power were limited or could only be fully manifested in some particular place. Jesus penetrates beneath all such inadequate ideas of God in his assertion that God can be worshipped with equal advantage anywhere because he is not limited in space — because his nature is spiritual.

Hence what is required in the worshipper is a devout and sincere heart, not resort to some special locality. The purport of the saying is strictly practical. Both the Jew and the Samaritan would theoretically admit its truth. It was the basal principle of the religion of both. But it was often obscured and practically forgotten. The aim of Jesus was to direct attention to the nature of God as a spiritual Being who is everywhere present with his sincere worshippers, in order that he might emphasize the relative unimportance of the outward form and accompaniments of divine worship in comparison with its sincerity and spirituality. While no similar saying is reported in the Synoptics, the same conception of God and of his worship underlies the expression which, in some form, he doubtless employed, that he would build a "temple made without hands," that is, set up a purely spiritual worship (Mk. xiv. 58).¹

Since God is spirit he reveals himself in ways appropriate to his nature. He does not manifest himself to the senses; no one has seen the Father, except in the revelation which he has made of himself in his Son (vi. 46); "he that hath seen me," said Jesus, "hath seen the Father" (xiv. 9). But it is a spiritual vision of God which is thus obtained; it is an interpretation of his nature and character which is derived from the life of Christ. Those who are incapable of this spiritual perception neither truly see God in his progressive self-disclosure in Jewish history nor in his consummate revelation in Christ. The spiritually blinded Jews of our Lord's time were incapable of hearing that voice of God which had so long been speaking in their own history or of discerning the divine form which had so long been moving amidst the

¹ They were, indeed, "false witnesses" who testified that he said: "I will destroy this temple," etc., but the alleged saying doubtless had some basis of fact. The falseness might well consist in the form into which his actual saying had been cast, *e.g.* in the revolutionary assertion ascribed to him that *he himself* would destroy the temple and build another in its place. What he probably did say — that he would constitute a spiritual worship — emerges quite clearly through the false interpretation which his enemies had given to his words.

prophetic ideals of the nation; and the reason for this was that the outer word of God was not for them also an inner word. Hence they continued to search their sacred writings, vainly seeking to find eternal life in them because they had lost the key to their true meaning and power (vi. 37-39). What is this but the doctrine found in the Synoptics that men must be morally akin to God in order to know him; that it is only the pure in heart who see God (Mt. v. 8)?

In the fourth Gospel we find the same ethical monotheism which we met with in the Synoptics. Both forms of the gospel tradition have the same Old Testament basis. The God of both is the God of Israel. He is "the only God" (v. 44), "the only true God" (xvii. 3), the one Being who in reality corresponds to the true idea of God. This is the basal truth of Israel's religion on which, according to Mark (xii. 29, 30), quite in agreement with the Old Testament (Deut. vi. 4, 5), Jesus based his great commandments of love to God and man.

But in John, as in the Synoptics, the most characteristic designation of God is "Father." We saw that the content of God's fatherhood, as presented in the first three Gospels, is gracious and universal love. We saw that God's fatherhood designated, in the first instance, a unique relation to his Son, and also a special fellowship between God and the disciples of Jesus, involving a disposition of complaisance towards them on God's part corresponding to their obedience and love. But we also found that God was spoken of as being the Father of all men in the sense that he loves and blesses all men, who are by nature akin to himself. The same conceptions meet us in John. In relation to Christ, God is the Father in a unique sense. The Father's love to the Son is grounded upon an original, eternal relation. The Father loved him before the foundation of the world (xvii. 24). In consequence of that relation of love which exists between them, God has given to his Son all authority and power (iii. 35). "He showeth him all things that himself doeth" (v. 20). A historic reason is also given for this love of the Father to the Son, namely, the Son's willing-

ness to lay down his life for mankind (x. 17), and it is the archetype of Christ's own love to his disciples (xv. 9).

The complaisant love of the Father to the filial and obedient, that is, to Christ's disciples, is several times emphasized. The Father specially loves those who love Christ and keep his word (xiv. 23). He regards with particular approval those who love the Son and believe in his divine mission (xvi. 27); indeed, this special loving favor of God to the believing and obedient is likened to the love which the Father has to the Son himself (xvii. 23). This representation corresponds to the usage of the Synoptists who, when speaking of the relation between God and man, apply the terms "fatherhood" and "sonship" by preference to the fellowship which exists between God and the trustful and obedient. The relation which these words, when so used, denote is a reciprocal one, and can only be perfectly realized when man fulfils by obedience and love his side of the relation. To the numerous Synoptic passages which speak of God as the Father of Christians, correspond these Johannine references to the special love and favor with which he regards those who accept the mission and work of his Son. But neither of these representations limits his fatherhood and love to one portion of mankind. All men are still ideally his sons by virtue of their native kinship to him, and he loves all in his unceasing and boundless benevolence.

The supreme proof of God's love to the whole world is seen in his sending his Son to save it (iii. 16). If love is the essence of the divine fatherhood, then must it follow that if God loves all men, he is the Father of all. We accordingly find that Jesus designates him as "the Father" without qualification (iv. 23; xv. 16; xvi. 23). It may, indeed, be claimed that in these passages God is spoken of as "the Father" with reference to his relation to Christ himself. But it appears to me quite impossible to impose this limitation upon the title. In the first of the passages just cited Jesus is speaking of God as an object of worship by his creatures and not of God's relation to himself. The Father desires sincere and rational worship, he says. In

both the other passages Jesus is speaking of the conditions on which his disciples may secure from the Father that which they seek in prayer. Moreover, the obvious references in the first Epistle to God as the Father of men (ii. 1; iii. 1) seem to me to make it evident that the apostle understood God's fatherhood, as represented in Jesus' teaching, to be universal. If this view is correct, the fourth Gospel yields us, in the substance of its report of our Lord's doctrine, the same view of God's fatherhood as the Synoptics. God is the Father of all men because he made and loves all; still he is more commonly designated by the title of Father in his relation to believers, because their attitude towards him makes it possible for him to feel and act towards them as he is indeed disposed to do towards all, that is, to show them that favor and complaisance which correspond to their obedience and love to him. In like manner, all men are his sons in what may be called the natural sense, but they become his true children in the higher spiritual sense, corresponding to his perfect love, only by an ethical transformation and development.¹

In entire agreement with these ideas of God's boundless love and universal fatherhood he is described as unceasingly engaged in the bestowment of blessing upon his creatures. Jesus represented his beneficent works as having their ground and spring in the beneficence of the Father who had sent him on his mission of mercy to earth. In accomplishing this mission his life was but keyed to harmony with the Father's nature. "My Father worketh even until now, and I work," he said (v. 17).

¹ Jn. viii. 41-44, especially the words: "Ye are of your father the devil," are sometimes adduced, as by Professor C. M. Mead, *Am. Jour. of Theol.*, July, 1898, to show that Christ's application of the term "Father" is "not as broad as the whole human race," "is not universal," and even as an "explicit declaration that God is not the Father of all men" (pp. 591, 592). But what Jesus is here asserting is that some men are not true sons of God; they are not like him, but are like the devil. He no more asserts that God is not the Father even of those men than in saying: "If Abraham were your Father," he denied that the persons addressed were Abraham's descendants. The passage is not concerned with teaching any doctrine about God, but only with describing the moral character of the men in question.

The Father is a perpetual worker in all the methods which are known to his wisdom and love by which he can bless mankind. To this truth Jesus made his appeal when he was reproached for healing the sick on the sabbath. His answer was: The nature of God is my justification; his benevolence does not cease on the sabbath, nor should mine.

This incident furnished the keynote for the whole discourse which followed (v. 19 *sq.*). The whole work of Jesus is grounded in the Father's nature; he does nothing but what he sees the Father doing. God delights to bestow spiritual life and blessing, and he has sent his Son to earth for this very purpose (v. 21). And this, continued Jesus, is the hour of spiritual quickening for all who will hear the divine voice which summons them forth from the stupor of self-satisfaction and sin (v. 25 *sq.*). At this point (v. 28) the passage, as it lies before us in our source, seems to pass over into the thought of the consummation of the life-giving process in the resurrection at the end of the current age. The Father, then, as the absolute Source of spiritual life, has made the Son also the bearer of the same life to all who will receive him (v. 26). God is the absolutely living One (*ὁ ζῶν πατήρ*, vi. 57), and he imparts spiritual life to the world through the Son who lives because of the Father (*διὰ τὸν πατέρα*, vi. 57); that is, the Son is made the dispenser of life because of his unique and essential relation to the Father. The work of Christ for men is thus wholly in the sphere of the spirit; it concerns man's higher life in which he is kindred to God; it occupies itself not with what is outward and incidental, but with what is essential to man's true nature and destiny (vi. 63). Thus it appears how his vocation expresses the nature of God as the all-merciful and the all-pervading Spirit, in fellowship with whom man fulfils his destiny. These mystical descriptions are the Johannine counterpart of the Synoptic teaching concerning God's boundless and universal love and the possible sonship of man to God which he realizes in a life of love like that of God, which is the type of all moral perfection (Mt. v. 48).

As the loving Father, God desires not to condemn but to save men (v. 22). Hence he sent his Son, not to judge the world, but "that the world should be saved through him" (iii. 17). Hence Jesus assured men that the aim of his coming to earth was not to judge them (viii. 15; xii. 47). A process of judgment is, however, inseparable from his saving mission. Truth, like light, necessarily judges everything which it touches. Jesus' disclosures of truth to men, and his very efforts to save them, involve their judgment if they spurn his truth and reject his salvation. Hence he says that his truth cannot but test men; his word will judge them and the reason why it will do so is that it is not his mere personal word, but the divine truth which he has received from the Father (xii. 48-50). His primary function is not that of Judge, but that of Saviour; yet his work judges men, and that because he is not alone, but stands in living and perfect fellowship with God, and must deal with men in a way which corresponds with God's own perfect ethical nature. God reveals himself for men's salvation, but it will depend upon their attitude towards his gracious revelation whether it will involve their salvation or their judgment. In this way the teaching and work of Christ — God's consummate self-manifestation — become the test of men. To Christ God has committed the work of salvation; but with that is inseparably connected a work of judgment, because he that honors the Son honors the Father, and he that honors not the Son, honors not the Father who sent him (v. 22, 23).

This teaching but exhibits in clear light the reverse side of the benevolence of God. It lays the strongest emphasis on the divine willingness to bless and save, but shows how that disposition must be affected by the attitude which men take up towards it. God cannot approve or bless with his favor those who scorn his mercy. Salvation implies conditions which must be fulfilled by those to whom it is offered. This truth is brought out in the Synoptic teaching in a less general form, in connection with the divine forgiveness. It is insisted upon that God cannot unconditionally forgive (Mt. vi. 15). He must maintain

the attitude of disapproval or condemnation towards those who will not fulfil the conditions on which alone his grace can be offered or bestowed. This is the idea which is elaborated in more generic form in the teaching of the Johannine discourses concerning the divine judgment. God is essentially gracious, but he manifests his grace in accordance with the demands of his total perfection. Being what he is, he must judge, and men are therefore approved or rejected by him according as they fulfil or refuse to fulfil the essential moral conditions which belong to the very nature of the filial and obedient life of fellowship with God.

In entire accord with this idea the discourses speak of God as righteous and holy. These references (xvii. 11, 25) are, indeed, quite incidental, but they are not on that account less significant. The terms are used in the intercessory prayer of Jesus as appellatives of the Father. Their connection shows that they do not designate specifically the judicial aspect of the divine nature, but refer to what we may call the divine equitableness or self-consistency. To the "holy Father" Jesus appeals to keep or guard his disciples. The implication of the petition is that the holy, the perfectly good and just, Father will not forsake those who have believed on his Son (xvii. 11). The second petition (xvii. 25) is similar: "O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I knew thee," etc. It is an appeal to God as the righteous One to regard the disciples with that tender love and protecting care which are correlative to their believing acceptance of Christ. The righteousness of God seems to be conceived of as the guaranty that God will bestow special regard upon those who have heard and obeyed the voice with which he has spoken in his Son. It is the uprightness or rectitude of God which, on the one hand, necessitates his judgment of unbelief and sin, and, on the other, assures his favor to humble trust and devout acceptance of his truth. It is but an outcropping of the idea which is found in the Old Testament, and which underlay Jesus' teaching, that righteousness, self-consistency or self-respect, and benevo-

lence, mercy or self-imparting goodness, meet and blend in the perfect love of God.

It remains to consider the conditions on which God is to be known. The most instructive single passage, in this connection, is xvii. 3: "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." Interpreters are divided on the question whether this statement is intended to define the nature of eternal life¹ or is to be understood as an assertion of the condition on which eternal life is obtained.² While I adopt the latter view of the passage, I would maintain a very close and vital connection between the knowledge of God and eternal life. To possess the former, in the sense in which the words are used in our passage, is to possess the latter. This is but to say that the knowledge of God is no merely intellectual affair; it is a spiritual intuition, and is founded on ethical likeness and fellowship of life. He knows God who obeys and loves him. The knowledge of God is the consent of the whole being to the divine will, the sympathy of the whole nature with God's perfections and requirements. This knowledge of God is impossible, except by a transformation whereby man becomes conformed to God in thought, will, and action. A purity of heart and purpose, whereby one comes into an inner likeness to God, is the necessary organ of this knowledge. Here again we meet with the same truth which we found in the Synoptic version of our Lord's teaching: The pure in heart see God, for the pure heart is the eye (Mt. v. 8).

Accordingly Jesus teaches that to know him — to apprehend the real significance of his person, teaching, and work — is to know God: "If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also" (xiv. 7). The sinful world knows neither him nor the Father who sent him (xvi. 3). Those, however, who recover their spiritual vision so as to see him in his true significance and character, see also the Father who speaks and works through him (xiv. 9).

¹ So Weiss and Westcott.

² So Lücke, Meyer, Wendt, and Beyschlag.

Those who are born from above, that is, those who receive a divine impartation of life and light from God, see his Kingdom — apprehend and consent to its heavenly truths and laws; and what is this but entering into the knowledge of God as he discloses his nature and purposes in human history? God does indeed reveal himself to man in historic action; but this outward revelation only becomes a real possession through the soul's appropriation of it according to its true meaning and power. The light of God came into the world in Christ, but it illuminates only those who open their hearts to it. God can dwell only with him who loves that which is Godlike. Love is therefore the essence of the knowledge of God (xiv. 21-23). Love is the true bond between the soul and God; it alone can open the way to the realization of eternal life. Here again we are brought back to the Synoptic teaching that love is the sum of all God's requirements (Mk. xii. 28-31; Mt. xxii. 35-40), the indispensable condition of all growth in the life and likeness of God (Mt. v. 43-48).

CHAPTER III

THE SINFUL WORLD

“THE world” is spoken of in the fourth Gospel in three distinguishable senses. It sometimes means creation in general, as when Jesus speaks of the fellowship which he had with the Father “before the world was” (xvii. 5), or “before the foundation of the world” (xvii. 24). Sometimes it denotes humanity — the present world considered as a realm of rational and moral action. In this sense Christ came into the world as its light (iii. 19); that is, he came to man and entered into his life that he might bring to him the blessings of salvation (xi. 27; xvi. 28). This idea of the world easily passes over into that which is characteristic of our source, namely, the idea of the world as a sphere of evil — the world as alienated from God by sin. Hence Christ came to “save the world” (xii. 46, 47). It was in danger of perishing in consequence of its sinfulness; but God in his love sent his Son to save it (iii. 16). In this sense “the world” means mankind as it is by nature — sinful man exposed to the divine judgment and needing the divine mercy.

The world, then, in this sense is mankind as the subject of redemption and includes all men so far as they still fall short of the true life of fellowship with God or of likeness to him. Hence the contrariety between Christ’s Kingdom and the world (xviii. 36). The people of his time for the most part illustrated the spirit of the world which is alienated from God. The world, he declares, did not know God (xvii. 25); hates his disciples (xvii. 14); cannot receive the Spirit of truth (xiv. 17), and is in bondage to Satan as its prince (xii. 31; xiv. 30). Jesus was the champion of a spiritual life and a spiritual Kingdom; the

people of his time were mainly given over to religious formalism and selfish ambition. Between him and them there was little common ground. Without a marked change of standpoint and temper they could never appreciate his truth. They were from beneath, he was from above; they were of this world, he was not of this world (viii. 23). Jesus described their state as one of bondage (viii. 33-36). It was a bondage, however, which they had imposed upon themselves by sin. From this servitude he offered them freedom through the acceptance of the truth as it was embodied in his own person. The true life of love — life according to its perfect pattern, the nature of God himself — was open to them. But most were too blind to see it, lacking in the very capacity to desire it. They had become willing captives to the world of self-seeking ambition — bondslaves of sin (viii. 34). Steeped in self-satisfaction the people were insensible to their own need and folly. Though really blind, they persisted in saying: "We see" (ix. 41). Here was a double fault. To be spiritually blind through wilful self-perversion were, indeed, bad enough; but how radical must be the moral depravity of those who are not even conscious of their blindness, who have extirpated the very capacity to desire the spiritual life.

In the Johannine discourses sin is represented as darkness, while truth and holiness are analogous to light. Darkness is the symbol of ignorance, evil, and death. The sinful world loves the darkness rather than the light, and hence rejects him who brings to it the truth and the life. This is, indeed, the world's judgment that it prefers its own folly to the heavenly wisdom which Christ offers (iii. 19-21). He is the light of the world and offers the light of life to those who are walking in darkness (viii. 12; xii. 35, 46). By this analogy, drawn from the natural world, the evil of sin is set in contrast to the joy and blessedness of goodness. Light suggests every attribute of goodness — its purity, its beneficence, its perfect accord with man's true nature, its divineness. On this white background is set the deformity, the misery, the wicked

folly of sin. Sin is the eclipse of the soul; the obscuration of man's sense of his divine origin and destiny. It is failure, perversion, moral death. It is a defacing of the image of God in man; the forfeiture of man's true life as a son of God.

The Synoptists also represent Jesus as making use of the figure of light and darkness in his teaching concerning holiness and sin. There, too, light is the symbol of the blessedness of the spiritual life. As the light fills the world with brightness and beauty when the eye which is adapted to it is healthy, so God fills the spiritual world with supreme attraction and interest when the soul is freely open to his heavenly truth (Mt. vi. 22-24). Light is a name for man's true and normal life as a son of God. The resulting doctrine is the same as we have found in John. To refuse the light is to become "full of darkness." It is to forfeit one's true life and to renounce his divine destiny. It is, so far, to lose one's own self (Lk. ix. 25). Sin is thus that which is abnormal in the moral life of man. It is discord in a world which is divinely attuned to harmony; rupture in a world which is made for unity; a shadow which obscures to human eyes the very purpose of the Eternal, spreads its fatal blight over all the relations of life, and darkens the brightest dreams of human happiness and achievement.

The contrast of flesh and spirit is also found in our source: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (iii. 6). This passage is a part of Jesus' teaching concerning the "birth from above." It rests upon the idea that there are two orders, — the order of nature and the order of spirit. Our natural birth pertains to the former; by it we are ushered into the realm of personal, independent activity. But if we are to fulfil our supreme destiny, we must experience another birth — birth into the world of spiritual interests and realities. To both these realms we are related; it is not enough to fulfil our relation to one, and not to the other and higher. Jesus does not here represent the natural life as essentially sinful, but only as something lower

than man's proper destiny. He must live the spiritual life, the life of God's Kingdom, if he is to attain his divinely destined goal. The inference is inevitable, however, that if the lower life is made supreme and sufficient, the sinful perversion which has been described under other terms must follow. The outward, the incidental, the mere husk of existence, is not inherently evil, although it is comparatively valueless (vi. 63). But it may become an occasion of evil if chosen and estimated as supreme. Then the lower becomes the enemy of the higher. This false estimate Jesus seeks to prevent by leading men to esteem as highest that which is truly highest, by placing first that which is really supreme — the spiritual life of love in fellowship with God, a primary interest in the highest things.

We find essentially the same contrast and the same resulting doctrine in the Synoptic version of Jesus' teaching. "Flesh and blood" has not revealed Jesus' messiahship to Peter (Mt. xvi. 17); he did not derive the knowledge of it from any outward or natural source of information, but by spiritual discernment. He had spiritually perceived what Jesus was by that living apprehension, that vital affinity of life with him, which is fittingly described as an inspiration from God. This higher spiritual nature of Peter, this eager interest and devoted attachment to his Master's person, was very strong in him; the spirit was willing, but on the dark night of Jesus' sorrow and betrayal, it was temporarily overcome, because the flesh was weak. The lower nature — the natural fears and aversion to danger — asserted themselves, calling forth the mild rebuke: "Couldst thou not watch one hour?" (Mt. xiv. 38). The lesson running through both forms of teaching is: Subordinate the lower to the higher; place that first which *is* first; make the spiritual life primary; seek God's Kingdom and righteousness *first* (Mt. vi. 33), and let every other legitimate object of desire be sought *second*.

There is no formal definition of sin in the Johannine discourses. It is, however, described as an enslaving power (viii. 34), a perverting principle which gains sway

over the lives of men (viii. 21). Jesus recognizes the sin or sinfulness of men as something more than the sum of specific acts of sin. There is such a thing as sinful character — a state of sin of which sinful acts are the evidence and expression. He also speaks of “sins” (viii. 24; xx. 23) which he evidently regards as having their root in sinful habit and propensity. This is especially manifest in the way in which he is represented as speaking of habitual sinning and of committing acts of sin: “Every one that committeth sin (*πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*) is the bondservant of sin,” (viii. 34); that is, every one who habitually sins, who lives the sinful life, is in a moral bondage to evil, a bondage of will which springs out of the sinful character which he has developed. But “to sin” sometimes refers rather to the commission of sinful acts, as in the conversation in which the disciples asked Jesus concerning the man who was born blind: “Rabbi, who did sin (*τίς ἥμαρτεν*), this man, or his parents, that he should be born blind?” (ix. 2). Their idea apparently was that *some one* must have committed a great act of sin of which the man’s blindness was the consequence. Jesus set aside this assumption on which their question rested and said, in effect: His blindness is not the result of an act of sin on the part of any one.

In the apostle’s own development of the doctrine of sin some important discriminations turn on this distinction between doing acts of sin and living the habitually sinful life.¹ It is obvious that while they are to be distinguished, the former tends to pass into the latter. This tendency, however, is rather implied than explicitly expressed in the discourses. But the recognition of sin as an inner principle or power, reminds one of the Synoptic teaching which pictures sin as having its seat in the inner life (Mt. v. 22; xii. 34; Mk. vii. 20–23). As the fruit of a tree is the expression of its nature (Mt. vii. 16–18), so the words and acts of men are the expression of their characters (Mt. xii. 35–37). In its substance, this is the same teaching as that found in John. The heart determines the conduct. The

¹ Cf. my *Johannine Theology*, pp. 137, 138.

man who gives his life over to sin comes under the power of a moral necessity of expressing his evil propensities in action. He must act as he is. Moreover, his bondage to evil is cumulative. By a sinful life he welds the fetters of evil more and more strongly upon his soul. The view taken of the nature and practical effect of evil is the same in both forms of the evangelical tradition, although its operation is more graphically pictured, and with a greater variety of illustration, in the Synoptics than in John.

Like the Synoptics the Johannine tradition represents Jesus as assuming that all men are sinful. He describes the work of the Spirit as including the convincing of the world "concerning sin"; that is, making the world conscious of the sinfulness involved in its unwillingness to receive Christ. While this is not an explicit assertion of the absolute universality of sin, it clearly reflects the consciousness on the part of Jesus that the world of his time was mainly against him. More explicit are the sayings in which he declares that he is come to save the world (iii. 17; xii. 46, 47), especially the *locus classicus*: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (iii. 16). If salvation is for the whole world, the whole world must stand in need of it; all men must be regarded as sinful. We found this same presupposition running through the Synoptic teaching. No exceptions from the requirement of repentance were recognized. Even kind and generous parents were spoken of as "evil," that is, sinful (Mt. vii. 11). Even Jesus' own disciples whose lives were under the inspiring power of his own, and whom he would unquestionably class with "good" men (Mt. xii. 35), must ask to have their sins forgiven and their hearts more completely delivered from evil desires and passions (Lk. xi. 4; Mt. vi. 12-15). The goodness of the best of men is but relative. Evil pervades human life as a subtle atmosphere. Man can be delivered from it only in proportion as he puts his life under the conquering might of goodness and becomes the bonds slave

of righteousness — a good tree which brings forth fruit “after its kind” by a necessity which is founded in the law of life that what a man chooses, says, and does is essentially determined by what he is (Mt. xii. 33–37).

The phenomena of “demoniacal possession,” which are so vividly described in the Synoptics, do not appear in the fourth Gospel. The only “possession” which is there recognized is that which his enemies maliciously ascribed to Jesus himself. Several times they charged him with having “a demon” (vii. 20; viii. 48; x. 20). The context of these passages shows that this possession which they attributed to him was thought of as a form of madness. When he solemnly asked the Jews why they were seeking to kill him, they replied by the taunt: “Thou hast a demon: who seeketh to kill thee?” (vii. 20). The third passage (x. 20) describes a dispute as to his sanity. Some said: “He hath a demon, and is mad; why hear ye him?” The second passage expresses the charge of madness leading to absurd and irreverent presumption. The Jews say: “Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon” (viii. 48); and when he still asserts his divine mission and his power to bestow life, they return the charge more vehemently: “Now we know that thou hast a demon” (viii. 52). From these passages we see that “possession” by demons was popularly regarded, according to the fourth Gospel, as the explanation of aggravated forms of mania which led its subjects into wild and irrational ideas and actions.

We note here the same fact which we observed in the Synoptic representations, namely, that “possession” is not associated with special wickedness. The fourth Gospel strongly confirms the conclusion to which we were led by an examination of the Synoptic passages, — that all the symptoms which are ascribed to demoniacal possession are characteristic of various forms of disease, especially of mental disease; and no one would experience any difficulty in explaining them as such if the language of the Gospels did not attribute them to possession by demons. We find no idea of the subject in the fourth Gospel which is not explicable in the same way. Possession is mania;

and its relation to special wickedness, if it exists, is mediate and indirect. In the language which the fourth Gospel ascribes to Jesus, there is no reference whatever to the possession of men by demons. This source, therefore, reflects only the popular idea of it, and does not represent Jesus himself as making any reference to the subject. The phenomena of "possession," therefore, yield us no data for the doctrine of sin which we are seeking to derive from the Johannine memoranda of the Lord's words.

The same cannot be said, however, with respect to the idea of Satan. The reality and power of the devil as a source of wickedness in men are clearly recognized in the discourses under review. It is true that we find a somewhat broad and loose use of the term "devil," according to which it may be applied to an evil man. Judas is called a "devil" (*διάβολος*, vi. 70), that is, diabolical in nature, hostile to Christ. This reminds us of the application of the epithet "Satan" to Peter (Mk. viii. 34; Mt. xvi. 23). In the other cases (of which there are but two: viii. 44; xiii. 2) "the devil" means the prince of evil. The first of these is the more explicit. Jesus is rebuking the Jews for their insensibility to his truth and their hostility to his work. In the midst of this denunciation he cries out: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and stood not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof" (viii. 44).

This sonship to Satan is here set in contrast to the sonship to God which the Jews claimed for themselves. In both instances an ethical kinship is referred to. The Jews show that they are not truly sons of God, because in accusing and opposing Jesus they evince their unlikeness to God and their antipathy to his supreme self-revelation in his Son. Nor are they, in this deeper ethical sense, sons of Abraham. In disposition and action they are totally unlike him (viii. 40). Abraham read the mind and will of God in his revelations; they, on the contrary, are blind to the meaning of the plainest words of God. Jesus then

plainly asserts their real kinship to the devil whose evil desires they are disposed to obey.

In what follows we have the fullest characterization of Satan to be found in our source. He is described (1) as a murderer from the beginning, (2) as not standing in the truth, and (3) as a liar and the father of lying. I shall briefly consider the meaning of each of these characterizations. Interpreters are divided in their judgment respecting the meaning of the phrase "a murderer from the beginning" (*ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*). Some suppose it to refer to an agency of Satan in inciting Cain to kill his brother. On this view the meaning of the words would be that from the infancy of the race Satan has been inciting men to murderous thoughts and deeds. The principal objection to this view is that in the Old Testament narrative (Gen. iv. 3 *sq.*) the murder of Abel by Cain is not attributed to Satan's instigation. Nor does this interpretation seem to yield an idea which quite matches the other elements of the description. Others would take *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* absolutely — a view which would imply either that God had created Satan evil from the beginning of his existence, or that an evil being had always existed alongside of the eternally good Deity. Still others explain *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* as meaning from Satan's beginning *as Satan*, that is, from the time of his fall from holiness. The former of these two interpretations is contrary to the nature of the dualism which is recognized in John, as we shall see a little later on; the latter does not accord well with the natural meaning of the word "murderer" which, it would seem, limits *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* to the field of human life and experience. Moreover, this view finds no support in the Johannine writings elsewhere since they make no allusion to a fall of Satan.

The phrase is most naturally understood as a reference to the temptation in which Satan, in the form of a serpent (Gen. iii. 1 *sq.*), is represented as causing the fall of man. In this case, the words would describe Satan as having been an agent of man's moral destruction, a foe to God's beneficent designs from the beginning of the human race. It is quite in this spirit of Satan that the Jews are

now seeking to destroy Jesus and to thwart his work for mankind. This portion of our passage certainly presupposes the real existence of a spirit of evil who acts a great part in the drama of human history, but contains no suggestions respecting Satan's origin or fall.

The meaning of the phrase, "stood not in the truth," etc. (*ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἔστηκεν*), is, at least, slightly affected by the way in which *ἔστηκεν* is punctuated. If written *ἔστηκεν*, as by Westcott and Hort, the verb would be the imperfect of the late and inferior verb *στήκω*, and should be rendered as in the Revised Version, "stood not," did not remain firm or steadfast, in the truth. If, however, with Tischendorf, Meyer, Weiss, and Holtzmann, we punctuate it with the rough breathing, *ἔστηκεν*, we have then the perfect of *ἵστημι* with the force of the present, and the meaning is, "he does not stand in the truth," the realm of truth is foreign to his life. With the former punctuation it is possible to regard the phrase as most patristic and Roman Catholic interpreters do, as referring to a fall of Satan. In my judgment, the reading *ἔστηκεν* is decidedly to be preferred, both on the ground of usage¹ and of suitability of meaning to the context. This phrase, then, simply asserts the utter falseness of Satan.

Respecting the third phrase, "for he is a liar and the father thereof" (*ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ*), the view has been taken by some modern interpreters² that *αὐτοῦ* relates specifically to *ψεύστης*, and that *ὁ πατήρ* is not in apposition to *ψεύστης*, but refers to another person. In this case the meaning would be: He (Satan) is a liar, and so is his father. This same idea of the father of the devil is also found at the beginning of the verse, where *ὕμεις ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστέ* is rendered: Ye are from the father of the devil. Grammatically considered, both these renderings are possible. The contention of those who adopt this interpretation is that we have here

¹ The imperfect *ἔστηκεν* is nowhere else found, unless it be (so W. and H.) in Rev. xii. 4, where all other editors, so far as I have been able to ascertain, punctuate *ἔστηκεν*. Here, too, the Revisers follow W. and H.

² *E.g.* Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, O. Holtzmann.

a reflection of the Gnostic demonology which represents the Demiurge, the inferior God of the Jews, as really the father of the devil. This is an item in the proof of the late origin and speculative character of the fourth Gospel. But the monstrous idea which this interpretation finds here is absolutely foreign to our Gospel and to the whole Bible. It finds no confirmation in the context. 'Αυτοῦ should be understood as referring to ψεύστης generically conceived: The father of the liar, whoever he may be, — or to the idea of ψεῦδος, previously expressed, and implied in ψεύστης.¹ H. J. Holtzmann aptly says: "We owe to a carelessness of style this interesting discovery of a father of the devil, very much as we owe to an oversight of the compiler of the hymn-book the idea of the devil's widow."² The phrase in question is to be understood simply as a more particular explanation of the general statement, made just before, that Satan does not live in the element of truth, but in that of falsehood.

We have already seen that in the Synoptic report of Jesus' teaching Satan is several times spoken of. He appears at the beginning of our Lord's ministry, and seeks to divert him from his Messianic calling (Mt. iv. 1-11). He catches away the good seed (Mk. iv. 15), and desires to test Peter (Lk. xxii. 31). We saw that while such passages recognize Satan's existence and activity, they are more figurative, that is, less definite and didactic, than is commonly supposed. He is even pictorially described as falling "like lightning from heaven" (Lk. x. 17). But from neither form of the gospel tradition can we derive more than the idea of a causative agency of Satan in the sinfulness of mankind. Sin is presented as alliance with Satan, as kinship of spirit with him. Beyond this general idea no explanation of the origin and development of sin is offered in the tradition of our Lord's words.

Sin is always represented in the Johannine discourses as

¹ A similar construction is found in ix. 31, where αὐτοῦ refers, not to θεοσεβής, but to the θεός in the previous phrase.

² *Hand-Commentar, in loco.* See the *Autobiography* of F. W. Krummacher (Eng. trans., New York, 1869), pp. 303, 304.

a voluntary affair. Whatever may have been the temptations inciting to sin from without, it is considered as caused by him who commits it. There is a dualism of light and darkness in the world, but the darkness is chosen by those who walk in it (iii. 19). God is the source of the light only, not of the darkness. Men would possess and enjoy the light if they loved and followed it. It is light and not darkness which is primary and fundamental in the universe. Sin is never represented as an essential or eternal principle. Sin is a perversion due to free personal action. No duality of good and evil as coeternal powers is recognized in our sources. The dualism of these discourses, as of John's own teaching, is ethical, not metaphysical. It is a conflict of opposing moral principles and powers. The sons of light are those who choose and pursue love, truth, and goodness; those who walk in darkness do so freely and with full responsibility. The world is a realm of freedom; its good is praiseworthy; its evil is equally blameworthy. Sin is not viewed in the teaching of Jesus as due to the action of an evil deity as original and powerful as God himself, or as consisting in a metaphysical imperfection inhering in the very constitution of the universe, but as a wilful and guilty disobedience of the supreme law of righteousness, a violation of man's true nature, and a forfeiture of his divine destiny.

CHAPTER IV

JESUS' TESTIMONY TO HIMSELF

THE titles "Son of man" and "Son of God" which we have studied in the Synoptics are both of frequent occurrence in the fourth Gospel. We will here consider the way in which these terms are used in the sayings of Jesus. To Nathaniel he says that heaven will be opened and that angels will descend upon the Son of man (i. 51) — evidently a figurative way of saying, with an allusion to Gen. xxviii. 12, that in him communication between heaven and earth is established. He speaks of himself as the Son of man who descended from heaven and who is now in heaven (iii. 13), that is, belongs to heaven as his native sphere.¹ The Son of man is the dispenser of eternal life (vi. 27, 53), must be lifted up on the cross (iii. 14; viii. 28), shall ascend to heaven where he was before (vi. 62; xii. 23; xiii. 31), and shall judge the world (v. 27).

We observe that here, as in the Synoptics, the title is used by Jesus only. It evidently designates for his mind something that is characteristic and unique in his personality and mission. The use of it accords well with the conclusion which we reached when studying the Synoptic passages in which it is employed, namely, that it is a name for the founder and head of the Kingdom of God and thus a veiled designation of the Messiah. The Johannine description of the Son of man as bestowing eternal life

¹ Attention should, however, be called to the fact that preponderating external authority (including **NBL**) is against the genuineness of the words: $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \omicron\upsilon\ \rho\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}$. W. and H. regarded the phrase as a Western gloss, perhaps suggested by i. 18. It is retained by Tischendorf, Meyer, Weiss, and Beyschlag (*per contra*, Wendt). Weiss regards $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ as equivalent to $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\sigma}\ \acute{\eta}\nu$ — "who was with the Father" before the incarnation. But on this view the words would be almost identical in meaning with the previous clause: $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\ \rho\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.

(vi. 27) corresponds to the Synoptic representation that the Son of man forgives sins (Mk. ii. 10) and seeks and saves that which is lost (Lk. xix. 10). Eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man seems to be a mystical way of depicting the believing acceptance and appropriation of Christ in heart and life which the Synoptic discourses so often emphasize (*e.g.* in Mt. xi. 28-30). The lifting up of the Son of man on the cross (iii. 14; viii. 28) is the Johannine counterpart of the second group of passages (see p. 41) in which the Synoptists describe the necessity of his sufferings and death (*e.g.* Mk. viii. 31; ix. 31; xiv. 21). In the Synoptics we found the correlative of this doctrine of the suffering and dying Messiah in the teaching concerning his majesty. After his death he should be exalted to the throne of power and glory in heaven whence he would come to judge the world (Mt. xxiv. 31; xxv. 31). The analogue to this idea also is found in the fourth Gospel where Jesus speaks of his ascension to heaven, of his glorification at the Father's side (xii. 23; xvii. 5), and of his authority to execute judgment "because he is the Son [or, a Son] of man" (*υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*; v. 27). As the One who founds the Kingdom of heaven upon earth, who presents eternal life to men by bringing to them a living revelation of God in human form, the Son of man must judge men; his truth must test them and determine their place in the scale of moral being. Thus our source reflects the same contrast between the humiliation and the dignity of the Son of man, and suggests the same method of reconciling the apparent contradiction. The life of lowliest condescension proves to be the life of supreme exaltation. The way of the cross is the way to the throne of the world. The seeming inconsistency disappears in a higher unity. The testimony of Jesus concerning himself which stands connected with the title "Son of man" is thus in substance the same in both forms of our gospel tradition.

The doctrine of Jesus' sonship to God is most fully set forth in three of his discourses: (1) that of which the conversation with Nicodemus was the occasion (iii. 16-21);

(2) that in which he justified his healing a man on the sabbath, and further explained and defended his divine mission (v. 16-47); and (3) the discourse on the bread of life (vi. 32-58). Several briefer passages are also important (*e.g.* viii. 56-58; x. 30, 38; xiv. 11; xvii. 5). We will review these discourses in order.

In the first discourse the main idea is that the Son is the bearer of salvation to the world, the light which shines in its darkness, thereby testing men and determining their divine acceptance or rejection according to the attitude which they assume towards himself. The Son is the Saviour; belief on him secures eternal life; rejection of him entails condemnation at the bar of the divine judgment. Whatever be the relation between the Son and the Father underlying these representations, it is certain that the Son is the representative of God, the embodiment of the divine light and love in such a sense that the attitude of men towards him involves their attitude towards God (*cf.* v. 23) and is decisive of the favor or disfavor of heaven. Twice the intimacy of this relation between the Son and the Father is emphasized by the application to the former of the term "only begotten" (*μονογενήης*).¹ This word is in all cases applied to the incarnate Son of God and accentuates the uniqueness of his sonship. "The only begotten Son" cannot imply less than that Jesus Christ is the Son of God in a different sense from that in which men become sons of God. It distinguishes him as One who, in the meaning of the title "Son of God" as applied to him, has no brethren. Whatever the nature of his sonship, it is unique and incomparable; it is shared by no other.²

In the next discourse (v. 16-47) Jesus asserts the per-

¹ This term is used by John in three other passages in application to Christ: i. 14, 18; I. iv. 9. This use of the word to characterize Christ's sonship is peculiar to John's writings.

² Even Wendt (*Teaching of Jesus*, II. 151 *sq.*; orig. p. 450 *sq.*) and Beyschlag (*N. T. Theol.* I. 242, 243; Bk. II. ch. iii. § 3) admit that Jesus is described in our source as Son of God in a unique and preëminent sense. This they explain, however, as involving only a preëminent human perfection and a unique mission.

fect accord of his work with the Father's will and nature. The work of the Father and that of the Son are essentially one. The Son doeth nothing from (*ἀπό*) himself; "for the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth" (*v.* 20). Then follows a description of the work of the Son. It includes the bestowment of spiritual life (*v.* 21), the execution of judgment (*vv.* 22-24), and the resurrection of the dead (*vv.* 25-29). The remainder of the discourse (*vv.* 30-47) enforces the divine attestation of his mission from God.

The discourse on the bread of life (*vi.* 32-58) was occasioned by the miracle of the loaves (*vi.* 1-14). When a multitude followed him in the hope of securing a further supply, Jesus urged them to seek from him rather the spiritual food which he had come to bestow. To their question as to what he meant that they should do, he replied that they should believe on him whom God had sent (*v.* 29). They then called for the credentials of his divine mission — some sign which should authenticate his claim as the giving of manna attested the providential leadership of Moses (*vv.* 30, 31.) To this request the discourse in question is the reply. Jesus begins by contrasting the manna which supplied only the physical wants of the present with the heavenly bread of life which he gives and which meets the deep and permanent needs of the soul. The true bread from heaven God is now giving them; it is himself. Those who eat this bread, that is, those who inwardly appropriate him in their hearts, shall have life spiritual and eternal. When the Jews murmured at these sayings, he explained that those only who had a predisposition to spiritual things would appreciate his truth or receive him; those only whose spiritual natures had been quickened — who had some kinship of spirit to God — would welcome him who came from God and perfectly represented the divine will and nature (*vv.* 44-46). The rest of the discourse (*vv.* 52-58) contains that mystical description of the appropriation of Christ under the figures of eating his flesh and drinking his blood whose meaning may best be considered in another connection.

The uniqueness of Jesus' relation to the Father is strongly asserted in his address to the Jews recorded in the eighth chapter of the Gospel. He here declares that he came forth from God (*v.* 42) and knows him (*v.* 55); he maintains his sinlessness (*v.* 46), and concludes by saying that his own being antedates the birth of Abraham (*v.* 58). On another occasion in a similar disputation with his critics he affirms that he and the Father are one (*x.* 30); that is, they coöperate perfectly in all that concerns the salvation of men. A perfect fellowship of life, purpose, and work exists between them. He is in the Father, and the Father in him (*x.* 38; *xiv.* 11), so that he who has seen the Son has seen the Father also (*xiv.* 9), because the Son perfectly embodies and reveals the Father's will. In the intercessory prayer he again refers to this perfect ethical union between the Father and himself as the true type of the union which should exist among his disciples (*xvii.* 21), although he also refers to the glory which he possessed in fellowship with the Father before the world was (*xvii.* 5). This passage seems clearly to involve an incomparable relation which he sustained to the Father, since no similar language is anywhere applied to any other person.

In reviewing the Synoptic teaching concerning Jesus' sonship to God we saw that his preferred self-designation was "Son of man" and that the title "Son of God" was chiefly applied to him by others. But we also saw that he did recognize the latter title as applicable to himself by the way in which he spoke of God as "the Father," and especially by the correlation of "the Son" with "the Father" in the passages, *Mt.* xi. 27 (*Lk.* x. 22) and *Mk.* xiii. 32. A noticeable point of difference in this respect is that in the Johannine discourses Jesus frequently applies this title to himself. The title "Son of man" is used only by himself, as in the Synoptics, but it is relatively less used; the title "Son of God" is applied to him both by himself¹ and by others, but, according to John, is much more freely used

¹ This he sometimes does by implication, and in other instances he uses only the shortened form "the Son."

by him than the Synoptists would lead us to suppose. This fact may be due to John's reproducing more fully the implications of Jesus' self-testimony. There is, no doubt, a difference of emphasis upon the sonship of Jesus to God in the two forms of our gospel tradition. John's version of our Lord's teaching brings into stronger relief the unique and inscrutable relation of Christ as Son to the Father. But there is no essential difference in meaning between his sonship as represented in John and that which the Synoptists recognize.

We observed that in the first three Gospels there is no passage in which Jesus classes himself along with other men as a Son of God in the same sense in which they are sons of God, and that, accordingly, he uses the terms "my Father," "your Father," not "our Father," in referring to the divine fatherhood. The same care in the use of words is observed in the fourth Gospel. The two sources are thus perfectly at one in ascribing a unique sonship to Jesus. God's fatherhood, in its relation to him, meant something more than it meant in its relation to others. God was his Father, and God was their Father, but not in the same sense. The fourth Gospel accents this distinction by naming Christ the "only begotten" Son, but in so doing it merely designates by a special word a peculiarity of Christ's person and relation to God which the language of the Synoptics is also scrupulously careful to recognize.

In both forms of the evangelical tradition the title retains its historical basis. It denotes one who is the special object of God's complaisant love. The relation to God which it emphasizes is not primarily ontological, but ethical. It denotes a reciprocal and dynamic fellowship. The title, though not a common synonym for "Messiah" among the Jews, was peculiarly appropriate for the Messianic King, the Founder of the divine Kingdom on earth. Accordingly, in John, we find his sonship to God most emphasized in those discourses in which he is explaining and defending his saving mission to earth. As "eternal life" may be called the Johannine counterpart of the Synoptic "Kingdom of God," so we find that in the fourth Gospel

Christ's sonship is most closely correlated with the bestowment of eternal life, as in the Synoptics it is most associated with his Messianic mission as the Founder of the Kingdom. But while the title has thus a certain kinship to "Messiah," it appears to have been rather a personal than an official title. His messiahship was grounded in his sonship to God. The former term describes the mission to which he was appointed; the latter his fitness for that mission. He could be the Messiah because he was the Son of God *par éminence*. Hence, when in our source he emphasizes his sonship to God in connection with his work, it is because that work for men is grounded in what he *is*; his saving work as Son of God is always conceived of as being possible because of that inscrutable personal relation to God which his sonship involves.

When, therefore, we trace the roots of this idea of sonship and observe the marked peculiarities of emphasis and language which the Gospels exhibit in the presentation of it, we are constrained to conclude that it expresses not so much a historic function or vocation as a nature or character which is fundamental in the personality of Christ.

Before pursuing further the inquiry into the nature of Jesus' sonship to God, we must consider the import of the passages which speak of his preëxistence. Those which are of most importance are vi. 62: "What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?" viii. 58: "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was born, I am" (*πρὶν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί*); xvii. 5: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self (*παρὰ σεαυτῶ*, at thy side) with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," and xvii. 24: "For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." A number of recent writers have advocated the opinion that these passages refer not to an actual but to an ideal existence of Christ with God before his earthly life. Some seek to justify this conclusion by exegesis, some by general historical considerations, and still others by a combination of the two.¹ Wendt and

¹ For a sketch of the views of Harnack, Baldensperger, and Bornemann, see Orr's *Christian View of God and the World*, 1893, pp. 508-510.

Beyschlag approach the subject from the standpoint of Biblical Theology, and I will therefore select their discussions for a brief description and review.

Wendt thinks that Jesus "came forth from God" (xvi. 28) only in a figurative sense, as his disciples were not "from this world" (xv. 19) and as the Jews were "from the devil" (viii. 44). Believers are also described as being from God (I. iv. 4) or as born from above (iii. 7). Jesus' claim to have been sent forth from God means, on this view, that he was chosen by God for a special work. The preëxistence asserted in viii. 58 was an ideal preëxistence only. As Abraham's vision of Messiah's day was only ideal, so the existence of Messiah at the time was only in the plan or purpose of God. The saying in the intercessory prayer (xvii. 5) Wendt explains after the analogy of those passages which represent rewards as stored up for men in heaven (Mt. v. 12; vi. 20, etc.). Such rewards have no real, but only an ideal, existence; they exist in the divine mind or intention. In like manner the Son existed before his earthly life began in the divine destination only. The glory which he had with the Father was an ideal glory which the Father destined for him. Wendt admits that this language could not have this meaning as we moderns use words. For us the terms would signify real preëxistence, but not according to a method of thinking and speaking which is current in the New Testament. "According to the mode of speech and conception prevalent in the New Testament, a heavenly good, and so also a heavenly glory, can be conceived and spoken of as existing with God and belonging to a person, not because this person already exists and is invested with glory, but because the glory of God is in some way deposited and preserved for this person in heaven."¹

To this interpretation I would present the following objections:² (1) The language which Jesus applies to

¹ *Teaching of Jesus*, II. 169 (orig. p. 465).

² I have more fully reviewed Wendt's arguments in *The Johannine Theology*, pp. 115-122.

himself is entirely unique. In saying that others are "from the world" or "from God" he refers, as the connection clearly shows, to ethical likeness. But he never says of any other than himself that he abode at the Father's side before the world existed, sharing his glory, and that the Father sent him into the world. Nor is there any indication in the context of any of the relevant passages that their language is figurative. (2) Wendt's interpretation of viii. 58 does not suit the connection of thought in which it stands. To the assertion of Jesus that Abraham saw his day (*v.* 56), the Jews reply that Abraham lived centuries ago, while he is not yet fifty years old (*v.* 57). They would thus involve him in what was to them the absurdity of claiming that he coexisted with Abraham. Jesus meets the objection squarely by asserting not only that he existed when Abraham lived, but that he existed before Abraham was born. Nothing but a reference to real personal preëxistence in the answer of Jesus fits the meaning of the objection which called it forth. (3) The supposed analogy between xvii. 5 and passages like Mt. v. 12 and vi. 20 is very remote. In the latter Jesus speaks of the rewards of his disciples as existing in advance in heaven, but he does not speak of the disciples themselves as preëxisting. In the former he does not merely speak of his glory as stored up for him in heaven, but of himself as already possessing that glory at the Father's side before the world was. If he had said that his disciples preëxisted in the enjoyment of heavenly bliss, he would have said something analogous to xvii. 5. In order to have furnished the analogy which Wendt seeks to find, Jesus should either have said in this passage that his glory preëxisted, or in the other passages that his disciples preëxisted. (4) The argument from the alleged prevalence in antiquity of the idea of preëxistence is precarious, and would often prove too much. The New Testament writers exhibit no tendency to overwork that idea. Unless this be an example, they exhibit no confusion in their language between ideal and real preëxistence. The idea of God's purpose was indeed strong among the

Jews. The careers and characters of men are often spoken of in the New Testament as divinely purposed, but the writers do not therefore speak of the preëxistence of the persons in question, or show that they confused the totally different conceptions of real and ideal existence. The destinies of men may be conceived as existing ideally in God's purpose, but I know of no instance in which this idea is confounded with that of the personal, much less the eternal, preëxistence of the men themselves. Who ever imagined that the author of Hebrews (viii. 5) supposed the tabernacle to have really existed in heaven before it was constructed on earth? Jesus doubtless spoke of his perfected Kingdom as already prepared for his disciples in God's purpose (Mt. xxv. 34); yet he did not say: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom in which you have participated from the foundation of the world."

Beyschlag has adopted a somewhat different method in the effort to establish a conclusion similar to that of Wendt. The expressions of Jesus which seem to assert his preëxistence were all spoken in "very agitated moments" of his life. Jesus was under the spell of the current idea of preëxistence. How natural that he should think of himself as preëxisting in God's purpose, just as the tabernacle and the Kingdom of God preëxisted. Especially would he so express himself in "excited moments" when he attained the most vivid vision of his divine calling. But does not the language of Jesus in the Johannine discourses speak of a real, and not merely of an ideal, preëxistence? Beyschlag gives a twofold answer: (1) We cannot assume that John has given a *verbatim* report of Jesus' actual language; (2) the distinction between ideal and real existence is a modern one, and is not applicable in the interpretation of Biblical language. Our author then takes up the passages. When Jesus speaks of the Son of man ascending up where he was before (vi. 62), he implies that he preëxisted as the Son of man. Now the Messiah could preëxist *as such* only ideally. The passage "Before Abraham was born, I am" (viii. 58) may be interpreted,

says Beyschlag, according to any preconception which one brings to it. The real meaning of it (when it is interpreted without any preconception) is: Before God thought of the birth of Abraham, he purposed my mission. Respecting xvii. 5 the argument is: If Jesus had here referred to a glory possessed by him in heaven before his incarnation, he could not now ask it back as a reward of his work, as he does. What one possesses by nature he cannot receive as a reward. This "glory" was not an eternal possession, but the reward of his life-work which the theory of real preëxistence absurdly condemns as an "empty phantasmagoria." Respecting xvii. 24 our author says that it would have astonished the Biblical writers to be told that God can love only a real person. Does not Jeremiah (i. 5) speak of God's knowing people before their birth, and Paul (Eph. i. 5) of his choosing men before the foundation of the world? The meaning is that God eternally loved Jesus by anticipation; that he loved the idea of him to which he proposed to give reality in due time by his creation.¹

This exposition encounters the same general difficulties as that of Wendt. I will, however, offer the following additional observations in regard to it: (1) It would require no special appeal to "agitated" or "excited moments" of Jesus' life to explain his conviction that his life-work was the realization of a divine ideal. That conception underlay the whole life of Jesus. Paul entertained a similar conviction respecting his own life even when under no special stress of excitement. (2) The two answers of Beyschlag to the question: Do the relevant passages refer to a real preëxistence? would lead to two very different solutions of the problem. The first would lead to the view that Jesus did not speak of a real preëxistence at all, though John has represented him as doing so. The second would involve the idea that even if Jesus did use the language attributed to him by John, he did not intend by means of it to describe real preëxistence. The conclusion first suggested is that Jesus did not even

¹ *N. T. Theol.* I. 250-255 (Bk. II. ch. iii. §§ 6, 7, 8).

seem to speak of his real preëxistence; that next suggested is that he did seem to do so, but really did not. Beyschlag wants to avail himself of the advantages of these two entirely different suggestions. If one will not break the force of the interpretation which derives the idea of personal preëxistence from the passages in question, perhaps the other will. And yet he speaks with emphatic disapproval of those who bring dogmatic prepossessions to the interpretation of these passages. (3) When the doctrine of real preëxistence is to be disproved, Beyschlag favors treating the language of John in the freest and loosest manner; but when occasion requires it for the establishment of the opposite view, it must be construed with the strictest literal severity. The statements that Christ existed before Abraham was born, shared the Father's glory, and was the object of his love before the world was created, are only loose expressions for the notion that God had eternally in his mind an idea of bringing such a person as Jesus Christ into existence; but when he speaks of the preëxistence of the Son of man we must have no loose handling of words. It was *as Son of man* that he preëxisted; but that could only be in an ideal sense. There is nothing like popular speech or accommodation in these passages so far as they favor one conclusion; there is nothing else in them—not even a consciousness of the “modern” distinction between the ideal and the real—so far as they favor another. The strict construction which Beyschlag proposes for vi. 62 would hopelessly ruin his whole case if applied to viii. 58, xvii. 5, and xvii. 24. It should hardly need be said that the passage which speaks of the Son of man ascending where he was before, implies only the continuity and preëxistence of his personality, not the perpetuity of his historic calling as Son of man. If Jesus had said in so many words: The Messiah preëxisted, who (except Beyschlag) would ever have argued that this could only mean that he preëxisted as the Messiah of the Jewish people.¹ (4) The

¹ If I say: Professor Dr. Beyschlag studied theology in Bonn and Berlin from 1840 to 1844, and was court-preacher in Karlsruhe from 1857 to

considerations which Beyschlag advances as determining the interpretation of xvii. 5 and 24 consist, in the first instance, of a dogmatic inference,¹ and, in the second, of an argument from analogy. Since, on Beyschlag's own principles, dogmatic considerations are to be ruled out, and since the analogies adduced to support the idealistic interpretation of xvii. 24 are not parallels, I am content to set the plain words of these verses over against Beyschlag's inference and alleged analogies and join with him in appealing the question to the reader's candor. I will also join in his protest against dogmatic bias in exegesis; but while he warns against "traditional" prejudice, I will ask to file a *caveat* against "critical" prejudgment. The position of those who hold that the fourth Gospel attributes to Jesus a doctrine of his preëxistence which he probably did not hold, or which, in any case, is not true,² appears to me to be much more straightforward than the exegetical ingenuities of writers like Wendt and Beyschlag.

When we compare the doctrine of Christ's sonship as found in the fourth Gospel with that which is presented in the first three, we observe both difference and likeness. The preëxistence of the Son is not asserted in the Synoptic discourses. The title of Son is less frequently heard on the lips of Jesus himself, and his references to his sonship are much less explicit than in John. The more frequent use of the title by others in the Synoptic narratives does not enable us to form a very definite idea of Jesus' own conception of its meaning. From an examination of the Old Testament roots of the conception and of the Synoptic use of the title, we conclude that its generic idea was that of one uniquely loved or chosen by God. I think the same notion underlies the usage of the fourth Gospel. Jesus claims for himself a unique ethical sonship to God—an incomparable fellowship with the Father. The Johannine

1860, who would insist that it was as *Professor Dr. Beyschlag* that he so studied and preached?

¹ "Die Frage nach dem Verhältniss der neuanzutretenden Herrlichkeit zu der früheren (betont von Beyschlag, I. 254; Bk. II. ch. iii. § 8) thut hier nichts zur Sache." (Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* II. 403.)

² See Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* II. 401-404.

idea is the same as that of the Synoptic passage whose "Johannine tone" has been already remarked: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him" (Mt. xi. 27; Lk. x. 22). The relation of Jesus to God which this sonship denotes is, according to both forms of teaching, absolutely unique; it can be predicated of no other. This uniqueness the fourth Gospel sets in strong relief by its doctrine of eternal preëxistence. Christ does not *become* a son of God; he *is* the Son of God.

At this point our inquiries bring us again face to face with the great problem of doctrinal theology respecting the person of Christ. That problem is, whether this altogether exceptional intimacy between the Father and the Son, taken in connection with the sinless perfection of Christ and his explicit assertions of an eternal fellowship with God, does not force us beyond the limits of humanity for the explanation of his person, and require us to posit an ontological relation as its only adequate ground. A negative answer to this question can only be justified by explaining away the testimonies of Jesus to his preëxistence and by showing that neither his sinlessness nor his unique fellowship with God requires for its explanation any fundamental difference between him and other men. All this is easily accomplished by those who discredit the Gospels at the outset; but the efforts of those who seek to reach the same conclusion on the assumption of the substantial trustworthiness of the Gospels and the genuineness of the fourth, are not, in my judgment, successful. Those who are convinced that the consciousness of Jesus was "purely human," would do far better to seek the confirmation of their conclusion in some other field than that of exegesis. As against this conclusion the apostolic Church and, for the most part, the Church of all subsequent ages have heeded that the self-testimony of Jesus as presented in the New Testament compels the inference that he eternally partakes in the nature of Deity. I hold that this conclusion is correct.

CHAPTER V

THE HOLY SPIRIT

THE teaching of Jesus concerning the Holy Spirit is, in a sense, the counterpart of the Synoptic teaching regarding the parousia. It is found wrought into those discourses which were uttered towards the close of his earthly life, and the purpose of which was to comfort his disciples in view of his approaching departure from them. He assures them that, although they will be bereft of his bodily presence, he will still be with them in the gift and presence of the Spirit.

To this "Holy Spirit" (xiv. 26), or "Spirit of truth" (xiv. 17; xv. 26), these discourses apply by preference the name "Paraclete" (*παράκλητος*). In most English translations of the Bible this word has been rendered "Comforter," that is, one who strengthens. In the one place, however, where the word occurs outside of the discourses in question (1 Jn. ii. 1), it is rendered "Advocate." The word *παράκλητος* means one who is called in to the side of another, and was commonly applied to an advocate at law, especially the advocate for the defence. Practically, therefore, it means an advocate, counsellor, or helper. The word "Comforter," in the sense of supporter, represents very well the essential import of *παράκλητος*, although Advocate or Helper would have been a more accurate rendering and one which could have been consistently adopted in all the passages. Since in xiv. 16 the Holy Spirit is called *ἄλλος παράκλητος*, — that is, since the term *παράκλητος* is by implication applied both to Christ and the Spirit and in the same sense, — it is evidently desirable to assign the same

meaning to *παράκλητος* in the discourses and in 1 Jn. ii. 1. The Spirit is the Christian's divine Helper.

Various functions are ascribed to the Holy Spirit. He will teach the disciples (xiv. 26), declare Christ's truth (xvi. 14), guide the disciples into all the truth of Christ (xvi. 13), bring his teaching home to the recollection of his followers (xiv. 26), glorify Christ and bear testimony concerning him (xvi. 14; xv. 26), and convict the world concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment (xvi. 8). He will hold constant fellowship with the disciples (xiv. 16), will continually abide at their side and dwell within them as a source of inspiration (xiv. 17). This description of the Spirit's activities shows in what sense he is called "the Spirit of truth." He is the bearer and mediator of the truth which Jesus embodied in his revealing, saving work. The world of the Spirit's activity is the same as that of Christ. He is the continuator of the redemptive process in the world; he makes real and effective in human life the truth which the earthly mission of Christ revealed. Hence the Spirit of truth interprets those divine realities which constitute the inner meaning of the life of Jesus and fosters in men the spiritual life which accords with them. In this way he leads men into all the truth, that is, into the ever fuller realization of the true import and purpose of Christ's work; into the increasing fulfilment of the life of love and fellowship with God. Thus the Spirit's work is the same in kind with that of Christ. It is a method or aspect of God's redemptive action in bringing men to a saving knowledge of himself. It is not so much an addition to the intellectual possessions of men which this teaching of the Spirit contemplates, as a translation of the motives and principles which reigned in the life of Christ into their conduct and characters.

It is necessary now to consider the questions whether in these discourses the Spirit is conceived of as a self distinct from Christ, or is a name for an impersonal principle, or for the continued spiritual presence of Christ himself with his disciples after his departure from earth. I regard the use of pronouns which refer to the Spirit as important

in its bearing on this question. Since the word *πνεῦμα* is grammatically neuter, all pronouns which have *πνεῦμα* for their immediate antecedent must, of course, be neuter also (xiv. 17, 26; xv. 26). It is obvious that the use of neuter pronouns in these circumstances can have no bearing on the question of the personality of the Spirit. It is a noticeable fact, however, that pronouns referring to the Spirit which do not have *πνεῦμα* for their immediate antecedent are, in all cases, masculine, that is, the Spirit is described by personal designations except where grammatical necessity compels the use of neuter words. For example, in xiv. 26, we read: "The Holy Spirit which (ὁ) the Father will send in my name, he (ἐκεῖνος) shall teach you all things." The same peculiarity of language is observed in xv. 26: "The Spirit of truth which (ὁ) proceedeth from the Father, he (ἐκεῖνος) shall bear witness of me." In xvi. 13 this usage is still more pronounced since the Spirit is designated by *ἐκεῖνος*, although the neuter *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας* stands in immediate apposition with it. If the use of masculine pronouns in xvi. 7, 8 might seem to be due to the presence of the masculine noun *παράκλητος*, this certainly cannot be the case in vv. 13 and 14 where *παράκλητος* is not used. The conclusion which these facts justify is that our sources, with the utmost possible uniformity refer to the Spirit in terms implying personality.

The view that the Holy Spirit is a name for the glorified Christ himself by which he described his spiritual presence with his disciples, is supported by appeal to the following considerations. In xiv. 17, 18 the Spirit's coming and his own coming to his disciples seem to be identical: "He (the Spirit) abideth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you desolate: I come to you." In connection with the promise of the Spirit Jesus assures his followers that they shall soon behold him again: "A little while, and ye behold me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see me" (xvi. 16; cf. xiv. 19). This is understood to mean that although he will soon be withdrawn from their physical sight, he will still be spiritually present with them and they shall see him with the eye of the spirit. In

both manifestations he is the same; the name "Holy Spirit" is but a personification of the invisible relation which he will sustain to them after his ascension.¹ The same identification of Christ and the Spirit is found in the words of Jesus after his resurrection when he breathed on his disciples and said: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit" (xx. 22). This, it is said, was a symbolical action in which Jesus imparted to his followers a power from himself; the Spirit which he bestowed was the blessing of his own inspiring and sanctifying spiritual presence. Thus it appears that the name "Holy Spirit" represents only a hypostatizing of the thought of Jesus' continued invisible presence with his disciples. In reality, the Spirit is identical with himself. The ascription of personal activities and the striking application of personal pronouns to the Spirit which we have observed would be explained as natural and appropriate on this view, since the Holy Spirit is a person in the sense of being identical with the glorified Redeemer. The Holy Spirit is regarded as Christ's continued life, and this life is personal.

Alongside of the passages which seem capable of this explanation, we must now place another group of sayings which explicitly distinguish the Holy Spirit from Christ. The Spirit is called "another Advocate" (*ἄλλος παράκλητος*, xiv. 16). Christ was an Advocate or Helper; the Spirit will be another. Here the two Helpers are plainly distinguished by the word *ἄλλος* as personally different. The Spirit is another besides Christ. The same distinction is sharply marked in xiv. 26: "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." It is difficult to conceive of Jesus as saying that the Father would send the Spirit in his name and that he would quicken the memory and

¹ So Reuss, *Hist. Christ. Theol.* II. 469 sq. (orig. II. 524 sq.). Cf. Bovon, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, I. 521, who holds that the fourth Gospel, with its practical and religious tendency, gives no indication towards solving the question whether the Holy Spirit denotes a force or a person. The author evidently inclines strongly to the former idea.