

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

need through that Humanity which understands it, through that Deity which can supply it above all our imagination.

And would it not be expedient and gracious to use the name far more in preaching the Gospel? Of all the names it raises the least question, it offers the fullest blessing. There may be some who for a while shall not be able to say, "My Lord and my God," but whose lips linger on the sound of Jesus. There are many who cannot at once accept the mystery of the Holy Trinity, but there are none who would not desire to be saved from their sins. Wherefore the name is a conciliation, a commendation, an invitation. As a vagrant passing down a street in the cold winter time sees through an open door the unthought-of comfort and beauty of a home, so does the wandering soul behold the heart of God open in the word Jesus, and feel itself suddenly encompassed by the warmth and welcome of the Divine Love.

JOHN WATSON.

THE ARTICLES OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

III. BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria virgine. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

Rom.: τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.—*Aqu.*: qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine.—*Afric.*: the same.¹—*Jerus.*: σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.²—*Antioch.*: qui propter nos venit et natus est ex Maria virgine.³

The complete form of this Article in our Creed is almost unknown in all the Creeds, except those which can be

¹ Only *ex virgine Maria*. Close by is *qui natus est*, also *natum*.

² So according to Cyril (cf. Caspari, in the *norweg. Abhandlungen*, pp. 95-102); the Liturgy of James, if it made known the Creed up to this point, would unquestionably show an older, more popular form. In his 12th *Catechesis* Cyril does justice to the meaning of the other formulas.

³ On the variations of the fragmentary Greek text see Caspari, I. 79 f.

proved to be derived from it.¹ It must, therefore, have been peculiar, we do not know for how long, to the South-Gallican Church, to which we owe our recension of the Creed. It only states more fully, and in Biblical language,² what all the other forms also state, that Jesus, without a human father, through the wonderful operation of the Holy Ghost, was conceived by Mary, and was therefore born of a Virgin. But this has been an element of the Creed as far back as we can trace it; and if Ignatius may count as a witness for a yet older confession belonging to yet earlier Apostolic times, the name of the Virgin Mary was already contained in it,³ as well as that of Pontius Pilate. We can also maintain that during the first four centuries of the Church no teacher, and no religious community which had any pretence to consider themselves inheritors of the original Christianity, took any other view of the beginning

¹ Cf. Caspari, II. 203; III. 213. The oldest form of Creed in which we read: "qui de coelo descendit, conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria virgine," is that which the Court theologians carried through at the Synod of Rimini, A.D. 359 (Hieron. c. *Lucif.*, c. 17, 18; Vallarsi, II². 189). In the Greek text of the formula of Niké, which is the groundwork of this formula of Rimini (cf. Hefele, *Conziliengesch.*, I². 708), we find simply γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου (Theodoretī H.E., II. 21). The variation in the Latin setting seems to have been a concession to the custom of some of the Westerns who were present. The second Creed quoted by Caspari with the above formula is attributed to Damasus, which is certainly a mistake (Hieron., ed. Vallarsi, XI. 200. Its historical value cannot be estimated without the solution of a whole chain of complicated questions and comparisons; cf. *Pseudoaug. sermo 235* (ed. Bass., XVI. 1286, with the Benedictines' preface); *Cod. can. eccl. Rom.*, c. 39 (Leonis opp. ed. Ballerini, III. 279, 919 f., 946 ff.). Moreover, in the latter text "conceptus de Spiritu Sancto" is missing. It has often crept into older texts, which in other respects have no connection with the later Apostles' Creed, and have not been interpolated to agree with it in other places, e.g., in a sermon probably of Ambrose (Caspari, II. 57, 126; IV. 220), and in a similar sermon of Augustine (Caspari, II. 275 ff. See the corrected text, IV. 233).

² Luke 1. 31, 35; Matt. 1. 18, 20.

³ See above, p. 43. Germ. ed. For the fact that Justin in the passages resembling a Creed (*Apol.* I. 31, 46; *Dial.* 85) always speaks of the Virgin only, without naming her, is unimportant for the history of the Creed. Elsewhere he is not silent (*Dial.* 100 twice; *Dial.* 120). Nor is it important that Aristides in his *Apology*, c. 2, should call her only the "Hebrew Virgin."

of the life of Jesus. Only those who dissolved the whole historical appearance of Jesus into a deceptive phantom taught otherwise. Cerinthus, who taught that the Saviour, the true Christ, entered into a personal union with Jesus at His Baptism, which was dissolved again before His Passion, allowed that the man Jesus was the son of Joseph. The only importance that this man possessed for religion was that he served as a visible form, a mouthpiece to the Christ quite distinct from him. Old Cerinthus would not be such a strange figure among our modern theologians. According to Irenæus, he declared the Virgin Birth to be impossible, and he preferred St. Mark's Gospel, which is silent on that subject.¹ Marcion, who preferred to write a new Gospel for himself and his community, allowed his Christ to come into the world without human aid in the synagogue at Capernaum. But this Christ remained a stranger on the earth so utterly strange to him. His whole history is a Theophany lasting a year, which only the absurd superstition of the Church could have accepted as corporeal reality. Since the beginning of the second century Jewish Christians, who resented the development of the Church since the days of St. Paul, and violently hated that Apostle, sought to win followers for a mixed religion, which was more nearly related to Islam on the one side and to Buddhism on the other than to Christianity. They fought for it with the weapons of a relentless criticism against all historical revelation and documentary evidence. They were indifferent to the human beginning of Jesus' life. They did not care if the Jews did call Him the son of Joseph. For they found compensation for the surrender of the mystery of the Christian faith in a fantastic doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and in the assertion that Jesus was an incarnation of the true prophet, who

¹ So according to the single trustworthy notice of the use of the Gospels by the Cerinthians in Irenæus III. 11, 7, where he refers back to I. 26, 1; III. 11, 1.

had often already, especially in Adam and Moses, become flesh and man. We do not know whether a real community, a church of this faith, ever existed. But, on the other hand, the Jewish communities, which prolonged a sectarian existence to about 400 A.D., or possibly even longer, while holding tenaciously to their nationality, their language, their Old Testament, and their Hebrew Gospel, were just as faithful to the confession of Jesus as the Son of the Virgin.¹ Even in heathen Christendom the less violent innovators, such as the imaginative Valentinus (c. 140–160), the followers of the shoemaker Theodotus, who were well equipped with classical culture (c. 200), and the worldly Paul of Samosata in the Bishop's house at Antioch (c. 270), did not dare to attack it directly. The only renowned theologian who did was Photinus of Sirmium (c. 340–370). Julian the Apostate congratulated him thereon, and called him an uncommonly rational theologian.² Inasmuch as Photinus declared 'Jesus, the legitimate son of Joseph and Mary, to be a deified man because of His moral worth,'³ he made theology fit for a drawing-room, and in the eyes of the Cæsar, who had relapsed into heathenism, almost fit for a court. We must set beside this what Polycarp has related of his teacher, St. John. When the Apostle visited the Public Baths in Ephesus, and caught sight of Cerinthus, he hurried away, saying, "Let us fly, that the Baths may not collapse in which is found Cerinthus, the enemy of truth."

In the face of these facts, it may well seem strange that any one should consider the judgment on the value of this

¹ Cf. my *Hist. of the Canon*, II. 668–673; esp. p. 670, note 3; also pp. 686–690.

² Facundus of Hermione (*Defensio tr. cap.*, IV. 2; Migne 67, col. 621) has preserved the fragment of Julian's letter. Julian has also favoured him with special regard in his polemic against Christianity (*Juliani contra Christ. quæ supersunt*, ed. Neumann, p. 214, 1).

³ Cf. my *Marcellus*, pp. 191, 193. In the latter passage, note 2, the improbable is explained to be probable only in respect of Paul of Samosata.

Article of the Confession had any kind of connection with the question as to the value of certain anthropological theories of isolated Church teachers. Long before Christians found time to set up theories on the original development of individual personality from the species, and also long before any one had derived unhistorical consequences from the miracle of the Conception of Jesus with reference to Mary and the brothers of Jesus, the fruit of her marriage with Joseph, belief in Jesus as the Son of the Virgin was the universal Christian belief. Was there ever indeed a Christian community without this belief? It is not in accordance with the actual facts to represent this belief as depending upon the historical value assigned to the narratives of two Evangelists. But the most surprising thing is that Lessing¹ should have lived so utterly in vain for certain Protestant theologians, that they can still imagine that the contradictions between St. Matthew and St. Luke furnish a valid proof against the historical value of their accounts of the Birth. How would these theologians judge of the history so inconvenient to them if the two accounts of the event agreed in every particular and only differed in outward expression? They would unquestionably maintain that they were not two witnesses, who would continuously guarantee a certain extension and a greater age for the myth, but only a single witness for the existence of the myth at the time of the Evangelist who first recorded it, if indeed he had not simply invented the history out of his own head. No further notice would be taken of the second narrator as a corrector of the style. But, as it is, we have two historical works, intended for very different circles of readers, which certainly, in this as in many other points, were drawn from perfectly different sources.

¹ I am referring to Lessing's famous thesis (W.W., pub. by Maltzahn, x. 51), "The Resurrection of Christ may well be true, although the narratives in the Gospels are contradictory," which he so brilliantly expounds.

St. Luke already knows of many attempts to write the Gospel history. The writers like himself had received the history to be related from eye-witnesses. He appeals to the fact that as an investigator he has traced back the things he has to relate to their very beginning.

His whole work rests on these suppositions. By its means he hopes to lead on Theophilus, who was by birth a heathen, and probably did not yet belong to the Christian community, to the conviction that the Christian traditions of which he had heard were not pious myths, but trustworthy history. According to this the narrative in St. Luke 1. and 2. cannot have been the peculiar property of a small circle of Christians.

This is also corroborated by the narrative in St. Matthew 1., and indeed not only by its existence and its evident independence of St. Luke. The Gospel intended for the Jews and Jewish Christians is not a simple account of wonderful events in the life of Jesus, but a carefully arranged account of events of which a superficial knowledge is for the most part supposed. But the point of view from which St. Matthew looks at everything is not the simple confession that Jesus is the promised Messiah. The point kept strictly in view from the first page to the last is much more apologetic, and so far as it is unavoidable polemic. That which St. Matthew plainly declares at the end with reference to the Resurrection of Jesus (chap. 28. 11-15) the attentive reader should read throughout between the lines. His theme is as follows: Jesus, who from the beginning was an offence to the Jews, who was rejected by His people, and thus became a stumbling-block to the Jews, who was ignominiously slandered, even beyond the grave, that Jesus is nevertheless the Messiah. Just where the Jews scoff at and calumniate Him He fulfils the prophecy of the Messiah when rightly understood. It is only from this point of view that we can understand

the first chapter of St. Matthew. With few and simple words, but with a power of narration which lays hold of every sympathizing reader, the Evangelist pictures in chapter 1: 18-21 the imminent danger lest He who should save His people from their sins should be born as the illegitimate child of a wife who had been put away by her lawful husband on account of unfaithfulness. It is a holy work of God which has caused this horrible suggestion, it is the fulfilment of the prophet's prediction. Even those who will not acknowledge it have no right to blaspheme, for the danger is arrested by God's ordering. Mary did not give birth to her Son till Joseph had acknowledged her as his lawful wife, and had taken her unto him. The Evangelist had already prepared for this thoroughly apologetic narrative by the preceding genealogical table. Four women's names attract our notice in what is otherwise such a dry list of men's names. The honourable female ancestors of the race, such as Sarah or Rebecca, are not mentioned, but only those women whose characters are highly offensive to Jewish, and in three cases out of four to every human, feeling. The name of Tamar (1. 3) reminds us of a most awful chapter in the history of the Patriarchs (Gen. 38.). Rahab was not only a heathen, but every Jew and Jewish Christian mentally added that bad epithet to her name which Christian teachers also in ancient times did not spare her (Jas. 2. 25; Heb. 11. 31). Ruth (1. 5) appears to us as a lovable character; to the Jews she remains a Moabitish heathen. Solomon's mother is not even mentioned by name, but is only called the wife of Uriah (1. 6), by whose murder David sealed his adultery. What is the meaning of these shameful blots in the pre-historic and historic accounts of the Davidic house, whose genealogical tree was brought to perfection in Jesus the Christ, the noblest shoot? Why must Mary allow herself to be added as the fifth to these four women? As it is

plain that the Evangelist had no blasphemous intention there remains only one imaginable reason for these statements—the same apologetic purpose which governs his account of the Conception and Birth of Jesus. He would say to the Jews and to those Christians who were still affected by their attacks, as follows: “Suppose that all were true which Jewish hatred has invented about the beginning of Jesus’ life, the Jew who does not allow those dark passages in the history of the house of David to disturb his faith in it as the history of a Divine Revelation still waiting for its fulfilment, has also no right, because of those unwarrantable accusations against Mary and her Son, to keep himself afar from Jesus, and to allow himself to be embittered against Him. Those well-known Jewish blasphemies¹ did not arise from the reading of Matthew 1. Just the reverse was the case. The Evangelist knew of them before, and refutes them in that chapter scarcely less distinctly than he opposes in chapter 28. 11–15 the Jewish slander that the disciples of Jesus had stolen His body from the grave. Whoever cannot decide, as S. Reimarus did with reference to the Resurrection, to accept the Jewish as the original and true account, and on the other hand to explain the Evangelist’s narrative to be an apologetic fiction, must be prepared on the contrary to acknowledge the connection between the two narratives, if indeed he be capable of honest thought. The Jewish assertion that Jesus was an unlawful son of Mary, which St. Matthew assumes to be universally known, is as certainly a caricature of the Christian tradition of the Miraculous Conception as the Jewish fable in Matthew 28. 15 is a caricature of the Apostolic preaching of the Resurrection of Jesus. How old and how well known the Christian tradition must have been in Palestine if the Jewish caricature was so widely spread at the time St. Matthew’s

¹ Cf. Laible, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud* (1891) pp. 9–39, (p. 7 Eng. trans.).

Gospel was written, that the Evangelist deemed it necessary at the beginning of his book to oppose it so decidedly.

But there is no question here of a narrative undeniably known in the most diverse districts long before the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke were written. It was believed in especially by the Christians in Palestine, and known also to the Jews there, who distorted the narrative by the most hateful fictions. Just as the account of the Flight into Egypt gave rise to Jewish misrepresentations, so the unanimous and unambiguous accounts of all the four Evangelists of the Feeding of the Five Thousand have not protected that story from the most foolish rationalizing attacks of our theologians. According to the Evangelists, who relate the wonderful beginning of Jesus' life, this is in very deed the foundation of His Divine Sonship. St. Luke says this distinctly (1. 35; cf. 1. 32). Consequently he would have the heavenly call at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration understood not as declaring Jesus to be the Son of God, but as a repeated confirmation and loud proclamation of His Divine Sonship, which had been grounded in His Conception and Birth. This Divine Sonship is represented as the real condition of Jesus in opposition to His supposed relationship to Joseph (Luke 3. 22, 23). St. Matthew takes the same view. Jesus is first called the Son of God in chapter 2. 15, but he gives the reader no other ground for the statement than the narrative in chapter 1. 18-25. St. John calls the Saviour for the first time the Son of God, and indeed the Only-begotten, namely in a peculiar sense (see above, p. 53), after he has said: "The Word was made flesh." Though St. John has said nothing in chapter 1. 1-13 of the Generation of the Logos from God as a pre-temporal act, on which the Church has speculated so profoundly, there is nevertheless no doubt that Jesus was for Him the only Son of God in the fullest sense, because He who was with God from

all eternity, at an appointed time in history became in the body living man. While the other children and sons of God have become so by virtue of their believing adherence to Jesus and in the strength of the power bestowed on them by Jesus after having formerly stood in a very different relationship to God (1. 12f.), Jesus is the Son of God because He came forth from God and became Man. And just because this "first-born among many brethren" (Rom. 8. 29; cf. John 20. 17) is the Son of God by birth and by nature, and not like them by being born again of grace and penitent faith, therefore He is the Only-begotten.

St. John relates as little as St. Mark does of the Birth and Childhood of Jesus. Even more plainly than St. Mark he avoids entering into a full account of the life of Jesus. When he begins to relate (1. 19) he places us at once at the height of the activity of the Baptist. Important events, like the Baptism of Jesus and His growth at Nazareth, come to light only incidentally, and are taken for granted (1. 32-34, 45). Therefore there is in his Gospel no definite account directly referring to the mode in which the Only-begotten became Man. Nevertheless no uncertainty exists as to what he thought about it. The Logos has *become* flesh as men *are* flesh. But He is also the Son of God, and indeed from His Birth. He could not have been this if He, like other men, had been the production of human nature, which propagates itself. Men are thus flesh by nature, and only subsequently, through the new birth, given by God, become the children of God. If He is from birth in an extraordinary and unique sense what the other children of men become in the course of their lives by virtue of a power given them by Christ, and in the sense of a drawing near to Him which reaches on into eternity (1 John 3. 2), His Birth must stand in an extraordinary sense for that for which

their second birth stands. But St. John has expressed himself most fully on the latter point immediately before the sentence about the Logos becoming flesh (1. 13), and he has united by means of an "and" the two statements that the children of men became the children of God, and the Logos became living Man, and at the same time the Only-begotten Son of God. The parallel is so startling that in the earliest times and in the most remote districts it was supposed that verse 13 referred directly to the Generation of Christ, and the text was altered in consequence.¹ No intelligent person would now think of pronouncing this altered text to be the original. But the impression, from which the alteration in the text arose, was right and is inevitable—that the Evangelist had in his mind the narratives of the Conception and Birth of the Son of God when he wrote his account of the begetting of the children of God. Why was he not content to say that man did not become the child of God by natural birth nor by a repetition of that birth, if such had been possible (cf. 3. 4-6), but only through the power of a new life proceeding directly from God? The express denial of the will of man in particular, as a co-operating factor in the begetting of the children of God, has never been credibly explained by any one who has denied the conscious reference in an extraordinary sense to the Conception and Birth of the Son of God. It is not, however, sufficient to acknowledge that here, as in numberless other passages in his book, the youngest Evangelist had in his mind and took into consideration the older

¹ Irenæus (III. 16, 2; 19, 2; V. 1, 3), and Tertullian (*De carne*, 19), both of whom had only a Greek New Testament in their hands, knew no other text than that which was otherwise only supported by Latin witnesses for John 1. 13 ("qui . . . natus est"). If one compares the context and the quotation in Iren. III. 19, 2 with Just. *Dial.* 63, one can hardly doubt that Justin had this reading. Tertullian seeks to prove that the text now generally recognised, and maintained by the Valentinians, is unreasonable.

traditions as recorded by the Synoptists. He has justified them and adhered to them by describing the origin of the later-born children of God in accordance with the Christian tradition of the Conception and Birth of the true and, in the fullest sense of the word, only Son of God. If St. John here, in the very introduction to his book, gives us to understand what he thinks of the Incarnation of the eternal Logos, and of the coincident Becoming of the Only-begotten, it is plain that he does not represent the event differently in the prologue and all the later statements,—his own in his Epistles and Gospel, and those of Jesus on the sending and coming of the Son of God from God, or from heaven, into this world. It was not necessary that he should tell his Christian readers that, on the first day of his meeting with Jesus, St. Philip did not know all that the community acknowledged about their Lord.¹ They said so themselves.

That there ever was a community in Apostolic times, whose faith was fixed on Jesus the son of Joseph, is an hypothesis which has been long exploded by all historical testimony. It is one which can never be proved. No one took a larger part than St. Paul in the founding of the communities in which we already find early in the second century that faith in the Son of the Virgin universally prevailed. He has not related the history of Jesus anywhere in his Epistles. But in the single passage where he refers in a few words to the historical circumstances under which God sent His Son into the world, besides God who is His Father he mentions only the woman who bare Him, and the law under which He was placed by His birth (Gal. 6. 4). St. Paul does not say here "born of a Virgin" but "born of a woman." The former would have been

¹ John 1. 45; cf. the omission of a correction in 7. 42; on the other side, however, 6. 42.

most unsuitably applied here, for he does not want to accentuate the difference of the Son of God from other men, but rather the likeness between His condition and position and the condition of those whom He was to save, and chiefly of the Israelites who were under the law and its curse. Therefore all the more imperatively an answer is demanded to the question: Why does St. Paul here only mention the mother when it is plain that it was much more decisive for the subjection of Jesus to the Mosaic law to which the context refers that He should have been born and have grown up the son of an Israelitish man?¹ Plainly because in the thought of St. Paul there was no room for Joseph as the father of Jesus beside His heavenly Father. It is said, or rather has been said during the last few generations, that St. Paul, like all the Evangelists and the Apocalypse, acknowledges the Davidic descent of Jesus, but Jesus' Davidic descent is transmitted through Joseph, not through Mary, of whose descent the Scriptures say nothing. The genealogies (Matt. 1., Luke 3.) make this quite plain, for they are traced down to Joseph, not to Mary. But if Jesus is not the son of Joseph after the flesh, then He cannot be really the son of David, and a fundamental article of the Apostolic Confession is purely imaginary. All this is quite true with the exception of the fraudulent conclusion. The oldest witnesses to be obtained for the Davidic descent of Jesus, which show this connection in a genealogy—St. Matthew and St. Luke—both say quite distinctly that Jesus as the son of Joseph was the son of David, and that He was Joseph's son not because He was begotten of him, but because He was born of Mary, the lawful wife of Joseph. As this connection was sufficient for the Lord Himself in His working among the people, so that His bitterest antagonists never denied His Davidic descent during His lifetime, and thus cut the ground from

¹ Timothy, the son of a Jewish mother, was an uncircumcised heathen.

beneath His feet, it sufficed for the Evangelists also.¹ How can it be proved that this was not the original view of the Christian community, and that a yet older generation had done homage to the coarse view that the historical right of Jesus to appear amongst His people as the Messiah depended upon the fact that the blood of David flowed in His veins? We must draw on our imagination, or, as Irenæus² so strikingly expresses it, "read books that have never been written," if we wish the history of Christendom to be other than that offered to us at its source.

To the same category belongs also the statement that the fact in question did not form a component part of the original proclamation of the gospel. We know, it is true, that Jesus, the first to proclaim the gospel, did not begin His preaching to His people by saying, "Do not take Me for the son of Joseph." He did not generally begin His preaching by speaking of Himself at all, but with the proclamation of the near approach and of the coming with Him of the kingdom of God. But how soon the Person of the King's Son, who was at the same time the preacher of the Kingdom of God, stands forth from the background which concealed Him during the first public preaching! This is true of Him not only as King of the kingdom, and Judge of the world, but also of His Person in relation to God and to man. That which is begotten and born of the flesh (for both are included in the Greek expression) needs repentance and the new birth in order to gain an entrance into the kingdom of God. The King's Son and the Heir of the kingdom needs neither, because He is not a production of the human race, which propagates itself, but the Son of God, who *is* in heaven, who descended from thence,

¹ Perhaps I should have done better to refer to the small but classical treatise by Hoffmann (*Protest. u. Kirche*, XXII. [1851] p. 114), in place of my remarks above. What has been said against my own investigations in the *Forschungen*, I. 264 ff. gives no occasion to make any corrections.

² I. 8, 1.

and who is born into the world.¹ If Jesus was unable wholly to keep silence about this heavenly background of His earthly existence from those who, like a Nicodemus, were afar off, and did not seem fully prepared for it, who can gauge how He spoke of it to His disciples, who thankfully confirm it by saying that He had openly spoken to them of His coming forth from God? The Fourth Gospel adheres in the opening to the Synoptic tradition of the beginning of the life of Jesus. It preserves for us many of the disciples' questions and requests for explanations. That it has not also preserved amongst them those which referred to His natural relationship to Joseph and Mary, is no proof that an anxious silence on it was preserved when the company of the disciples were gathered round their Master. If from the sermons in the Acts of the Apostles we can form some idea of the mode in which the gospel was preached to the unbelieving, we may venture to say that a narrative of that which preceded the appearance of the Baptist and the Baptism of Jesus did not regularly belong to the elements of the first missionary preaching.² Every sensible missionary will strive first to awaken consciences and allure hearts to believe. He will not begin with that which only requires faith, which if addressed to those who are afar off when they are not prepared for it would not only invite contradiction and mockery, but would be also utterly worthless. Yet to the original Gospel belongs all that was said of Jesus in the second and tenth chapters in the sermon addressed to these men, besides that which was made known to the newly baptized in the "doctrine of the Apostles" (Acts 2. 42). We do not know exactly what was included in those first articles of Christian instruction, some of which St. Paul

¹ Cf. John 3. 3-16; 8. 14-30, 55-58; 10. 30-38; 16. 28 ff.

² Acts 2. 14-36; 3. 12-26; 10. 34-43; 13. 16-41. Less to the point are Acts 14. 15-17; 17. 22-31.

enumerates for some special cause (1 Cor. 15, 3). And even if the teaching on the beginning of the life of Jesus was not included in the first articles, but was reserved for the instruction of the inner circle of Christians already baptized and confirmed in the faith (1 Cor. 2. 6), we are by no means therefore to suppose that it was, in the opinion of the Apostles, quite immaterial what was thought of the origin of the Man Jesus. On the contrary we know that there were no differences of opinion about the Person of Jesus amongst the communities of Apostolic times, or, as was then said, amongst those who "called upon the name of Jesus."¹ They could not have existed without leaving some trace in literature. Any such thing is entirely wanting. St. Paul himself assures even very questionable Jewish Christian missionaries that they preach no other Jesus than he preached.² This also proves that the existence of an original Christianity without faith in Jesus the Son of God, born of a Virgin, is a fiction of which surely no one need be proud.

THEOD. ZAHN.

¹ 1 Cor. 1. 2; Rom. 10. 12-14; Acts 1. 14, 21. Cf. my lecture on *Prayers to Jesus in the Apostolic Age* (1885). I speak of communities. Some there were in Apostolic times who did not "call on the Lord out of a pure heart" (2 Tim. 2. 22). Among them were those who were led into mistakes by false teaching on the Person of Christ. Cf. 1 John 2. 18-23; 4. 1-3; 5. 5-12; 2 John 7.

² 2 Cor. 11. 4; cf. Phil. 1. 14-18.