

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>

THE TEACHING OF JESUS
AND
THE JEWISH TEACHING OF HIS AGE

THE TEACHING OF JESUS AND THE JEWISH TEACHING OF HIS AGE

By the Rev. THOMAS WALKER, D.D. (LOND.)



LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C. 1

First published in 1923
Reprinted . . . 1924

(All rights reserved)

Printed in Great Britain

TO
ONE IN HEAVEN
WHO
STILL SPEAKS

8898

PREFACE

IN the labour of love, which is directed toward making Jesus better known, the present writer has presumed to join. He offers here the results of his toil in a not unimportant part of the field of inquiry (cf. *I.J.A.*, April 1910, pp. 36 f.). He has aimed first at furnishing a connected account of the teaching of the extra-canonical Jewish literature of the period 200 B.C.-100 A.D. In so doing he has as far as possible allowed the writers to state their teaching in their own words. Accuracy in detail has been aimed at, also a true impression of the moral and religious atmosphere in which these people lived. The teaching of Jesus on each subject has then been given in parallelism thereto, section by section. A close comparison of his teaching with that of these writers has thus been obtained. An endeavour has also been made to realise the difference in the moral and religious atmosphere which his teaching made for those of his fellow Jews who were prepared to follow it out. In the execution of this task the assistance of Jewish and Christian scholarship has been required, and is duly acknowledged. The writer can only hope that both to inquiring Jew and to inquiring Christian this modest outcome of his investigations into the truth concerning the teaching of Jesus may be of some service.

STAMFORD HILL,
LONDON, 1922.

THE AUTHOR'S NOTE TO THE REPRINT

THAT a reprint should be called for so soon after publication is in itself a great reward. The enthusiastic reception, which both Jewish and Christian reviewers, here and in America, have given to my work, has had much to do with this happy result. Only one criticism deserves notice here. Several scholars have rightly called attention to the fact that the Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha do not fully represent the Judaism of the time of Jesus. These have, however, overlooked the important fact that the Rabbinical literature has been used constantly (see Index), and, even where not directly referred to, it has been the chief guide to the detection of elements of the Judaism of the time which are only incidentally mentioned in the selected literature. In the interpretation, as well as the discovery, of this common stock the Rabbinical literature has been followed. My treatment of the Law (pp. 225 ff.) and the Sabbath (pp. 242 f.) are sufficient proof of the sincerity and thoroughness with which this method has been adopted. The result, therefore, is that in the sections on Judaism the reader is supplied with an interpretation which has the advantage of Rabbinical guidance, plus elements which certainly characterised the Judaism of the time of Jesus very much more than the Rabbinical literature would have us suppose.

FOREST GATE,
LONDON, 1924.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

	PAGE
1. Value of the study of this literature	27
2. Literature with dates	27
3. Gospels as sources for teaching of Jesus	29
4. Jesus and this literature	30
5. His acquaintance with its outlook	31
6. Plan of the present work	32

CHAPTER I

THE IDEA OF GOD

A. THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE.

I. *The Nature of God.*

1. Absence of Pantheism	35
2. "Father" subordinate among titles for God	36
3. Spirituality of God	38

II. *The Character of God.*

1. Justice of God and problem of suffering	39
2. Love of God towards righteous and sinner	42

III. *The Relation of God to All Other Existence.*

1. Creator, and ever-present Governor, never falsely transcendent	44
2. Angel's presence God's presence	47
3. Wisdom complementary or equivalent to angels	49

IV. *The Motive of God in His relation to All Other Existence.*

1. Synagogue and prayer	51
2. Writers men of prayer	52
3. Significance of God's accessibility in prayer	55
Summary of conclusions	55

B. JESUS AND THIS TEACHING.

I. *The Nature of God.*

1. Exploration of paternal relation	57
2. Prominence and meaning of "Father"	57
3. Full realisation of spiritual idea	62

	PAGE
II. <i>The Character of God.</i>	
1. Realm in which is perfect justice of God	64
2. Love of God's Fatherhood thoroughly comprehended	68
III. <i>The Relation of God to All Other Existence.</i>	
1. Creator never resting, and Governor having love's Omniscience	71
2. No longer God as angel	73
3. Wisdom and the Spirit of God	75
IV. <i>The Motive of God in His relation to All Other Existence.</i>	
1. Unexplored possibilities in prayer	77
2. Prayer ruled by Fatherly idea	78
3. Prayer preservation of communion by unreserved committal	79
Summary of claims	81

CHAPTER II

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

A. THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE.

Correct definition a sinless community	85
I. <i>The Time, Duration, and Locality of the Kingdom.</i>	
1. Before final Judgment and of limited duration on earth	85
2. After final Judgment and really a Hereafter on earth	88
3. This pessimistic view becomes a Hereafter proper	89
4. Pessimists no human Messiah, occasionally the Superhuman	90
II. <i>The Members of the Kingdom.</i>	
1. Optimists look for considerable, pessimists for small, Gentile incoming	90
2. To both the Kingdom essentially Jewish	94
III. <i>The Factors in the Bringing in of the Kingdom.</i>	
1. Optimists' emphasis on repentance	96
2. Against leaving everything to catastrophic changes	97
3. Only the pessimists wait for the end	98
Summary of conclusions	99

B. JESUS AND THIS TEACHING.

A community in a new sense righteous	101
I. <i>The Time, Duration, and Locality of the Kingdom.</i>	
1. Kingdom is near	102
2. Kingdom is here	103
3. Kingdom is yet to be	104
4. General scheme of events that of the optimists	106
II. <i>The Members of the Kingdom.</i>	
1. Work among own people challenges orthodox particularism	107
2. Interest in incoming of Gentiles without proselytism	111

	PAGE
III. <i>The Factors in the Bringing in of the Kingdom.</i>	
1. Repentance toward missionary sacrifice	117
2. Servant conception of discipleship	120
3. Progress expected through sacrificial community	122
Summary of claims	123

CHAPTER III

THE CHARACTER OF THE MESSIAH

A. THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE.

"The Anointed" applied to two figures 129

I. *The Characteristics of the Messiah.*

1. Always God's delegate 130
2. Pre-eminent in righteousness. 130
3. Endowed with the wisdom of God 131

II. *The Human Messiah.*

1. A ruler, not always, but latterly of house of David 132
2. To secure adequate national supremacy for Israel 134
3. To be active in political action necessary thereto 135
4. Woes mostly inevitable war, and its accompaniments 137
5. Peace obtained to be sustained by peace of God 138
6. To rule righteous people by his scribe-prophet influence 139

III. *The Superhuman Messiah.*

1. Son of Man a real pre-existent somebody 141
2. Work begins at final Judgment, acting for God 143
3. To be revealed especially against native rulers and Seducers 144
4. Fusion with the idea of human Messiah 145
5. Afterwards dwells with glorified righteous 146
- Summary of conclusions 146

B. JESUS AND THIS TEACHING.

"The Anointed" never used by him of himself 148

I. *The Characteristics of the Messiah.*

1. God's delegate through leadership in sonship 149
2. Pre-eminence of his righteousness as seeking love 151
3. Himself the wisdom of God to men 152

II. *The Human Messiah.*

1. Dissociates himself from son of David idea 155
2. Refuses to think Israel's national supremacy necessary 157
3. To be no party to political action against Rome 158
4. Persecution and martyrdom substituted for usual war
 "woes" 161

	PAGE
5. Peace among men to arise entirely out of reconciliation to God	165
6. Everything left to prophetic appeal of his sonship	167
 III. <i>The Superhuman Messiah.</i>	
1. No idea of his own real pre-existence	170
2. Form of his faith in God as Vindicator of righteous	171
3. Appropriateness of expression of his faith in this form	172
4. Confusion with his use of 'son of man'	175
5. Reason of confusion	179
Summary of claims	180

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN

A. THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE.

I. *Man as Body and Spirit.*

1. Dichotomous view only one held	185
2. Spirit, soul, etc., practically equivalents	185
3. Greek disparagement of the body absent	186
4. Soul, or personality here, and retained hereafter	188

II. *Man as a Moral Being.*

1. Image of God more in moral capability than in rulership	189
2. Obligation, and development of conscience under the Law	190
3. Human freedom, whatever Divine determinism may be	192
4. Obligation and freedom illustrated from 4 Macc.	193

III. *Man's Early History.*

1. Legend of the Watchers	194
2. Story of the Fall	197
3. Doctrine of the <i>Yetzer</i>	203
Summary of conclusions	205

B. JESUS AND THIS TEACHING.

I. *Man as Body and Spirit.*

1. Agreement with apocalyptists' dichotomous view	207
2. Spirit and heart aspects of man's self	207
3. Same worthy idea of the body	208
4. Centrality of interest in soul as outliving death	209

II. *Man as a Moral Being.*

1. Image of God clearly defined as sonship	211
2. Obligation to be strong son of God	212
3. Freedom to become such	213
4. Obligation and freedom illustrated by own experience	214

	PAGE
III. <i>Man's Early History.</i>	
1. Effect of Watcher legend on language	215
2. Traces of Fall story.	216
3. Evidence of use of <i>Yetser</i> doctrine	218
Summary of claims	220

CHAPTER V

THE WAY OF SALVATION

THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE.

I. <i>The Idea of the Law.</i>	
1. Covenant or obligation in which joy taken	225
2. Righteousness by means of holiness	227
II. <i>The Idea of Righteousness</i>	
1. Justice and philanthropy	227
2. Virtues, with limited range of exercise	229
3. Quality of inwardness insisted on	231
4. Particular aspects—	
(1) Sin of adultery	233
(2) Duty to parents	234
(3) Wealth	235
(4) <i>Lex talionis</i>	236
III. <i>The Idea of Holiness.</i>	
1. Practical purpose in view	239
2. Cardinal commands—	
(1) Sabbath	239
(2) Circumcision—clean and unclean	243
IV. <i>The Fear of God.</i>	
1. Climax of Law's wisdom in love of God	246
2. Relation to and pre-eminence over love of neighbour	247
V. <i>The Treatment of Sin.</i>	
1. Ritual offences and moral delinquencies distinguished	249
2. Treatment of former by oblation, etc.	250
3. Necessity for repentance and reformation	252
4. Assistance by grace of God	254
5. Atoning value of almsgiving, etc.	255
6. Doctrine of merit and mercy of God	257
Summary of conclusions.	261

JESUS AND THIS TEACHING

I. <i>The Idea of the Law.</i>	
1. Appreciation of revelation in Torah	262
2. Violent departure from customs not premeditated	264

II. <i>The Idea of Righteousness.</i>	
1. Significant addition of seeking love toward sinner	266
2. Virtues exercised over much extended range	269
3. Deeper inwardness of saving love	272
4. Particular aspects—	
(1) Sin of Adultery	273
(2) Duty to parents	276
(3) Wealth	278
(4) <i>Lex talionis</i>	282
III. <i>The Idea of Holiness.</i>	
1. Loyalty and freedom in respect to Moses	284
2. Cardinal commands—	
(1) Sabbath	288
(2) Circumcision—clean and unclean	291
IV. <i>The Fear of God.</i>	
1. Reverence for God filial	293
2. Reverence for God expressed in brotherliness	294
V. <i>The Treatment of Sin.</i>	
1. Ritual offences and moral delinquencies separated	296
2. Disregard of the unintentional	297
3. Necessity for repentance and regeneration	298
4. Greater emphasis on grace of God	300
5. Absence of atoning value of almsgiving, etc.	302
6. Merit interpreted as filial obedience	303
Summary of claims	305

CHAPTER VI

THE HOPE OF THE HEREAFTER

A. THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE.	
Occasional retention of old idea of Sheol	311
I. <i>The Intermediate State.</i>	
1. Threefold division of Sheol	311
2. Paradise for the righteous	312
3. Darkness without fire for the wicked	315
II. <i>The Resurrection.</i>	
1. Spiritual after temporal Messianic Kingdom	317
2. Resuscitation and transformation for an eternal Kingdom on earth	319
3. Resuscitation for recognition and transformation after Judgment	321
4. Judgment by God or the Son of Man	324

CONTENTS

17

	PAGE
III. <i>The Final Doom.</i>	
1. Significance of death, and hope till Judgment.	325
2. Gehenna, antithesis of mystic experience of God as fire	327
Summary of conclusions.	329
 B. JESUS AND THIS TEACHING.	
Old idea of Sheol rejected and resurrection accepted	331
I. <i>The Intermediate State.</i>	
1. Hint of third division in Sheol	331
2. Paradise made home-like	332
3. Prison of outmost darkness retained	335
II. <i>The Resurrection.</i>	
1. Spiritual at the close of Kingdom on earth	337
2. Scene heaven, no interest in resuscitation and empty tombs	339
3. Not interested in process of change—spiritual resurrection	340
4. Judgment by the Son of Man on new principle	341
III. <i>The Final Doom.</i>	
1. Reasons for and signs of hope beyond death	343
2. Gehenna, as last and severest process of redemption	347
Summary of claims	349
 INDEX	
I. Important Subjects and Names	351
II. Passages from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	357
III. Passages from the Gospels	371

WORKS QUOTED

N.B.—The following works are quoted by name of author and page only, and where there is more than one work by the same author, the number which precedes each work is given before the page:—

- ABBOTT, E. A. The Son of Man.
- ABELSON, J.
I. The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature.
II. Jewish Mysticism.
- ABRAHAMS, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels.
- ALLEN, W. C.
I. St. Matthew (I.C.C.).
II. The Gospel according to St. Mark with introduction and notes.
- ANDREWS, H. T.
I. The Apocryphal Books of the Old and New Testament.
II. Article in "Mansfield College Essays."
III. Article in "London Theological Studies."
- ARNOLD, M. Literature and Dogma.
- BENNETT, W. H.
I. The Theology of the Old Testament.
II. The Life of Christ according to St. Mark.
- BEYSCHLAG, W. New Testament Theology, vol. i.
- BOUSSET, D. W. Die Religion des Judentums (1903).
- BOUSSET, W. Jesus.
- BOX, G. H.
I. The Apocalypse of Abraham.
II. The Ezra-Apocalypse.
III. The Book of Isaiah.
IV. Divorce in the New Testament.
- BRIGGS, C. A. The Messiah of the Gospels.
- BROWNE, L. E. The Parables of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Criticism.
- BRUCE, A. B.
I. The Parabolic Teaching of Jesus.
II. Apologetics; or Christianity defensively stated.
- BÜCHLER, A. Types of Jewish-Palestinian piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E., the Ancient Pious Men.
- BUCKLER, G. G. National Sentiment and Patriotism in the New Testament.
- BURKITT, F. C.
I. Jewish and Christian Apocalypses.
II. The Gospel History and its Transmission.
- BURNEY, C. F. The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.
- CAMPBELL, J. McLEOD. The Nature of the Atonement.
- CARPENTER, J. E. The Historical Jesus and the Theological Christ.

CHARLES, R. H.

I. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life.

II. The Book of Enoch.

III. The Book of Jubilees.

IV. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

V. The Assumption of Moses.

VI. The Apocalypse of Baruch.

VII. Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments.

VIII. The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce.

CLARKE, W. N. An Outline of Christian Theology.

DALE, R. W. The Atonement.

DALMAN, G. The Words of Jesus.

DALMAN, G. H. Christianity and Judaism.

DAVIDSON, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament.

DAVIES, T. W. The Relation of Judaism and Christianity (a pamphlet.)

DEISSMANN, A.

I. Bible Studies.

II. Light from the Ancient East.

DENNEY, J. Jesus and the Gospel.

DEWICK, E. C. Primitive Christian Eschatology.

DOUGALL, L., & EMMET, C. W. The Lord of Thought.

DRIVER, S. R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy (I.C.C.).

DRUMMOND, J.

I. The Jewish Messiah.

II. The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

DU BOSE, W. P. The Gospel in the Gospels.

DUHM, B. The Ever-coming Kingdom of God.

EDERSHEIM, A.

I. Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ.

II. The Temple: its ministry and service as they were at the time of Jesus Christ.

EMMETT, C. W. The Eschatological Question in the Gospels.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. The Place of Christ in Modern Theology.

FAIRWEATHER, W. The Background of the Gospels.

FERRAR, W. J. The Uncanonical Jewish Books.

FINDLAY, J. A. Jesus as they saw Him.

FLETCHER, R. J. The Christian Doctrine of Prayer.

FORREST, D. W.

I. The Christ of History and of Experience.

II. The Authority of Christ.

FORSYTH, P. T. The Person and Place of Jesus Christ.

FRIEDLANDER, G.

I. The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount.

II. The Grace of God.

III. Rabbinical Philosophy and Ethics.

IV. Hellenism and Christianity.

GARDNER, P. A Historic View of the New Testament.

GARVIE, A. E. Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus.

GLOVER, T. R.

I. The Jesus of History.

II. Jesus in the Experience of Men.

- GOODMAN, P. The Synagogue and the Church.
- GORE, C. The Sermon on the Mount.
- GOULD, E. P.
 I. The Biblical Theology of the New Testament.
 II. St. Mark (I.C.C.).
- GRENFELL, B. P., and HUNT, A. S. Sayings of our Lord from an early Greek Papyrus.
- GRIST, W. A. The Historic Christ in the Faith of To-day.
- HALL, T. C. History of Ethics within Organised Christianity.
- HARNACK, A.
 I. The Sayings of Jesus.
 II. What is Christianity.
- HARPER, A. The Book of Deuteronomy.
- HERFORD, R. T.
 I. Pharisaism.
 II. Christianity in Talmud and Midrash.
- HERSHON, P. I. Treasures of the Talmud.
- HERTZ, J. H. A Book of Jewish Thoughts (Soldiers' and Sailors' Edition).
- HIRSCH, S. A. "The Jewish Sibylline Oracles" in "A Book of Essays."
- HOLLMANN, G. The Jewish Religion in the Time of Jesus.
- HORT, F. J. A. The Christian Ecclesia.
- HUGHES, H. M. The Ethics of the Jewish Apocryphal Literature.
- JACKSON, F. J. FOAKES. The Parting of the Roads: Studies in the Development of Judaism and Early Christianity. Edited by.
- JACKSON, F. J. FOAKES, and LAKE, KIRSOPP (= J.L.). The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, vol. i.
- JACKSON, H. L. The Eschatology of Jesus.
- JAMES, M. R. The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament.
- JOSEPH, M. Judaism as Creed and Life.
- KENNEDY, H. A. A. Philo's Contribution to Religion.
- KING, H. C. The Ethics of Jesus.
- KOHLER, K. Jewish Theology systematically and historically considered.
- KUENEN, A. National Religions and Universal Religions.
- LAKE, K. The Stewardship of Faith.
- LAZARUS, M. The Ethics of Judaism.
- LECKIE, J. H. The World to come and Final Destiny.
- LEVY, S. Original Virtue, and other short studies.
- LIDGETT, J. S. The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement.
- LOISY, A. Les Évangiles Synoptiques.
- MACFARLAND, C. S. Jesus and the Prophets.
- MACKINTOSH, H. R. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ.
- MANSON, W. The Kingdom of God.
- MATHEWS, S.
 I. The Social Teaching of Jesus.
 II. A History of New Testament times in Palestine.
 III. The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.
- MARMORSTEIN, A. The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature.
- MCLACHLAN. St. Luke Evangelist and Historian.
- MCNEILE, A. H. The Gospel according to St. Matthew.
- MENZIES, A. The Earliest Gospel.
- MILLIGAN, G. Selections from the Greek Papyri.

- MOBERLY, R. C. Atonement and Personality.
- MOFFATT, J.
- I. The Theology of the Gospels.
 - II. The New Testament—a new translation.
- MONTEFIORE, C. G.
- I. The Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.
 - II. Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels.
 - III. The Synoptic Gospels.
 - IV. The Place of Judaism among the Religions of the world.
 - V. Judaism and St. Paul.
- MOULTON, J. H. A Grammar of the New Testament Greek, vol. i. Prolegomena.
- MOZLEY, J. K. The Doctrine of the Atonement.
- MUIRHEAD, L. A. The Eschatology of Jesus.
- NEUMANN, A. Jesus.
- NEWMAN, F. W. Hebrew Jesus.
- OESTERLEY, W. O. E.
- I. The Books of the Apocrypha.
 - II. The Doctrine of Mediation.
 - III. The Evolution of the Messianic Idea.
 - IV. The Doctrine of the Last Things.
 - V. Life, Death, and Immortality.
 - VI. Ecclesiasticus (Cambridge Bible).
- OESTERLEY, W. O. E., and BOX, G. H.
- I. The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.
 - II. A Short History of Rabbinical and Mediæval Judaism.
- PEABODY, F. G.
- I. Jesus Christ and the Christian Character.
 - II. Jesus Christ and the Social Question.
- PEAKE, A. S. (=P.). A Commentary on the Bible.
- PLUMMER, A.
- I. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.
 - II. St. Luke (I.C.C.).
- PORTER, F. C. The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers.
- RASHDALL, H. Conscience and Christ.
- REES, T.
- I. The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience.
 - II. Essay in "Mansfield College Essays."
- RIHBANY, A. M. The Syrian Christ.
- RIX, H. Rabbi, Messiah, Martyr.
- ROBERTSON, J. A. The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Jesus.
- ROBINSON, H. W. The Christian Doctrine of Man.
- RYLE, H. E., and JAMES, M. R. The Psalms of Solomon.
- SABATIER, A. Outline of a Philosophy of Religion, based on Psychology and History.
- SAVAGE, H. E. The Gospel of the Kingdom.
- SCHECHTER, S.
- I. Studies in Judaism.
 - II. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology.

- SCHMIDT, N. The Prophet of Nazareth.
- SCHÜRER, E. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.
(5 vols. 1890).
- SCHWEITZER, A. The Quest of the Historical Jesus.
- SCOTT, E. F.
I. The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology.
II. The Kingdom and the Messiah.
- SEELEY, J. Ecce Homo.
- SELWYN, E. G. The Teaching of Christ.
- SINGER, S. The Authorised Daily Prayer Book (Jewish).
- SMITH, D. The Days of His Flesh.
- SMITH, G. A. The Book of Isaiah, vol. ii.
- SMITH, W. R. The Religion of the Semites.
- SMYTH, N. Christian Ethics.
- SOUTER, A. A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament.
- STANLEY, A. P. Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church (vol. iii).
- STANTON, V. H.
I. The Jewish and Christian Messiahs.
II. The Gospels as Historical Documents,
Part II. The Synoptic Gospels.
- STEVENS, G. B.
I. The Theology of the New Testament.
II. The Johannine Theology.
III. The Christian Doctrine of Salvation.
IV. The Teaching of Jesus.
- SWETE, H. B.
I. The Gospel according to St. Mark.
II. The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint.
- TEMPLE, W. The Universality of Christ.
- TENNANT, F. R. The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin.
- THACKERAY, H. ST. JOHN. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary
Jewish Thought.
- THOMSON, J. E. H. Books which influenced our Lord and His Apostles.
- TOWNSEND, H. The Doctrine of Grace in the Synoptic Gospels.
- TOY, C. H. Judaism and Christianity.
- TYRRELL, G. Christianity at the Cross-Roads.
- WEISS, B. New Testament Theology.
- WENDT, H. H. The Teaching of Jesus (2 vols.).
- WERNLE, P. The Beginnings of Christianity (vol. i.).
- WESTCOTT, B. F. The Gospel according to St. John.
- WICKS, H. J. The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apoc-
lyptic Literature.
- WILLIAMS, A. L. The Hebrew-Christian Messiah.
- WINSTANLEY, E. W. Jesus and the Future.
- WORSLEY, F. W. The Apocalypse of Jesus.

ABBREVIATIONS

THE following abbreviations have also been used :—

- *A.P. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, edited by R. H. Charles.
- B.D.B. Hebrew and English Lexicon to the Old Testament, edited by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs.
- D.C.G. A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, edited by J. Hastings.
- D.B. A Dictionary of the Bible, edited by J. Hastings (5 vols.).
- E. The Expositor.
- E.B. Encyclopædia Biblica.
- E.G.T. The Expositor's Greek Testament.
- H.J. The Hibbert Journal.
- I. The Interpreter.
- I.J.A. The International Journal of the Apocrypha.
- J.E. The Jewish Encyclopædia.
- J.L. See above, Jackson and Lake.
- J.Q.R. The Jewish Quarterly Review.
- J.Th.S. The Journal of Theological Studies.
- LXX. The Septuagint.
- M.M. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, by J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan.
- N.T. The New Testament.
- O.T. The Old Testament.
- P. See above, Peake.

* See, also, for the individual books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the *italics* on pp. 27 ff.

NOTE.—The works of G. Friedlander, C. G. Montefiore, S. Schechter, G. H. Box, R. H. Charles and W. O. E. Oesterley, require special acknowledgment. The commentaries on the Gospels have been constantly in use, and the indebtedness to these is by no means adequately represented by the few direct quotations from them. *The passages from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha have been given, for the most part, in the translation to be found in A.P.* The Greek text of the Gospels has been translated so as to suggest often the order and emphasis of the words in the original, though occasionally difficult words have been freely paraphrased rather than translated—the works of G. Milligan, J. Moffatt, J. H. Moulton, and A. Souter being here of great service.

The author very cordially thanks the Rev. Prof. H. T. Andrews, M.A., D.D. for reading his MS., the Rev. S. Levy, M.A. for the scrupulous care he has bestowed upon the greater part of the proofs, and the Rev. Josiah Thomas, for such kindness as has added to the joy of honest toil.

INTRODUCTION

1. To appreciate fully the value of N.T. teaching a knowledge of the Apocrypha in its wider sense as including the Pseudepigrapha is as essential as a knowledge of the O.T.; in particular, the originality of Jesus cannot be clearly seen except by a careful study of the Gospels in comparison not only with the canonical books of the O.T., but also with these extra-canonical books of the period extending approximately from 200 B.C. to 100 A.D. It has been customary to say "that the apocalyptic writings lie for the most part outside the line of the purest Jewish development and often present but the fringe or excrescence, and not the real substance of the dominating religious thought. The fact that the originals of those which were written in Hebrew or Aramaic are nearly all lost, partly shows that they had no deep hold on the people, or were off the beaten track of the official religion" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 467). Another view of the facts is supplied by W. O. E. Oesterley, who says of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, "It cannot . . . be too strongly insisted upon that, although both these classes of literature were rejected by the Jewish religious leaders in Palestine, they reflected nevertheless the thoughts and convictions and aspirations of a large body of Jewish thinkers, and that the influence of these upon the bulk of the Jewish people was originally greater than that of the Pharisaic (i.e. official) party. . . . It is a fact which does not admit of contradiction that, speaking generally, the direct line of sequence runs thus: Old Testament, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha" (II, pp. 30 f.; cf. I.J.A., Oct. 1909, p. 78, July 1914, p. 68; E., Oct. 1909, pp. 289 f.; P., p. 636, L. Dougall, p. 10).

2. These extra-canonical books with dates as given in A.P. are as follows:—

Epistle of Jeremy	<i>Ep. Jer.</i>	just before 200 B.C.
Sirach or Ecclesiasticus	<i>Sir.</i>	180-175 B.C.
Tobit	<i>Tob.</i>	before 170 B.C.
Judith	<i>Jud.</i>	towards 150 B.C.
Sibylline Oracles iii, 97-819 (mostly)	<i>Sib. iii.</i>	about 140 B.C.
First Book of Maccabees	<i>1 Macc.</i>	125-100 B.C.
Second Book of Maccabees	<i>2 Macc.</i>	shortly before 106 B.C.
Book of Jubilees	<i>Jub.</i>	109-105 B.C.
Testaments of the XII Patriarchs	<i>Test.</i>	109-107 B.C.
Later Jewish additions thereto		mostly 70-40 B.C.

The Testaments are referred to separately as follows :—

Asher	<i>T.A.</i>	Issachar	<i>T.Iss.</i>	Naphtali	<i>T.N.</i>
Benjamin	<i>T.B.</i>	Joseph	<i>T.Jos.</i>	Reuben	<i>T.R.</i>
Dan	<i>T.D.</i>	Judah	<i>T.Jud.</i>	Simeon	<i>T.S.</i>
Gad	<i>T.G.</i>	Levi	<i>T.L.</i>	Zebulun	<i>T.Z.</i>
Third Book of Maccabees		3 <i>Macc.</i>		about 100 B.C.	
First Book of Enoch, Ethiopic		1 <i>En.</i>			
Chapters (i-v), vi-xxxvi				before 170 B.C.	
" lxxxiii-xc				before 161 B.C.	
" lxxii-lxxxii				before or about 110 B.C.	
" xci-civ				95-79 B.C., or 70-64 B.C.	
" xxxvii-lxxi (The Similitudes)				94-79 B.C., or 70-64 B.C.	
NOTE.—Fragments of an earlier work, The Book of Noah, preserved in this book are vi-xi, liv-lv, 2, lx, lxx-lxix, 25, cvi-cvii; cv. is an independent fragment, and cviii an appendix later than the original editor.					
Prayer of Azariah and Song of the Three Children		<i>Azar.</i>		Prayer, about 170-168 B.C. ; Song, probably some time after success of Maccabean revolt.	
				The addition as a whole probably 1st cent. B.C.	
Susanna		<i>Sus.</i>		95-80 B.C.	
Bel and the Dragon		<i>Bel.</i>		uncertain.	
Additions to Esther		<i>Add. Esth.</i>		at different times between 125 or 80 B.C. and 90 A.D.	
Prayer of Manasses		<i>P. Man.</i>		uncertain.	
First Book of Esdras		1 <i>Esd.</i>		uncertain.	
Psalms of Solomon		<i>Ps. Sol.</i>		about 50 B.C.	
Fourth Book of Maccabees		4 <i>Macc.</i>		63 B.C.-38 A.D.	
Zadokite Fragments		<i>Zad.</i>		18 B.C.-70 A.D., or more probably 18-8 B.C.	
Book of Wisdom		<i>Wisd.</i>			
Part I. i-ix. 7				50-30 B.C.	
Part II. ix. 8 to end				30 B.C.-10 A.D.	
Martyrdom of Isaiah		<i>Mart. Is.</i>		uncertain	
Assumption of Moses		<i>Ass. Mos.</i>		7-30 A.D.	
Second Book of Enoch, Slavonic		2 <i>En.</i>		1-50 A.D.	
First Book of Baruch, apocryphal		1 <i>Bar.</i>			
i-iii. 8 = A ; iii. 9-iv. 4 = B ;				shortly after 70 A.D.	
iv. 5-v. 9 = C				78 A.D. or later	
Sibylline Oracle iv		<i>Sib. iv.</i>		about 80 A.D.	
Apocalypse of Abraham (not in A.P.)		<i>Apoc. Abr.</i>		last decades 1st cent. A.D.	
Apocalypse of Moses (A.P., vol. ii. pp. 134-154)		<i>Apoc. Mos.</i>		original nucleus last decades 1st cent. A.D., present copy a slightly revised version.	

NOTE.—In A.P. this is part of the Books of Adam and Eve, *A. & E.*

Second Book of Baruch	2 <i>Bar.</i>	
apocalyptic		
xxvii-xxx. 1 = A 1; xxxvi-xl = A 2;		before 70 A.D.
liii-lxxiv = A 3		
i-ix. 1, xxxii. 2-4, xlili-xliv. 7, xlv-xlvi,		after 70 A.D.
lxxvii-lxxxii, lxxxvi, lxxxvii = B 1;		
ix. 2-xxv, xxx. 2-xxxii. 1, xxxii.		
5-xxxv, xli, xlii, xlii. 8-15, xlvii-lii,		
lxxv, lxxvi, lxxxiii = B 2; and lxxxv		
= B 3		
Fourth (or Second) Book of Ezra	4 <i>Ez.</i>	
Ezra Apocalypse, iv. 52-v. 13A, vi. 13-29		before 70 A.D.,
(vii. 26-44, viii. 63-ix. 12) = E		and possibly about 30 A.D.
Son of Man vision 13 (partly), = M		before 70 A.D.
		and later than E.
Eagle Vision, xi, xii (mostly), = A		69-79 A.D.
Salathiel Apocalypse, iii. 1-31, iv. 1-51,		about 100 A.D.
v. 13B-vi. 10, vi. 30-vii. 25, vii.		
45-viii. 62, ix. 15-x. 57, xii. 40-48,		
xiv. 28-35 = S; and Ezra piece,		
xiv. 1-17A, 18-27, 36-47 = E 2		
Redactor's date		about 120 A.D.

On some of the dates and analyses which are given above the judgment of certain other scholars would not perhaps be in entire agreement; see, for example, W. Sanday, in G. H. Box's edition of *The Ezra-Apocalypse*. For our purpose, however, such differences are not serious. The justification for the inclusion of writers who are dated in the Christian era is that "the material which these men employed was older, and in part even very old; we may, therefore, make use of their writings to depict the background of Christianity" (Carl Clemen, E., Oct. 1909, p. 292; cf. July 1916, p. 3). On the other hand, the circumstance that this literature has come down to us through Christian channels must be borne in mind, that we may steer clear of manifestly Christian additions. (For further particulars, see the introductions to the separate books in A.P., or W. O. E. Oesterley, I, and W. J. Ferrar, or H. T. Andrews, I.)

3. The Gospels are the sources of information for the second half of our subject. For the object in view, the teaching of Jesus is contained in his recorded sayings. This is a severe limitation, as C. G. Montefiore has in several places observed: "The life gives to the teaching its true significance and highest value. Divorced from the life, the words are shorn of half of their reality" (H. J., vol. iii. p. 650; cf. D. W. Forrest, II, pp. 7 f., 120; J. Seeley, pp. 95 f.; P. T. Forsyth, p. 36). In part, however, this limitation may be surmounted, since the words are so often life. "His teachings are the expositions of this life; the ideal which he set forth as the divine way of living he himself first lived" (S. Mathews, III, p. 132). The findings of such scholars as, for

example, V. H. Stanton, who accept the priority of Mark to the other Gospels, and the use of substantially our Mark and the Matthean Logia (different redactions) by Luke and the author of our Matthew are here assumed. A measure of later interpretation in association with the original substance of a saying of Jesus is recognised in some few places in the earlier Gospels as well as more extensively in the Fourth Gospel. In extremity, some verses even from the Synoptics purporting to give words of Jesus may have to be excluded from consideration. Where there is ambiguity, one of the meanings will have to be chosen, or else an exegetical departure made. Otherwise, the sayings of Jesus as they are given by these evangelists are taken as reliable data for the teaching of Jesus, and not, as F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake would have it even in the case of Mark, "far more a primary authority for the thought of the Apostolic Age than for the life of Jesus" (p. 268; cf. pp. 317 f.; F. W. Newman, pp. 14 f., 55; contrast F. W. Worsley, Book II, chap. i). As regards the material of the Fourth Gospel, there is much that is either the author's own, or so much the author's own as to make it difficult in most cases to arrive at the original saying; and yet there are some occasions when the real voice of Jesus may be heard, and others when echoes more or less distinct of that living voice may still be recognised. These will be of some service in our investigations.

4. The interest of Jesus in some part at least of the extra-canonical literature cannot any longer be doubted. H. G. Wood puts the case with caution: "With regard to the apocalyptic writings . . . the case is not so clear (as that for his use of certain parts of the O.T.); but it is difficult to resist the conclusion that at least the Book of Enoch and the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs must be ranked among the books which influenced our Lord as well as his Apostles. Where in the Gospels the title 'The Son of Man' is clearly Messianic, and the Son of Man is endowed with supernatural attributes, it is difficult to deny the influence of the Book of Enoch, as well as of Dan. vii. 13. The picture of the last judgment in Matt. xxv., as well as the conception of Gehenna, seems also to reflect the teaching embodied in Enoch. The bringing together of the two great commandments, and the teaching about forgiveness in the Sermon on the Mount, are apparently anticipated in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs. Whether or no there is direct literary dependence, it is clear Jesus accepted in some important particulars the language and thought of a circle which had been influenced by these apocalyptic writings" (P., p. 661; cf. I.J.A., Oct. 1917, pp. 56 f.; F. C. Burkitt, I, pp. 23, 25).

By far the greater part of the literature under review goes back to Semitic originals now lost. This loss was in part the

outcome of the ultimate dislike of these books by non-Christian Jews which matured shortly after the decisions of the Synod of Jamnia on the subject of the canon of O.T. Scripture (cf. F. C. Burkitt, I, p. 9; I.J.A., April 1912, p. 24). The Semitic originals probably did not long survive the development of this attitude of hostility; and besides, there arose a "rule which forbade the writing of any book that did not form part of the Old Testament, a rule faithfully observed until the Moslems had set the example of composing books other than their Koran" (D. S. Margoliouth, E., Aug. 1913, p. 164). Such translations as are now possessed are due almost entirely to the fostering care of the early Christian Church, which held to apocalyptic rejected finally by triumphant Pharisaism toward the close of the first century A.D., and to the use of the Septuagint version which had practically become ere this the Bible of the Christians—a reason sufficient for the rejection of that version by later Judaism (cf. I.J.A., Oct. 1907, p. 9; J.Th.S., vol. xiii. p. 333). At the best, therefore, we have but translations of the Semitic originals of most of the literature in which we are specially interested. In some cases we are at one stage farther from the originals, the Greek translations of the originals themselves being lost, and only translations of the Greek translations being available. The details of this need not, however, detain us. On turning to the main sources of information for the other section of our subject, a similar fact is to be reckoned with. In the Gospels we have at most only Greek translations of the sayings of Jesus. It follows, then, that exact quotation in the words of Jesus in proof of his use of any Jewish apocryphal book is hardly possible. Even where some close resemblance does appear, as, for example, in the reference to the sea in Luke xxi. 25—compare Ass. Mos. x. 6, quoted below, p. 174—a common source may have to be assumed (see R. H. Charles, V, pp. lxiv f.).

5. This literature has been read alongside of the Gospels in the hope of coming upon some similarities sufficiently close to prove direct literary dependence on the part of Jesus; but in vain (cf. I.J.A., April 1908, pp. 4 f.). The scanty results of this endeavour will emerge at points in the body of this thesis, where the possibility of reminiscence is suggested. With the present material it does not seem likely that much progress can be made in that direction. The close attention to similarities between the Gospels and these books which this effort has involved has, however, served to deepen the impression that Jesus had a sufficient acquaintance with, and appreciation of, the outlook of these writers to warrant us in speaking of a relation between his teaching and the type or types of teaching which they represent. Since with such as these writers leading the way popular thinking had in many matters moved on from the O.T. position, Jesus would have

been out of touch with much even of the ordinary religious thought of his time, and hence unintelligible to men of his generation, had there not been some such relation. J. E. H. Thomson's dictum that "any books commonly read in Judæa at the time might be said to have influenced Jesus; . . . whatever the books read, our Lord's teaching would of necessity be modified by them, even though he might not have read them" (pp. 11 f.), should be extended to books read in Galilee, where, it is thought (cf. R. H. Charles, VII, pp. 156 f.; P., p. 660), there was a freer and perhaps finer religious life than in Judæa. "Our Lord's teachings implied a certain kind and degree of culture toward which His exhortations were directed" (J. E. H. Thomson, p. 475; cf. I.J.A., July 1915, p. 45).

There is good reason for giving more heed to the suggestion that "we should revise somewhat the idea we hold of the educational system and opportunities available in the time of Christ. . . . There was probably connected with the synagogue a very fair and quite adequate system of education." Jesus "could read, for he was invited to do so at Nazareth, and that means that he could read Hebrew, which apart from religious worship was practically a dead language. . . . The picture in Luke of Christ among the doctors may have more history behind it than we recognise" (W. E. Orchard, I.J.A., July 1915, pp. 48 f.; cf. H. Rashdall, p. 165). "At the synagogue school which he would have attended while yet he was a little boy he learned to read the difficult script of the sacred rolls, so that at twelve years of age he could argue with the learned Rabbis at Jerusalem, and later in the synagogue at Nazareth find the passage he wanted and read and interpret in the popular Aramaic, so that 'many hearing him were astonished'" (C. Hargrove, H.J., vol. xiv. p. 368; cf. E.B., 1195-1201; D.B., vol. i. pp. 649-651, vol. v. pp. 54 f.; D.C.G., vol. i. pp. 222 f.; J.E., vol. v. pp. 43; F. Schürer, II, ii. pp. 47-52). Jesus now impresses us as a studious Jew of the working classes whose reading covered much more than the books of the canonical O.T.; he seems to have had at his disposal a very considerable educational equipment. His liking for Capernaum may have been due in part to the opportunities for reading afforded by its large synagogue.

6. It is proposed, then, to set forth the teaching of these writers on God, the Kingdom, the Messiah, Man, Salvation, and the Hereafter, and in each case to indicate the relation of Jesus thereto. In every chapter, Section A, containing the teaching of this literature, and Section B, dealing with Jesus and this teaching, have been arranged as far as possible in parallelism to each other so that on any point comparison may be easily made.

CHAPTER I

THE IDEA OF GOD

A—THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE

IN justification of his own statement of the Christian conception of God, W. N. Clarke points out that the following must be covered in any such doctrinal expression: the nature of God, the character of God, the relation of God to all other existence, and the motive of God in His relation to all other existence (p. 66). Under these headings, therefore, is here arranged what is to be learned from our writers concerning their idea of God.

I. THE NATURE OF GOD.

I. The pantheistic conception is absent. These writers think themselves as having to do with a living and personal God. The only passage in which there is even a semblance of any other idea on examination is found to be in harmony with this statement. Sir. says: "And the conclusion of the matter is: He (i.e. God, is all" (xliii. 27). The Hellenistic complexion of this clause cannot, however, conceal the real intention of the author to express his conviction that the supreme fact everywhere is God. Jahveh to him is as much the Lord of nature distinct from, and yet working through, His creation as ever He was to the most enlightened of O.T. saints. "How awe-inspiring is the work of Jahveh! . . . great is Jahveh that made him (i.e. the sun). . . . Moreover, the moon He made for its due season. . . . At the word of the Holy One they (i.e. the stars) take their prescribed place. . . . Behold the rainbow and bless its Maker . . . the hand of God has spread it out in pride. His might marks out the lightning. . . . By His mighty power He makes strong the clouds. . . . By His counsel He has stilled the deep, and has planted the islands in the ocean. . . . And at His word what He wills is done. . . . He is all" (xliii. 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 23, 26, 27). Ben Sira would say of God as a comparatively recent Jewish saint, Baalshem, has said: "If you do not see the world in the light of God, you separate the creation from its Creator. He who does not fully believe in this universality of God's presence has never properly acknowledged God's Sovereignty, for he excludes God from an existing portion of the actual world" (S. Schechter, I, p. 25). The only title of Jahveh in our Sir. passage, "the Holy One" (ver. 10),

is just the title which most of all implies distinction from the universe, the one, therefore, least consistent with the pantheistic idea of God, the expression, "He is all," would at first appear to suggest. "Judaism is very serious in its assertion of what is often called the divine transcendence and the divine personality. If there is one direction . . . in which it is one-sided, and in which it must, perhaps, remain one-sided, it is here—in a certain bias against Pantheism" (C. G. Montefiore, IV, pp. 44 f.; cf. M. Joseph, p. 76). So our writers.

2. The very number, and much more the character, of the titles these writers give to God are very indicative of their fixed habit of thought not to confuse the Deity with His universe. This is very impressively brought to one's notice by an examination of the references in the index of H. J. Wick's book under "titles of God," where every reference is to the section in which he treats of the transcendence of God. These titles, for the most part, may be classified as follows: (1) Those which merely suggest God's superiority to, or separation from, the universe. He is, e.g., "the Most High" (Sir. xxiii. 23), "the Most High God" (Jub. vii. 36), "the Holy One" (1 Bar. iv. 22), "the Holy God" (Sib. iii. 478), "the Great Glory" (1 En. xiv. 20), "the Holy and Great One" (1 En. lxxxiv. 1), "the Head of Days" (1 En. xlvi. 2), "God . . . dwelling in the highest" (Psa. Sol. xviii. 11), "Lord God of heaven" (Jud. vi. 19), "the heavenly God" (Sib. iv. 51), "the almighty living God of heaven" (3 Macc. vi. 28), etc. (2) Those which define that superiority, or separation, as being that of a ruler or king. He is addressed or described as, e.g., "the Great King" (1 En. xci. 13), "holy King" (3 Macc. ii. 13), "the everlasting King" (Tob. xiii. 6), "a great King and righteous" (Psa. Sol. ii. 36), "the King of kings" (2 Macc. xiii. 4), "Lord of lords" (1 En. ix. 4), "the God of Gods" (Apoc. Abr. viii), "the Lord of Spirits" (1 En. xxxvii. 2), "the Lord of the sheep" (1 En. xc. 20), "the very Lord of all the ages" (Jub. xxxi. 13), "Lord of all, King on the lofty throne" (Ass. Mos. iv. 2), etc. (3) That which adds the fatherly conception of rulership, a care for men amounting in some instances to a parental interest in the individual.

It is not difficult, and may be useful, to give an exhaustive list of the passages which fall under this head. Some regard God as the Father of the privileged people: "And I will be their Father and they shall be My children . . . every angel and spirit shall know . . . that these are My children, and that I am their Father in uprightness and righteousness, and that I love them . . . and all shall know that I am the God of Israel and the Father of all the children of Jacob" (Jub. i. 24 f., 28); "He is our Lord, and He our God, and He our Father" (Tob. xiii. 4); "all the sons of the great God (cf. ver. 296, 'the Great Father') . . . gladden

with hymns God our Father throughout our households" (Sib. iii. 702, 726); "the God the Father (*προπάτωρ*) of all holy among the holy ones" (3 Macc. ii. 21); "the almighty Lord and ruler of all power, their merciful God and Father" (3 Macc. v. 7); "O Father, Thou didst destroy Pharaoh" (3 Macc. vi. 4); "Thou didst restore him (i.e. Jonah), O Father, uninjured to all his household" (3 Macc. vi. 8); "fighting on their side continually as a father for his children (*υἱῶν*)" (3 Macc. vii. 6); "upon the destruction of the firstborn they confessed the people to be God's son (*Θεοῦ υἱόν*)" (Wisd. xviii. 13; cf. xvi. 26). To some it is a fatherhood which has reference to all: "the Immortal Father of gods and of all men" (Sib. iii. 278); "reverence the name of the Father of all" (Sib. iii. 550); "Pardon him, Father of all, for he is Thine image . . . delivered into the hands of the invisible Father, even our God" (Apoc. Mos. xxxv. 2 f.); "the Father of all . . . took Adam" (Apoc. Mos. xxxvii. 4). The sonship corresponding is sometimes moral fitness for high office involving real communion in spirit with God as Father: "the Most High has heard your prayer, to separate you from iniquity, and that you should become to Him a son, and a servant, and a minister of His presence" (T.L. iv. 2); "the first who is anointed to the priesthood shall be great, and shall speak to God as to a father" (T.L. xvii. 2); "the heavens shall be opened, and from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification, with the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac, and the glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him" (T.L. xviii. 6); "and the heavens shall be opened unto him, to pour out the spirit, (even) the blessing of the Holy Father" (T.Jud. xxiv. 2). God is also clearly the Father of the individual in the following: "O Lord, Father and God of my life" (Sir. xxiii. 1-4A); "I will thank Thee, my God, my Father" (Sir. li. 1, Heb.); "O Jahveh, my Father, art Thou" (Sir. li. 10); "Thy providence, O Father, guides it along" (Wisd. xiv. 3). Moral uprightness is implied in the right of the individual to God as his Father: "Be as a father to orphans . . . then God will call you 'son'" (Sir. iv. 10); "for he shall know them, that they are all sons of their God" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 30); "the latter end of the righteous he calls happy; and he vaunts that God is his father . . . if the righteous man is God's son (*υἱὸς Θεοῦ*) he will uphold him" (Wisd. ii. 16, 18; cf. ver. 13, "servant (*παῖδα*) of the Lord"); "How was he numbered among sons of God! (*υἱοῖς Θεοῦ*)" (Wisd. v. 5). Cf. in Rabbinical literature, A. Büchler, pp. 106 f, 220, 248).

The very remarkable frequency of such titles as are given in (1) and (2) throws into some obscurity the few instances of the title under (3). This confirms C. H. Toy's statement that "taking into account all the circumstances, it seems probable that the idea of the fatherhood of God was, in the beginning of the first century of

our era, not unfamiliar to advanced religious circles" (p. 86). The possible influence of these advanced circles on synagogue ritual makes it likely that Father in heaven, "one of the greatest watchwords of spiritual religion . . . can only have come into use in the time between the Maccabees and Jesus; and no other source for it can be deemed so probable as the synagogue, the home of the religion of Torah" (R. T. Herford, I, p. 124). Compare Pirke Aboth v. 23, "To do the will of your Father in heaven." And yet the Great King who rules and judges was still the familiar conception. But whether clearly as King or dimly as Father, God was distinct from and superior to His subjects or children. The idea of God as a person not to be identified with the universe, or confused with any part or aspect of it, remains in these writers,—a grand heritage from the religious life of their people, which they are not in the least disposed to surrender.

3. "God no one has seen yet at any time" (John i. 18) is also axiomatic for them. "There is no antagonism of thought between those who use anthropomorphic expressions and those who avoid them. . . . Anthropopathic expressions are sparingly used by some writers, and do not appear at all in a few of the books. By the majority of the authors they are used quite freely in each century, nor is there any difference in this respect between Palestinian and non-Palestinian writings" (H. J. Wicks, p. 122). Ben Sira asks: "Who has seen Him, that he may tell thereof" (xl. 31). In the idea of 1 En., "None of the angels could enter and could behold His face by reason of the magnificence and glory, and no flesh could behold Him" (xiv. 21). God Himself invisible is sometimes represented as revealing Himself by fire—a materialisation of the mystical phenomenon of the Divine Presence (cf. J. Abelson, I, p. 216; II, p. 39); e.g. in Sib. iii. 705 f.: "He by Himself shall shield them, standing beside them alone in His might, encircling them, as it were, with a wall of flaming fire"; and in Apoc. Abr. xvi f., where Abraham tells how the angel said to him: "Remain by me; fear not! And He whom you see come straight toward us with great voice of holiness—that is the Eternal One who loves you; but Himself you cannot see," and then goes on to say what happened: "And while he yet spoke, lo! fire came against us round about, and a voice was in the fire like a voice of many waters, like the sound of the sea in its uproar. And the angel bent his head with me and worshipped." So 2 En. xxii. 4B makes Enoch in the tenth heaven say that he "could not see the Lord God," while Sib. iv. 10-12 is very explicit: "He is one Whom none can see from earth, nor measure with mortal eyes, seeing He was not fashioned by mortal hand. With all-embracing view He beholds all, yet Himself is seen by none."

All other phenomena relevant here can be explained in accord-

ance with these statements. Very frequently there is the language of vision: "I saw the Head of Days" (1 En. xlvii. 3). "He shall be seen sitting upon the throne of judgment" (4 Ez. vii. 33 Ar.), which it would be a mistake to take other than poetically. This is easily proved by a consideration of passages from 2 En. Enoch says: "I am one who has seen the Lord's face" (xxxix. 3A), yea more, "I have seen the Lord's eyes" (ver. 4); and at once a case of crudest anthropomorphism is suspected. These verses are, however, immediately paralleled in the same chapter by others which show how ungrounded is such suspicion; in verse 5 we read: "I have seen the Lord's right hand filling heaven as He helped me," and in verse 6: "I have seen the Lord's limitless and perfect compass, which has no end,"—compare, "no work can remain hidden before the Lord's face" (lxvi. 5). The poetic character of these expressions is made even more manifest by reference to the chapter already quoted in the previous paragraph: "I saw the appearance of the Lord's face. . . . I saw the Lord's face, but the Lord's face is ineffable" (xxii. 1A), and to chapter xlvi, where the writer's real view emerges: "From the invisible He made all things visible, Himself being invisible" (ver. 5). In other connections the usual religious poetry makes its appearance; so even the author of *Wisd.* does not hesitate to refer to "the Lord's hand" (v. 16) which shall cover the righteous; Sib. iii. also, who is fairly careful in this matter, asks: "Who has put error in your heart, that you should . . . forsake the face of Mighty God?" (vers. 548 f.); and 4 Ez. in like terms comes very near to the thought of Matt. v. 8: "They (i.e. the righteous) are hastening to behold the face of Him Whom in life they served" (vii. 98). Hence, though W. Fairweather does no more than admit "that in at least one of the most important Apocryphal books, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, there is an appreciable development towards a more spiritual idea of God" (D.B., vol. v. p. 281), it should be maintained that even the writer of *Jud.*, the book of this literature in which he thinks the conception of God is lowest, had no need to be reminded of the fact that "God is spirit" (John iv. 24). All these writers would subscribe to the idea of the Similitudes that God is "the Lord of Spirits."

II. THE CHARACTER OF GOD.

1. "Assuming that justice and mercy are the two complementary aspects of holiness, justice is the aspect emphasised in the O.T. It may be regarded as distinctively the O.T. attribute or virtue" (D.B., vol. ii. p. 826). A very substantial part of the creed of our writers could be given in such O.T. terms as, "Just and right is he" (Deut. xxxii. 4), "a just God and a saviour"

(Isa. xlv. 21), "for the Lord is righteous; He loves righteousness: the upright shall behold His face" (Psa. xi. 7). To take extreme cases, Sib. iii. 260 speaks of one perishing "by divine justice," and in 4 Macc. xii. 12 deliverance "unto a more rapid and an eternal fire and torments . . . to all eternity" is conceived to be the work of "the divine justice." Jub. may be allowed to expound this divine justice: "He is the living God, and He is holy and faithful, and He is righteous beyond all, and there is with Him no accepting of (men's) persons and no accepting of gifts: for God is righteous, and executes judgment on all those who transgress His commandments and despise His covenant" (xxi. 4; cf. Sir. vii. 5, xxxv. 12).

The seriousness with which this idea of God is held is nowhere better seen than in the manner in which the manifest inequalities of this life are faced, and a solution is sought for the problem of the suffering of the righteous (cf. S. Levy, pp. 48 f.). Suffering is very generally regarded as a penalty for sin; the justice of God is seen in experiences which are thought to be His punishments for wrongdoing. "Because you moved God to wrath, you were delivered unto your adversaries" (1 Bar. iv. 6); "for this cause (i.e. sin) has God stricken such an one marvellously, and smitten him to the uttermost" (Sir. x. 13; cf. xxxviii. 9 f.). Normally, righteousness should bring material prosperity. "Work uprightness and righteousness before Him, that He may have pleasure in you and grant you His mercy, and send rain upon you morning and evening" (Jub. xx. 9). The principle of solidarity is enunciated. The fifth of the martyrs in 2 Macc. addresses the tyrant: "Go on, and you will find how His sovereign power will torture you and your seed" (vii. 17); and the last of them understands his own sufferings as the completion of the national punishment: "I, like my brothers, give up body and soul for our fathers' laws, calling on God to show favour to our nation soon . . . and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and in my brothers" (vers. 37 f.). God's justice is here sometimes safeguarded by the suggestion that the children have followed their fathers in committing sin. "They sinned against Thee and disobeyed Thy commandments, and Thou gavest us for spoil and captivity, and death. . . . And now Thy many judgments are true in exacting from me the penalty of my sins, because we did not keep Thy commandments and walked not truly before Thee" (Tob. iii. 4 f.). The corrective function of trial is not lost sight of. Judith is certain that "The Lord scourges them that come near unto Him, to admonish them" (viii. 27); and Sib. iii. understands that "the Eternal shall impose on all men retribution and famine and woes and groans, war, too, and pestilence and fearful calamities. . . . And then at length

to God the great King, the Eternal, they shall bend the white knee upon the fruitful earth" (vers. 601-3, 616 f.). This helps to distinguish the case of the righteous individual in affliction from that of others: "Happy is the man whom the Lord remembers with reproving, and whom He restrains from the way of evil with strokes, that he may be cleansed from sin, that it may not be multiplied. He that makes ready his back for strokes shall be cleansed, for the Lord is good to them that endure chastening" (Psa. Sol. x. 1 f.). (Cf. A. Büchler, pp 176 ff.).

Further, life is not complete, and anything may happen suddenly before death. "Envy not the ungodly man, for you do not know what his destiny shall be. Take no pleasure in the arrogant that prospers, remember that he shall not escape unpunished till death" (Sir. ix. 11 f.). By right conduct under trial it may be demonstrated to denizens of the unseen that there are folk on earth who "fear God for nought." The evil spirit, Mastema, having proposed to God to command Abraham to offer Isaac "as a burnt offering on the altar," that God may "see if he will do this command," and "if he is faithful in everything," is "put to shame" by the patriarch's manifest will to obey (Jub. xvii. 16, xviii. 12). What people suffer may constitute an atonement to God for their own sin. "The Lord spares His pious ones, and blots out their errors by His chastening" (Psa. Sol. xiii. 9). It may, too, be for the good of others that they pass through periods of adversity. Joseph illustrates the "prophecy of heaven . . . that a blameless one shall be delivered up for lawless men, and a sinless one shall die for ungodly men" (T.B. iii. 8). The most valuable possession of all may be left untouched by the direst calamity. "Get wisdom in the fear of God with diligence; for though there be a leading into captivity, and cities and lands be destroyed, and gold and silver and every possession perish, the wisdom of the wise nought can take away, save the blindness of ungodliness, and the callousness (that comes) of sin" (T.L. xiii. 7). Besides, there is a life beyond in which the losses of this life will be compensated for. "Though in the sight of men they (i.e. the righteous) be punished, their hope is full of immortality; and having borne a little chastening, they shall receive great good, because God tested them, and found them worthy of Himself" (Wisd. iii. 4 f.). And even if an adequate explanation is not to be found, they must have faith that what has come upon them must be right. "His ways . . . though past finding out, are right" (2 Bar. xlv. 6).

This wrestling with the problem of suffering is due largely to their firm belief in the inexorable justice of God; as Ben Sira says: "The Lord alone shall be justified" (xviii. 2). (For the same idea in Rabbinical literature, see S. Schechter, I, chap. viii). This

jealousy for the justice of God may also be seen in their theories of the entrance of sin into human experience (see below, pp. 194-205). Their attitude, too, to the Gentile world is determined according as their thought is on the wickedness of the heathen world which God's justice must punish, or on those elements of good in pagan life which He cannot, since He is just, let go unrecognised, or as it moves now certainly, now uncertainly, between these two (see below, pp. 90-96).

2. In very remarkable subordination to this idea of God as just is the idea of Him as loving. The scantiness of the references to God under this aspect is impressive. Some can contribute all they have to give without a single direct allusion to the love of God. Only by a very fine exercise of imagination is it possible to infer any tenderness in their conception of God. So, for example, the authors of the various sections of 1 En. Too much, however, should not be made of this, since the kindness of God in apocalypses usually recedes. Compare, "compassion shall pass away . . . and longsuffering be withdrawn" (4 Ez. vii. 33). Kindness, conceivably, has been of little avail with some people. This phenomenon is observable even in the N.T. Apocalypse, where outside the first three chapters there is only one reference to God as Father (xiv. 1), and the solitary allusion to His love is in the phrase "the beloved city" (xx. 9).

The love of God to Israel appears with some frequency in this literature. "How the Eternal loves these men!" (Sib. iii. 711). "I bear in mind my brethren, the love of Him . . . Who loved us from of old, and never hated us, but above all educated us" (2 Bar. lxxviii. 3). Even so, it is not often expounded or emphasised as a love which persists irrespective of the moral condition of Israel. The more usual thought is that God's love is toward the righteous in Israel. It is of a regenerate Israel that Jub. speaks: "They will fulfil My commandments, and I will be their Father, and they shall be My children . . . in uprightness and righteousness, and . . . I love them" (i. 24 f.; cf. Wisd. iii. 9). Among those whom the Messiah shall know as "sons of their God," the psalmist does not include "any man that knows wickedness" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 29 f.). The fact that certain Jews have been excommunicated as "sinners" limits the statement: "Thy love (is) toward the seed of Abraham, the children of Israel" (xviii. 4; cf. I.J.A., April 1907, p. 13). So the solitary mention of God's love in A 3 of 2 Bar.: "the land . . . was then beloved by the Lord . . . because its inhabitants sinned not" (lxi. 7; cf. xxi. 21; 4 Ez. iv. 23). Accordingly individuals of eminent piety are singled out for special mention as Jahveh's beloved. Of Enoch it is said, "The Lord conceived love for him and received him" (title 2 En. A.). Abraham is referred to in prayer as "beloved of Thee"

(Azar., ver. 12; cf. T. Iss. i. 1; 4 Ez. iii. 14), also addressed as "Friend of God Who loves you" (Apoc. Abr. x.). Joseph says of himself: "The Lord loved me" (T. Jos. i. 4). So more generally: "Everyone who does the Law of the Lord shall be loved by Him" (T. Jos. xi. 2); "God loves him who in a den of wickedness combines fasting with chastity" (ix. 2). "If you work that which is good, my children, . . . the Lord shall love you. . . . Be therefore wise in God . . . and prudent, understanding the order of His commandments, and the laws of every word, that the Lord may love you" (T.N. viii. 4, 10); "They that serve her (i.e. wisdom) serve the Holy One, and God loves them that love her" (Sir. iv. 14); "For nothing does God love save him that dwells with wisdom" (Wisd. vii. 28); "Being found well-pleasing unto God, he (i.e. the righteous individual) was beloved of Him" (iv. 10). This accounts for the frequency with which the hatred of God comes up in these books (e.g. Sir. xii. 6, xxvii. 24; T.N. viii. 6; Wisd. xii. 4; 3 Macc. vi. 9, etc.), and gives the key to what is intended. "The Lord hates what is unjust" (2 En. lxvi. 2). The hatred of God is essentially His dislike of the morally bad condition of people (2 Bar. lxiv. 4; cf. lix. 6; contrast T. Jos. x. 2)—something, therefore, no more unlovely or unlovable in God than in man—"the evil-hating justice of the all-surveying God" (Add. Esth. xvi. 4). (Contrast H. J. Wicks, e.g. p. 332). Where there is an appearance of anything less worthy, Oriental rhetoric is to be allowed for (as e.g. in 1 En. lxxxix. 59 f.; xciv. 10; Wisd. iv. 18; Apoc. Abr. xxiii.; 4 Ez. xiii. 28).

Love which continues, sin notwithstanding, is, however, recognised. "And loving the house of Israel, Thou didst promise that if there should be a falling away, and distress should overtake us, and we should come to this place and make our supplication, Thou wouldst hear our prayer" (3 Macc. ii. 10). In 4 Ez. Uriel speaking for God informs the seer that the limit is not in sight "of the love that I have declared unto My people" (v. 40); and with the seer who has feelings because "the other nations . . . are nothing" (vi. 56), God remonstrates: "You come far short of being able to love My creation more than I!" (viii. 47). The following, then, is not entirely alone in this literature: "For Thou lovest all things that are, and abhorrest none of the things which Thou didst make; for never wouldst Thou have formed anything, if Thou didst hate it. . . . Thou sparest all things, because they are Thine, O Sovereign Lord, Thou lover of souls . . . that escaping from their wickedness they may believe on Thee, O Lord" (Wisd. xi. 24-xii. 2; cf. i. 6, vi. 7; Apoc. Abr. xvii). This means more than that the love of God is an attitude of His justice toward the righteous. A love that will not let the sinner go is not entirely absent from the mind of these writers. It is sometimes

subordinate in their thinking, and apt on occasions to be forgotten ; but it is perhaps more often assumed than first impressions would lead one to suppose, as, for instance, when God is spoken of as merciful (Sir. xviii. 11-14) or compassionate (4 Ez. vii. 132-140). (Compare the silence on the Fatherhood of God in R. W. Dale's book on *The Atonement*.) Some idea of this love of God is involved in the confession of faith to which all these writers would subscribe : " Thou, our God, art gracious and true, longsuffering, and in mercy ordering all things " (Wisd. xv. 1 ; cf. Sir. ii. 11, 18, v. 4 ; 3 Macc. vi. 3 ; cf. in Rabbinic literature, G. Friedlander, III, p. 256 ; also see K. Kohler, pp. 113 f.). Note further, mercy in connection with the doctrine of merit, treated below, pp. 257-261.

III. THE RELATION OF GOD TO ALL OTHER EXISTENCE.

I. All would agree with Sib. iii. that God is " eternal " and " immortal " (vers. 101, 276) ; with Sir., that He is the all-seeing God, " beholding all the ways of men, and looking into secret places ; for all things are known unto Him before they are created, so also (He sees them) after they are perfected " (xxiii. 19 f.) ; and with 4 Ez., that He is the Almighty, " Whose word is sure, and behest constant " (viii. 22). Hence, He " created all things together " (Sir. xviii. 1), " created from non-being, and visible things from invisible " (2 En. xxiv. 2), " created man in the likeness of his own face " (xliv. 1), " created the world out of formless matter " (Wisd. xi. 17). Probably this passage from Wisd. is no exception to the rule, that in these books God is the Creator not in the attenuated sense of architect and builder up of previously existing matter, but with the full connotation of His being the originator of the matter as well as of the arrangement of it. The prophets begin their survey with the birth of the nation ; the apocalyptists always with the creation of the world. Salathiel addresses God : " O Lord my Lord, was it not Thou Who in the beginning, when Thou didst form the earth—and that Thyself alone—didst speak and commandedst the dust, so that it gave Thee Adam, a lifeless body ? But yet it was both itself the formation of Thy hands and Thou breathedst into him the breath of life, so that he was made living before Thee " (4 Ez. iii. 4 f.) ; and later God says : " Even then had I these things in mind ; and through Me alone were they created, as also the End (shall come) through Me and none other " (vi. 6). The beginning of creation was His own unmediated act ; so also will be that which brings the end of creation.

But God is not only present at the beginning and the end ; He is also to be found at every point between these extremes. In the interval He is not an absentee Lord ; He is the real governor

in the affairs of His creatures. "The nearness of God to His creatures is an implication of His very nature. A remote God is no God" (M. Joseph, p. 81). These writers are not deists, whose God is so remote from human experience that His intervention after the first creative act was not to be looked for. There is no limit to the wide range of God's interest in, and influence upon, the course of events in the universe; it is a universe with God always and everywhere in it. He can use all the forces of nature for His purposes: "Observe the heaven, you children of Heaven (i.e. righteous Israelites), and every work of the Most High, and fear Him and work no evil in His presence. If he closes the windows of heaven, and withholds the rain and the dew from descending on the earth on your account, what will you do then?" (1 En. ci. 1 f.). The inaccessibility of God spoken of immediately after does not refer to any essential remoteness of God, but to the usual barrier,— "crooked thoughts separate from God" (Wisd. i. 3),—to man's approach to God which sin forms. "And if he sends His anger upon you because of your deeds, you cannot petition Him; for you spoke proud and insolent words against His righteousness: therefore you shall have no peace" (ver. 3). God has been, still is, and always will be the most potent factor in the history of Israel. In 1 En. lxxxix-xc., He is the Good Shepherd who from the Exodus onward has pastured them and is leading them on through the dark valley of the present affliction to the green pastures of the future Messianic period. The same controlling hand is visible in Gentile history. "The rule over the world is in the hands of God, and at the right time He sets over it one that is worthy. In the hand of God is the rule of every man, and He invests the commander with his dignity" (Sir. x. 4 f.). The angels also are subject to His will, and do all their work "before the Lord's face . . . before the Lord at His footstool" (2 En. xix. 5 f.). And what influence the demons have is by His permission and not independent of His control. It is the "Lord Creator" who says: "Let the tenth part of them remain before him (i.e. Mastema, their chief), and let nine parts descend into the place of condemnation"; so "Satan on the earth" by the Divine consent is left with only "a tenth part" of his forces (Jub. x. 9, 11).

The idea of His omniscience may be given in the words of Moses: "All the nations which are in the earth God has created and us, He has foreseen them and us from the beginning of the creation of the earth unto the end of the age, and nothing has been neglected by Him, even to the least thing, but all things He has foreseen and caused all to come forth. (Yea) all things which are to be in this earth the Lord has foreseen, and lo! they are brought forward (into the light)" (Ass. Mos. xii. 4 f.). "The lights

of the heaven, the foundations of the earth have been made and approved by God and are under the signet ring of His right hand" (ver. 9), and at any crisis it is God Himself who "will go forth, who has foreseen all things for ever" (ver. 13). Psa. cxxxix is echoed in 2 En.: "The Lord sees all things. . . . If you look to heaven, the Lord is there: if you take thought of the sea's deep and all the under-earth, the Lord is there" (lxvi. 3 f.). This supervision is not over peoples only, but is carried out with a particularity which takes full cognisance of the individual. "The eye of Jahveh watches him for good" (Sir. xi. 12). H. J. Wicks (p. 59) finds the author of 1 En. i-xxxvi guilty of holding the "false idea of transcendence," but with the following reservation: "It is important also to observe that even in En. i-xxxvi God is represented as exercising an immediate influence on the mind of Enoch. Normally, God is remote from man in that book, yet it is clear that the writer regarded Him as One who can and does come into an immediate contact with chosen men at times" (p. 125). On direct approach to God in prayer, see below, pp. 52-55.

In this literature, then, there are represented different aspects of Judaism, other schools of thought from those which have given the Targums, since if W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box (contrast J. Abelson, I) have to be followed "in the Targums a very pronounced transcendentalism is taught; so much so that the thought of the divine working in the hearts of men directly seems to be almost entirely eliminated. Moreover, this one-sided doctrine of God is in so far antagonistic to the Old Testament teaching in that it altogether does away with the belief in God as the God of history; for the divine transcendence as taught in the Targums is such that God is represented as one who is too holy and of necessity too separate from human affairs to take any interest in man and his doings" (II, pp. 46 f.). It has been contended that "the later apocalyptic developments of Judaism represented a strong reaction against the severely transcendent doctrine of God which prevailed in those days," as, for example, by Baldensperger, also that "a much simpler and warmer piety accompanied the more popular forms of apocalyptic religion" (W. Manson, pp. 98 f.). Our impression is that in justice to these people we shall have to go very much farther in this direction than has been usual, and express ourselves with more reserve when speaking of "the frigidness of legalism."

Here, for example, the significance of angels and wisdom for the religious life of our writers must be more sympathetically considered. Where each has a definite function of its own, they are best understood as complementary. While Jub. may be most impressed with the ministry of angels, and Sir. and Wisd. with the activity of wisdom, 2 En. holds them together in one system of thought concerning God. The belief in angels has more

in view the *true* transcendence of God, the doctrine of wisdom more the *true* immanence of God. The italicising of *true* in each case is intended to bring to the front what has already been established above, that the latter is nowhere pushed as far as pantheism, and that the former is nowhere allowed to become deism. Where, therefore, angels are brought on the scene, the anxiety of the writer is to conserve the spirituality of God: where wisdom appears, the chief concern is to maintain the spiritual presence of God everywhere (cf. "the Memra," J. Abelson, I, p. 159; J.E., vol. vii. pp. 464 f.; G. Friedlander, III, p. 107).

2. G. W. Gilmore has pointed out, in dealing with the influence of Zoroastrianism on Jewish doctrine in the inter-Testamental period, that angels, one of the doctrines met by Hebrew communities in the East, was just the impetus needed to develop the content of the faith implicit in the doctrine of God's providence. "The result was, however, not brought about simply by borrowing Zoroastrian doctrine . . . but by unfolding the germs already present in Israel's own religion" (I.J.A., Jan. 1915, p. 13). The appropriation of this angelology was so effected as to leave the genius of the religion of Israel unaltered. That angels were often regarded as realities distinct from God need not be doubted; but that distinctness from God was, however, never so put as to make God dwell, as it were, on the farther side of the angel, remote from man. The angel's presence was virtually God's presence (Jub. xvi. 1; cf. Gen. xviii. 1); the effect of the introduction of an angel was to bring God near and yet to keep Him spirit. So God focussed, so to speak, at a particular spot or series of clearly defined places is an angel. Hence in 3 Macc. angels as "His holy face" make their appearance (vi. 18). In the Test. Simeon speaks of the special providence which saved Joseph from falling a victim to his jealousy thus: "His God and the God of his fathers sent forth His angel, and delivered him out of my hands" (T.S. ii. 8). Tobit assured his son of divine protection on his journey by reference to an angel: "God who is in heaven preserve you there and restore you to me in safety and His angel accompany you with deliverance, child" (v. 17), and in similar terms comforted his wife: "Fear not for them, sister, for a good angel shall go with him" (v. 22; cf. Ep. Jer. ver. 7). This is seen most where a writer essays to speak of a revelation from God in the form of a conversation. "The angel of peace" is Enoch's guide (1 En. xl. 8, lii. 5, liii. 4). "There was a natural disinclination to bring the Godhead down into human conditions, and for supernatural conversations angels formed a convenient substitute for God. Such a use was quite compatible with a full sense of personal communion with God in every-day life" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 430; cf. J. Abelson, I, pp. 13 f., 128, 145, 196, 217).

Sometimes angels approximate to poetic figures. To speak of natural phenomena as the writer of Jub. does, where he refers to "the angels of the spirit of the winds, and the angels of the spirit of the clouds" etc. (ii. 2), is to use the poetry which has taken up the element of truth in polytheistic thinking, and gone on to something higher (cf. K. Kohler, p. 183). God is now separated from phenomena, but phenomena are still inseparable from Him. "O Lord," says the seer, "that dwellest eternally, Whose are the highest heavens, Whose chambers are in the air, Whose throne is beyond imagination, Whose glory inconceivable; before Whom (heaven's) hosts stand trembling, and at Thy word change to wind and fire" (4 Ez. viii. 20 f.). "Heaven's hosts" changing "to wind and fire" is just God effective through nature, yet not Himself nature. Similarly, angels introduced as mediators in prayer: "To . . . the holy ones of heaven, the souls of men make their suit, saying, Bring our cause before the Most High" (1 En. ix. 3). "His righteous angels . . . petitioned and interceded and prayed for the children of men" (xxxix. 5; cf. xl. 6). "The holy ones who dwell above in the heavens shall unite with one voice and supplicate and pray" (xlvi. 2) for the vindication of the righteous. "Raise your prayers as a memorial and place them as a testimony before the angels, that they may place the sin of the sinners for a memorial before the Most High" (xcix. 3; cf. ver. 16; Tob. iii. 16, xii. 12, 15; 1 En. xc. 22; T.L. iii. 5). This is perhaps no more than saying in a very impressive way in the language of the time, that when one prays something really happens over and above the subjective effect upon the praying mind (cf. T.L. v. 6 f.; T.D. vi. 2, 5; T.B. vi. 1). So when things have gone beyond the power of prayer to alter them, it is said that the angels refuse intercession. Michael refuses to interpose on behalf of the fallen angels, saying to Raphael: "I will not take their part under the eye of the Lord; for the Lord of Spirits has been angry with them, because they do as if they were the Lord" (1 En. lxviii. 4).

In this connection there is seen a tendency to substitute, for angels proper, righteous and glorified men. In the Beyond men distinguished for goodness continue the office of mediator which they had fulfilled here. Moses tells Joshua, who had been troubled lest on his leader's death "they have no advocate to offer prayers on their behalf to the Lord": "The Lord has on their behalf appointed me to (pray) for their sins and (make intercession) for them" (Ass. Mos. xi. 17, xii. 6; cf. i. 14). So also the phrase "for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (T.A. vii. 7), should probably be taken as referring to "intercession of the fathers" (2 Bar. lxxxv. 12); compare, "for Adam's sake . . . his prayers and intercession" (A. and E. xxi. 2). Jeremiah illustrates "prayers of the prophets" (2 Bar. lxxxv. 12); for during his lifetime his

"prayers" were "as a strong wall" (2 Bar. ii. 2), and after death he is still "the lover of the brethren, who prays fervently for the people and the holy city" (2 Macc. xv. 14). Enoch, however, is pre-eminent here, occupying among these much the same place as Michael does among the angels. In what he does he is often indistinguishable from the latter. He is the heavenly "scribe of righteousness" (1 En. xii. 3 f., xv. 1; 2 En. xxii. 11 f., xl. 13, lxiv. 5; cf. on Michael 1 En. lxxxix. 76, xc. 14, 22; Apoc. Mos. xiii. 2; and intercessor even for the Watchers (1 En. xiii. 4, xv. 2), 2 En. vii. 4, xviii. 7); his intercession fails, Michael refuses to intercede (1 En. lxxviii. 4), two ways of emphasising the Watchers' hopeless plight; and he, like Michael, mediates in revelation (1 En. lxxv. 2; cf. lxxi. 3; Apoc. Mos. iii. 2, xiii. 2). In 4 Ez., as in 2 Bar., it is the intercession of men, not of angels, which matters; and no mediation on their part means no hope of salvation, the arrival of the Day of Judgment when destinies cannot be reversed (4 Ez. vii. 102-115; cf. 1 En. liii. 1; 2 Bar. lxxxv. 12).

There is not anywhere discernible the idea of gradations of being at the top of which stands God, and at the bottom of which stands man, with necessary intermediate beings between these extremes without whom God and man could never meet at all. Angels in the religious speech of Judaism suggested real operations of God. It was not so much that God did things through angels, but that it was God as angel Who did them. These people would probably have agreed, had it been put to them in that way, that God was made angel and dwelt among them. One who thought after that fashion could not be a believer in a far-off deity. It is not that the angel comes between the worshipper and God, but that the angel makes the worshipper realise very vividly the reality of God's presence. "The truth is that God was in many senses brought very near, and the angel was but an aspect of this nearness" (J. Abelson, II, p. 54; cf. O.T. teaching thereon, A. B. Davidson, chap. ix. 1). This interpretation is probably truer to the best religious experience of the time than the more usual one represented, for example, by G. Hollmann, who in one sentence says, "that the religious longing to perceive the divine power in daily life is satisfied by means of the angels," and in the next goes on to say that these angels "stand between man and God, who retires into the distance" (p. 44). It should not be so readily assumed that "in the popular faith" of Judaism in the time of Jesus "the angels received a prominence which endangered monotheism itself" (p. 76).

3. Wisdom is God not under the aspect of special visitor on occasions, but of permanent resident. Here the foreign influence is Greek, but again while this thought-form is adopted, the content of the thought is supplied by the moral and religious genius native

to Israel. Wisdom "has power to do all things and . . . renews all things; and from generation to generation passing into holy souls, she makes them friends of God and prophets" (Wisd. vii. 27; cf. 2 En. xxx. 8, xxxiii. 4); "a spirit that loves man" and "fills the world" (Wisd. i. 6 f.; cf. vii. 23, xii. 1; Apoc. Abr. xvii); "knows all things and has understanding thereof" (Wisd. ix. 11; cf. ver. 17); "instructs . . . and enlightens all who give heed" (Sir. iv. 11; cf. vi. 22, xxxviii. 24); "upon all flesh in measure, but without measure . . . to them that love Him" (Sir. i. 10; cf. vi. 25-28, xvii. 7),—the only remoteness possible being that occasioned at any time by the refusal on the part of "the children of men" to find a suitable "dwelling-place" (1 En. xlii. 2); hence, "Wisdom will not enter into a soul that devises evil . . . the holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit" (Wisd. i. 4 f.; cf. Sir. xxiv. 8; 1 Bar. iii. 30 f.). "Wisdom is more mobile than any motion . . . pervades and penetrates all things by reason of her pureness . . . is a breath of the power of God, and a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty" (Wisd. vii. 24; cf. viii. 1); "a spirit . . . loving what is good . . . and penetrating through all spirits that are quick of understanding" (vers. 22 f.); it is in human experience "right guidance" (2 Bar. xxxviii. 2), as Baruch in prayer says; "And the Law which is amongst us will aid us, and the surpassing wisdom which is in us will help us" (2 Bar. xlvi. 24). Nowhere is this religious and moral nature of wisdom more clearly stated than in 4 Macc.: "Wisdom I take to be the knowledge of things, divine and human, and of their causes. This I take to be the culture acquired under the Law, through which we learn with due reverence the things of God and for our worldly profit the things of man. Now wisdom is manifested under the forms of judgment, and justice, and courage, and temperance" (i. 16-18; cf. Sir. ix. 15, xxxvii. 16). Thus wisdom (= "word," Wisd. ix. 4) is the spirit of God in the life of man (cf. J. Abelson, I. p. 200), and "in kinship unto wisdom is immortality" (Wisd. viii. 17; cf. xv. 3). Wisdom also is the omnipresent spirit of God in history who "guarded to the end the first formed father of the world . . . when . . . the earth was drowning with a flood . . . saved it. . . . While the ungodly were perishing . . . delivered a righteous man (i.e. Lot). . . . When a righteous man was a fugitive from a brother's wrath . . . guided him (i.e. Jacob) in straight paths . . . showed him God's kingdom, and gave him knowledge of holy things. . . . When a righteous man (i.e. Joseph) was sold . . . forsook him not . . . delivered him," also under Moses "delivered a holy people and blameless seed from a nation of oppressors" (Wisd. x. 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 15). This is wisdom as the providence of God. (Cf. "word," Wisd. xviii. 15; also G. Friedlander, IV p. 70; J.E., vol. viii. p. 464.)

The doctrine of wisdom sometimes covers the same facts in life as the belief in angels. So wisdom may do precisely what the angels are said to do in passages quoted above; see, e.g., *Wisd. i. 9*. This very wisdom concentrated at a point becomes the "good angel" referred to, for instance, in *2 Macc. xi. 6, xv. 23*; the latter is then simply the wisdom of God become angel. Much which from the point of view of God's transcendence is done by angels, from the point of view of God's immanence may also be thought of as issuing directly from His wisdom. The tendency was to drop reference to angels when face to face with prevailing Greek culture, and to unify as wisdom all influences having their source in God. In view of this practical equivalence of angels and wisdom,—one writer saying that the angels do what another regards as the work of wisdom (see further below, pp. 254 f.)—what W. O. E. Oesterley says should be carefully scrutinised: "The lack of teaching on Mediation which is characteristic, in general, of the Apocrypha, and the, on the whole, fuller and more developed teaching of the Pseudepigrapha, represent evidently two schools of thought within Judaism" (II, p. 195). In the Apocrypha he has to except *Tob. and 2 Macc.* Our interest in drawing attention to his treatment of the subject centres in the following remarks of his on *Sir. and Wisd.*: "In the reference to the final Judgment . . . the idea of the intercession of the righteous on behalf of sinners is altogether absent. It is this silence concerning the subject in passages where mention of it might reasonably be expected which is so significant" (p. 33). But in precisely the same situation such mediation is blankly refused in *4 Ez.*, as we have shown above (p. 49) and as this writer himself notes. The facts might better be stated thus: wisdom has been mediating taking the place of angels or angelic men elsewhere; hence, what is called "silence concerning the subject" is an impression really due to the silence now assumed by wisdom (e.g. *Sir. xi. 26*; *Wisd. v. 1 ff.*; cf. *I.J.A.*, July 1910, p. 62), who with some men has failed as mediator,—the same catastrophe as other writers allude to when they say that Michael refuses intercession, or Enoch fails in his intercession, or intercession is no longer permissible.

IV. THE MOTIVE OF GOD IN HIS RELATION TO ALL OTHER EXISTENCE.

1. It is regarded "as certain that, even before the Maccabean era, the Temple worship included, apart from the sacrifices, prayer, confession, reading and explanation of Scripture, the *Shema* and the Ten Commandments being accorded special prominence, and *Psalms*. These are the elements, belonging to the non-sacrificial part of the Temple worship and practised daily, which constitute

the foundation of the daily worship of the synagogue" (W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, II, pp. 174 f.; cf. K. Kohler, pp. 266 f.). The rise of the synagogue gave to prayer an importance in the religious life of the people which hitherto it had not obtained. The experience of prayer "must always constitute an important element in that portion of the evidences for the being of God which is drawn from human consciousness" (D.B., vol. iv. p. 42). The very frequent appearance of prayer in these writings becomes, therefore, exceedingly significant.

2. That our writers were men of prayer cannot be made too much of. Our literature supplies abundant reason for hesitation before such statements as the following be accepted without reservation: "The effect of the covenant theory upon the religious consciousness of the Jew was to discipline somewhat severely the precativè instinct. . . . Nor did the post-exilic theology lay very much stress on prayer. . . . If exile generated a tendency to more spiritual views and a greater reliance on prayer, the pendulum swung back after the return" (R. J. Fletcher, pp. 8-10). In most of these books prayer is definitely mentioned, and examples of people at prayer are given. Ben Sira is impressed with prayer as a means to self-control (xxiii. 3-6), to enlightenment on the difficult duties of a counsellor (xxxvii. 15), to the case of the poor being heard by a God of justice who would show no partiality (xxxv. 17), and to the recovery of the sick (xxxviii. 9-14). Tobit and Sarah alike seek God in prayer for release even by death from their distressing circumstances (iii. 1-6, 13-16); the former's instruction to his son on leaving home includes: "And bless the Lord at all times, and ask of Him that your ways may be made straight, and that all your paths and counsels may prosper" (iv. 19); the newly married couple on the first evening of their married life pray together: "Tobias rose up from the bed, and said unto her, Sister, arise; let us pray. . . . And she arose and they began to pray" (viii. 4 f.) for a blessing on their home; and since the happy issue out of his own troubles has cleared his vision with regard to the providence of God in the affairs of his own people, the old man lets his soul go out to God in a hymn of prayerful thanksgiving (xiii.; cf. 1 Esd. iv. 58-60). In Jub. the great prayer times of the patriarchs are carefully marked; e.g. Abraham's habit of prayer in youth keeps him from the surrounding idolatry and its associated "uncleanness and vileness" (xi. 17); on the eve of leaving Haran for Canaan he prays for guidance, and particularly for deliverance "from the hands of evil spirits who have dominion over the thoughts of men's hearts" (xii. 20); twice on the same spot he makes prayerful acknowledgment of God's providence (xiii. 8, 16), and so on (see x. 3-7, xxii. 7-9, 28-30), Rebecca even appearing in the rôle of a prayerful mother,

"when the spirit of righteousness descended into her mind" (xxv. 14).

Other books also bear testimony to the idea these writers had of the patriarchs as prayerful folk (cf. in Rabbinic literature, "Abraham introduced the morning prayer . . . Isaac . . . the afternoon prayer . . . Jacob the evening prayer" G. Friedlander, III, pp. 83 f.). 1 En. represents Enoch as saying: "After that (i.e. after the awakening from the vision of the destruction of the earth) I arose and prayed and implored and besought, and wrote down my prayer for the generations of the world" (lxxxiii. 10)—the prayer then given being a trustful committal of his posterity to the wisdom of God (lxxxiv). In the Test. Reuben signifies in reference to his recovery from a long illness: "And had not my father Jacob prayed for me to the Lord, the Lord would have destroyed me" (T.R. i. 7); the prayer of this righteous man availing much also in a similar experience which Gad says he had (T.G. v. 9; cf. T.B. x. 1); it is told how "Levi, girt about with sackcloth, prayed for us all unto the Lord. And when the storm ceased, the ship reached the land as it were in peace" (T.N. vi. 8); sorely tempted by the lustful solicitations of his master's wife, Joseph finds his protection in prayer: "I remembered the words of my father, and going into my chamber, I wept and prayed unto the Lord" (T.Jos. iii. 3); "I gave myself yet more to fasting and to prayer, that the Lord might deliver me from her" (iv. 8); "I knelt before the Lord all day, and all the night; and about dawn I rose up, weeping the while and praying for a release from her" (viii. 1; cf. vii. 4); in like manner Gad thinks of prayer as an insurance of the mind against covetousness: "If a man prospers more than you, do not be vexed, but pray also for him, that he may have perfect prosperity" (T.G. vii. 1; cf. T.S. iii. 5 f.).

In Judith the people in their extremity seek God in prayer (iv. 9, 13, vi. 18 f., vii. 19), and the heroine is fortified for her dreadful task by prayer (ix, xii. 6, 8, xiii. 4, 7; cf. xi. 17). In 1 Macc. their coming through every crisis is attributed not to the arm of flesh, but to God's help given in response to prayer; after prayer Judas organises his forces (iii. 46 f.), and whoever the enemy be, whether Gorgias (iv. 10), or Lysias (iv. 30; cf. 2 Macc. xi. 6, xiii. 10), or Nicanor (vii. 40; cf. 2 Macc. viii. 2, 29), he is confronted by people who have just prayed. This phenomenon does not favour the idea that, because this writer "never mentions the Divine Name," preferring to use "Heaven" for "God" (see e.g. ii. 21, iii. 50, iv. 10, xvi. 3), "his conception of God is so transcendental as to become almost deistic" (H. M. Hughes, p. 71). The attitude of mind in 2 Macc. is fairly represented thus: on the eve of battle "committing the outcome of it to the Creator

of the world, and charging his men to fight stoutly, even to death," after victory confessing "This was due to the help of God's protection" (xiii. 14, 17; cf. 2 Macc. iii. 15, 18, 20 f., x. 16, 26, xv. 27; 1 Macc. v. 33, xi. 71). When the scene is in Egypt, as it is mostly in 3 Macc., the subject is just as much as ever the deliverance of a praying people, considerable space being given to examples of the type of prayer offered (ii. 1-20, vi. 1-15; cf. 2 Macc. i. 2-5, 24-29). The Add. Esth. give the prayers of Mordecai and Esther (xiii. 12-17, xiv. 3-19); and faith in what prayer may do is beautifully put in Mordecai's dream: "And they cried unto God; and from their cry, as it were from a small spring, there came up a great river, even much water" (xi. 10). Theodotion's version gives the prayer of the falsely accused Susanna: "O everlasting God, that knowest the secrets, that knowest all things before they be: Thou knowest that they have borne false witness against me, and, behold, I must die; whereas I never did such things as these men have maliciously invented against me" (Sus., vers. 42 f.), the basis on which such a prayer rests being finely put in Ep. Jer.: "But say in your hearts, O Lord, we must worship Thee (i.e. a living God, not a dead idol). For Mine angel is with you, and I Myself care for your souls" (vers. 6 f.). The P. Man. is interesting in that it is an example of the approach of a very sinful individual to God: "The sins I have sinned are more in number than the sands of the sea . . . forgive me, O Lord, forgive me" (vers. 8, 13). The Psa. Sol. emphasise that "the Lord is good to them that call upon Him in patience" (ii. 40); "The Lord hears the prayer of every one that fears God, and every request of the soul that hopes for Him the Lord accomplishes" (vi. 8); "Thine ears listen to the hopeful prayer of the poor" (xviii. 3).

In Wisd. Solomon states the outcome of his prayer: "For this cause I prayed, and understanding was given me: I called upon God, and there came to me a spirit of wisdom" (vii. 7; cf. viii. 21, ix.); and "xvi. 27, 28, contains a beautiful illustration with regard to prayer. As manna has to be gathered at daybreak, lest it should melt in the heat of the sun, so we must rise at daybreak to gather spiritual food by prayer" (D.B., vol. iv. p. 42). Baruch's message is: "Be of good cheer . . . cry unto God" (1 Bar. iv. 21; cf. ver. 27); and the assumption of 1 En. is that "the prayer of the righteous" will "not be in vain" (xlvii. 2); just as in Apoc. Abr. God is addressed as He "Who receives the prayers of such as honour" Him (xvii), "every single prayer of man" (xxv). The mediatorship of Moses in Ass. Mos. (xi. 17) is of the kind open to the specially prayerful mind in every age; it in no way implies the impossibility of direct approach to God on the part of others (cf. iv. 1). The accessibility of the throne of grace is nowhere better seen than in Sib. iv, where non-Jews are exhorted in prayer

to "seek forgiveness" (ver. 166). The enlightenment, too, which the Apocalypists value so highly is what comes only to the prayerful soul. Baruch "prayed and said, O Lord, my Lord, Thou dost always enlighten those who are led by understanding. Thy Law is life, and Thy wisdom is right guidance. Make known to me therefore the interpretation of this vision" (2 Bar. xxxviii. 1-3). The recurring seven days' fasts in 4 Ez. (v. 20, vi. 35, ix. 26 f.) which precede every revelation are just periods of prayerful preparation, even though indeed it is represented that not till the end of the seven days did prayer become articulate. Hence, as in Rabbinic theology, so here prayer is given a place of singular importance, and, to quote J. Abelson: "prayer is only possible when the Deity is comprehended under the double aspect of the transcendent and the immanent. It is futile to pray to a merely transcendent God because He is too far removed to hear or interfere. To the pantheist prayer is an absurdity" (I, p. 39; cf. pp. 323, 329; also K. Kohler, pp. 270 ff). False transcendentalism characterised the thought of these writers as little as did pantheism.

3. No occasional introduction of intermediaries can do away with the impression which this set of phenomena gives that God was directly accessible to the seeking mind everywhere. Books which countenance mediation are not less emphatic on direct approach to God, since nearly the whole of this literature has contributed to the material just given. "The presence of God is attainable without any such interpository etiquette" (I. Abrahams, p. 140). God is attentive to the cry of the prayerful whoever they be and wherever, being moved to such attention, on the one hand, by a regard for justice to His creatures, and, on the other, from a desire for their religious and moral purity. The former manifests itself in that providence which is ensuring the ultimate triumph of the right, securing *en route* certain remarkable deliverances; the latter, in the revelation which fortifies the soul beset by temptation to moral unworthiness in the present, or else harassed by doubts and fears about the future. God's motive, therefore, was thought to be the production and vindication of morally worthy souls. His interest is general in that He seeks the establishment of a community in fellowship with Himself; particular, in that such a community can only come to be as there are individuals in His fellowship. This particularity is one of the best fruits of the period, as R. T. Herford says: "The Torah made the religion of Israel personal and individual to a far greater degree than it had been before; and it did so by conveying to the individual Jew not merely the legal precept, but the prophetic fervour, the joy and the inspiration of personal communion with God as well as the high privilege of serving Him" (I, p. 73, cf. A. Büchler, pp. 89, 106).

To summarise conclusions : In this literature God is thought of as a person living and moving and having His being in very real distinction from, and yet in very intimate relation to, His universe. In this relationship He is regarded much more as the Great King than as the loving Father. He is, in nature, spirit, Whose presence is recognisable only by the instinct of the devout mind. In character He is first and foremost just, these writers being convinced that somehow the entrance of sin, the experience of suffering, the reprobation of the Gentiles in general, and the acceptability to Him of usually but a few of these were facts reconcilable therewith. When His love comes to the fore, for the most part it is the approval by His supremely just mind of such as have in their life and conduct met His righteous demands on them ; but the yearning love for the sinner which waits to be merciful is not altogether lacking, and probably is assumed more often than appears on the surface. Eternal, All-seeing, Almighty, He is the Creator of everything there is, and is ever and everywhere present in His universe with His hand firmly on all things—sometimes at certain peculiar moments very really felt near as an angel, and at all times discernible as the wisdom which unfolds itself in providence and in the mind of man. He is looked upon as being in all things moved by desire for the establishment of a community worthy of Himself—individuals in character exactly to His mind being a *sine qua non* of a community in accordance with His will. This investigation results, then, in parting company with such as W. Fairweather, when he says : “ Jewish Apocalyptic literature is . . . characterised by a transcendental conception of God and His relation to the world. . . . The result of this whole way of conceiving of God and His relation to the world was the development of an elaborate hierarchy of angels and spirits in order to bridge the gulf thus created between God and man, and so meet what was felt to be an intellectual necessity ” (pp. 279, 281) ; and in joining S. Schechter who feels “ how unphilosophical the idea of those writers is who maintain that the rigid monotheism of the Jews makes God so transcendental that He is banished from the world . . . it is just this assertion of His absolute Unity which not only suffers no substitute for God, but also removes every separation between Him and the world (I, p. 143 ; cf. p. 76). On the other hand, on the question of the Fatherhood of God, the impression derived from this literature is accurately reflected in C. H. Toy’s statement : “ Gradually the paternal relation, as expressing most completely the combination of guidance and tenderness, came to be employed as the representative of God’s relation to man. . . . Still, it does not seem to have been a favourite conception ; the Jewish national feeling was strong enough to depress it ” (p. 84 ; cf. J. Abelson, II, pp. 79 f.).

B—JESUS AND THIS TEACHING

I. THE NATURE OF GOD.

1. JESUS explored the paternal relation of God to the human soul. God therefore is thought of by him as living and personal in the superlative degree. This degree, new and original, marks the inauguration of a distinct era in human acquaintance with God—the outcome of a moral and spiritual experience in which intimacy with and distinction from God were felt in the highest intensity. “All (i.e. a full revelation) has been given over (i.e. as the outcome of religious experience) to me (i.e. as an open-minded child) by (God as) my Father. And no one recognises the Son (i.e. this Sonship in me) except (God as) the Father (to me); and the Father (i.e. this Fatherhood of God) no one recognises except (me who have the experience of being) the Son (i.e. of Sonship), and he to whomever the Son wills (i.e. I as having this experience of Sonship chooses) to reveal (i.e. this secret of my religious experience)” (Matt. xi. 27 || Luke x. 22; cf. John i. 18; also E. W. Winstanley, pp. 197–199; A. Harnack, I, p. 297, II, Lecture VII (5); E. F. Scott, II, p. 154). “When Jesus testifies that all things are delivered unto Him by ‘His Father,’ and adds that only ‘the Son’ and ‘the Father’ are mutually known to each other, the statement may be understood as a reference to a real relationship which exists universally between a father and a son, and thus finds also an application as between Jesus and His Father”—(G. Dalman, pp. 193 f.; cf. J. A. Robertson, pp. 19 ff.). Thus in harmony with our writers and their predecessors, Jesus keeps far away from that fusion of the human with the Divine which is so characteristic of all forms of pantheism. He surpasses them all, however, in his experience of real personal union with God. “Jesus indeed was animated by a strong, one may even say a unique, sense of his own relation to and unbroken intercourse with God” (I. Abrahams, p. 142; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 118; P. Goodman, p. 277). His conviction was that the secret of union with God was not in mystic dreaming, but in intense personal communion.

2. The Gospels reveal on his part, however, no pedantic avoidance of popular titles for God. “The Most High” (Luke vi. 35)

may owe its present place in his recorded words to Luke's personal predilection, but there is no real reason against his use of this title ; E. A. Abbott remarks that " Luke's ' Most High ' seems to represent the original " (p. 574). G. Dalman (pp. 179, 183, 197) has also suggested that where " Lord " in one Gospel is dropped out altogether, or is rendered " God " in another, or appears in O.T. quotations, " the Name " was the actual term which was used by Jesus, thus : " Report to them how great things the Name has done for you " (Mark v. 19 || Luke viii. 39). " When he says the Name is the God of Abraham " (Luke xx. 37 || Mark xii. 26, Matt. xxii. 32), " unless the Name had cut short the days " (Mark xiii. 20 || Matt. xxiv. 22). " You should love the Name your God " (Mark xii. 30 || Matt. xxii. 37, Luke x. 27), " the Name said to my Lord " (Mark xii. 36 || Matt. xxii. 44, Luke xx. 42) ; and that elsewhere " God " in our records sometimes represents " the Name " or " Heaven " in the original utterance, thus : " What then the Name (or ' Heaven ') has yoked together, let not man separate " (Mark x. 9 || Matt. xix. 6). " You cannot serve the Name (or ' Heaven ') and Mammon " (Matt. vi. 24 || Luke xvi. 13). The preference is to be given to " the Name " (see further below, pp. 148, 154), since in our Gospels there is no consistent attempt to remove " Heaven " in the sense of " God,"—a fact which confirms the judgment which has been given above (p. 53), that such a usage implies reverence for God, but not the remoteness of God.

The phrase " the Kingdom of Heaven," which is so characteristic of Matthew, is simplified for Hellenistic readers into " the Kingdom of God " by Mark and Luke ; but also " reward in heaven " = " reward with God " (Matt. v. 12 || Luke vi. 23), " inscribed in heaven " = " inscribed with God " (Luke x. 20), " treasures in heaven " = " treasures with God " (Matt. vi. 20 || Luke xii. 33 ; cf. Matt. xix. 21 || Mark x. 21, Luke xviii. 22), " bound (or ' loosed ') in heaven " = " bound (or ' loosed ') by God " (Matt. xvi. 19 ; cf. xviii. 18), " joy in heaven " = " joy with God " (Luke xv. 7 ; cf. xix. 38) ; and possibly " from heaven " = " from God " (Matt. xxi. 25 || Mark xi. 30, Luke xx. 4), " sinned against heaven " = " sinned against God " (Luke xv. 18 ; cf. ver. 21), " angels in (or ' of ') heaven " = " angels with (or ' of ') God " (Matt. xxii. 30, xxiv. 36 || Mark xii. 25, xiii. 32), and " ' the Son of Man ' in heaven " = " ' the Son of Man ' with God " (Matt. xxiv. 30). Once Jesus is made to refer to God as " the Power," which in Rabbinical literature is frequent for the name of God (see G. Friedlander, III, p. 177), thus : " the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Power " (Mark xiv. 62 || Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xxii. 69),—an instance which our own version has obscured, and Luke has elucidated by the addition, " of God." This may be the relic of a more extensive use ; e.g. " the power

of God" (Mark xii. 24 || Matt. xxii. 29) may be another case where "of God" is explanatory; and in the clause "'the Son of Man' coming . . . with great power and glory" (Mark xiii. 26 || Matt. xxiv. 30, Luke xxi. 27, "with power and great glory"), since "the Great Glory" is a title for God in 1 En., the last phrase may be taken as referring to God under two titles, thus, "with the Power and the Great Glory" (cf. also Mark ix. 1).

Though also J. Moffatt says: "The association of remoteness and ritual which had gathered round the divine name of 'holy,' probably accounted for Jesus' avoidance of it" (p. 101), there is really not much to be said for his purposely putting aside altogether the term "holy" in reference to God. Probably "holy" suggested no more remoteness than "Heaven," and like "heavenly" or "in the heavens" meant little more than "divine"; thus, "Holy Father" (John xvii. 11; cf. T. Jud. xxiv. 2) = "Divine Father." E. A. Abbott accounts for the variation "before the angels of God" (Luke xii. 8; cf. ver. 9), "before my Father in heaven" (Matt. x. 32; cf. ver. 33), by an original, "before the Holy One" (p. 214). The original form of references to "holy spirit" in the words of Jesus may be perhaps seen through the text of Matt. xii. 32, translated "against the spirit of the Holy,"—compare ver. 28 "by the spirit of God." Mark and Luke have made "holy" an adjective qualifying "spirit," hence, "the divine spirit" (Mark iii. 29, xii. 36, xiii. 11, Luke xi. 13 (?), xii. 10, 12; cf. John xiv. 26, xx. 22). "The Spirit" without any qualification (see e.g. Matt. xii. 31, xxii. 43), may then be due to a habit of speech which developed within the Church, since ordinary Jewish usage would appear to have been against such unqualified use of the term (cf. G. Dalman, p. 203).

Jesus' preference, however, was to use the titles "King" and "Father." "The former," to quote G. B. Stevens, "is but infrequently used. It is, indeed, a noticeable fact that although he spoke so often of the Kingdom of God, he seldom spoke of God as King" (I, p. 66). To put the case thus, however, tends to obscure the real centrality of the idea of the Kingship of God in the teaching of Jesus. To such examples as "the city of the Great King" (Matt. v. 35), "the Kingdom of Heaven is compared to a human king" (Matt. xviii. 23, xxii. 2), should be added: "the kings of the earth from whom do they receive revenues or poll-tax?" (Matt. xvii. 25), where the Kingship of God is suggested; "the throne of his glory" (Matt. xix. 28, xxv. 31), where the Son of Man acts for God as "King" (Matt. xxv. 34, 40) on "the throne of God" (Matt. xxiii. 22; cf. Matt. v. 34); and the impression of his constant reference to the "Kingdom" or "Sovereignty" or "Reign" of God should not be minimised. God was King in the sense that His vast domain was never at any moment

beyond His power of control, and that He would have the last word in everything. This Kingly idea was never lost sight of throughout all his intensification of the Fatherly idea of God (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 91); witness, "Our *Father* in heaven . . . let *Thy Kingdom* come" (Matt. vi. 9 f. || Luke xi. 2), "my *Father*, Lord of heaven and earth" (Matt. xi. 25 || Luke x. 21), "in my *Father's Kingdom*" (Matt. xxvi. 29), "your *Father* is delighted to give you the *Kingdom*" (Luke xii. 32), "the Son of Man" acting for God as "King" comes "in the glory of his *Father*" (Mark viii. 38 || Luke ix. 26, Matt. xvi. 27), "Come, blessed of my *Father*, inherit the *Kingdom*" (Matt. xxv. 34), "then the just will shine forth . . . in the *Kingdom* of their *Father*" (Matt. xiii. 43).

His own unique personal intimacy with God is seen in his liking for the title "Father." The general tendency was "unquestionably in the direction of conceiving God as more merciful, fatherly, and gracious" (C. G. Montefiore in J.L., p. 49; cf. pp. 288, 401 f.; F. W. Newman, p. 3). A reference here to the quotations from our literature (see above, pp. 36 ff.), will reveal the inadequacy of W. Beyschlag's account of the facts, where he says: "If pious men after the Exile speak here and there of God as their Father . . . they do so really, only in the sense of Creator and gracious Preserver" (p. 81). These quotations, few as they are, show a definite move in the direction of a personal relationship with God, which meant not merely that God cared for the individual, but also that that care signified a desire that the individual share the divine life with the intimacy of a child sharing the life of a parent. This idea the synagogue service with its emphasis on personal religion, and its probable reference in its ritual to God as "Father in heaven" (cf. R. T. Herford, I, pp. 123 f.), tended to inspire in the mind of its best adherents; witness the place of "Fatherhood and Sonship" in the teaching of Philo (H. A. A. Kennedy, pp. 179-184; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 92). The distinction of Jesus is that he was so gripped by this idea and so gripped it that he succeeded in giving amazingly clear expression to it (cf. A. E. Garvie, p. 200).

He gave a real fatherly content to the idea of God as King. "The Father is the Sovereign; and as the Father is such must the Sovereign be. Hence the primary and determinative conception is the Fatherhood, and so through it the Sovereignty must be read and interpreted" (A. M. Fairbairn, p. 444; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. pp. 190 f.). Hence it is not "simply . . . that God is a beneficent ruler, whose people are enshrined in his heart" (E. P. Gould, I. p. 19). It is so much more than that (cf. T. R. Glover, pp. 100, 127) that in later Christian language, rightly interpreting his meaning, "the Father" became the character name of God;

so its occasional appearance in the Synoptics (Mark xiii. 32 || Matt. xxiv. 36, Luke ix. 26, Matt. xxviii. 19; cf. Acts i. 7), and its frequency in the Fourth Gospel. "National and religious prejudices" which had hitherto "prevented the free development of the conception of a completely impartial God" (C. G. Montefiore in J.L., p. 46), in him ceased to operate. Jesus thinks of God as a perfect parent who enters with intimate concern into the life of each of His millions of children, and looks for each to share His life to the degree in which a child should share his parents' life. If, indeed, no human mother can love a million, the simple yet soul-stirring truth which came home to the mind of Jesus, and which he expounded to his followers, was that God could and did love each unit of innumerable millions.

The frequency of "Father in heaven" in Matt. represents the habit of Jesus more accurately than the single instance in Mark (xi. 25) and Luke (xi. 13), who here again exhibit their tendency to Gentilise Jewish expressions. In most instances, that is, prayers perhaps excepted, where "in heaven" is omitted, it may with safety be restored to let one hear his words as they were originally spoken. The new departure is probably in the emphatic substitution of "my" or "thy" or "your" for the more conventional "our." Not that there are no traces elsewhere of such substitution (see for Rabbinical examples, G. Friedlander, III, pp. 118, 186 f., 252, also S. Schechter, II, p. 55), but that Jesus was the first to feel, and to succeed in making others feel, its full significance (cf. W. Temple, p. 76). In the Sermon on the Mount all three forms appear with impressive frequency: "*my* Father in heaven" (Matt. vii. 21), "*thy* Father (in heaven)" (Matt. vi. 4, 6, 18), "*your* Father in heaven" (Matt. v. 16, 45, vi. 1, 7, 11; cf. v. 48, vi. 8, 14, 15, 26, 32). In this way he signified the reality and intensity of the individual's relation to God as Father, as it was realised in his own case, and as it might be in that of any other. In places where a personal pronoun is wanting in the present text, it should be supplied for the original force of the utterance to be felt; it can mostly be got from a parallel in another Gospel (e.g. Luke xi. 13; cf. Matt. vii. 11).

One instance is very instructive. "Abba" in prayer has been properly rendered in Matt. xxvi. 39 (cf. ver. 42), "*My* Father, if it is a possibility," since though it "is just the definite form and therefore means strictly 'the Father'", yet "during the obsolescence of the form with the pronominal suffix . . . it became the regular form for 'my Father'" (G. Dalman, p. 192; cf. D.C.G., vol. i. p. 2). Luke renders it, "*Father*, if Thou art willing" (xxii. 42; cf. xxiii. 34, 46). Mark gives the original Aramaic first, and then translates it perhaps too literally, "*Abba, Father*, all things are possible to Thee" (xiv. 36). Compare Matt. xi. 25 f. ||

Luke x. 21. The power to say in sincerity "Abba," that is "my Father," to God became the hall-mark of genuine Christian experience (Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6); the spirit of the life of Jesus in the soul of a man made it natural for him to live with God as *his* Father. This way of viewing the data differs from that of G. Dalman, who says: "Jesus draws a sharp line of distinction between Himself and the disciples in purposely setting aside the usual Jewish 'our Father in heaven,' where He Himself is concerned, and yet prescribing its use for His disciples, Matt. vi. 9" (p. 190). Rather the simple "Abba" may be original in the Lord's prayer (Luke xi. 2; cf. E., April 1910, pp. 359 f., July 1915, pp. 24 f.; E. A. Abbott, p. 597). God was Father in that His love was such as particularised to the point of seeking for Himself to be realised as the closest and most inspiring companion of each and every human soul (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 192; F. W. Worsley, pp. 105, 119; C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 92). "When he uses the term 'Abba' he implies no such distinction as the Greek gives us between 'Our' father and 'my' father" (T. C. Hall, p. 53, cf. T. R. Glover, I, p. 15; J. A. Robertson, pp. 31 ff.; J.E., vol. i. p. 28).

3. This involved a full appreciation of the spiritual idea of God. "What is totally absent from this conception of God as Father is the notion that any ceremony is required upon the part of man to render honour and glory to Him, or to thank Him publicly or formally for His goodness" (J. Moffatt, p. 103). While our literature is evidence that the thought "God is spirit" (John iv. 24), did not begin with him, yet it is nevertheless true that he led the way to an adequate recognition of the fact that "the conditions of true worship are . . . that the highest affections of the worshipper shall be consecrated to God, and . . . shall proceed from a true and worthy idea of the divine nature" (G. B. Stevens, II, p. 47). This emerges particularly in an attitude of his towards the Temple on which the Synoptics even are not indefinite, and in respect to which the Fourth Gospel is at any rate an accurate interpretation of his outlook.

In Mark's version of his accusers' words the contrast is impressive between the shrine made and the shrine not made with hands: "We have heard him say, I will destroy this shrine made by hands, and in three days another not made by hands I will build" (xiv. 58 || Matt. xxvi. 61; cf. Mark xv. 29 || Matt. xxvii. 40). A version of this very saying, or of one like it, which was uttered on a similar occasion, the Fourth Evangelist has put in the forefront of his presentation of Jesus' mind: "Jesus in reply said to them, Destroy this shrine, and in three days I will erect it" (ii. 19), on which A. E. Garvie comments: "Jesus, confident of his vocation and endowment, challenges the priesthood

to destroy the religion concentrated in the Temple, and declares His ability to compensate for that loss by restoring the worship of God" (E., March 1914, p. 242; cf. A. E. Garvie, p. 174; E. A. Abbott, pp. 753 ff.). It may have been that "the Temple cult had long ceased to play the part which had belonged to it in the first centuries of the renovated Temple," and that "though outwardly still an object of splendour, it had lost its inward significance for and power over the souls of the pious nation" (W. Bousset, p. 107). But yet some things about the Temple and its ministrations appealed to Jesus, for Luke and John—though the Greek text is not as identical as our English translation suggests—are at one in making him refer to it as "my Father's house" (Luke ii. 49, John ii. 16; cf. E., March 1911, p. 261; G. Milligan, p. 97). If these two allusions may serve as guide, the attraction of the Temple for him lay for the most part in its being a central place of teaching, i.e. of Scribal activity (Luke ii. 46, Mark xiv. 49 || Matt. xxvi. 55, Luke xxii. 53), and "a house of prayer" (Mark xi. 17, || Matt. xxi. 13, Luke xix. 46). "That there were prayers in the Temple is of course certain. . . . Isaiah's phrase (lvi. 7) 'a house of prayer' . . . applied to the Temple was fulfilled to the letter. . . . The very word *Abodah* used of the Temple service became an epithet for the service of prayer" (I. Abrahams, p. 2; cf. P. Goodman, p. 240). Compare, "Two men went up into the temple to pray" (Luke xviii. 10). Jesus may have hoped for such a reformation as would make that institution a fitter instrument of God's purpose in Jerusalem, and through Jerusalem, whence pilgrims from all parts gathered, in the world. His anguish and tears were very real when he had to retreat and leave their house to them (Matt. xxiii. 37 f.).

The hold of the Holy City and the Temple on his devout Jewish soul was then great, hence his temptation from that direction. This temptation and the struggle to overcome it,—the tempter's presence in his affectionate regard for the Temple which was inclining him to give it an essential place in his teaching, and his thrusting of the thought from him after deliberation,—are portrayed in the following: "Then the devil takes him into *the Holy City*, and he placed him on the wall of the Temple (cf. A. Souter, p. 224), and says to him, If you are son of God, throw yourself down; for it is written, 'To his angels He will give orders concerning you, and on their hands they will lift you up, lest at any time you strike your foot against a stone.' To him Jesus said, Again it is written, 'You should not test the Name your God'" (Matt. iv. 5-7 || Luke iv. 9-12). In the light of his own experience it presented itself as a hazardous venture which he had some inclination to make, but finally did not make, since he realised it to be inconsistent with his own perfectly spiritual idea of God.

"The Temple was loved; it was the great visible symbol of the religion . . . the omnipresent God was yet especially near to the Temple. The sanctuary kept God within Israel" (C. G. Montefiore in P., p. 620). He, therefore, refused to make this Jewish institution an essential of religion as he conceived it.

It is his real mind one gets, when in reply to the Samaritan woman's remark, "Sir, I see that you are a prophet. Our fathers at this mountain worshipped; and you say, that at Jerusalem is the place where one ought to worship," he is represented as indicating that he would not impose his own preference on any, that what began with Jews was not bound up with much which Jews held dear, or, for that matter, Samaritans,—“To her Jesus says, Believe me, woman, there is coming an hour when neither at this mountain nor at Jerusalem will you worship the Father. You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know; for (the moral and religious experience of) salvation is from the Jews. But there is coming an hour, and now it is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit, that is (*καί*) truly (*ἀληθείᾳ*), for the Father even seeks such to be His worshippers" (John iv. 19-23; cf. A. E. Garvie, pp. 189 f.). To his mind, then, "religion . . . could exist apart from the Temple, apart from the Holy City; it required no area to restrict it, no space to contain it" (cf. Ephraim Levine in F. J. Foakes Jackson, p. 286). Since the City and the Temple were among the institutions "taken for granted by all the prophets" (W. H. Bennet, p. 85), this is an advance on anything hitherto taught by the most spiritual of Israel's teachers (cf. H. J., vol. x. p. 775).

II. THE CHARACTER OF GOD.

1. The justice of God which is seen in His assigning to each and to all due rewards or punishments, and which is dwelt upon so much in our literature, falls into the background in the teaching of Jesus only in so far as the idea of God as King is subordinated to the idea of Him as Father, not that it is made negligible. To have made it so would have robbed of their reality the distinction between right and wrong, which lies at the very foundation of all moral life. God must see to it that ultimately it makes a difference to a man, if he choose to live one way rather than another. This is plainly asserted by Jesus. The two sets of relevant passages are received with the meaning which was intended, when they are taken as a reminder of a matter of fact in a morally constituted universe, where there can be no accidents,—a reminder likely, and designed, to be an encouragement to the good and a warning to the bad. There are moments in human experience, when the agony or the pleasure of present circumstances is such,

that to speak plainly about punishments and rewards in accordance with the real state of the soul may be the only way to save one from the delusion of such adversity or such prosperity. So Jesus' picture of the distinction between souls which God in justice to Himself and to all must permit, yea, more, must guarantee: "between us and you a great chasm is fixed, that they who wish to pass from hence to you cannot, and they (i.e. on your side) should not cross over from thence to us" (Luke xvi. 26). Compare, "He shall separate them from one another, just as the shepherd separates the sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on His right and the goats on the left" (Matt. xxv. 32 f.); also the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt. xiii. 24-30; cf. vers. 47-50).

A vision of what this division would mean was the inspiration of some of his most severe words of warning (e.g. Matt. xii. 32, 36). This warning in the form of denunciation,—a form very natural to an Eastern, and not altogether unfamiliar to a Western,—should be recognised where he breaks out into, "Woe to you" (e.g. Matt. xxiii. 13 ff.). John v. 34: "But this I say, that you may be saved," is a better guide to the interpretation of all such passages than G. Friedlander, where he says: "Jesus himself did not love his enemies. He was . . . full of fierce anger towards the Scribes and Pharisees" (I, p. 77; cf. P., p. 666; also C. G. Montefiore's remarks to the same effect, e.g. II, pp. 53 f., on which see H. Rashdall, pp. 179, 182), and in so saying has surely forgotten the frequency of this locution on the lips of the Hebrew prophets, where so able a Jewish scholar would not deny that it was in Oriental fashion appeal by denunciation.

To the righteous Jesus sets forth the realities thus: "Blessed are you when men shall reproach you and persecute you, and speak every evil against you, lying, on account of me. Rejoice, and be delighted, for your *reward* (*μισθός*) is great" (Matt. v. 11 f. || Luke vi. 22 f.; cf. ver. 35). There is "*reward* with your Father in heaven" (Matt. vi. 1): "your Father . . . shall *pay* (*ἀποδώσει* cf. G. Milligan, pp. 3, 51; M.M., p. 61) you *back*" (ver. 4; cf. vers. 6, 18). There is "a prophet's *reward*," also "a just man's *reward*" (Matt. x. 41), and the undistinguished disciple "shall not lose his *reward*" (ver. 42; cf. Mark ix. 41). To people inclined to go contrary to his mind he puts the question: "What *reward* have you?" (Matt. v. 46), and to encourage them to go his way, —as "a counterpoise to the weight of temptations" (I. G. Smith, E., Dec. 1910, p. 555; cf. P., p. 665),—he says assuringly: "It shall be *paid back* (*ἀνταποδοθήσεται*) to you" (Luke xiv. 14). At times he is at pains to show the precision of the Divine justice in its treatment of souls. That a man be true to his inspirations, be they many or few, great or small, is the test of what a man is.

To the slave who could say, "Look! other two talents I have gained," and to the slave who could say, "Look! other five talents I have gained," the master said precisely the same: "Splendid! Generous and reliable slave! over little you have been reliable, over much I will place you: enter into the delight of your master" (Matt. xxv. 20-23),—"equal diligence in the use of an unequal endowment receiving an equal reward" (A. B. Bruce, p. 201).

The "mean and hesitant" (ver. 26) are such as do not think it worth while to put to good use the single occasional inspiration to goodness which may come to them. Those who do think it worth while may have varying success, and therefore a reward varying in correspondence thereto. The "nobleman" who "called his ten slaves and gave them ten five-pound notes" (cf. A. Souter, p. 161), on his return gave to him who could say, "Sir, your five-pound note has produced ten five-pound notes more," "authority over ten towns," and to him who could say, "Your five-pound note, sir, has made five five-pound notes" to be "over five towns" (Luke xix. 12-19). The darker side is put with as fine a sense of proportion. The wicked are not to be treated *en bloc* any more than the righteous: "And that slave, who knew his master's will, and did not make ready, or do according to his will, shall be flogged with many stripes; but he who did not know and did things worthy of stripes, shall be flogged with few. And to everyone to whom there has been given much, much will be sought from him, and to whom they entrust much, far more will they ask from him" (Luke xii. 47 f.). Compare the parable of the different conditions of the soil (Mark iv. 2-9 || Matt. xiii. 3-9, Luke viii. 4-8), also the well authenticated note in his preaching that it will be "more bearable for one" than for another "in the day of judgment" (Matt. xi. 22, 24 || Luke x. 12, 14; cf. Matt. x. 15).

There seems to be no writer of our period in which this sense of proportion in the justice of God has been so fully realised and so clearly expounded. If one were to forget that a "characteristic of Oriental speech is its unqualified positiveness," that "the language of the Oriental is that of sentiment and conviction, and not of highly differentiated and specialised thought," and "that the Oriental mind is that of the prophet and the seer, and not of the scientist and the philosopher," and our "cautiousness in utterance" was not to be expected (cf. A. M. Ribhany, pp. 129-132), one might see in our writers sometimes a low spirit of revenge instead of an intense desire for justice. The very intensity of their desire, amounting to an enthusiasm, to see in life the even-handed justice of God has, however, in some measure hindered them from being accurate expositors of this their favourite topic. For clarity of apprehension of the justice of God and dispassionate-

ness in the exposition of it, Jesus has no equal among our writers. This is incidentally confirmed by the place of the Gentiles in his teaching (see below, pp. 111-117).

Through all this apprehension and exposition of the justice of God the problem of suffering, as it comes up so often in our literature, hardly appears at all. "There is no more perplexing problem for theistic belief than that raised by some forms of human calamity and suffering. Though Christ refers often to the subject, and utters the most penetrating sayings, He always speaks of it as if He felt no need of a theoretical solution and no desire for it" (D. W. Forrest, ii. p. 134). To his mind rewards and punishments belong to a realm of experience to which pleasure and pain, prosperity and adversity, in the ordinary sense do not belong. To his own questions: "Do you think that these Galileans (i.e. those killed in a recent massacre in the city) were sinners beyond all the Galileans, because they have suffered this? . . . Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, do you think that they were debtors beyond all people who dwell in Jerusalem?" he answered, unequivocally and earnestly: "No, I tell you, . . . No, I tell you" (Luke xiii. 2-5). To say the least, he "does, if only incidentally, set some limit to an exaggerated application of the doctrine of divine retribution" (C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 99). With this accords the way in which he rules out the disciples' suggestions with regard to the blind man: "Rabbi, who sinned, this (fellow) or his parents, that he was born blind? . . . Neither this (fellow) sinned, nor his parents" (John ix. 2 f.).

Where such views as are hinted at here were held to the point of obsession,—a not infrequent occurrence when diseases were regarded with very much superstition,—some of his cures may have been effected by disillusionment. The faith which he required and inspired may have been, in part, acceptance of his own view that the real punishment was not strictly in any physical experience whatsoever. "My boy, your sins are forgiven," he says to the sick man (Mark ii. 5). "Look! you are restored to health; do not sin (*μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε*, i.e. as you are in danger of doing, or may now try to do, see below, p. 276), lest something worse (i.e. than an illness) happen you," he says to a discharged patient (John v. 14). So, more generally, on the so-called hard lot in life. The "beggar" in his parable (Luke xvi. 20) is a worthy person in the sight of God. That he himself "has nowhere to rest his head" (Matt. viii. 20 || Luke ix. 58) does not cloud his consciousness of favour with God. Similarly, his view of ordinary prosperity. The "rich man . . . clothed in purple and fine linen, enjoying himself every day in fine style" (Luke xvi. 19), is not approved of God; and to "gain the whole world" (Mark viii. 36 || Matt.

xvi. 26, Luke ix. 25), may be in some a sure sign that they have entered or are going to enter into punishment.

Good health or bad, plenty or poverty may have a relation to the goodness or sin of some, but to his mind they are not really for anyone reward or punishment from God. Hence the problem of suffering and the justice of God never presents itself on his level of thought. "In his public ministry he is animated by a faith not in need of blinking the facts of existence that belie the current doctrine of retribution, because it rests upon the perception of a higher law of compensation" (N. S. Schmidt, p. 311). Though physical suffering was very real to him, so real that once in the solicitude of Peter for his safety he felt the tug of "Satan,"—the appeal of the temptation to shrink from it,—yet withal there was no problem for him on that plane of experience. "You do not think of God's interests, but of men's interests" (Mark viii. 33 || Matt. xvi. 23),—to think like God was to realise that life's gain or loss was not really a matter of so much common pleasure or pain (cf. G. W. Stewart, E., Aug., Sept., 1910). A single saying, which has hardly been taken as seriously as Jesus intended,— "His sun He makes rise on mean and generous, and He rains on just and unjust" (Matt. v. 45),—reveals how sameness of treatment accorded righteous and wicked in the natural realm did not for him bring any confusion of mind on the justice of God.

The place of apocalyptic in his teaching has to do, for one thing, with his faith in this perfect justice of God, with his belief that there was a sense and a realm in which that justice held good. It stood for him and for his hearers as a confession of faith that the Judge of all the earth would do right. So in his application of the parable of the success of the untiring approaches of the widow to the unrighteous judge: "And will not God secure justice for his elect, who cry to him day and night, and (i.e. at the same time) be long-suffering over them (i.e. the wicked; cf. Sir. xxxv. 18)? I tell you, that he will secure justice for them (i.e. his elect) speedily. But then, when 'the Son of Man' comes, will he find this (τῆν) faith on earth?" (Luke xviii. 7 f.),—the faith meant being that God can do both things, namely, secure justice for the good, and be long-suffering toward the bad, for "then (i.e. in the End) he shall pay back (ἀποδώσει, see above, p. 52) to each according to his conduct" (πρᾶξιν) (Matt. xvi. 65).

2. That, however, the idea of God as just was subordinate in his teaching one parable alone is sufficient proof. It represents God as "an ordinary head of a household who went out early in the morning to hire . . . workers at the standard-wage a day," and who, having engaged others at a later time in the day chose to be generous with these latter, contending that in so doing he was not unjust to any, and that it was within his right to be generous

if he wished to be,—“my dear fellow (ἐταῖρε) I am not acting unjustly towards you. . . . Is it not permitted me to do what I will with my own? or is your eye mean because I am generous?” (Matt. xx. 1-15). The justice of God is real, but, after all, the generosity of God is all determinative; and there is no conflict between the two, since the early opportunity as well as the late springs from the generosity or goodness of God. The parable’s “prime purpose was to show that Christ had come to inaugurate a new relationship between God and men, or, rather, to declare more fully what that relationship really was and always had been” (W. O. E. Oesterley, E., April 1908, p. 343; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 196; C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 100 f.). The significance of the love of God and its centrality in the teaching of Jesus can hardly be missed. Though he is not given to much direct mention of God’s love, yet data are abundant on which to formulate his idea of it.

Take, for example, what he believed God Himself does. Some parables in which the Kingdom of God is portrayed in the active, as a person doing something, are portraits of God at work. The parable which has been referred to in the previous paragraph is the chief of these, and is typical. So “the Kingdom of Heaven is like a merchant seeking good pearls; and having found one (really) valuable pearl, he went and sold all that he had, and bought it” (Matt. xiii. 45). G. G. Findlay, following W. M. Metcalfe (E., July 1884, p. 54), holds that “the story teaches . . . *the supreme value of man to the kingdom, and the cost to which the kingdom is prepared to put itself on man’s account*” (E., Feb. 1908, p. 162; cf. J. A. Findlay, pp. 127, 257). God seeks the soul of man, and to gain possession thereof would give the whole world (cf. in Rabbinical literature, “a righteous man” as “a pearl,” A. Marmorstein, p. 67). The initiative in all good is taken by God: “The Kingdom of Heaven is compared to (a situation after) a man has sowed good (καλόν) seed in his field” (Matt. xiii. 24). What He sows, too, is a seed of His own love, which is to be seen oftenest and clearest in a large exercise of mercy; He expects it to bring forth in the soul of man the spirit of love such as leads to that very mercy: “Therefore is the Kingdom of Heaven compared to a human king” who “forgave the loan” of his bankrupt slave, and who expected from that slave that he “forgive . . . his brother” slave from the heart (Matt. xviii. 23, 27, 35). God seeks man by showing a fine sacrificial generosity toward him, and desires to enthrone him with the same towards others. His love is an out-going seeking love, which works to make the slave-soul into a son-soul having fellowship with His own spirit. He is “complete” (τέλειος) in every respect as “heavenly Father” (Matt. v. 48), by no means loving only where

He receives love in return, but revealing toward all a self-giving love which hastens to forgive, and hopes to make of the sinner a fit companion to Himself in His genuine seeking love. "The very life of God is the unselfish self-giving life of the Father" (H. C. King, p. 132). Over against "the broken sonship" there is always "the unbroken Fatherhood" (cf. H. W. Robinson, pp. 91 ff.). This grace of God "is manifested immediately in God's leniency towards those who transgress his law. But its final meaning is to be found, not in this leniency, but in God's persistent activity in the rescue and cure of lost and invalid souls" (E. P. Gould, I, p. 23; cf. A. M. Fairbairn, I, pp. 463 f.). God offers His unselfish friendship; He is constantly working to initiate a love-communion with the soul of man. To Jesus this is the very foundation of everything. It lies at the back of his own religious experience: "Thou hast loved me before the world's foundation" (John xvii. 24). That seeking love of the Father would find others, as it had found him: "Thou hast loved them as me Thou hast loved" (ver. 23). (See further what he felt God approved in him, below pp. 151 f., and what he said God required of the disciple, below pp. 267-269.)

"The fact is indisputable that the Jews, long before the birth of Jesus" spoke of, and addressed, God as "Father," and it should not be said that there is no idea of the love of God in our literature. But it is one thing to have an idea, quite another so to be at home with that idea as to be able to do no other than live with it (cf. K. Kohler, pp. 129-133). This Jesus succeeded in doing with this idea of God,—what no other before him had done, and probably no one since has excelled him in doing. He is more thoroughly at home with the idea of God's love than some of our writers are with that of God's justice. He more consistently shows the meaning of the former in human life than they do the meaning of the latter. The love of God is constantly suppressed by our writers; by Jesus as constantly expressed. In reading this literature one might be pardoned if one forgot the love of God; in the Gospels one cannot get away from it. G. Friedlander's denial is, then, to be denied, where he says: "We deny that the Fatherhood of God is expounded by Jesus with more depth and intensity than by the great prophets and teachers of Israel who lived before the age of Jesus" (I, pp. 126 f.; cf. II, p. 36). If the Synoptics may be credited with at least witnessing to the central ideas of Jesus, then C. H. Toy's statement holds good, that "it was the profound spiritual instinct of Jesus which led him to make it (i.e. the Fatherhood of God) the central point of his theistic teaching. He discerned its dominant relation to other sides of the conception of God; he infused into it the warmth and colouring of human feeling and the practicalness of every-

day life, and therefore he is to be regarded in a true sense as its author" (p. 86; cf. A. M. Fairbairn, pp. 449-452; C. G. Montefiore, I, pp. 442, 463; L. Dougall, p. 182).

III. THE RELATION OF GOD TO ALL OTHER EXISTENCE.

I. His idea of God as the Creator is involved in the priority of God's love to all other love, a love older than the world (John xvii. 24). The fulness of his idea of divine creatorship comes out in his rejection of the notion of any sabbath's rest in the life of God: "My Father up to (and at) this very moment (*ἔως ἄρτι*) is working" (John v. 17). He addresses this very Father as "Lord of heaven and earth," but in so doing is thinking particularly of the Omnipotent Creator as He is engaged in the most difficult of His works, that of getting His mind into human minds,—never so plainly Omnipotent as when He sets bounds to the accomplishment of certain types of men: "Thou didst hide this from the wise and educated (*σοφροῦν*, i.e. in the precise findings of the doctors of the Law),"—never so clearly Creator as when He secures that the revelation cannot miss a certain type: "Thou didst reveal it to babies (i.e. so-called). Yes, my Father (I praise Thee) that of such result (*οὕτως*) there was hearty approval before Thee" (Matt. xi. 25 f.; cf. Luke xv. 10). While Jesus recognised God as the Creator of all in the natural world, and often thought of "the power of God" as, on the one hand, securing an exalted future life (Mark xii. 24 || Matt. xxii. 29), and, on the other, "able both soul and body to destroy in Gehenna" (Matt. x. 28 || Luke xii. 5),—see also above, p. 58, on the title "the Power,"—he was yet more impressed with God's omnipotence as revealed in what was going on in the mind of man, or what was yet possible to the soul apparently most unmanageable from the highest point of view. When the disciples were alarmed at the barriers in the way of a rich man's entrance into the Kingdom of God, and exclaimed: "And (i.e. if that be so) who (i.e. in all the world) can be saved?" he gave them a look such as they never forgot, and said: "In the sight of men an impossibility! but not in the sight of God; for all things are possible in the sight of God" (Mark x. 26 f. || Matt. xix. 25 f., Luke xviii. 26 f.). One of the great surprises which he had was that any religious teacher, especially "of Israel," could presume to do his work except on the basal assumption, that God Himself was active in bringing to birth a new mind in man. Instances of people "born from above . . . born of the spirit," constituted for him the supreme proof of the unabated creative energy of Almighty God (John iii. 3, 8). This idea of God as always powerfully at work creating a new spirit was often to him the meaning of faith in God.

He speaks often of the actual presence of God in the world, being in this at one with the most devout of his contemporaries, who knew God "to be not far off but very near, no mere abstract power, no hard taskmaster, but the Heavenly Father" (R. T. Herford, I, p. 111). "He makes His sun rise . . . and He rains" (Matt. v. 45). "Look at the birds of the heaven . . . your heavenly Father nourishes them. . . . Learn from the lilies of the field . . . the grass of the field . . . God in this way clothes" (Matt. vi. 26, 28, 30 || Luke xii. 24, 27 f.). The natural blessings are then all provided already, and should be no anxiety; "for your heavenly Father knows that you need all these" (Matt. vi. 32 || Luke xii. 30). Besides, "heaven . . . is the throne of God . . . earth . . . is the footstool of His feet . . . Jerusalem . . . is the city of the great King" (Matt. v. 34 f.); and the remoteness of God is, as in our literature, just the remoteness which a man's badness necessitates: "Go away from me, workers of lawlessness" (Matt. vii. 23; cf. xxv. 41, Luke xiii. 27).

Proof of his belief in the providence of God in human history is abundantly given in his frequent references to the Kingdom of God. To his mind also there is no real rival power to God in the ultimate determination of events. In 1 En. lxxxvi. 1 one reads: "And behold a star (i.e. Azazel) fell from heaven," signifying what was thought to be the cause of the demoralisation of mankind; and, in language determined by that manner of thought, Jesus said: "I was looking on Satan as a gleam (i.e. of a meteor; cf. ἀστραπή, Luke xi. 36; also E. G. T., vol. v. pp. 405 f.; on Rev. viii. 10, ix. 1) from heaven fallen (i.e. thoroughly spent and gone out)" (Luke x. 18; cf. John xii. 31). One of his great visions had been that Satan in his progress downward had spent himself,—he was an exhausted force. This is all in a line with the teaching in our literature which constantly witnesses to the present limitation of Satan's power and gives assurances of its destruction in the Messianic age.

The omniscience of God takes in, as is usual, all the future; he says: "Concerning that day or the hour (i.e. of the day) . . . knows . . . the Father" (Mark xiii. 32 || Matt. xxiv. 36), just as e.g. in Psa. Sol. it is said: "At the time in which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant" (xvii. 23). But in his teaching, not the wide range, but the fine particularity of God's omniscience is given prominence. This idea is held consistently to the point of attention to infinitely small detail; it is believed to be a real personal interest in the minutiae of His universe. "To Jesus, God's omniscience is the omniscience of love. The amazing thing about it is not its extent, but its intimacy. God's interest in the solitary individual,—that is the holiest fact about Jesus' God" (J. A. Robertson, p. 67; cf. A. Harnack,

II, Lecture IV, II; T. R. Glover, I, p. 98). He is the Father who sees "in secret" that solitary individual, as he gives alms privately, or prays alone, or returns quietly in contrition (Matt. vi. 4, 6, 18). A single sparrow does not "fall on the ground without your Father (i.e. having His eye on it); but even the hairs of your head are all numbered (i.e. there is, if possible, a greater precision of attention in the case of persons like you). Fear not then; of more value than many sparrows are you" (Matt. x. 29-31 || Luke xii. 6 f.; cf. Luke xxi. 18). So, then, no one can die a martyr's death and the Father not see him. All this, of course, is just one aspect of the very real intensification of the idea of God as Father, which has been already claimed for him. "The Fatherhood of God is certainly an aspect of His Omnipresence; it is an incontestable proof of His nearness" (J. Abelson, I, p. 51).

2. On supernatural spiritual beings in his teaching H. H. Wendt has said, that "so far as their existence, nature, and ordinary mode of activity are concerned, He has simply accepted the current ideas of His countrymen" (vol. i. p. 162). The reality and nature of the existence of angels is thought of much as in our literature. "For when from the dead they shall rise, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven" (Mark xii. 25 || Matt. xxii. 30, Luke xx. 35); compare the words in 1 En. addressed to the fallen angels: "And though you were holy, spiritual, living the eternal life, you have defiled yourselves with the blood of women. . . . But you were formerly spiritual, living the eternal life, and immortal for all generations of the world. And therefore I have not appointed wives for you: for as for the spiritual ones of the heaven, in heaven is their dwelling" (xv. 4, 6 f.). Luke's version of Jesus' words here adds to the reference to unfallen angel existence, in which there was no relationship with women, "For they can die no more, for they are like angels" (Luke xx. 36), which can also be paralleled from 1 En., thus: "Exactly like the angels . . . and death, which destroys everything, could not have taken hold of them" (lxix. 11) For the thought of both forms, compare, "You shall become companions of the host of heaven" (1 En. civ. 6).

Again: "Joy in heaven . . . joy before the angels of God" (Luke xv. 7, 10), compare, "And the faces of (all) the angels in heaven shall be lighted up with joy" (1 En. li. 4; cf. civ. 4). In saying, "And then he will commission the angels and will collect his Elect (individuals) from the four winds from earth's boundary to heaven's boundary" (Mark xiii. 27 || Matt. xxiv. 31), he may have thought of two sets of angels at work, namely, those over the souls who are at the time still on earth, "the guardians of the earth" (2 En. xxxv. 2B), and those over the souls of the departed,—compare, "And over all the righteous and holy He

will appoint guardians from amongst the holy angels to guard them as the apple of an eye, until He makes an end of all wickedness and all sin, and though the righteous sleep a long sleep, they have nought to fear" (1 En. c. 5). "Then the just will shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii. 43; cf. xvii. 2) was also another ordinary contemporary manner of reference to angel-like existence; compare, "And all the righteous and elect before Him shall shine as fiery lights" (1 En. xxxix. 7); "you shall shine as the lights of heaven (civ. 2); "And I will bring forth in shining light those who have loved My holy name" (cviii. 12); also "their (i.e. angels') faces were shining like the sun" (2 En. i. 5; 4 cf. xix. 1; 4 Ez. vii. 97; Wisd. iii. 7); "shining like the sun's rays . . . I looked at myself, and was like one of His glorious ones" (2 En. xxii. 10); "he who fears God . . . shall be more glorious in time to come" (xl. 3). "More than twelve legions of angels" (Matt. xxvi. 53; cf. John xviii. 36; D.C.G., vol. i. p. 20) are "incorporeal forces . . . all the heavenly troops" (2 En. xx. 1, 3; cf. xxix. 3, xxxiii. 6, xxxix. 8; also 1 En. lxi. 10, lxxi. 7-9). "No one knows, not even the angels in heaven" (Mark xiii. 32 || Matt. xxiv. 36) is in the same strain as "not to My angels have I told My secret" (2 En. xxiv. 3), "not even the angels see the number" (xl. 3). "He will cut him in two and his part with unbelievers he will fix" (Luke xii. 46 || Matt. xxiv. 51), would call up in the mind of a hearer just such a picture as appears in Susanna, "for the angel of the Lord will cleave your soul this day . . . even now the angel of the Lord is standing with drawn sword . . . that he may cut you in pieces" (vers. 55, 59; see below, p. 336).

Our Gospel material, then, testifies that the teaching of Jesus made no difference in early Christian thinking on the question of belief in angels. But as to their ministry, in his recorded words there is no instance of angels in the phenomena of nature, nor of angels acting as mediators in prayer (cf. J.L., pp. 47 f.). That, of course, may be accidental and is immaterial, since for our writers it has been shown that while angels "may be servants of God," "they do not come between God and man to keep them apart, or to serve as the necessary medium of intercourse" (R. T. Herford, I, p. 263; contrast D.C.G., vol. i. p. 57). Mostly the angels figure in the Judgment scenes (Matt. xiii. 49, xxiv. 31 || Mark xiii. 27; cf. Luke xvi. 22, Matt. xxii. 13, "attendants"). Perhaps the Judgment could not be made a picture of without them. In some instances, however, E. A. Abbott (pp. 212, 215) prefers to see here "the holy ones" in the sense of "saints" (e.g. in Mark viii. 38 || Matt. xvi. 27; Luke ix. 26; cf. Matt. xxv. 31). For the rest, the angels seem to be so called in, as it were, around God as to have no other function left to them except to

do God's "will . . . in heaven" (Matt. vi. 10). *In toto* they are let represent in a poetic way the presence of God (Luke xv. 10; cf. ver. 7, Matt. iv. 11 || Mark i. 13),—though in this case G. Dalman (p. 210) suggests an original "before Heaven (i.e. God)." The idea of guardian angels is utilised only to express the precision of the Divine Omniscience: "See that you do not despise one of these little ones, for I tell you, that their angels in heaven continually see the face of my Father in heaven" (Matt. xviii. 10; cf. vi. 8). Moreover, our records never make Jesus refer to an angel in the singular (cf. E.B. 169). That may mean that he succeeded in thinking of God's presence with him without conceiving of that presence as in the form of an angel, an indirect testimony to his full realisation of God as spirit, and to the continuity of his consciousness of God. God to him was not occasional visitor (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, III, pp. 97 f.), a guide, whom he met at one point, and to whom said adieu at another. "His God was a present reality. And a most living reality too. Never was God felt as such a living presence in the life of any man" (W. Bousset, p. 103).

3. He shows a very full appreciation of God as wisdom constantly operative in the soul. "Blessed they who hunger and thirst for righteousness! for they will have their fill" (Matt. v. 6), is in the style in which the wisdom of God in our literature makes her promises to the soul who desires her. The petition: "And do not carry us into trial, but rescue us from the evil" (Matt. vi. 13), may belong to the same category; witness, either "And at first I (i.e. wisdom) will try him with temptations . . . until his heart is filled with me. . . . If he turn away (from me) I . . . will deliver him over to the spoilers" (Sir. iv. 17, 19), or else in Matt. vi. 13 translate "the evil inclination," see below, p. 219. (Contrast A. Schweitzer, pp. 362, 387; G. Tyrrell, pp. 54 f.) In such association this petition takes on the aspect of a prayer that the wisdom of God may so succeed in its purpose, that either severity may not be called for, or the evil inclination may not prevail. In Mark viii. 36 f. (|| Matt. xvi. 26): "For what does it benefit a man to gain the whole world, and inflict loss on his soul? For what should a man give in exchange for his soul?" "soul" should be thought of in the light of Sir. xxvi. 14: "And there is no exchange for a well-instructed soul."

The feminine pronoun in Matt. x. 39 (|| Luke xvii. 33) might be rendered "her," not as is usual "it"; thus: "He who has found (εὕρων) his life will lose her; and he who has lost (ἀπολέσας) his life on account of me will find her" (cf. Mark viii. 35 || Matt. xvi. 25), and should then be taken as referring to wisdom in the style of Sir. li. 26 (Heb.): "And he that is intent (lit. 'that gives his soul,' or 'life') finds her." Later experiences may have brought

this saying into its present associations. To lose "her" is, then, the experience of no "forgiveness" which belongs to him who "speaks against the spirit of the Holy" (Matt. xii. 32 || Mark iii. 29; Luke xii. 10). The blasphemers are such as lack devotion to the wisdom of God who offers herself to them, and who is the inspiring spirit of the good inclination (see below, p. 204). This would come with special force, since the sinful state of the Gentiles was thought to arise from refusal to let wisdom dwell with them, whereas in Israel wisdom, it was said, had been welcomed. There is probably a reference to the Gentiles in the very mention of unforgivable sin (see below, pp. 343 f.). That there was this direction of attention to wisdom in the conversation on the worst of blasphemies is incidentally confirmed by the grouping with it, in Matthew, of the saying about making "the tree sound and its fruit sound" (xii. 33). "The tree of wisdom" (cf. 1 En. xxxii. 3-6) is a common figure,—compare e.g. Sir. xxiv. 16: "I (i.e. wisdom) as a terebinth stretched forth my branches, and my branches were branches of glory and grace,"—and better results than were seen in these people were to be expected as the fruit of wisdom.

Again, as "wisdom instructs her sons" (Sir. iv. 11), so Jesus says: "Wisdom has been vindicated by her children" (Matt. xi. 19 marg. || Luke vii. 35),—a protest against confinement of the operations of the wisdom of God to lines which at the moment were generally received. Wisdom, it was thought, taking only of the things of the Law showed them to men, that she might secure appreciation of and conformity to the Law. But "the wisdom of God" had raised up a succession of inspired men who were not always acceptable to strictly orthodox legalists. "Because of this also the wisdom of God said, I will commission unto them prophets and (other) commissioners, and some of them they will kill and persecute" (Luke xi. 49 || Matt. xxiii. 34). Here "prophets and (other) commissioners" in Luke, and "prophets, wise men and scribes" in Matthew, may be later paraphrases of the earlier term, "witnesses" (Acts i. 8), Jesus' words being on this occasion an adaptation of Jub. i. 12: "And I will send witnesses unto them . . . but they . . . will slay the witnesses also, and they will persecute those who seek the Law." That "there shall be bestowed upon the elect wisdom" (1 En. v. 8), is the assumption behind the words, "to lead astray, if possible, the Elect" (Mark xiii. 22 || Matt. xxiv. 24). So also "you are not the speakers, but the holy spirit" (Mark xiii. 11 || Matt. x. 20, Luke xxi. 15), is in its Lukan form, (I, perhaps originally, 'I am' i.e. God, see below, pp. 286 ff.) will give you mouth and wisdom."

The importance of this side of his teaching has been most fully realised by the Fourth Evangelist, who, in isolating it, has probably

sharpened the form in which it was originally given. It is not the wisdom of God in a general way in history or providence, but in the human soul which most impresses one when Jesus is read. In confirmation of the disappearance of the angel from the experience of Jesus, the Fourth Evangelist has learned through him that the spirit of God, not an angel, secures that a revelation which has been once given be not lost: "He will remind you of all that I have told you" (John xiv. 26),—contrast where an angel says: "I will bring all things to your remembrance" (Jub. xxxii. 25). It should also be noted that "the word (λόγος) of God" in the following may be the equivalent of, or have an oblique reference to, the wisdom of God: "The seed is the word of God" (Luke viii. 11 || Mark iv. 14; Matt. xiii. 19); "Blessed they who hear the word of God" (Luke xi. 28; cf. viii. 21); "the word . . . is not mine, but His who sent me,—Father's" (John xiv. 24; cf. xii. 48, xv. 3). Jesus was, then, deeply impressed by the spirit, the wisdom of God, in the experience of men. (See further below, pp. 152-155 on the wisdom of God in himself.)

IV. THE MOTIVE OF GOD IN HIS RELATION TO ALL OTHER EXISTENCE.

I. Jesus was a man of his people in making much of prayer. "Private prayer never confined itself to stated forms, and private prayer was always an essential element in the religion of Torah" (R. T. Herford, I, p. 89; cf. pp. 243 f., 305; S. Schechter, II, p. 154 f.). The idea of personal communion with God, it has been seen, had come to be more generally thought of; and he, on his part, was never tired of recommending a thorough exploration of what that communion might result in in daily life. "Prayer to him was not an occasional thing, to be used under the pressure of urgent need, . . . but a constant aspiration towards God, which did not, however, exclude the more specialised aspiration expressed in words" (E.B., 3830). This is very beautifully put in the Johannine story of the conversation between Jesus and Nathaniel, the verisimilitude of one point of which there is no good reason to doubt. The sight of Nathaniel at prayer has brought Jacob to his mind (John i. 47). He tells him that there are greater possibilities along the line of prayer than he has yet realised,— "more than this you will see" (ver. 50). The opportunity of religious devotion was that the soul might become, as it was intended to be, the ladder up to the always open heaven. "The angels of God going up and coming down on the 'son of man'" (ver. 51), the communion which angels taking prayer upward to God, and angels bringing down blessing from God symbolised, was Jesus' own experience (cf. A. E. Garvie, p. 150 ff.), and would

be what a man of Nathaniel's type "will see," i.e. come himself to experience.

2. Much of what he says on prayer are the commonplaces of the best minds of his day (cf. R. T. Herford, I, p. 262). "And in praying do not utter empty words" (Matt. vi. 7),—compare, "And repeat not your words in your prayer" (Sir. vii. 14; cf. J.E., vol. viii. p. 137). "And whenever you stand praying, forgive, if anything you have against anyone: that your Father in heaven also may forgive you your lapses" (Mark xi. 25; cf. Matt. vi. 12, 14 || Luke xi. 4)—compare, "Forgive your neighbour the injury (done to you), and then when you pray, your sins will be forgiven" (Sir. xxviii. 2; cf. ver. 4, xxxiv. 18 f., xxxv. 2; T.Z. v. 3, viii. 1); "But you, when you pray, go into your private room, and having shut your door, pray to your Father. . . . But you, while fasting, anoint your head, and your face wash, that you may not seem to people to be fasting, but to your Father" (Matt. vi. 6, 17 f.); compare, "But I (i.e. Joseph) remembered the words of my father, and going into my chamber, I wept and prayed unto the Lord. And I fasted in those seven years, and I appeared to the Egyptians as one living delicately, for they that fast for God's sake receive beauty of face" (T. Jos. iii. 3). "The virtuous Joseph" (4 Macc. ii. 2) was a popular topic, and a lost book, of late date, but probably taking as its basis an earlier idea, was entitled "The Prayer of Joseph" (see M. R. James, pp. 21-31, and cf. in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, III, pp. 100 f.). The illustration of going into the private room to pray and of fasting, but not outwardly, which would leap to the mind of one acquainted with our literature, would, it seems, be Joseph. This may have been Jesus' intention, since there is other evidence of his fondness for these stories about Joseph.

Again, the legitimate occasions for prayer are much the same as in our literature. In thanksgiving, "I praise Thee, my Father" (Matt. xi. 25; cf. John xi. 41); in temptation, "Keep waken and pray, that you may not go into trial" (Mark xiv. 38 || Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxii. 46; cf. ver. 40); "Be careful on every occasion, requesting that you may have strength to escape all these things (i.e. self-indulgences, drunkenness, anxieties) which are going to happen" (Luke xxi. 36; cf. Mark xiii. 33); in sickness and for the expulsion of evil spirits, "This sort by nothing can come out,—except by prayer" (Mark ix. 29 || Matt. xvii. 21); in other ordinary or extraordinary difficulties, "Our coming day's bread give us to-day" (Matt. vi. 11 || Luke xi. 3); "pray that it (i.e. flight) may not happen in winter" (Mark xiii. 18 || Matt. xxiv. 20); in intercession, "I have requested concerning you that your faith may not utterly fail" (Luke xxii. 32; cf. John xvii. 9, 15, 20, also xiv. 16, xvi. 26); "Request . . . the

Master of the harvest, that He send out workers into His harvest" (Matt. ix. 38 || Luke x. 2); "pray on behalf of your persecutors" (Matt. v. 44 || Luke vi. 28); "My Father, forgive them: for they do not know what they are doing" (Luke xxiii. 34; cf. E., Jan. 1914, pp. 92 f.). Other occasions are a new demand, when resources are exhausted: "Friend, lend me three loaves, since a friend of mine on a journey has reached me, and I have nothing to set before him" (Luke xi. 5 f.),—a delay of justice trying to faith: "Secure justice for me from the defendant" (Luke xviii. 3),—from parables portraying God as He appears to be sometimes, not as He actually is. The argument is that God is not as He seems often to be to the finite human mind, but very much better: hence the reference of the importunity, which is made prominent, is to earnest trust that "everyone who asks receives" (Matt. vii. 8 || Luke xi. 10; cf. Mark xi. 24 || Matt. xxi. 22).

3. The stress falls here with significant force on knowledge of God's Fatherhood, "how much more shall your Father in heaven give good things (or 'generously') to those who ask him?" (Matt. vii. 11 || Luke xi. 13). He is never tired of giving a reminder of God's fatherly knowledge of what is needed: "Your Father knows what you have need of before you ask him" (Matt. vi. 8; cf. vi. 32 || Luke xii. 30); and a "knowledge of the Father's will is so far from suggesting an inactive waiting in the expectation that all will necessarily be as the Father wills, that on the contrary, that knowledge only moves to earnest pleading and entreaty,—the hope cherished seeking to realise itself by laying hold in a way of prayerful trust on that in the heart of the Father by which it is encouraged" (J. McLeod Campbell, pp. 232 f.; cf. J. A. Robertson, p. 129). In this stress on full committal to the Fatherly will of God in everything, whatever that may mean, Jesus has improved the very nature of prayer as it was to our writers, and so has clarified the conception of the motive of God in requiring man to enter into communion with Him by prayer.

This appears in the very heart of the outline prayer which he gave his disciples. G. Friedlander says: "The fact that the sources of the Lord's Prayer are the Old Testament, and the pre-Christian Apocalyptic and Apocryphal literature of the Jews, forces the impartial critic to deny any originality to the author of this prayer" (I, p. 163; cf. J.E., vol. viii., p. 183). R. T. Herford may be allowed to answer: "For the prayer as a whole, there is no parallel in Jewish sources—a very significant fact . . . and if 'Thy will be done' means the same in the Lord's prayer as it meant when uttered in Gethsemane, there is no parallel to it in Jewish sources" (I, pp. 118 f.; cf. P. Gardner, p. 82; E., July 1915, p. 28). The Jewish scholar is evidently in difficulty with regard to the particular named. His best parallel is 1 Macc. iii. 60:

“Nevertheless, as may be the will of Heaven, so shall He do.” The point at issue, however, is not mere committal to the will of God. That is common enough, and may be done by people of very different religious attainment. Everything hangs on the idea entertained of the God to whom one commits oneself; according as that is higher, the committal is of a higher order. Judas Maccabeus is not a serious competitor with Jesus in his very full appreciation of the Fatherhood of the God to whom he makes the great surrender. “My Father, all things are possible to Thee: carry away this cup from me; but,—not what I will, but what Thou wilt” (Mark xiv. 36 || Matt. xxvi. 39; cf. ver. 42, Luke xxii. 42). Under analysis this state of mind reveals the presence in it of the following: the Father’s power to remove what to his soul was a revolting agony; the wish for its removal, expressed with the frankness of a child coming to a father; a suspicion, perhaps more than a suspicion, that the revolting agony may have to be gone through with to the very end; in that case, no disturbance of trust in God’s Fatherly love, but a full committal of his soul to God’s will in the belief that the worst which may happen to him cannot be inconsistent therewith. “The simple and sublime words show prayer at its highest” (C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 338; cf. on the history of prayer, A. Sabatier, Bk. I, chap. iv. 4).

This committal is unaltered by the fact that in death his mind rambled, so it seems, through a suffering servant psalm: “My God, my God, why hast Thou deserted me?” (Mark xv. 34 || Matt. xxvii. 46). (Contrast R. W. Dale, p. 60; D.C.G., vol. i, pp. 447 f.; also compare J. E. Carpenter quoted in C. G. Montefiore, III, pp. 372 f.; J. McLeod Campbell, pp. 276–281; R. C. Moberly, pp. 407 ff.; H. H. Wendt, vol. ii, p. 250; A. E. Garvie, p. 418; W. A. Grist, p. 481; J. K. Mozley, pp. 56 ff.; J.E., vol. vii, p. 166.) At any rate, “Jesus’ words . . . are not to be taken as the despairing cry of a lost cause . . . but in the light of a prayer to his heavenly Father for His presence in an hour of need, naturally uttered in scriptural language” (C. S. Macfarland, p. 143). The Lukan, “My Father, into Thy hands I entrust my spirit” (xxiii. 46; cf. in the Jewish Prayer Book, S. Singer, p. 3), marks his emergence to full consciousness for one brief moment before death, revealing again his true mind, which is seen most distinctly in the Gethsemane prayer. His idea of the motive of God in relation to the highest of His creatures was, then, that He desired communion with them on the basis of unreserved committal of themselves to His Fatherly love in everything, be it life or death. There is nothing just like that in our literature. “The religious view of the will is set forth in the Gospels as it is taught nowhere else . . . the active and living idea or

principle which inspired the life of the Founder of Christianity" (P. Gardner, pp. 87; cf. A. Büchler, p. 178).

To summarise what has been claimed for Jesus under this head: God, in his teaching, is more thoroughly personal than in our literature. This is seen particularly in the fact that, whereas in the latter the idea of God as King was central, and the idea of Him as Father was only beginning to supplement it, to Jesus the Fatherhood of God makes the Divine Kingship wholly attractive, imparting to it a really loving character. The implications, too, of a spiritual idea of God are in his teaching worked out fully, as they are not in anything our writers say. He has also a clearer apprehension of the justice of God, and a finer vision of the exact region in which that justice with unerring precision holds good. This results in the practical disappearance of the problem of suffering, as it was raised usually in connection with that justice. It is, however, in his idea of God as superlatively generous, as Himself having an essentially seeking, searching love, and desiring that same love in others so that Divine love and human love meet in, and are concentrated on, the effort to save the sinner, that there is to be discovered what a new thing he made of the idea of God as "Father in heaven,"—an idea which before this had probably appeared in synagogue ritual. The aspect of God's omnipotence that most impresses him is, consequently, the Divine power as it creates a new mind in man. So also the feature of God's omniscience, which is made most of by him, is not that it comprehends all worlds, but that it is a real living interest in each individual, even in the so-called insignificant one. Consequently, he at no time thinks of God's presence as an angel, as occasional special visitor. His own experience has made him construe the presence of God with men as entirely an indwelling wisdom. He agrees, of course, that the motive of all Divine activity is the creation of a community the individuals of which are each in fellowship with Himself; but he lays down, more clearly than ever before, that the only possible ground of such communion as God wills is full trust by the soul in all experiences to His Fatherly love, a love which is conceived to be consistent with requiring from one the utmost sacrifice in the service which one is rendering for the salvation of others.

CHAPTER II

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

A—THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE

THE term itself, "the Kingdom of God," is very seldom met with in our literature. The only instances are "the Kingdom of our God" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 4), "the Kingdom of the Lord" (T.B. ix. 1), and "God's Kingdom" (Wisd. x. 10). But there can be little doubt concerning the popularity of the phrase during our period. To the best minds it signified a great hope, the establishment of a community in which there would be no sinner. "They that love God in truth shall rejoice, and they that do sin and unrighteousness shall cease from all the earth" (Tob. xiv. 7). "Envy is no good thing for miserable mortals . . . all the undisciplined empty-minded people . . . shall perish" (Sib. iii. 662, 670 f.). "Then shall there be bestowed upon the elect wisdom, and they shall all live and never again sin, either through ungodliness, or through pride" (1 En. v. 8). "The earth shall be cleansed from all defilement and from all sin" (x. 22). "Unrighteousness shall disappear as a shadow and have no continuance" (xlix. 2). "All evil shall pass away" (lxix. 29). "Sin shall come to an end" (T.L. xviii. 9). "Nor shall there dwell with them any man that knows wickedness . . . there shall be no unrighteousness in his days in their midst" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 29, 36). "Judgments, and railings, and contentions, and revenges, and blood, and passions, and envy, and hatred, and whatsoever are like these shall go into condemnation when they are removed. For it is these very things which have filled this world with evils, and on account of these the life of man has been greatly troubled" (2 Bar. lxxiii. 4 f.). Our writers may be classified according as they are optimistic or pessimistic concerning the setting up of such a community in this present world.

I. THE TIME, DURATION, AND LOCALITY OF THE KINGDOM.

1. The Kingdom is sometimes thought of as coming before the final Judgment, and therefore of limited duration upon earth. In this case the idea of a Hereafter is kept separate therefrom, and the effect of the final Judgment is to fix the eternal destiny of each individual according as he has helped or hindered the

coming of that Kingdom here. Where it is the former, the Hereafter is a blessed one, and is therefore in a superlative sense the Kingdom of God. So the author of Sib. iii. does not think the Messianic Kingdom on earth is to be permanent, since, in describing the peace of that period, he says: "King shall be friendly with king till the end of the age" (vers. 756 f.). The Judgment follows, "when the Eternal will surely be wroth with him who commits . . . sins. And then . . . He will raise up his Kingdom for all ages" (vers. 766 f.). The scene of this latter is, as in Sib. iv., "on earth (i.e. after its renovation) when God gives breath and life and grace to them, the godly" (vers. 187-190). The words of Jub., "And the days shall begin to grow many and increase amongst those children of men, till their days draw nigh to one thousand years, and to a greater number of years than (before) was the number of the days" (xxiii. 27), of themselves do not suggest a position different from that of 1 En. i-xxxvi (see below, pp. 88 f.). Verse 11 seems to put "the day of the great judgment" (cf. xxiv. 33) prior to the Messianic Kingdom, and if that were really what was intended, Jub. would have to be associated with 1 En. i-xxxvi in thinking of the kingdom as eternal, and the lives of its members long, but yet temporal. As, however, the resurrection is unmistakably put after the quotation above, in verse 30, the Kingdom is of limited duration, the Judgment following it preparatory to the final spiritual bliss of the righteous; at the close of the Messianic Kingdom, "the righteous . . . shall see all their judgments and all their curses on their enemies" (xxiii. 30). In the Test. much space is given (see below, pp. 139 ff.) to progressive work under the leadership and inspiration of the Messiah prior to the final Judgment, when the eternal Kingdom will be set up: "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom which shall not pass away" (T. Jos. xix. 12). This latter, however, including those raised and acquitted at the Judgment (see below, pp. 324 f.) is really a Hereafter on a changed earth. In 1 En. lxxxiii.-xc. there is upon earth a real advance of the cause of God's people leading up to a grand last scene, where a change comes over the resurrected righteous: the righteous dead rise now to share in the Kingdom: "And all that had been destroyed . . . assembled . . . all their generations were transformed" (xc. 33, 38), and the Kingdom thus passes into a Hereafter on the earth, life now being thought to be unending.

The temporary character of the Kingdom on the present earth is more clearly seen, where it is thought that only the surviving righteous become members of the Kingdom; thus Psa. Sol. xvii: "Blessed be they that shall be in those days, in that they shall see the good fortune of Israel which God shall bring to pass in the gathering together of the tribes" (ver. 50). Zad. expects that

in this life the Messiah "shall make them know His holy spirit" (ii. 10); but he also looks beyond that age, "they who hold fast to Him (i.e. God) are for the life of eternity" (v. 6)—the Messiah's reign on the present earth is distinct from the blessed future life, an intervening Judgment being implied. In their use of the phrase, "for the age," A 2 and A 3 of 2 Bar. share the same view; in the former, e.g., "his (i.e. Messiah's) principate will stand for the age, until the world of corruption is at an end, and until the times aforesaid are fulfilled" (xl. 3); in the latter, a time is spoken of, when the Messiah "has sat down in peace for the age on the throne of His kingdom" (lxxiii. 1); and A 1 of the same book accords with this interpretation: "And it shall come to pass after these things (i.e. after the Messianic age), when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled (i.e. after his reign), that he shall return in glory (i.e. to heaven)" (xxx. 1),—"the consummation of the time (i.e. the Messianic age)" (xxix. 8) is completed before "the consummation of the times (i.e. the final Judgment)" (xxx. 3). The redactor of 4 Ez. so handles part of his material as to represent the same sequence of events: "My Son, the Messiah shall be revealed . . . and shall rejoice the survivors four hundred years. And it shall be after these years, that my Son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath" (vii. 28 f.); then, after the close of that Messianic Kingdom "shall the world be turned into the primæval silence seven days. . . . And it shall be after seven days that . . . the Most High shall be revealed upon the throne of judgment (vii. 30, 33). He reveals the same view in his treatment of the Eagle vision. In the vision itself the world empire is destroyed before the rule of God is brought in, "the whole earth freed from your (i.e. the Eagle's, Rome's) violence shall be refreshed again, and hope for the judgment and mercy of Him that made her" (xi. 46); but after that he himself looks forward, to quote him, "until the End come, even the Day of Judgment, of which I have spoken unto you from the beginning" (xii. 34).

The authorities quoted for this optimistic view up to now, with the possible exception of Sib. iii. and iv, agree in looking for a human Messiah to initiate the Kingdom, and to remain as its ruling influence. Three other writers adopt the same outline of future events, but they give no place to a Messiah. 1 En. xci.-civ. explicitly declares the temporary nature of the Kingdom: in his scheme of the last three weeks, the Kingdom comes in "the eighth week, that of righteousness" (xc. 12); in the following verse he indicates things to happen "at its close," and then goes on to say, "and after that, in the ninth week, the righteous judgment shall be revealed to the whole world" (xc. 14A); i.e. it is first the Kingdom, then the last Judgment. Similarly in the

Ass. Mos. the sequence is: the destruction of Rome by Israel, a transitory Kingdom, the Judgment, and the exaltation of Israel to heaven,—“and He will appear to punish the Gentiles. . . . Then, O Israel, you shall be happy . . . and God will exalt you . . . to the heaven . . . and you shall look from on high” (x. 7-10). 2 En. also places the Kingdom in the present world and sets a time limit for it: “And I blessed the seventh day, which is the sabbath, on which he rested from all his works. And I appointed the eighth day also, that the eighth day should be the first-created after My work, and that the first seven revolve in the form of the seventh thousand” (xxxii. 2-xxxiii. 2),—in other words, the course of the world is thought to be seven thousand years, six thousand have already passed, one thousand still remain as the period of the Messianic rest and blessedness; and then follows “the great Judgment” (lviii. 6, lxv. 6, lxvi. 7), itself followed by “the eighth day . . . a time of not-counting, endless” (xxxiii. 1 f.), that eternal day when time shall be no more. The optimism of the writers quoted in this and the foregoing paragraphs should be carefully noted, since an all-round pessimism in respect of what was to be expected on earth has been too often assumed to be the normal attitude of the mind of Judaism during our period. By these the present earth is not given up as hopeless, God-forsaken, as if there could be no change for the better till the crack of doom for the wicked.

2. A less optimistic view was, however, entertained by some, according to which the Kingdom was thought to come after the final Judgment. It was to be in some sense an eternal Kingdom upon the earth, but always in such a sense as to make it to be of the nature of a Hereafter on the earth. The present earth was from the first, on this view, given up as too bad for anything, hence after some modification and spiritualisation this latent pessimism comes out distinctly, and then only a blessed Hereafter is looked for. “Eternal” seems at first to be used with the limited meaning of a usually long time; e.g. in 1 En. x. 10 “to live an eternal life” means to “live five hundred years.” In this paragraph it is used almost as equivalent to “final,” the Kingdom being the last stage of things with no other beyond it. In 1. En. i.-xxxvi. the reward of the righteous is to “complete the number of the days of their life. And their lives shall be increased in peace and the years of their joy shall be multiplied, in eternal gladness and peace, all the days of their life” (v. 9); “they shall live a long life on earth, such as your fathers (i.e. the patriarchs) lived” (xxv. 6). A succession of generations is expected, since the writer speaks of what continues “throughout all the days of the world and throughout all the generations of men” (xi. 2); “and it shall prove a blessing; the works of righteousness and

truth shall be planted in truth and joy for evermore" (x. 16). In this connection the solitary instance of a very sensuous picture of the Messianic bliss occurs—and that incidentally, not centrally,—in which the righteous "live till they beget thousands of children, and the days of their youth and their old age shall they complete in peace" (ver. 17). In 2 Macc. God is invoked as He "Who had established (i.e. presumably, had purposed to establish) His own people to all eternity" (xiv. 15); and to share in that eternal Kingdom on earth the martyrs expect to be resuscitated (see below, pp. 319 f.).

The fusion of this idea with that of a Hereafter proper is well illustrated by 1 En. xxxvii.—lxxi. The righteous are to enjoy a transformed earth: "I will transform the earth and make it a blessing . . . but the sinners and evil doers shall not set foot thereon" (xliv. 5). Though, possibly, in this section "the unities of time and place are curiously neglected" (A.P., vol. ii. p. 210; cf. R. H. Charles, II, pp. 74 f.), in estimating the author's view earth is not to be eliminated; he does not disregard the Kingdom of God on earth. But the Kingdom is established not only on earth, but also in heaven, both of which shall have undergone transformation. "I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light" (xliv. 4). Full provision is, therefore, made for an enduring Kingdom in the conception of a new heaven and a new earth. Whether or not the author had thought out clearly what he meant by these, he at least succeeds in getting rid of the idea of a life of limited duration for the righteous within an everlasting Kingdom. Enoch speaks of "the good pleasure of the Lord of Spirits by whom the lot of eternal life has been given to" him (xxxvii. 4). The redeemed are to "inherit eternal life" (xl. 9). "The elect (shall be) in the light of eternal life" (lviii. 3). "With the Son of Man shall they eat and lie down and rise up for ever and ever" (lxii. 14). The truth is, this writer is loosening from the idea of an everlasting Kingdom on earth, and is feeling his way towards the position assumed by such as surrender the idea altogether.

3. The author of B 2 in 2 Bar. has abandoned all hope of the rise of any Kingdom of righteousness upon earth. "How long will that which is corruptible remain," he asks in despair of the present world, "and how long will the time of mortals be prospered, and until what time will those who transgress in the world be polluted with much wickedness?" (xxi. 19). "Bring to an end . . . henceforth mortality," he prays (xxi. 22). "For that which is to be shall be the object of desire, and for that which comes afterwards shall we hope" (xliv. 11). In B 3 of the same book the pessimism is even deeper: "Before therefore judgment exact its own, and truth that which is its due, let us prepare our

soul. . . . For the youth of the world is past, and the strength of the creation already exhausted " (lxxxv. 9 f.). Similarly, in the Salathiel Apocalypse of 4 Ez., " creation is already grown old, and is already past the strength of youth " (v. 55) ; besides which, in chapter vi. 7-10, " in allegorical language . . . the apocalyptist indicates that the present corrupt age (symbolised by Esau) will be succeeded immediately, without a break, by the glorious future age of incorruption (symbolised by Jacob) . . . there is no room for a Messianic interim " (A.P., vol. ii. p. 575). In an Ezra piece, embodied in the same book, the outlook is likewise pessimistic : " For the world has lost its youth, the times begin to wax old . . . now renounce the life that is corruptible . . . and hasten to remove from these times. . . . For the weaker the world grows through age, so much the more shall evils increase upon the dwellers on earth. Truth shall withdraw further off, and falsehood be nigh at hand " (xiv. 10, 13-17). Here optimism with regard to this world is at lowest ebb.

4. The writers who support the less optimistic view in no instance make room for the human Messiah, and of them only 1 En. xxxvii-lxxi introduces the superhuman Messiah. If also Apoc. Abr. xxxi, with its reference to a Messiah, be a later addition, as G. H. Box (I, p. xxviii) thinks, then that book in having no Messiah falls into line here with the majority ; if it is retained, then the view taken by that author is to be associated with that of the Similitudes. " Before the Age of the righteous begins to grow, My judgment shall come upon the lawless heathen through the people of your seed who have been separated for Me " (xxix), may be taken of the woes preceding the final Judgment, and " then I will sound the trumpet out of the air, and will send Mine Elect One, having in him all My power, one measure ; and this one shall summon My despised people from the nations, and I will burn with fire those who have insulted them and who have ruled among them in (this) Age " (xxxii.), of the final Judgment itself with the superhuman Messiah acting for God. In that case resurrection for that Judgment, though not specifically mentioned, may be presumed as part of the writer's conception of what shall be.

II. THE MEMBERS OF THE KINGDOM.

1. Our optimists think the Kingdom really open to the Gentiles. The Sib. iii and iv, standing respectively at the beginning and the end of our period, illustrate the persistency of the missionary idea throughout these centuries. " From every land they shall bring frankincense and gifts to the house of the great God : and there shall be no other house for men even in future generations to know, but only that which He has given to faithful

men to honour. For mortals call that alone (the house) of the great God" (iii. 772-6). On this ideal is based the final appeal of the next oracle to the Gentile folk: "O ill-starred mortals, let not these things be, and drive not the great God to various deeds of wrath . . . stretching your hands to heaven, seek forgiveness for your former deeds, and with praises ask pardon for your bitter ungodliness. God will grant repentance and will not slay: He will stay His wrath once more, if with one accord you practise precious godliness in your hearts" (iv. 162 f., 166-70). Jub. harps on blessing to come to mankind through Israel; thus, "In your seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed" (xviii. 16), "and you will be for a blessing on the earth, and all nations of the earth will desire you" (xx. 10). Possibly these words meant more to him than is at present traceable. Some sort of submission seems implied in: "Then shall the Gentiles fear before your face" (xxx. 18), a statement which looks towards what Tob. has in mind: "all shall turn and fear God truly and all shall leave their idols, who err after the false error" (xiv. 6; cf. xiii. 11; also I.J.A., Jan. 1909, p. 10). The strong passage, where, putting ultimate result as immediate purpose, he says: "And over all (i.e. except Israel) has He placed spirits in authority to lead them astray from Him" (Jub. xv. 31), is therefore just an earnest expression of his horror at the mode of life of the average Gentile.

The Test. keep in view throughout "saving every race of men" (T.L. ii. 11). The Gentiles are to "be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth and enlightened through the grace of the Lord" (T.L. xviii. 9). The end sought is not only "to save the race of Israel," but also "to gather the righteous from amongst the Gentiles" (T.N. viii. 3). "The Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in His tender mercies forever" (T.L. iv. 4; cf. T.B. ix. 2). "The Lord shall reveal His salvation to all Gentiles" (T.B. x. 5). "He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles" (T.A. vii. 3). Probably this writer is more optimistic than most. In 1 En. lxxxiii.-xc. it is expected that Gentiles will survive to the time of the setting up of the New Jerusalem, and that conversion of them will take place, resulting in a spontaneous surrender to the new regime—"falling down and doing homage . . . and making petition . . . and obeying . . . in everything . . . they (i.e. both Israelites and Gentiles) were all good and had returned to His house . . . the eyes of them all were opened, and they saw the good, and there was not one among them that did not see. And I saw that that house was large and broad, and very full" (xc. 30, 33, 35 f.). In Psa. Sol. xvii. there is first Gentile submission, "the Kingdom of our God is for ever over the nations in judgment" (ver. 4); then of these under subjection to the Messiah it is said: "He shall judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteous-

ness. And he shall have the heathen nations to serve him under his yoke ; . . . nations shall come from the ends of the earth to see his glory " (vers. 31 f., 34), which, in view of the character of the Messiah taken in this psalm, seems to mean that their repentance and conversion have followed their subjection. The author of Zad. is occupied with a mission to Israelites. He has the same horror as the writer of Jub. of being as are the Gentiles (viii. 12) ; but one who had taken up the idea of " the New Covenant " (viii. 16, ix. 28, 37), and made so much of " the prophets, whose words Israel has despised " (ix. 7), would not be predisposed to neglect the prophetic universalism.

Even the author of A 3 in 2 Bar., who remarks : " but regarding the Gentiles it were tedious to tell how they always wrought impiety and wickedness, and never wrought righteousness " (lxii. 7), finds it in his heart to say : " And some of them he shall spare. . . . And this because some out of every nation shall be subjected to your people " (lxxii. 3, 5). That those spared have not been cruel oppressors of God's people means that subjection is only for the most hopeful of the Gentiles. Proselytism might very properly be called subjection ; and if not so used here, the spared are probably looked upon as people likely to become proselytes. In this connection words from two parts of B 1 of the same book should be brought together as a warning against making too much of very strong language. In one place the writer says : " For lo ! we see now the multitude of the prosperity of the Gentiles, though they act impiously, but they shall be like a vapour . . . like unto a drop . . . accounted as spittle . . . as smoke they shall pass away . . . as grass that withers shall they fade away . . . as a wave that passes shall they be broken . . . they shall pass away as a passing cloud " (lxxxii. 3-9). Similar words are to be found in 4 Ez. vi. 56, quoted later (see below, p. 94). Here, however, they lack the apparently wide reference they have in 4 Ez., being intended only of the prosperous Gentile tyrants. For the rest this writer has an eye for seeing a great opportunity in the exile ; " the word of the Lord " has come to him saying : " I will scatter this people among the Gentiles that they may do good to the Gentiles " (i. 1, 4). The editor of 4 Ez. is rightly impressed with the superiority of his own people, and remarks : " Individual men of note indeed Thou mayst find to have kept Thy precepts ; but nations Thou shall not find " (iii. 36). He is not, therefore, over sanguine ; the pessimism of some of his sources has affected him. All the more remarkable is it that he retains in the vision given in chapter xiii, " some (i.e. Gentiles) brought others (i.e. Jews) who should be offered " (ver. 13),—a picture of impressed Gentiles returning the captives they had taken, as the similar words " bringing as gifts her sons who had fainted "

or "been scattered from her" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 34) show. He seems to intend these Gentiles to be, as proselytes, part of the "multitude which was peaceable" (ver. 12), and not to be included among those to be reproached "to their face with their evil thoughts and with the tortures with which they are destined to be tortured" (ver. 38).

The writers whose scheme of future happenings is substantially the same as the above,—though they have no place for the Messiah,—are also in agreement on the point under consideration. From 1 En. xci.—civ., if the line be original and as placed in A.P., vol. ii. p. 264, note: "And all mankind shall look to the path of uprightness" (xc. 14d). Ass. Mos. says: "And then His kingdom shall appear throughout all His creation" (x. 1)—a statement which should be read in the light of the earlier one: "For He has created the world on behalf of His people. But He was not pleased to manifest this purpose of creation from the foundation of the world, in order that the Gentiles might thereby be convicted, yea to their own humiliation might by (their) arguments convict one another" (i. 12 f.). To emphasise as narrow the idea of the world being made for Israel, and to pass over the conviction of the Gentiles, yea even of one Gentile by another, is to do this writer a serious injustice. That the unconvicted who hold to "all their idols" God "will appear to punish" (x. 7), implies that the convicted become part of Israel. Throughout 2 En. the interest is more human than Israelitish: "As one year is more honourable than another, so is one man more honourable than another, some for great possessions, some for wisdom of heart, some for particular intellect, some for cunning, one for silence of lip, another for cleanliness, one for strength, another for comeliness, one for youth, another for sharp wit, one for shape of body, another for sensibility, let it be heard everywhere, but there is none better than he who fears God, he shall be more glorious in time to come" (xliii. 2 f. A). "He who fears God" this writer knew to be most often illustrated from among his fellow Jews, and yet his consistency in speaking of man without racial distinction of any sort compels one to believe that he recognised there were good illustrations among the Gentiles. He would probably have joined the author of Wisd. in his appeal to the heathen to become partakers in the privileges of God's people: "Unto you therefore, O princes, are my words, that you may learn wisdom and not fall away. . . . Set your desire therefore upon my words; long for them and you shall be instructed" (vi. 9, 11).

The pessimists appear to anticipate only a comparatively small incoming of Gentiles. In 1 En. i.—xxvi it is expected that Gentiles will be spared at the Judgment, and that, too, because of what they may become through the influence of the Messianic Kingdom

to which they will be subject. "And all the children of men shall become righteous, and all nations shall offer adoration and shall praise Me, and all shall worship Me" (x. 21). In 1 En. xxxvii.-lxxi. R. H. Charles (I, p. 297) considers that annihilation seems to await the Gentiles; H. J. Wicks (p. 177) dissents from his view, and one is inclined to take sides with the latter. The establishment of a universal Kingdom of righteousness is in mind; the Messiah "shall be the light of the Gentiles. . . . All who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship before him" (xlviii. 4 f.). The sight of the victorious righteous is sufficient to secure "that they (i.e. Gentiles just referred to as 'others') may repent, and forgo the works of their hands" (1. 2). Still, the repentance of the Gentiles is not emphasised, and in lxiii. 1, 10-12 it is unavailing. It is in S, of 4 Ez. the most sweeping statement occurs: "But as for the other nations, which are descended from Adam, you have said that they are nothing, and that they are like unto spittle; and you have likened the abundance of them to a drop on a bucket" (vi. 56). But that this idea was ever carried so far as to mean the unconditional exclusion of the individual Gentile, there is no good reason to suppose. Whatever extensive exclusion was thought of, arose from the feeling that the Gentiles were not likely to fulfil the religious and moral conditions held to be necessary. Even the very legal writer of Jud. thinks that some Gentiles are impressionable, since he records that "when Achior (i.e. the Ammonite) saw all the things that the God of Israel had done, he believed in God exceedingly, and circumcised the flesh of his foreskin, and was joined unto the house of Israel, unto this day" (xiv. 10). In Apoc. Abr. the sparing of some Gentiles is taught: "These who are on the left side are the multitude of the peoples (i.e. the heathen world as opposed to the Jews) . . . destined, some for judgment and restoration, and others for vengeance and destruction at the end of the world" (xxii); and the conversion of these spared heathen is probably in view, where God is pictured as saying: "(The righteous) shall behold Me full of joy, rejoicing with My people, and receiving those (i.e. the heathen) who return to Me in repentance" (xxix). Among devout people, then, an optimistic majority retained the missionary outlook of the finest prophets of the O.T. (see A. Kuenen, chap. iii), while by a pessimistic minority the seeking of the Gentiles for the Kingdom was not taken seriously as a duty.

2. J. B. Mayor has said that the three views of the future of the Gentile world, which our writers as readers of the O.T. would have presented to them from which to make their choice, would be: "(1) They are the enemies of God and of His people, doomed to be exterminated like the Canaanites and Amalekites; (2) They stand in no relation to God, and are merely to be exploited for

the benefit of Israel; (3) They are God's children, made in His likeness, and the duty and glory of Israel is to impart to them the revelation of God, made to themselves" (E., Nov. 1909, p. 390). Our pessimists favour something approximating now and then to the first view; our optimists inclined to the last. All are agreed in refusing to look at the second view; in no case is the Gentile retained in submission with a view to exploitation,—see the progressive work under the Messiah treated of below, pp. 139 ff. Besides, the superlative material blessings of the Kingdom on earth are in no instance the result of exploitation; they are due rather to the absence of it in an exceptionally productive land. According to Sib. iii the subjects of the Kingdom "shall live quietly around the temple" (ver. 703); "Earth the universal mother shall give to mortals her best" (ver. 744); and "the cities shall be full of good things and the fields rich" (ver. 750). The reference to the Messianic banquet, at which, in language derived from ancient legend (for which see W. O. E. Oesterley, III, p. 54), it is said: "Behemoth . . . and Leviathan . . . those two great monsters . . . shall be food for all that are left" (2 Bar. xxix. 4), is made clear by the following picture of ideal material satisfactions: "The earth also shall yield its fruit ten thousandfold, and on each vine there shall be a thousand branches, and each branch shall produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster produce a thousand grapes, and each grape produce a cor of wine. And those who have hungered shall rejoice" (xxix. 5 f.),—compare, "The vine which they plant thereon shall yield wine in abundance, and as for all the seed which is sown thereon each measure (of it) shall bear a thousand, and each measure of olives shall yield ten presses of oil. And cleanse the earth from all oppression" (1 En. x. 19 f.). With these should be read: "And then healing shall descend in dew, and disease shall withdraw, and anxiety and anguish and lamentation pass from amongst men, and gladness proceed through the whole earth . . . the reapers shall not grow weary, nor those that build be toil-worn" (2 Bar. lxxiii. 2-lxxiv. 1). Hence, if in one or two instances the subjection rather than the conversion of the Gentiles may be spoken of, the idea of exploitation of them is not present. Our writers were far too honestly religious and moral to regard their subjection as an end in itself.

"The liberal party, which was strong among the Hellenistic Jews, and had influential support even in Palestine, was willing to divest Judaism of its accidental elements and to insist upon essentials,—the profession of faith in one God, the observance of the Sabbath-rest, and the abjuration of idolatry in all its forms as well as its immoral accompaniments. In a word, all that it insisted upon was ethical monotheism. Circumcision was not

demanding as a *sine qua non* for the admission of proselytes, only the purificatory bath of baptism" (G. H. Box, J.Th.S., vol. xiii p. 324). "The only reference given for this last statement is Sib. iv. 165: "And wash your whole bodies in ever-running rivers," and on such terms probably full equality of Jew and Gentile was seldom, if ever, admitted (see J.L., pp. 42-45, 165 f., 342; D.B., vol. i, pp. 239 f.; E.B., 3904 f.; and cf. in Rabbinical literature the merit of circumcision, A. Marmorstein, pp. 179 f.). The universalism of our writers is one which includes that particularism contained in the requirement that the Gentile be *fully* admitted only on his making himself a Jew. "Every Jew understood . . . that the hidden rule of God should be plainly manifested, that his Kingdom should appear visibly upon the earth; but their faith had a reverse side—in the minds of the Jews this Kingdom was *their* Kingdom" (G. Holman, p. 80; cf. C. G. Montefiore on "National Monotheism" in P., pp. 619 f.).

III. THE FACTORS IN THE BRINGING IN OF THE KINGDOM.

I. Our optimists are agreed in calling for repentance as necessary in order to the creation by God of the conditions under which a godly community be established on earth. Jub. holds that Israel's restoration cannot come about, unless there be a very radical national reformation. The message of God is: "And after this (i.e. after their scattering among the Gentiles, and their subsequent forgetting of God's law, commandments and judgments) they will turn to Me from amongst the Gentiles with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their strength, and I will gather them from amongst all the Gentiles, and they will seek Me, so that I shall be found of them, when they seek Me with all their heart and with all their soul . . . they will turn to Me in all uprightness and with all (their) heart and with all (their) soul, and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their seed, and I will create in them a holy spirit, and I will cleanse them so that they shall not turn away from Me from that day unto eternity" (i. 15, 23). The Test. looks for the end of a bad state of things: "until you turn unto the Lord with perfect heart repenting and walking in all the commandments of God, and the Lord will visit you with mercy and bring you up from captivity among the Gentiles" (T.Jud. xxiii. 5A). Again: "And after these things (i.e. captivity) you shall remember the Lord and repent" (T.Z. ix. 7); "he (i.e. the enemy) knows that upon the day on which Israel shall repent, the kingdom of the enemy shall be brought to an end" (T.D. vi. 4). The Ass. Mos. expects "that His name should be called upon until

the day of repentance in the visitation wherewith the Lord will visit them in the consummation of the end of the days (i.e. in the time of the Kingdom)" (i. 18). This repentance, too, is to be interpreted in agreement, probably, with the phrase in Zad.: "to return to the Law of Moses with all his heart and all his soul" (xix. 11; cf. vers. 9, 14; xx. 2). Zad. looks for the coming of a Teacher of Righteousness who shall bring about such repentance in preparation for the advent of the Messiah. So in 4 Ez. vi. 26, by the preaching of supernatural Messianic forerunners "shall the heart of the inhabitants (of the world) be changed, and be converted to a different spirit." Hence, for these writers a necessary human condition for the ushering in of the Kingdom of God was just such a national or world repentance as would result in a return to real religious and moral earnestness in everything. Even where not mentioned in so many words, it may be taken as one of their assumptions. (On repentance, see further below, pp. 252 ff.)

2. The idea that a "catastrophic change . . . at variance with all the spiritual experience of mankind" (cf. R. H. Charles, I, p. 330) was what was expected, should not be too readily assumed. In certain instances the attainment of the high perfection hoped for is not thought to be instantaneous, but gradual. Thus, in T.L. xviii. 9, sin is to come to an end, not on the advent of the Messiah, but during his reign: "In his priesthood shall sin come to an end, and the lawless shall cease to do evil." In Jub. a work of gradual transformation of the world, moral and physical, is going on "according to the individual years, according to all the numbers of the jubilees, from the day of the creation until the heavens and the earth shall be renewed and all their creation according to the powers of the heaven, and according to all the creation of the earth, until the sanctuary of the Lord shall be made in Jerusalem on Mount Zion, and all the luminaries be renewed for healing and for peace and for blessing for all the elect of Israel, and that thus it may be from that day and unto all the days of the earth" (i. 29; cf. l. 5). The last stage of this development begins with the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom: "Mount Zion will be sanctified in the new creation for a sanctification of the earth" (iv. 26); "and He shall make for all His works a new and righteous nature, so that they should not sin in their whole nature for ever, but should be all righteous each in his kind alway" (v. 12). Spiritual transformation goes on side by side with renewed and progressive study of the Law: "in those days the children shall begin to study the laws, and to seek the commandments, and to return to the path of righteousness" (xxiii. 26). The provision of a human Messiah had, for one thing, just such a progressive work in view (see below, pp. 139 ff.). These people,

then, probably had more than an inkling that "Godlike character cannot come from without as an external gift, nor can it be won in a moment, but can only be the slow result of the spiritual travail of the human heart in communion with the divine" (cf. R. H. Charles, I, pp. 330 f.). An impression to the contrary may be of the nature of a first impression, due to taking too literally the form in which they expressed their faith that the hand of God was so in things that they were bound to be changed for the better. That they spoke so often of the Godward side of events should not blind one to the fact that they assumed always a very real, if somewhat limited, human co-operation. (See further below, pp. 192 ff., also cf. L. Dougall, p. 23.)

3. Our pessimists think rather differently. They have given up the present as so thoroughly bad that they wait for God's direct interference to bring the course of events here to a catastrophic close. Looking only for the final Judgment, their normal attitude of mind is that of earnest prayer for its speedy arrival. So, for instance, the prayer: "Destroy all wrong from the face of the earth and let every evil come to an end; and let the plant of righteousness and truth (i.e. Israel) appear" (1 En. x. 16). It is the one and only hope of the martyrs, who constantly remind their murderers of what it will mean to them, even rejoice to think of that great day of vengeance on them (2 Macc. vii. 17, 35 f.). They anticipate with the writer just quoted that "in the last days there shall be upon them (i.e. the wicked) the spectacle of righteous judgment," and that "in the days of judgment . . . they (i.e. the righteous) shall bless Him for the mercy in accordance with which He has assigned them (their lot)" (1 En. xxvii. 3 f.). In 1 En. xxxvii-lxxi the Kingdom is introduced by the judgment of the wicked: "sinners shall be judged for their sins, and shall be driven from the face of the earth" (xxxviii. 1),—this, too, in harmony with "the prayer of the righteous . . . that judgment may be done unto them, and that they may not have to suffer for ever" (xlvii. 2); in this way it shall come to pass that "the righteous shall have rest from the oppression of sinners" (liii. 7). This judgment is, however, only a preliminary, taking the place of the political activity usually assumed necessary by our optimists. The idea of progress afterwards is implied even in what is expected from the, on this view, comparatively few spared Gentiles (see above, pp. 93 f.); and, besides, where the superhuman Messiah is introduced, he not only acts for God at the great Assize, but also remains after that with the redeemed people as the chief influence on their life, so that life advances from glory to glory (see below, p. 146).

These writers, then, the only ones of whom R. H. Charles' remark (I, p. 330) could hold good, that "spiritual transforma-

tion" is thought by them to be "brought about catastrophically and in the main mechanically," and that "by the eternal fiat of the Almighty sin is banished at once and for ever from the hearts of the members of the Messianic Kingdom," may not after all be as guilty as at first they appear. For them the Judgment by the removal of the hopelessly bad sinners gives just those conditions in which righteous life can come forth in all its splendid fulness. It is, however, the undisturbed influence of God, exercised directly or through the superhuman Messiah with whom they shall dwell, which shall effect such changes as have not yet clearly entered into the mind of man to conceive. As regards what is possible in the present world, they wait for the End, when the Divine Judgment will clear the way for the glorious time to be. Till then things are at a standstill; but afterward righteousness and happiness will be for ever on the increase. Besides, even here their own expectancy in waiting for God involves religious and moral sincerity and earnestness not to be left out of consideration.

To summarise conclusions: two main streams of thought are represented in our literature, the one characterised by optimism, the other by pessimism, in regard to what was possible in the way of establishing the Kingdom of God in the present world. The optimists believed that there would be on this earth a Kingdom of limited duration. Most of them thought that a human Messiah would be active in its establishment, and during the whole period of its existence. The final Judgment would come at the close of the Messianic Kingdom. It is at this point that, for these writers, the Hereafter proper begins, and is in a higher degree and sense the Kingdom of God. These also sustain the missionary outlook toward the Gentiles of the most enlightened of the O.T. prophets; and be the Kingdom great or small, they expect that some considerable proportion of its members will be of Gentile origin. These Gentiles will have by subjection come to be converted, or else their subjection is to be understood as referring to their proselytism. Hence, in this universal Kingdom all had to be Jews or to become Jews, that is, they were either Jews or quasi-Jews. The Kingdom can only come when there has come to be on earth a really penitent people. Progress may be made toward a grand climax in a great day of repentance; and, after the political settlement obtained with or without the Messiah, a progressive sanctification goes on under the Messiah, or, without him, under God. On the other hand, the pessimists do not look for any Kingdom of God before the final Judgment. However, therefore, they try to keep the idea of its being on the earth, from the first their conception is really that of a Hereafter on the earth, so much so that after some modification it is resolved into a Here-

after proper. In this circle missionary enthusiasm sinks to a minimum; their general pessimism makes them look for little from the Gentiles, though they cannot shut their eyes to the genuinely good Gentile here and there to be met with. In religious and moral sincerity they wait for the final Judgment, praying that it may come quickly. The Judgment is conducted by God Himself, or through the super-human Messiah. After the Judgment they look under God, or that Messiah, for such a chance for the righteous life as has not been hitherto.—This result of our inquiry means that, on the whole, these people were not as oblivious to the processes of historical development as they have often been supposed to be, and that the Divine interposition looked for was not so mechanically conceived as first impressions perhaps would lead one to think. The optimists are sufficient proof that historical development and apocalyptic happenings are not to be opposed to one another; they are, by these, held together in one system of thought about the future on earth and in the Hereafter. Only by a pessimistic minority are things viewed as at a standstill, or for all human effort matters as bound to get worse; nothing but the Judgment Day, they think, will open the way to the chance they so much desire, for the undisturbed living out in all its possible fulness of the righteous life they love beyond all else.

B—JESUS AND THIS TEACHING

THE phrase "the Kingdom of Heaven (or 'God') " was familiar to, and frequently used by, Jesus, and for him signified a community of people here and hereafter who shall be in a new sense righteous (cf. J. H. Leckie, pp. 65 f.). He agrees with our writers in not being satisfied with any abstract conception of the Kingdom; for both it meant more than either "the abstract supremacy of the Law of God in the heart" or "God's order of Providence" (cf. W. Manson, p. 69; also S. Schechter, II, chap. vi. P., p. 625; J.L., p. 270). In "the recorded sayings of the Rabbis concerning the Kingdom of God . . . the phrase simply denotes the Divine Government which has been from the beginning and will continue for ever, but the existence and nature of which had been specially revealed to the Jew. Men are, moreover, said 'to take upon them the Kingdom' or 'the yoke of the Kingdom' by yielding conscious obedience to that Government. . . . It is very doubtful whether this use of the term was the common one among the Rabbis of our Lord's time" (V. H. Stanton, pp. 214 f.; cf. S. Schechter, II, pp. 66 f.). The more, therefore, one is given to speaking of the abstract Sovereignty of God rather than of a community in which that Sovereignty is acknowledged by a consistent doing of the Divine will on the part of its members (see R. H. Charles, I, pp. 84 f., against G. Dalman, p. 94; cf. E. G. Selwyn, p. 8; H. Rashdall, p. 54, note 1; H. E. Savage, p. 23), the less is one likely to understand their mind and his, when thinking of the Kingdom of God.

W. C. Allen remarks that "*ἐκκλησία* may well be the equivalent of some Aramaic expression for community, society, school, band of disciples" (I, p. 179; cf. F. J. A. Hort, Lecture I; E.B., 345, 820; T. C. Hall, p. 60; J. A. Findlay, pp. 231; G. Tyrrell, p. 57). "I will build my community . . . the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. xvi. 18 f.) may, then, be taken as a genuine note in the teaching of Jesus. "There is much to show that the idea of a community was present from the very beginning of the ministry of Jesus, the primary purpose of which was to draw out from the mass those who had the requisite qualifications for membership of the Kingdom" (W. K. L. Clarke in F. J. Foakes Jackson,

p. 185; cf. W. A. Grist, pp. 311 f.). This agreement with our writers (cf. V. H. Stanton, I, pp. 214 f., 217) determines that the difference between his conception and theirs cannot be stated by the simple antithesis, inward and outward. For example, on the former, from our literature can be quoted: "To the mind He gave the Law, by the which if a man order himself, he shall reign over a kingdom that is temperate, and just, and virtuous, and brave" (4 Macc. ii. 23). Only by careful study and comparison of the nature of the inwardness and outwardness which are presumed in his view and in theirs can any progress be made toward accurate differentiation. The latter, its aspect as mutual intercourse in a God-ruled community, is what is under discussion in the present chapter.

I. THE TIME, DURATION, AND LOCALITY OF THE KINGDOM.

I. Jesus joins the optimistic majority among his people in not waiting for the final Judgment before anything can be done, that is, in believing in the coming of God's Kingdom in the present world prior to that great settling up of accounts (cf. C. W. Emmett, p. 75 f.; S. Schechter, II, p. 104). His view must be associated with the earlier prophetic view, according to which "there is a distinction between the Messianic Kingdom and the glorious final condition of the world which follows later"; and not, as A. Schweitzer would have it, with the later apocalyptic view, according to which "the two coincide" (cf. E., Nov. 1913, p. 444). Concerning the time of the Kingdom there are three authentic notes in his teaching, namely, it is near, it is here, and it is yet to be. "There has come near the Kingdom of God" (Mark i. 15 || Matt. iv. 17; cf. Matt. iii. 2, x. 7),—the note struck by John the Baptist, the only note presumably,—was taken up by Jesus at the beginning of his public ministry, and under his instruction was sounded by the early disciples. The fashion among many scholars is to assume that by him also this was practically the only note struck. These make the message that it is near to mean that it is yet to be, and so practically eliminate altogether the idea that it is here.

A fairer treatment of our documents would perhaps result in an acknowledgment that this was only one note in his teaching. Failure to make this admission is largely due to the assumption of the "wholly apocalyptic character" of his idea of the Kingdom. Anything in the Gospels which deprives the Kingdom of this character is presumed to be the result of "the ecclesiastical idea . . . that the thought of Jesus was consciously directed towards the Church, in which His work had found its historical fulfilment"

(E. F. Scott, II, pp. 107 f.). It is assumed, also, that people of Jesus' time, when they spoke of the Kingdom, must necessarily have thought of it as in the future, on the other side of the final Judgment. That this was not the case has been already shown. The more pessimistic minority took that view,—“the Apocalyptic despairs altogether of the present age and the present world. . . . Apocalyptic is the literature of this despair” (H. T. Andrews in P., pp. 431 f.; cf. G. Tyrrell, p. 119); but the more optimistic majority thought of a real historical development this side the apocalyptic winding up of things at the final Judgment. The recorded words of Jesus can be fitted into the latter scheme without the strain involved in making his attitude, as in the former, entirely that of waiting for the great End of the Age that now is. If the imminence of the final Judgment had been the only, or even the prominent note in his preaching, there would have been no ground on which the people could have become enthusiastic over him as being possibly the very Messiah for whom they were looking. “There has come near the Kingdom of God” was intended to suggest that it was accessible, so near that it only rested with the people themselves to enter it, “You are not distant from the Kingdom of God” (Mark xii. 34); for, “Nowhere does He share the despair of the world, and of the impossibility of saving the mass of mankind, which is an integral element of apocalyptic teaching” (C. W. Emmett, E., Nov. 1912, p. 432). “Jesus by His faith in God made it appear that all this that prophets and apocalypticists had dreamed of, and kings and righteous men had desired to see, was only waiting on the faith of men in order to become real” (W. Manson, p. 88; cf. Matt. xiii. 16 f. || Luke x. 23 f.).

2. The second note, that it is here, appears in Luke xvii. 21: “Look! the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you,” where the reference may be for one thing to a fraternity in their midst (cf. E. A. Abbott, p. 340),—at the time, Jesus and his small circle of disciples (cf. S. Matthews, III, p. 81). He refused to establish the Kingdom by any political propaganda (see below, pp. 157 f.),—“The Kingdom of God is not coming with close watching (i.e. for an opportunity of hastening it ‘through rebellion or by force,’ cf. J.E., vol. vii. p. 503), nor will people say, ‘Look here!’ or ‘there!’” (Luke xvii. 20 f.); but the statement following the next “Look!” cannot mean less than that he thought that it was set up already among them (cf. A. Harnack, II, Lecture III, 1; T. C. Hall, pp. 67 f.). It may have been that “the Kingdom of God” was one of the terms Jesus as a Jewish teacher was constrained to use, even though its inadequacy was continually hampering him (cf. E. F. Scott, I, p. 7). But his use of it would have been wholly misleading, had it not retained on his lips its

fundamental idea of a community in which God governs. There is no good reason to suppose that he broke away from this fundamental conception of Biblical religion. "A people or community, and not an individual invisible spirit, was the fountain which brought forth the very highest ideas that were ever attained in the Biblical religion. Therefore a one-sided individualism can never be a just clue to the fundamental conceptions of that Biblical religion" (B. Duhm, p. 33; cf. J. Seeley, p. 52; J. Abelson, II, pp. 84 f.).

"If by God's spirit I am throwing out evil spirits, then there has arrived at you the Kingdom of God" (Matt. xii. 28 || Luke xi. 20),—compare the way in which the disciples were to bring home to men the presence of the Kingdom: "weak care for . . . evil spirits throw out" (Matt. x. 8). This meant that a frank consideration of what he and his disciples were doing should have led them to the conclusion, that the God-ruled community had been set up in their midst with a suddenness which had taken them by surprise (cf. S. Mathews, III, p. 81). Their sin was that they held aloof from this new community or hindered the progress of its formation, and used their influence to secure that others do the same: "you are shutting the Kingdom of Heaven in the face of men; for you,—you are not going in, and those who are going in, you do not let go in" (Matt. xxiii. 13 || Luke xi. 52). In the application of a parable, which is in part a trenchant criticism of them for so doing, he says: "Truly I tell you, that tax-gatherers and harlots are going before you into the Kingdom of God" (Matt. xxi. 31). These were joining the community of his disciples. This movement, too, began with the work of John the Baptist, and was going on still in spite of adverse criticism: "And from the days of John till now the Kingdom of Heaven is violated (i.e. as you critics would say), and the violent seize it" (Matt. xi. 12 || Luke xvi. 16),—a community such as he was establishing which admitted such folk into its fellowship was to his opponents an outrage on the very idea of the Kingdom of God. Since, then, "a body of disciples had been formed," Jesus looked upon it that "the Kingdom of God had really been inaugurated on earth" (F. C. Burkitt, pp. 83 f.; cf. F. W. Worsley, pp. 44 f., 47, 50; H. Rashdall, p. 66). See further below, pp. 122 f., on his idea of the development of the Kingdom on earth.

3. When, then, he speaks of the Kingdom as yet to be, the futurity of it which is intended is never a denial of its present existence (cf. S. Mathews, III, p. 74). His usual method is to link up intimately life in the Kingdom here with life in the Kingdom hereafter. Thus, when he is speaking of those who will or will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven in the future, his mind works from what now is; it is almost as if the community was got

together here, and was removed with its present membership into the Hereafter,—or at any rate the genuine part of its present membership with others, who had in their time and place striven to live up to the light which had been given them, went to make the heavenly community: “Let the boys come to me; don’t stop them; for of such (i.e. of their sort) is the Kingdom of God” (Mark x. 14 || Matt. xix. 14, Luke xviii. 16). Hence, “Whoever does not take to the Kingdom of God as a boy (i.e. takes to anything he appreciates)” (Mark x. 15 || Luke xviii. 17),—“unless you turn and become as boys” (Matt. xviii. 3), there is no entrance into the future divine community. The present community is as yet a community who are at the stage of new entrants,—“the smallest in the Kingdom of Heaven” (Matt. xi. 11 || Luke vii. 28). Yet to him they are satisfactory, if they are like boys, enthusiastic and pushful over anything they go in for, and like them, too, in that, immature as they are, they will grow (cf. F. G. Peabody, I, pp. 80, 85; T. R. Glover, I, pp. 132 f, II, pp. 49 f.). They had, or would develop the qualities which would fit them for the eternal Kingdom. Again: “Not every one who says to me, Sir, Sir, . . . but he who does the will of my Father in heaven” (Matt. vii. 21; cf. Luke xiii. 24, 27), whose “righteousness is very much over and above that of Scribes and Pharisees” (Matt. v. 20), will go into it. In the present community “both grow together” (Matt. xiii. 30), but afterwards at the making up of the future community they are separated, and only for the good is there “in the world (or ‘Age’) to come eternal life” (Mark x. 30 || Matt. xix. 29, Luke xviii. 30).

In every instance in the Synoptics where the idea of the “Father” is intimately associated with the idea of the Kingdom (see above, pp. 59 f.), it is this perfected Kingdom in the Hereafter, where His will is fully done, which is in view. This is the blessedness which is contemplated in the beatitudes; they will in that “Kingdom of Heaven . . . be comforted . . . have their fill (i.e. of righteousness) . . . be pitied . . . see God . . . be acknowledged as God’s sons . . . reward . . . in heaven” (Matt. v. 3–12 || Luke vi. 20–23). In respect to the immediacy or otherwise of this prospect, the parable of the maidens, in which the “sensible” or “prudent” were fully prepared for some delay in the bridegroom’s arrival in that they “took oil in their flasks,” leads up to the warning: “Keep waken, then, for you do not know the day nor the hour (i.e. of the day)” (Matt. xxv. 13). “Let Thy Kingdom come” (Matt. vi. 10 || Luke xi. 2), looked forward to this consummation beyond the Judgment; and this perfect Kingdom for which they prayed would be given to them. Here only, and of necessity, is the Kingdom apocalyptically conceived by him (contrast A. Schweitzer, pp. 368 f.). However

their particular form and association are to be accounted for, it is this thought of the final act of God which is foremost in such sayings as: "Truly I tell you, you (? Palestinians) (? without the spur of persecution) will not have finished (i.e. the missioning of) the towns of Israel, till ' the Son of Man ' comes " (Matt. x. 23) ; " And I tell you truly, there are some of those who are standing here who will not taste death till they see the Kingdom of God " (Luke ix. 27 || Mark ix. 1, Matt. xvi. 28) ; " So (i.e. just as you read the signs of the coming of summer in the trees putting out their green leaves) you too, when you see these things happening, recognise that near is the Kingdom of God " (Luke xxi. 31 || Mark xiii. 29, Matt. xxiv. 33).

4. Hence, whatever his followers may have done in developing the idea of a Church, and however that idea, when developed, may have modified in places his original sayings, they did not misinterpret his mind, when they refused to let go the idea that the Kingdom of God, if it was to mean anything at all for the present, must mean the formation of a community on earth committed to doing the will of God as he had interpreted that will. Such a community is the Kingdom in this world ; and, though there may be others, *bona fide* members of that community here are at any rate to be members of it, when it emerges in its full glory on the other side of the Judgment. The idea that Jesus used the term in the sense of a condition of soul is to be rejected (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 61). E. von Dobschütz speaks of the "inwardness of the Kingdom." "And because it is present, it is to be taken as something inward," "If to receive the kingdom is the condition for entering into the kingdom, it must be in the first place some kingdom before the kingdom, i.e., some inward experience, accessible to man in the present time, before the kingdom in the external eschatological sense is to be revealed " (E., April 1910, pp. 336 ff.). The fallacy here seems to be in the supposition that the Kingdom of God could not be thought of as "external" except in the "eschatological sense." But the popular scheme of thought which Jesus seems to have followed allowed for the existence of the Kingdom as a real community before the apocalyptic closing of the present age by the Judgment. Not to retain the idea of a divine community on the present earth seems to vitiate all understanding of Jesus. It was a community, too, whose witness should be to the defeat, if not to the annihilation, of Satan in the present life ; and later, the last Judgment on the defeated power would take place. (For the mythic basis of these ideas, see W. O. E. Oesterley, III, e.g. pp. 165, 170, 179, 183, 187).

However apocalyptically he may have spoken about that Judgment to come,—and how else could he have spoken of it? —that did not debar him from thinking that the community which

he had formed round himself had before it a real, though perhaps short, career on earth. The evangelisation of the world in a single generation seems to have been in his mind,—a not unreasonable programme, since “men had no idea then of the size of the earth, such as we know it now, nor of the infinite and persistent variety among the different races of men, which cause such great difficulties to missionary enterprise” (P. W. Wernle, p. 2). If also he believed himself to be the human Messiah actually establishing the Kingdom on earth (see later, pp. 149–155), then, in view of his approaching death, involving his leaving them behind,—a contingency unprovided for in any known scheme of thought on the Kingdom and the Messiah among Jews of his time,—he may have said something on the long time the Kingdom on earth was usually expected to last, which removed the notion of a very extended separation of himself from them. His words, which were interpreted as referring to his speedy return, may have been intended as a denial of the thought of their continuing, after he had gone, in a Messianic Kingdom of either a thousand, or four hundred years in separation from him. Such a very long life on earth was in accordance with prevailing ideas of what was going to happen prior to the Judgment. In terms of his day he could say that the maximum of separation from him would not be more than the span of an ordinary life by putting the Judgment at the end of that generation. “It is probably true that He believed the end of the world would be seen by the generation actually living around Him.” Probably also he “would not have held to this form of expectation, if He could have seen the earth as we see it.” This was the husk of his thought which belonged to his time; his real concern was “only with the kernel of things, and with the true inner meanings of doctrine and of practice” (cf. B. Duhm, pp. 73, 79).

II. THE MEMBERS OF THE KINGDOM.

I. The words of Jesus in the Gospels bearing on the extent of the fellowship of the Kingdom which was contemplated by him should be considered with two questions in mind, namely, Did he think of the admission of the Gentiles? And if he did, on what terms? That he himself confined his activities to his own people has inclined some to answer the former question in the negative. The nature of these activities, however, do not seem to warrant that conclusion. Take, first, his appeal to the synagogue goes (cf. F. C. Burkitt, II, p. 79). He “went round all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the good news of the Kingdom” (Matt. iv. 23 || Mark i. 39, Luke iv. 15, 44). “Being highly spoken of by all” (Luke iv. 15), signifies a period of acceptability

which was enjoyed by him. He gave the call of the Kingdom first where a most ready response might reasonably be looked for. That, however, he did not get what he had hoped for emerges at several points. He picks up the pious remark of a guest, "Lucky he who will eat bread in the Kingdom of God" (Luke xiv. 15), in a way which shows how he felt that the average synagogue worshippers were too absorbed in the ordinary duties of common life to respond worthily to his invitation; their life was substantially an excuse for refusing to do so. "A certain man was making a great supper; and he had invited many; and he delegated his slave at the hour of the supper to tell those invited, Come; for now things are ready. And they began from one mind—all of them to beg off. The first said to him, A field I have bought . . . another said, Teams of oxen I have bought—five, . . . And another said, A wife I have married" (vers. 16–21). The order and content of these excuses should be compared with the statement of man's duties in Sir. vii, which, excluding those specially toward God and His ministers, are set out thus: "Don't hate laborious work, nor husbandry. . . . Have you cattle, look (to them) yourself. . . . Have you a wife, do not abhor her" (vers. 15, 22, 26; cf. E., Jan. 1911, pp. 74–84). Jesus found lots of respectable people too busy to give time to the Kingdom to which he invited them; to say the least, for them it had no special attraction (cf. C. G. Montefiore, IV, pp. 22 f.). "They were negligent and went away, the one to his field, the other on his business" (Matt. xxii. 5).

In this connection is to be read: "Go in through the narrow gate; for broad is the gate and wide is the road which leads right on to Destruction,—and many there are who are going in through it. For narrow is the gate, and confined the road which leads right on to Life, and few there are who are finding it" (Matt. vii. 14). Jesus refused to take up the problem, whether "few . . . are being saved" (Luke xiii. 23), and in words (ver. 24) very similar to those which have just been quoted from Matthew exhorted his audience to take their chance and become thoroughly in earnest, before it was too late. His words, therefore, on the "few . . . who are finding it," also his saying, "Many are invited, but few (prove themselves to be) Elect" (Matt. xxii. 14), are not to be associated off-hand with the general pessimism which is to be met with, for example, in 4 Ez.: "This age the Most High has made for many, but the age to come for few. . . . Many have been created, but few shall be saved" (viii. 1, 3; cf. vii. 60),—as F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake do, where they write: "Jesus, like Ezra, thought that very few enter into life. . . . Jesus looked for few to follow him or attain life, either in this world or in the World to come" (J.L., p. 285; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 67 f.).

They are more likely to have been originally a statement of fact with regard to the slender result of his appeal in the synagogues of the land. The professed "sons of the Kingdom" (Matt. viii. 12) had failed him (cf. E., Nov. 1909, p. 396).

Second, there is his mission to the non-synagogue goers. "These outcasts of the Jewish Church had ceased to contemplate any approach to God as possible from their side. To conceive God as approaching them was more remote still" (H. Townsend, p. 102). This was not surprising, since "to seek out and redeem the fallen and unrepentant sinner was . . . not yet an acknowledged duty" (C. G. Montefiore in P., p. 623). To approach these in the name of the Father, Jesus regarded as an immense opportunity. "Harvest great, workers few" (Matt. ix. 37). This "few" are probably the same "few" as have been referred to in the paragraph above, and under the very aspect which explains why they were "few." To these he gave the command: "Into Gentiles' road do not go away, and into Samaritans' towns do not enter; but go rather (i.e. preferably) to the lost sheep of Israel's house" (Matt. x. 5). The scene in the Nazareth synagogue may explain his reference to Gentiles. His illustration of, "Nobody a prophet is acceptable in his native place," by "Elijah" sent "to Zarephath of Sidon to a widow (or 'Aramæan,' see C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 875) woman," and by "Elisha" and what he did for "Naaman the Syrian" (Luke iv. 24-27), was taken as significant of an outlook toward the Gentile which infuriated his neighbours,—that they could possibly miss a blessing a Gentile might receive was an outrageous suggestion (cf. C. S. Macfarland, p. 80). The "few," however, had caught his missionary enthusiasm, but for the moment he would have that enthusiasm harnessed definitely for work among the great mass of non-synagogue goers. This limitation was no more than a wise conservation of enthusiasm by a concentration of it on the seizure of the opportunity present; without such concentration it might have run itself out, as so often has been the case in similar circumstances, without doing anything. Probably his appeal was made first to the synagogues, because he had this mission in view, and when, in general, that appeal for a mission among these outsiders failed, he undertook it alone with the co-operation of the "few" (cf. F. W. Worsley, pp. 59 f.). They were to make up for the persistent neglect of "the lost sheep of Israel's house," the hated tax-gatherers and other such sinners so-called, on the part of those who determined the policy of the recognised religious institutions (cf. K. Lake, pp. 27 f.; P., p. 622; J.L., pp. 78 f., 291).

In a measure this was a feature of the mission work of John the Baptist,—one of its features probably that Jesus liked most. The Rabbi was not usually a missionary, but Jesus evidently

felt that this was the most effectual way of carrying forward John's work of establishing the new Israel" (H. Rix, p. 16; cf. M. Joseph, pp. 166 f.); so he became one in real earnest, manifesting a thoroughness in neglect of custom and precedent such as John does not seem to have shown. By the orthodox he was constantly attacked for it, and on more than one occasion made his defence, sometimes even counter-attacking his assailants. "But to what shall I compare this kind? Comparable is it to boys sitting in the market, who are calling out to others saying, 'We whistled for you, and you did not dance; we droned, and you did not beat breasts.' For John has come neither eating nor drinking, and people say, 'A devil he has.' And there has come the 'Son of Man' eating and drinking, and people say, 'Look! a man, glutton, and drunkard, tax-gatherers' friend and sinners'!" (Matt. xi. 16-19 || Luke vii. 31-34). Again, "The healthy have no need of a doctor, but those ill" (Mark ii. 17 || Matt. ix. 12, Luke v. 31). This mission is referred to in the parable, where the slave who got no response on his first errand is sent out on a second: "Go out quickly into the open spaces and streets of the town, and the poor and maimed and blind and lame lead in here" (Luke xiv. 21). The note which he struck during the mission is probably given in his words to Zacchæus: "To-day a deliverance to this house has come about, because even *he* is Abraham's son" (Luke xix. 9); that is, given the fulfilment of certain conditions respecting personal life, no one had any right to put the tax-gatherer outside the pale,—it was not the will of God that he be so excluded. As also he thought of himself, probably in the same connection as "the sower" who "went out to sow,"—"went out" being emphatic, and possibly a reference to the fact that he had to go out into the open away from the synagogues to get the opportunity he desired (cf. H. Rix, p. 22; F. C. Burkitt, p. 88),—for various reasons he looked for a measure of failure, but that, on the whole, he was working on "good land," he had not the slightest doubt (Mark iv. 3, 8 || Matt. xiii. 4, 8, Luke viii. 5, 8).

His work among his own people, then, was of such a character as to be a challenge to the particularism of the orthodox members of the Jewish synagogue (cf. H. J., vol. x. pp. 773 f.), a particularism which was substantially the position held, for example, by the author of Jub., and not really departed from by the most liberal of our writers. "The grounds on which He broke down the barriers within Judaism between Pharisees and sinners, between the scribes and the common people, implied the breaking down of all barriers between Judaism and what lay outside of it" (D. W. Forrest, I, pp. 417 f.; cf. H. Rashdall, p. 111; H. Rix, pp. 18 f.). It was a challenge, too, such as should make one hesitate before agreeing that "he had never dreamed of a general preaching of

the Kingdom among the heathen," but only that "he had contemplated, like the prophets before him, that many heathens would be admitted into the Kingdom at its establishment" (C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 144; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 349; E., Nov. 1909, pp. 394 f.). His enigmatic reference to the prophet Jonah may have been made with the fact in mind of that prophet's being a preacher to the heathen; he intended something "more than Jonah" was in his capacity as missionary to the Ninevites (Matt. xii. 41 || Luke xi. 32; cf. Matt. xvi. 4; cf. J. A. Robertson, p. 144; also see below, p. 338, on Mark xiv. 28 || Matt. xxvi. 32).

2. In the thought of his opponents, as also very frequently in that of our writers, "sinners" and "Gentiles" belong to the same category. "Sinners" was often used as a term interchangeable with "Gentiles." Jesus, too, was wont to think of the "tax-gatherer" and the "Gentile" together. They equally represented a standard of thought and conduct which gave to him no satisfaction at all. "For if you love those who love you . . . don't even the tax-gatherers do that? And if you greet your brothers only . . . don't even the Gentiles do that?" (Matt. v. 46 f. || Luke vi. 32 f.,—in the latter "sinners" is used throughout; cf. Matt. vi. 7, 32). The Samaritans can be brought into the same association. He had an eye for the good in the Samaritan (Luke x. 33 ff., xvii. 18), and did not exclude him from participation in his ministry of healing (Luke xvii. 16 ff.). He dissociated himself from the popular hostility toward them which on occasion leaped up even in his disciples (Luke ix. 54 f.). The actual occurrence of the visit to, and mission among, the Samaritans (John iv. 1-42) need not be doubted; even E. F. Scott says: "The story may well rest on some authentic record" (I, p. 110). The sneer, "Do we not put it well that you are a Samaritan?" (John viii. 48), is parallel to that in the Synoptics concerning his relation to tax-gatherers and sinners, and points to the intensity of his interest in Samaritans. Besides, in Samaria itself "the 'Samaritans' were only a small proportion of the population. The majority of the dwellers in Sebaste and the neighbourhood were heathen" (J.L., p. 342, note 3).

Proof is not lacking that he really had in mind the coming of the Gentiles within the influence of the Kingdom. "When we look more closely into those parables of the springing up of seed," to quote E. F. Scott again, "we find that the point of the comparison is not the slow unfolding of hidden potentialities, but simply the transition from something small to something great. . . . The change from small to great, from the tiny mustard-seed to the spreading tree, is not regarded as a mere natural process, but as a wonder, in which we can discern the power of God" (II, p. 102). True; but this parable should not then be pressed into service

to show "that the Kingdom was not to grow into being by some process of historical development, but was to break in all at once, by the direct intervention of God" (p. 103). H. Rashdall rightly comments: "Still the transition from the one to the other is by a process, not by a catastrophe" (p. 52, note 3). "Smallest of all seeds" and "largest of all plants," in Luke's shorter edition have no place. The constant element in the three versions is the accommodation for "the birds of the heaven" (Mark iv. 32 || Matt. xiii. 32, Luke xiii. 19; cf. Dan. iv. 12, 21; Ezek. xvii. 23; Psa. civ. 12, 17; also L. E. Browne, p. 47). In 1 En. xc. the phrase "the birds of the heaven," signifying "the eagles, the vultures, the kites, the ravens," are the Gentiles, or, more precisely, the Greeks (vers. 2, 18 f., 30, 37). This may be the reference in Jesus' parable. In that case he looked forward to a sudden development of the Kingdom such as would attract to it the Greeks in whom, if again one may feel oneself on historical ground in the Fourth Gospel, he showed on one occasion at least not inconsiderable interest (John xii. 20 ff.). The parable of the "great supper" definitely suggests this third stage: "Go out into the roads and paths (i.e. farther out than 'the open spaces and streets of the town,' to the 'sinners' farther afield, namely, the Gentiles), and urge them in, that my house be filled" (Luke xiv. 23; cf. Matt. xxii. 9). On this idea of a full house, it should be noted that in 1 En. xc., not until the Gentiles in some measure are brought in, does the seer see that "that house . . . large and broad" was "very full" (ver. 36).

While the parable of the Kingdom as the mustard-seed with the Gentiles as birds roosting "under its shade," if pressed beyond the point that the Kingdom would soon prove attractive to the Gentiles, might be taken to imply some subordination of the Gentiles, that idea is excluded by the parable of the "great supper." In the latter, the gracious invitation is the same for all, and acceptance of the invitation is the only requirement,—the one condition of participation which is applicable to all. "Already before the advent of Christ it had been laid down by the Jewish religious authorities that when proselytes were admitted into the fellowship of the 'Covenant People,' they should seal their acceptance of the new faith by a threefold rite. Firstly, they had to be circumcised. . . . Secondly, they had to be baptised. . . . And thirdly, they had to offer sacrifice" (W. O. E. Oesterley, and G. H. Box, I, p. 255). "The full proselyte had, as it were, to become a member of the Jewish nation as well as of the Jewish faith" (C. G. Montefiore, in J.L., p. 46; cf. R. T. Herford, I, pp. 221 f.). In the following "woe," therefore, it is not the missionary activity as such that Jesus is out against, but the objective of it, the making a proselyte of each convert who, just because of the terms of his own inclusion,

may become an enthusiast for the exclusive rights of the Jews in the Kingdom of God (cf. D.B., vol. iv. p. 137). "Woe to you . . . for you go round sea and land to make (Eth. 'baptise') one proselyte; and when it has come off, you make him Gehenna's son twice as much so as you" (Matt. xxiii. 15). Apart from any positive evidence, the very existence of this widespread Pharisee propaganda,—“the Pharisaic practice of winning over every year at least one proselyte each” (J.E., vol. x. p. 221),—makes it extremely improbable that Jesus did not think of launching, some day, a mission to proclaim his good news of the Kingdom in which contemporary Jewish thought was so far transcended that the idea of proselytism (cf. E.B., 1685) was regarded as out of place altogether. This transcendence of the idea of proselytism was prepared for in John the Baptist's new use of baptism. “This rite had been demanded for some time past as the condition of admittance into the ranks of the covenant people. But for John to demand such an initiation of Jews was a startling innovation. He was putting them in the position of outsiders, and practically saying: ‘You must be born again, before you can enter the Kingdom’” (W. K. L. Clarke in F. J. Foakes Jackson, p. 182).

A few passages claim special attention, since at first sight they seem to involve a measure of surrender to a more exclusive idea. Two of these present little difficulty, if it be borne in mind that Jesus never ceased to be an Oriental, and that “the Oriental loves . . . exaggeration and positiveness in speech. To him mild accuracy is weakness” (A. M. Ribhany, p. 85). “Let him be to you as Gentile and tax-gatherer” (Matt. xviii. 17; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 96 f.; also in the Jewish Prayer Book, S. Singer, p. 5). “‘Treat him as an outcast.’ The words are surprising if spoken by Jesus. . . . The passage seems to belong to a period of Jewish hostility, which was met in a spirit unlike the Master's,”—so comments A. H. McNeile (pp. 266 f.). But Jesus, on other occasions (see above, p. 111), used both Gentile and tax-gatherer in an illustrative way not at all complimentary to either. The commentator's feeling may then be due entirely to his coming to this saying with too Western a mind. The meaning, in “mild accuracy,” as it is put, for example, by W. C. Allen, is not so very un-Christlike after all: “The Christian disciple who refuses to be reconciled to his fellow-Christian is to be regarded as no true member of the Society” (I, p. 198). A. E. Garvie thinks that “in advising that the erring brother should be treated as a publican or Gentile, we may be sure He intended not contemptuous indifference, but tender and earnest solicitude” (p. 185).

Again, “Do not give the sacred thing to dogs, and do not throw your pearls in front of pigs, lest they tread them down among their feet and turn and tear you” (Matt. vii. 6), is a detached

saying which presents no difficulty as long as a pitfall of exegesis to take "dogs" everywhere as meaning "Gentiles" be avoided (cf. J. A. Findlay, pp. 235 f.). In Phil. iii. 2 "dogs" is parallel to, and has the general meaning of, "evil-workers." In Rabbinical literature, "the time of general degeneracy is a time when 'the generation will have the face of the dog'" (J.E., vol. iv. p. 632). The association of the pig with jewellery in proverbial sayings may be illustrated from Prov. xi. 22, "a ring of gold in a pig's snout." In addition the following from Sir. should be noted: "Talk not much with a foolish man, and consort not with a pig. Beware of him, lest you have trouble and you become defiled when he shakes himself" (xxii. 13). A. Harnack (I, p. 315) does not include the saying in his re-constructed text of Q. W. C. Allen, however, thinks it part of the Logia, and remarks that "it may express the Jewish-Christian point of view with regard to the preaching of Christianity to pagans" (I, p. 67). But Jesus himself exercised great discretion in his unfolding of "the secret of the Kingdom of God" (Mark iv. 11 || Matt. xiii. 11, Luke viii. 10), and did all he could, consistently with his vocation, to avoid trouble. "Jesus was no enthusiastic or fanatical seeker after persecution or martyrdom. He evaded and avoided it as long as it was right to do so" (W. P. Du Bose, p. 124). He had, however, some about him who might very readily run into trouble,—the two Simons, for example. Furthermore, "you can and you may reveal your best only to the reverent" (H. C. King, p. 249). In such association then this saying should probably be read.

The remaining passage, the Syro-Phenician episode (Mark vii. 24-30 || Matt. xv. 21-28), presents a greater, but not an insoluble difficulty. Only the main steps by which the solution here suggested has been arrived at can be indicated. "Dog" was sometimes used in reference to certain types of women, as, e.g., in Sir. xxvi. 25: "A headstrong woman will be regarded as a dog." Nothing with certainty can be made out of the diminutive form *κυνάρῖοις*, "little dogs" (cf. T. R. Glover, I, p. 48; E.G.T., vol. i. p. 217), as a softening of the more usual form, since in the vernacular very often "a diminutive . . . seems to have no diminutive sense attached to it" (see G. Milligan, p. 89). In the Markan version E. A. Abbott (pp. 366 f.) is followed in the idea that a change of speaker is required in ver. 29. The speaker up to that point was probably not Jesus, but a prominent disciple speaking for the others, as in the similar incident of the woman who had an issue of blood, where the remark about the crowd thronging Jesus is in Mark introduced by "his disciples said" (v. 31), but in Luke by "When all denied, Peter said" (viii. 45). To take Peter as the speaker in ver. 27 obviates the emendation E. A. Abbott suggests of *ἔλεγεν* into *ἔλεγον*; thus, "And (Peter) kept saying to

her, First let the children have their fill ; for it is not nice to take the bread of the children and throw to dogs. But she in reply said to him, Yes, sir ; and (i.e. a point missed) the dogs underneath the table make a meal from the boys' bits. And (Jesus) said to her, For this reason go ; there has gone out of your daughter the evil spirit " (Mark vii. 27-29).

Little more than careful attention to grammar is required to get the same result in the fuller version in Matthew. In ver. 23 the construction, $\delta \delta \acute{\epsilon} . . . \kappa \alpha \iota$, is an instance of co-ordination of clauses in place of the subordination of the former clause to the latter, a habit of speech not infrequent in vernacular Greek (see J. H. Moulton, p. 12 ; G. A. Deissmann, II, pp. 128 ff.). In vers. 24-27 $\delta \delta \acute{\epsilon} . . . \eta \delta \acute{\epsilon} . . . \delta \delta \acute{\epsilon} . . . \eta \delta \acute{\epsilon}$ is the familiar form for " the one . . . the other . . . the one . . . the other." " The one " may be a disciple, presumably Peter. Jesus, having sustained to this point the silence mentioned in ver. 23, gets his first word in in ver. 28, where he is definitely re-introduced by name, which is very natural if another has been the while speaking to the woman. The story, then, is as follows : " Before Jesus had answered to her a word, his disciples came and kept requesting him saying, Send her off, for she is shrieking behind us. And the one (? Peter, speaking for the rest) in reply said (i.e. interposing probably with the argument they had already used to the woman, or else translate, ' And the one in reply had said,' referring to what had happened previously), I was not commissioned except to the lost sheep of Israel's house. But the other (she) came (i.e. in spite of that argument) and was kneeling to him, saying, Sir, help me. And he (? Peter, still interposing) in reply said (probably quoting a proverb, cf. J.E., vol. iv. p. 632), It is not nice to take the bread of the children and throw to dogs. But she said, Yes, sir ; for,—even (i.e. a point missed, answering proverb by proverb) the dogs make a meal from the bits which fall from the table of their masters. Then Jesus (i.e. now interposing decisively with his first and last word in the case) in reply said to her, O woman, great is your faith : let it happen for you as you wish " (Matt. xv. 23-28).

In this episode, then, a disciple appears quoting the limited commission which had been given, whereas Jesus indicates that the limitation was not to be arbitrarily sustained, but had only been prudently adopted as a vigorous concentration on the mission field immediately presenting itself,—his idea evidently being that new opportunity should remove the limitation (cf. A. E. Garvie, p. 194). This is peculiarly in harmony with what he said in the Nazareth synagogue about the activity of the ancient prophets Elijah and Elisha, and being at the moment in the very neighbourhood of the episode which he quoted in connection with the former,

associations were rich in suggestion concerning the future. Further, there seems to be no sufficient reason for removing "first" from the sentence, "First let the children have their fill," as C. G. Montefiore does (II, p. 144; III, p. 178). Its retention now means that the disciples had an idea even then of the incoming of the Gentiles, probably, as the contrast "children" and "dogs" implies, as subordinates. Jesus here in no way confirms, but rather denies such a distinction. In taking the woman's side he repudiated the kind of thinking which the disciples' parley with her had revealed. It need only be added that if the crucial word used should be translated "little dogs," on our interpretation it reveals a softening of the disciples' feeling toward the Gentile,—an indirect testimony that the spirit of Jesus was already beginning to tell on the mind of the company.

The remaining sayings bearing on the subject harmonise with these conclusions. His reference to the "many" who "from East and West will come and recline at the table with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. viii. 11 || Luke xiii. 29), could be interpreted by his hearers in harmony with orthodox ideas (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 350). But such utterances were rightly understood to mean something which the Jewish Church of his time could not tolerate,—“the estimate which Jesus set upon the individual, at the cost of legalistic doctrine and practice” (H. Townsend, p. 106). His fiercest opponents he depicts as ill-disposed “vine-dressers,” concerning whose motive in seeking to kill him he is in no doubt; he represents them as saying to themselves: “This (fellow) is the heir; come on, let us kill him, and ours shall be the inheritance” (Mark xii. 7 || Matt. xxi. 38, Luke xx. 14). This “ours shall be the inheritance” is the cry of Jewish particularism in its determined opposition to the finer type of universalism in his teaching; they would have none of it. An earlier glimpse of this attitude is discernible in his remarks concerning the healing of an afflicted woman in the synagogue on the Sabbath: “And this woman being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan fastened, look! eighteen years, must she not be set free from this fastening on the Sabbath?” (Luke xiii. 16). That he should think it necessary to specify that she was “daughter of Abraham” hints that much, perhaps most, of his healing work on the Sabbath was performed on behalf of “the outsiders,”—if not often, apparently, for Gentiles,—who would have no scruples about approaching him on that day such as most orthodox Jewish patients might be expected to have (compare e.g. “And early evening arriving, when the sun set,” i.e. at the close of the Sabbath, “they began to carry to him all who were ill,” Mark i. 32 || Matt. viii. 16, Luke iv. 40). Surely, if they had raised a cry against his Sabbath activities for all sorts

of "outsiders," they were not against his being of service there and then to a very needy person, *a recognised member of their synagogue*! (cf. on the loosening of "them that are bound" in the Jewish Prayer Book, S. Singer, p. 6). The treatment by the synagogue authorities of the man whose sight was restored (John ix.) may have been a result of action which had been taken in reference to some such case. Their point against the man may have been originally this: that he had gone against a ruling which had been given in the name of orthodoxy, that no Jews should let themselves be healed by Jesus *on the Sabbath day* (see vers. 14, 16, 24, 25, 34).

So extensive a work among "the outsiders" as is implied everywhere in the Gospels makes it not unlikely that at some time he spoke plainly to his followers about their going forth "for witness-bearing . . . to the peoples" (Matt. x. 18, xxiv. 14 || Mark xiii. 9, Luke xxi. 12 f.). Everything points in the direction of his having said during the days of his flesh: "You will be my witnesses . . . to the end of the earth" (Acts i. 8); "make disciples of all peoples, baptising them into the name of the Father" (Matt. xxviii. 19). Since the Fatherly purpose of God was determinative of all relationship, there could be in the Kingdom, as he thought of it, no subtle favouritism (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II. pp. 69 ff.). The only possible qualification for "the sons of the Kingdom," which he could admit, was that they be, as it were, "good seed" (Matt. xiii. 38), people capable of, and actually growing toward, perfection as "sons" of their Father (cf. Matt. v. 45).

III. THE FACTORS IN THE BRINGING IN OF THE KINGDOM.

1. Both Jesus and his disciples put in the forefront of their appeal the need for repentance. But repentance has always in it a backward and a forward look; it is at the same time repentance *from* and repentance *unto*,—from a past and toward a future. It is the forward look of repentance, as it is in Jesus' idea, which it is important to appreciate at this stage (cf. H. L. Jackson, p. 55; H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 27). He seems here to make a very definite advance on anything which had ever before been taught among his people, as an examination of the "servant" passages in his sayings will show. Repentance, in his idea of it, does not so much land one into a state of being saved as into the state of being filled with the saving spirit as regards others. The Kingdom of God on earth was not so much a company of saved as a band of saviours. In a word, he puts the duty to be a missionary at the very heart of membership of the present Kingdom

of God. "Discipleship includes the duty of missionary work" (C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 926). Membership was not valid without full commitment to a life involving the utmost sacrificial service in winning others to the same commitment. It was "to become" one of the "fishers of men" (Mark i. 17 || Matt. iv. 19, Luke v. 10). To Jesus the Kingdom of God on earth was essentially a community of missionaries. The missionary spirit which he engendered was what he chiefly relied upon, humanly speaking.

He thought of himself in his own sacrificial life and death as in a supreme sense exemplifying it, and he looked to the nucleus of the new society to share in, and continue, his service and sacrifice, and so continually add to their number not only such as shall be saved, but also such as shall take their due share in the work of saving (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 79). He sought to create that missionary passion which would make one an untiring, ungrudging servant in the highest interests of others, never sparing oneself in order that others may be enthused with the same. Since he himself, "as a man of the people, deviated from the practice of the Essenes and Pharisees in not shunning contact with the sinners, the Publicans, and the despised 'Am Ha-Arez, as contaminating, and in endeavouring to elevate them" (J.E., vol. iv. pp. 50 f.), he expected every follower of his to do likewise. "Does the lamp come (into the house) that under that ($\tau\acute{o}\nu$) measure it be put or under that ($\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$) mat,—not that on that ($\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$) lamp-stand it be put? For there is not anything hidden, unless that it be made public; nor did it become hidden away, but that it come into publicity" (Mark iv. 21 f. || Matt. v. 14 f., Luke viii. 16 f., cf. Matt. x. 26 f.). In this connection, too, his own peculiar idea of Messiahship, that of Suffering Servant (see below, pp. 161-165) reacted on his idea of membership of the Kingdom. On the present earth the Kingdom was to be a society of suffering servants. "His chief work and that of his disciples consisted in the conscious attempt at 'saving souls.' Jesus was justified in thinking that this new departure would tend to bring dissension rather than peace into families, dividing sons and parent" (J.E., vol. vii. p. 164). It would "set a man at variance with his father . . . so that ($\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$) the man's enemies be his family relations" (Matt. x. 35 f. || Luke xii. 52 f.). (Cf. A. Büchler, p. 24.)

In this, and not in thought of the near End of the Age, is to be discovered the reason for his altogether secondary concern for things material. "Though St. Paul does present the rapidly approaching end as a consideration in a question of conduct (1 Cor. vii. 26-31), Jesus never uses it in this way" (A. T. Cadoux, I, Jan. 1919, p. 118; cf. E., May 1911, pp. 409 ff., Nov. 1912, pp. 427 ff.). He did not, for example, choose to make the home at Nazareth a minor concern for him, because he felt that the

Judgment was at hand. The temptation to make it other than this came upon him as soon as he was aware of his own high vocation, and later may, at times, have returned upon him. Bread winning in Nazareth had been, it may be presumed, a matter of turning stones into bread, a getting of a livelihood under very hard circumstances (cf. L. Dougall, p. 116.) "It may be suspected that the decease of Joseph early threw upon Him the obligation of maintaining the home by His toil in the carpenter shop, and perhaps shut out from His youthful thoughts the Jewish desire of marriage" (W. A. Grist, p. 39). When impressed with his own fitness and call to give himself in the moral and spiritual interests of his people, there came the constraint of temptation to go back to the old duty of furnishing bread for the family and himself. In Sir. there occurs a passage which may have fastened itself on his soul, till he felt tempted away from the task which he had been led to regard as God-given: "Be as a father to orphans, and in place of a husband to widows: then God will call you 'son'" (iv. 10). Obviously, "If you are son of God, say (i.e. give your consent and act so) that these stones become loaves" (Matt. iv. 3 || Luke iv. 3). That he was accustomed to make much of the fifth commandment (Matt. xv. 4-6 || Mark vii. 10-13), contributed to the severity of the fight which he had over this opposition of duties (cf. A. E. Garvie, p. 164). Sure, however, of himself and of God's will concerning him, he made the great plunge of faith that the life to which he was called came before livelihood,—he would live the one and trust for the other (cf. Matt. vi. 33 f.). "He in reply said, It is written, 'Not on bread only should man live, but by every utterance coming forth through God's mouth'" (Matt. iv. 4 || Luke iv. 4).

How that he expected every follower to follow him in this emerges, not only in his words about freedom from anxiety about the morrow (see below, p. 210), but also in his reply to a would-be disciple: "The foxes have holes and the birds of the heaven roosts; but the 'son of man' has nowhere to rest his head" (Luke ix. 58 || Matt. viii. 20). So, if "to bury one's father" means, as has been suggested (see e.g. D. Smith, p. 91; H. Rashdall, p. 179), "to look after home affairs first," the same is the import of his reply to one hesitating to follow him, "Let the dead bury their dead (i.e. don't let domestic duties have prior claim); but you,—go off and announce the Kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 60 || Matt. viii. 22). To a mind likely soon to be getting on with the task, but with a division of attention which was due to giving too much heed to home opinions, he said: "Nobody having set his hand to the plough, and looking behind, is suitable for the Kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 62). He expected his disciples to surrender family ties and property in order to join a missionary community,

which was for him the Kingdom of God on earth; for this reason, and not because of the approach of the End (cf. W. Manson, pp. III ff.), "houses, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or farms" (Matt. xix. 29 || Luke xviii. 29, Mark x. 29; cf. Matt. x. 37) would, as the case might be, have to be surrendered. To give these up on his account (see below, p. 154) just meant that they had chosen, as he had, to become a "servant."

2. How clear, too, he made it that "servant" was of the essence of membership in the Kingdom, that the utmost sacrifice was inseparable therefrom, and that in terms of service and sacrifice the worth of each to the Kingdom would be estimated! (cf. F. G. Peabody, I, p. 233). "At that hour the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Who then is greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven? And he called a boy (*παῖδιον* = 'boy' or 'servant' in LXX; cf. E. A. Abbott, p. 330) and placed him in the middle of them and said, . . . Whoever humbles himself as *this* boy, *this* is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. And whoever takes to *such* a boy on my name, me he takes to" (Matt. xviii. 1 f., 4 f.). Having regard to the Matthean method of grouping, the omission of the intervening verse, as above, gives the true sequence. Commentators do not appear to have given serious attention to "this" or "such" used here so significantly with "boy." The original reference must have been to a particular boy, and to what he had been doing. The company had just returned home after a tour (Matt. xvii. 24 || Mark ix. 33). On such tours it was customary for them to take turns at washing the feet of their party,—see John xiii. 5 f., where Jesus does it probably because, for some reason (cf. C. F. Burney, pp. 143 ff.), Peter had refused to take his turn. As they were here home again, some boy, possibly Peter's, may have done for all the menial's task (cf. H. Rashdall, p. 125). "This" and "such" are explained, if Jesus a few minutes afterwards took this very lad and set him among them as a living parable of the greatest in God's Kingdom. The parallels in Mark and Luke confirm this conjecture; the former gives the saying: "If anybody wishes to be first, he should be last of all, and attendant of all" (Mark ix. 35), and then represents Jesus' reference to the lad in the phrase "one of *such* boys" (ver. 37); the latter speaks of "*this* boy" (Luke ix. 48), and afterward gives the saying, "he who is least among you all, *this* is great."

That very picture of the boy-attendant he may have been recalling, himself in place of the lad, when he took the towel and washed their feet; and then "said to them, Do you recognise what I have done for you? You address me, Teacher. . . . If I then . . . the Teacher, have washed your feet . . . an example I have given you that as I have done for you, you, too, may do" (John xiii. 12-15). Compare, "Whoever wishes to become great

among you, should be your attendant: and whoever would be among you first, should be slave of all" (Mark x. 43 f. || Matt. xx. 26 f., Luke xxii. 26 f.; cf. Matt. xxiii. 11). The unity of the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics in bringing out the "servant" idea of the disciple is to be noted. "Whoever takes to one of such boys on my name (i.e. with the meaning I intend,—as representing what I have in mind), me he takes to" (Mark ix. 37 || Matt. xviii. 5, Luke ix. 48), comes, then, to mean, "Whoever welcomes the servant idea of himself, welcomes me." Yet again, in applying the parable of the servant who after ploughing or keeping sheep as a matter of course lays his master's supper, the same idea of discipleship is preached; "So also you, when you have done all commanded you, say, We are slaves (Syr.-Sin.); what we ought to do, we have done" (Luke xvii. 10).

The suffering side of this servant idea is also very clearly given (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 356, P., p. 668). "A learner is not over his teacher, nor a slave over his master. Sufficient for the learner that he become as his teacher, and the slave as his master. If the master of the household they have nicknamed Beelzebul (i.e. master of the nether world; cf. E.B., 514; D.C.G., vol. i. pp. 181 f.), how much more its members" (Matt. x. 24 f.); compare, "a slave is not greater than his master. If me they persecuted, you too they will persecute" (John xv. 20). Again, "Can you drink the cup which I am drinking? or the baptism which I am being baptised with be baptised with? . . . The cup which I am drinking you will drink; and the baptism which I am being baptised with you will be baptised with" (Mark x. 38 f. || Matt. xx. 22 f.). Contrast Mart. Is. v. 13: "And to the prophets who were with him (i.e. Isaiah) he said before he had been sawn in sunder: Go to the region of Tyre and Sidon: for for me only has God mingled the cup." The "cup" to which Jesus several times referred (Mark xiv. 36 || Matt. xxvi. 39; cf. ver. 42, Luke xxii. 42, John xviii. 11), was the cup of suffering to the point of martyrdom which had come to him in the fulfilment of his prophetic office, and which, possibly in reminiscence of, and yet in distinction from, the case of Isaiah, he hinted was probably to be mingled for more than himself. At the supper table he pledged them to the new covenant or religion of sacrifice even unto death in the words, "Drink of it, all (of you)" (Matt. xxvi. 27; cf. Mark xiv. 23, Luke xxii. 17).

"It was an ethical and spiritual loss that the doctrine of conscious self-sacrifice in Isa. liii. was not more widely developed and inculcated by the synagogue" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 523). This neglected doctrine,—neglected, too, by Hellenism (cf. F. G. Peabody, I, pp. 48 f.),—Jesus brings to the front; he rivets attention on this idea. The same idea was probably in mind when

he gave the parable of "the Kingdom of Heaven" as "comparable to treasure hidden in the field: which a man found and hid, and from his joy goes and sells all he has and buys that field" (Matt. xiii. 44). Those who know "the secret of the Kingdom of God" (Mark iv. 11 || Matt. xiii. 11, Luke viii. 10) must pay the price. The centrality of the cross in the experience of the disciple is then very plainly put by him: "If anybody wishes to come after me, let him deny himself and lift his cross, and accompany me" (Mark viii. 34 || Matt. xvi. 24, Luke ix. 23); "whoever does not carry his own cross, and come after me, cannot be a learner of mine" (Luke xiv. 27 || Matt. x. 38). This was the fruit "worthy of repentance" for which he looked; he would be satisfied with nothing less. It is, then, misleading to be told that Jesus "has nothing to say about martyrdom for a cause, even for the Gospel; but he has a supreme blessing for those who love life *for his sake* and the Gospel's" (P. T. Forsyth, p. 106). To lose life for his sake and the Gospel's is surely just to suffer martyrdom for a cause, even for the Gospel (cf. F. C. Burkitt, II, p. 211). "Jesus does not hesitate from laying this readiness to suffer martyrdom upon each disciple as a positive duty" (P. Wernle, p. 87; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 74 f., 78).

3. With this in mind, and his assumption that the price would be paid, the reasonableness of his expectation, that his little, almost secret, society would soon make astounding progress and have an amazing influence, becomes apparent (cf. F. W. Worsley, p. 228). Not apocalyptic possibilities, but the possibilities of this society, in which every person was a servant and prepared to be so to the utmost in suffering, were in mind in the utterance of that other parable: "The Kingdom of Heaven is comparable to yeast, which a woman took and covered up in three pecks of flour, till it was thoroughly yeasted" (Matt. xiii. 35 || Luke xiii. 21; cf. E., Jan. 1911, p. 76). "The metaphorical use of 'leaven' sometimes expresses an improving process . . . the leavened mass of humanity, through intrusion of the leaven, attains a superior moral condition" (I. Abrahams, p. 51). He was convinced that he had set things going, and the rest was only a matter of time. "After this fashion is the Kingdom of God,—as a man might throw seed on the land, and (afterward) sleep and rise night and day, and the seed sprouts and is lengthened how the man himself (*αὐτός*) does not know. Of its own accord the land bears fruit; first blade, next ear, next full corn in the ear" (Mark iv. 26-28; cf. E. C. Dewick, pp. 217 f.; T. C. Hall, pp. 66 f.).

This is a great advance on anything in our literature, where there is no such commitment of the individual to serious missionary propaganda (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 38; J. Seeley, p. 258). Here everything, humanly speaking, rests on that; for all, from

the Messiah downward, the missionary obligation is paramount, and from the suffering which is entailed in fulfilment of the obligation none is exempt. The Kingdom of God on earth is, in accordance with the seeking love of God which inspires it, of necessity a missionary society. Membership of the Kingdom is not valid, if missionary obligation is not recognised. He "laid down two principles that were in absolute opposition to Pharisaic precept and practice; firstly, God desires the recovery of the most sinful, and they are capable of such recovery; secondly, goodness is not self-protective only, but self-communicative, and such goodness alone resembles God's" (A. E. Garvie, p. 265). The growth of the Kingdom on earth is the outcome of this missionary spirit, and that growth is itself essentially an adding to it such as shall be missionaries. This is the very antithesis of the attitude of "the righteous" who "have merely with folded hands to wait for the appointed time of the Divine interposition for the destruction of evil" (W. Fairweather, p. 304), and reveals how there was in him the mind of the prophets rather than that of the apocalyp-tists (cf. E.B., 214; D.B., vol. i. p. 109; E. W. Worsley, p. 24; J.L., pp. 128 f.; E., March 1915, p. 204; L. Dougall, pp. 134 f.).

Little wonder that he expected so much to happen in a single generation, when he was constantly occupied with an idea of the Kingdom of God on earth so thoroughly and so profoundly missionary, that each member of it came to weep over his own sin and stayed to get inspiration to go out to suffer in the sacrificial service of removing the sin of others. The New Covenanters of Zad. were first and last penitents; the New Covenanters of Jesus were first penitents, and then second, and much more, suffering servants after the pattern of their head. The Kingdom here on earth was this sacrificial community, and the more it was itself the more it would grow. "God's will to establish the Kingdom and human faith to receive it being assumed, . . . He *did* regard time and progress as allies or co-efficients of the spiritual progress which brings about the Kingdom" (W. Manson, p. 90; cf. F. W. Worsley, p. 185), and in this important detail at any rate he broke through the habit of "the prophetic mind especially" which, occupying itself mostly with "the beginning and the end," "did not easily move in the category of progress" (E. G. Selwyn, p. 184; cf. H. C. King, pp. 74 f., 93). This "doctrine of the growth of the Kingdom of God" was, also, for his first disciples the real difficulty in his teaching; they were slow in grasping the idea (cf. F. C. Burkitt, II, pp. 85 f.).

To summarise what has been claimed for Jesus under this head: Jesus' idea of the Kingdom of God was that it was a community whose members were to be in a new sense righteous; "the goal of his efforts was the establishment of an ideal society

quite as much as the production of an ideal individual" (S. Mathews, I, p. 40). His scheme of the future was the same as that held by the optimists among our writers, who made provision for a real career for the Kingdom of God on earth before the final Judgment; not that of our pessimists, who put the Kingdom altogether on the farther side of that event. He offered men the opportunity of joining that community now, and emphasised the eternal significance of so doing, namely, that they, if genuine, were sure to be members of the glorified community. Only when thinking of the Judgment which preceded the formation of the latter did he think of the Kingdom apocalyptically; and how else could he think of it? "Consider how such a person even in this twentieth century, believing in God, in the infinite worth of the human personality, and the tremendous issues of right and wrong in human conduct, can hold speech on such matters as judgment and the hereafter, with the least power of appeal, even to human beings, who may be also philosophers, apart from the aid of just such apocalyptic pictures as Jesus employed" (L. A. Muirhead, p. 65). In view of the early death of himself as the founder of the new community, he seems to have denied the idea of a very long life on earth for his disciples, such as was looked for usually, when the Kingdom was brought this side the Judgment. This he did by telling them that the maximum of their separation from him would not be more than the span of an ordinary life,—a statement which was put in the form, and was probably intended to mean, that the Judgment would come at the end of that generation, and not a thousand, or even four hundred, years hence. He began his own mission in the synagogues, where he sought to rouse religious life to a sense of responsibility with regard to the almost altogether neglected "outsider." "Few" there, to his mind, proved themselves "Elect"; he took such indifference as he met with as evidence that the majority of the synagogue goers had not themselves entered into divine life as he understood it. The mission to the "outsiders" he undertook with the help of the "few." This mission in its freedom from precedent and custom was in principle a breach with Jewish particularism. During his lifetime there was a concentration on the most accessible mission field, "the lost sheep of Israel's house." This by no means meant a limitation of his vision thereto. On occasions he had both the Samaritan and the Gentile in mind, and while impressed with the suggestion involved in Pharisaic missionary propaganda, he did not like the proselytism which it made prominent. This latter idea was for him shut out by his perfectly spiritual conception of God's Fatherhood. He was not, however, blind to the immense possibilities of missionary propaganda on a wider basis and to profounder issues. His call to

repentance was not a mere echo of John's, neither was it directed, as for our writers, to conformity of life in accordance with the Torah as it was generally understood. Rather it was repentance toward a life of suffering service in the redemption of others,—“the Law of Service becomes the delight of the heart through a *μετάνοια*” (J. A. Robertson, p. 178). Redemption in each instance adds another who is willing to be, yea, more, committed to being a suffering servant of the new community. From such a community, small as it then was, Jesus expected great things immediately; by its service and sacrifice he expected that it would make almost miraculous progress in a single generation.

CHAPTER III

THE CHARACTER OF THE MESSIAH

A.—THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE

THE Hebrew term rendered "Messiah"—the Greek equivalent of which is represented by our word "Christ," and literally translated should be rendered "Anointed"—is used with very considerable latitude both in the O.T. and later (see articles on "Anointing," D.B. and E.B., also J.L., pp. 346-356). For example, Israel is "Thine anointed" or "messiah" (Psa. lxxxiv. 9), the prophets are "My anointed" or "messiahs" (Psa. cv. 15), and Cyrus is "His anointed" or "messiah" (Isa. xlv. 1). The rite of anointing seems to have continued longest in connection with the office of high-priest, and when "the rite had fallen into desuetude the word" itself "in the figurative meaning 'consecrated' or merely 'great' continued in use." Applied to prominent persons called under God to do great work among or for the people, it signified some special fitness to make real in human life the very sovereignty of God, to give visible effectiveness to the Divine rule. In our period "the anointed" had become a very generally recognised technical term for the human Messiah looked for usually, but not always, when the Kingdom of God is expected before the final Judgment. "All shall be holy and their king the anointed (or 'messiah') of the Lord" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 36),—and possibly the original of Psa. Sol. xviii. 6, 8, "the day of choice when He brings back His anointed (or 'His messiah'), . . . the rod of chastening of the Lord's anointed (or 'Lord's messiah')." To this usage which had grown up gradually the popular mind by the beginning of our era had accommodated itself. Similarly, "in certain (probably small) apocalyptic circles" (see G. H. Box, J.Th.S., vol. xiii. p. 326; cf. V. H. Stanton, p. 240) the one who was understood to be the destined instrument of the sovereignty of God in that wider and more spiritual world, which through the period of the exile and subsequently became increasingly real to the Jew, was also designated "the messiah." So in the Similitudes of Enoch "the Son of Man," "the Elect One" is "His Anointed" (or "His Messiah") (xlviii. 10, lii. 4); and though it has been said that "it is a methodical error which entails interminable confusion" to take these casual allusions "as a key to the interpretation of the Visions and distil from" them "the Messianic doctrine

A.—THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE

THE Hebrew term rendered "Messiah"—the Greek equivalent of which is represented by our word "Christ," and literally translated should be rendered "Anointed"—is used with very considerable latitude both in the O.T. and later (see articles on "Anointing," D.B. and E.B., also J.L., pp. 346-356). For example, Israel is "Thine anointed" or "messiah" (Psa. lxxxiv. 9), the prophets are "My anointed" or "messiahs" (Psa. cv. 15), and Cyrus is "His anointed" or "messiah" (Isa. xlv. 1). The rite of anointing seems to have continued longest in connection with the office of high-priest, and when "the rite had fallen into desuetude the word" itself "in the figurative meaning 'consecrated' or merely 'great' continued in use." Applied to prominent persons called under God to do great work among or for the people, it signified some special fitness to make real in human life the very sovereignty of God, to give visible effectiveness to the Divine rule. In our period "the anointed" had become a very generally recognised technical term for the human Messiah looked for usually, but not always, when the Kingdom of God is expected before the final Judgment. "All shall be holy and their king the anointed (or 'messiah') of the Lord" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 36),—and possibly the original of Psa. Sol. xviii. 6, 8, "the day of choice when He brings back His anointed (or 'His messiah'), . . . the rod of chastening of the Lord's anointed (or 'Lord's messiah')." To this usage which had grown up gradually the popular mind by the beginning of our era had accommodated itself. Similarly, "in certain (probably small) apocalyptic circles" (see G. H. Box, J.Th.S., vol. xiii. p. 326; cf. V. H. Stanton, p. 240) the one who was understood to be the destined instrument of the sovereignty of God in that wider and more spiritual world, which through the period of the exile and subsequently became increasingly real to the Jew, was also designated "the messiah." So in the Similitudes of Enoch "the Son of Man," "the Elect One" is "His Anointed" (or "His Messiah") (xlvi. 10, lii. 4); and though it has been said that "it is a methodical error which entails interminable confusion" to take these casual allusions "as a key to the interpretation of the Visions and distil from" them "the Messianic doctrine

of the author" (J.L., p. 355), there seems little reason to doubt that to such people the Son of Man was Messianic in relation to the larger universe beyond the final Judgment, just as much as the ordinarily thought of deliverer was in reference to the smaller world of the present this side the final Judgment.

I. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MESSIAH.

1. Whether human or superhuman, the Messiah is God's ambassador. The human Messiah is expected to do only the will of Him who sent him: "Nor shall he do all these things by his own will, but in obedience to the good ordinance of the mighty God" (Sib. iii. 655 f.). "Him has the Lord chosen" (T.R. vi. 11), and what he accomplishes is "the salvation of the Lord" (T.D. v. 10). The appeal in Psa. Sol. xvii. to "raise up unto them their king . . . that he may reign over Israel" (ver. 23) is made directly to Jahveh, and when he comes Jahveh is "his God" (ver. 28); "he shall glorify the Lord" (ver. 32); "his glory" is "the glory of the Lord" (vers. 34 f.); above all, "the Lord Himself is his King" (ver. 38). In Zad. also he is "His (i.e. Jahveh's) Messiah" (ii. 10), "His holy Messiah" (viii. 2); and in the A sections of 2 Bar. God speaks of him as "My Messiah" (xxxix. 7, lxxii. 2), and as "My servant Messiah" (lxx. 9). Similarly the case of the superhuman Messiah. The most usual mode of reference to the Son of Man is that "he is the Elect One before the Lord of Spirits according to His good pleasure" (1 En. xlix. 4), "the Lord of Spirits has chosen him" (xlvi. 3). "The throne of glory," so often referred to, is God's own throne: "in those days I saw the Head of Days when He seated Himself upon the throne of His glory" (1 En. xlvii. 3; cf. T.L. v. 1; also in the Jewish Prayer Book, S. Singer, p. 4). This very throne the Messiah is to occupy; so the Head of Days, the Lord of Spirits, says: "And the Elect One shall in those days sit on My throne" (li. 3). First and foremost "the throne of His (i.e. Jahveh's) glory" (lxii. 2), it is only "the throne of his (i.e. Messiah's) glory" (lxii. 3, 5, lxix. 27, 29), because the Son of Man is acting on behalf of God, doing God's work,—virtually *is* God. There are not two thrones. This is very significant, since from 1 En. cviii. 12, where the redeemed are represented as going to be "each on the throne of his honour," it is evident that it would have been quite easy to have given the Son of Man a throne distinct from the throne of God, had there not been a purpose in not doing so. Thereby the real exaltation and subordination of the Messiah are secured; he is above all other creatures, but is under God, though very intimately associated with Him in the functions for which the throne stands.

2. The Messiah is pre-eminently righteous. Righteousness is

that quality in him which guarantees him capable of effecting only what a righteous God would have done. He is no diplomatist on occasions doing justice because it may be expedient, but one whose nature is to do justly. The human Messiah is "a man working righteousness and working mercy" (T.N. iv. 5),—"a man shall arise . . . like the sun of righteousness" (T.Jud. xxiv. 1). "He (shall be) a righteous king, taught of God, over them" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 35), and "a rod of righteousness to the Gentiles" (T.Jud. xxiv. 6). "He shall judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 31). There is no moral deflection in him: "he himself (will be) pure from sin, so that he may rule a great people" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 41),—"no sin shall be found in him" (T.Jud. xxiv. 1). His just rule rests securely on his perfect uprightness. However different in many respects the superhuman Messiah, he, too, is "the Righteous One" (1 En. xxxviii. 2), "the Righteous and Elect One" (liii. 6), "the Elect One of righteousness" (xxxix. 6). "The spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him" (lxii. 2). "He is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness" (xlix. 2). "He shall be a staff to the righteous whereon to stay themselves and not fall" (xlviii. 4). "This is the Son of Man who has righteousness, with whom dwells righteousness" (xlvi. 3). "This is the Son of Man who is born unto righteousness, and righteousness abides over him, and the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes him not" (lxxi. 14). In respect of righteousness, therefore, each could say: "I and God are one"; in one passage indeed God from His side is made to say as much, also that together they will be one with the redeemed people,— "I and My Son (i.e. the Messiah) will be united with them (i.e. the righteous) for ever in the paths of uprightness in their lives" (cv. 2; cf. Zad. ii. 10).

3. The Messiah is also endowed with wisdom, that gift which makes his righteousness eminently effective. He is not to be another instance of unsuccessful righteousness; in him righteousness will not be at a standstill, unable to do anything; he as the righteous one will make headway. He will know how to get righteousness to work on the apparently desperate situation presenting itself. This is unequivocally stated of both types of Messiah. Of the human Messiah it is said: "God will make him . . . wise by means of the spirit of understanding, with strength and righteousness" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 42); "the Lord's anointed" acts "in the spirit of wisdom and righteousness and strength" (xviii. 8). Wisdom is insight into the proper application of righteousness; action based thereon makes righteousness powerful in human affairs. "The spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him" (T.L. xviii. 7), "walking with the sons of men in meekness (i.e. toward God, 'godliness')"

(T. Jud. xxiv. 1). The success of righteousness expected under the Messiah is the explanation of the phenomenon noted by R. H. Charles in 2 Bar. : "The Messianic expectation tends to eclipse the supremacy of the Law, and after the Messiah's advent there is no allusion to it" (A.P., vol. ii. p. 491; cf. R. H. Charles, VI, pp. 29 f.). Much is made of a thing, till it has been fulfilled and becomes a commonplace; then little or nothing is said of it. The oral Law was really a method of developing and keeping up to date the teaching of the written Law. What the scribe strove after in his treatment of the written Law, the wisdom he aspired to in his formulation of the oral Law or tradition,—that very wisdom in its sublime completeness the Messiah will have; he will have the endowment necessary to making the principles of the Torah in their widest application workable in the new community. The wisdom of the Messiah will make righteousness, so long required by the Law and hitherto so much emphasised, an ordinary feature of the life of the children of the Kingdom. The Law's requirements having been met, yea, more than met,—since the Kingdom is more universal than the Torah (see S. Schechter, II, pp. 91 f. and note),—in the redeemed community the emphasis is no longer on the Law, but on the mind of the Messiah. See further, p. 140 below, where he fulfils the office of an ideal scribe. Of the super-human Messiah it is said: "Wisdom is poured out like water, and glory does not fail before him for evermore. . . . And in him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit which gives insight, and the spirit of understanding and of might, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness" (1 En. xlix. 1, 3); "his mouth shall pour forth all the secrets of wisdom and counsel" (ii. 3). Here, again, righteousness will be so wisely formulated that it cannot fail of its intention.

II. THE HUMAN MESSIAH.

1. The human Messiah is by far the more usual of the two,—a mortal " (relying) upon his God, throughout his days he will not stumble" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 42). In Sib. iii. the words, "And then the God of heaven shall send a king. . . . And then from the sunrise (i.e. from heaven) God shall send a king" (vers. 286, 652), if Messianic, cannot refer to a supernatural Messiah, (cf. for uncertainty C. A. Briggs, p. 18), but to a man like Cyrus, whom the writer might regard as heaven-sent, i.e. sent from God. The Oracle's interest is in peace and the blessings of peace. It traces the beginning of war, and indicates the moral and social tragedies which result from war. Those who originate wars must be defeated; tyrannies have to be broken. The heaven-sent King is to accomplish this. There can, then, scarcely be any doubt as to the type of Messiah, if any, for which this author looks. A man like Simon

Maccabeus (see S. Mathews, II, pp. 47-58 ; A. P. Stanley, pp. 317-322) would have suited him admirably, a person in whom were combined skill as a military leader and ability in the administration of justice. This hope of a human saviour is very distinct where particulars about the ancestry of the Messiah are ventured upon.

At the beginning of our period the old idea of the Messianic possibilities of the house of David is met with, though not very clearly. In Sir. there are passing references : " His covenant was with David " (xlv. 25). " He gave to him (i.e. David) the decree of the kingdom " (xlvii. 11). " He will give . . . to the house of David a root from him " (ver. 22 ; cf. after li. 12, Heb.). After this other ideas of the Messiah's origin prevail, contemporary events for the most part determining the direction whence this saviour of God's people was expected to emerge. So when the Maccabees were in power the tribe of Levi was looked to to supply him : " To Levi God gave the sovereignty. . . . Therefore I command you to hearken to Levi . . . as the appointed High Priest . . . because him has the Lord chosen to be king over all the nation " (T.R. vi. 7 f., 11). " And there shall arise unto you from the tribe of . . . Levi the salvation of the Lord " (T.D. v. 10). When, however, they and the Pharisees became strained in their relationship to each other, or parted company, Judah's ability in the matter is heard of : " The Lord shall raise up . . . from Judah as it were a king. He shall save all the race of Israel " (T.S. vii. 2) ; " a king shall arise in Judah " (T.L. viii. 14) ; " for the Lord gave . . . to Judah the kingdom " (T.Iss. v. 7). Some even of the supporters of the Maccabees clung throughout to a Messiah of Judah's stock ; so Jub. xxxi. 18 f. : " And to Judah he said . . . A prince shall you be, you and one of your sons . . . and in you shall be found the salvation of Israel." There was also sometimes a disposition to unite Levi and Judah in honour here ; as e.g. in T.L. ii. 11 : " By you (i.e. Levi) and Judah shall the Lord appear among men," and in T.N. viii. 2, " For through them (i.e. Levi and Judah) shall salvation arise unto Israel." Compare the strange statement several times repeated in Zad. that " the Messiah comes from Aaron and Israel " (ix. 10B ; cf. ver. 29B, xv. 4. See W. O. E. Oesterley, I, pp. 149 f.).

With the Psa. Sol. the idea of the Messiah as the son of David makes its appearance again to become by the beginning of our era once more the popular conception : " Thou, O Lord, didst choose David (to be) king over Israel, and swarest to him touching his seed that never should his kingdom fail before Thee. . . . Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David " (xvii. 5, 23). Anyhow, the Messiah was to come out of the midst of the people themselves ; the Lord " will raise him up "

Psa. Sol. xvii. 47), "a man shall arise" (T.Jud. xxiv. 1). Thus whatever is obscure about the Messiah in 1 En. xc. 37 f. the sentence, "the first (i.e. the Messiah represented as a white bull) among them (i.e. the people all represented as white bulls) became a lamb," leaves no doubt that "the Messiah emerges from the bosom of the community. He is not angelic, but human" (A.P., vol. ii. p. 260; cf. R. H. Charles, II, p. 215). A 2 of 2 Bar. also falls into line here; he anticipates that the Messiah will come on the scene from some out-of-the-way, or unexpected, or never exactly identifiable, quarter,—so "revealed" used twice in xxxix. 7,—a wise reticence in face of the empire whose downfall he hoped for, or perhaps a rebuke to the tribal and family jealousy in the matter such as has been already noticed, he himself probably sharing the now again popular hope that the poor, possibly hardly traceable, remnant of the house of David would even yet supply the much-needed man.

Judaism, then, in the time of Jesus had not identified any historical person with the human Messiah. An occasional opinion had been put forward in the direction of so doing, but none had secured general acceptance. Public opinion was against the idea that the Messiah had already come in any national celebrity. The ode in Simon's honour, 1 Macc. xiv. 4-15, comes nearest to recognising an historical character as Messiah, but even there W. O. E. Oesterley (I.J.A., April 1907, p. 9) suspects "that the writer himself was in two minds as to whether or not Simon was to be regarded as the Messiah." So if words originally spoken of him (see Psa. cx.) are in T.R. vi. 8 applied to John Hyrcanus, that ode as well as what is said of John in T.L. viii. 15 and xviii. 6 (and possibly T.Jos. xix. 8. 1 En. xc.; see below, p. 135) should be taken merely as indicating that some characteristics and experiences of these noble men were suggestive of those the Messiah, when he came, might be expected to have,—not that either in his lifetime was popularly held to be the Messiah. On the other hand, while G. H. Dalman's words hold good in general, that "for Judaism the *Messianic Age* and the *Redemption* have always been more important than the Messiah" (p. 56), yet for the last two centuries of our period the mind of Judaism was rather more than hitherto occupied with the idea of the coming of the Messiah (cf. C. H. Toy, p. 330; V. H. Stanton, p. 121).

2. The first work of this Messiah was to secure political advantages such as would give adequate worldly supremacy to Israel. This seems to be the view in the earliest allusion to the Messiah in a kingdom of limited duration, Jub. xxxi. 18 f., where "May the Lord give you strength and power to tread down all that hate you" is made clear by the reference in the next line to "a prince," and, "May your name and the name of your sons

go forth and traverse every land and region," to the author means, "Then shall the Gentiles fear before your face, and all the nations shall quake" as a result of Messiah's arrival and leadership. In the Test. the Messiah takes the foremost place in the active operations against the Gentiles: "the lamb (i.e. the Messiah) overcame them and destroyed them" (T. Jos. xix. 8). In 1 En. lxxxiii-xc the author cannot see other than that there must be some sword-work to be done before things are as they should be. This sword-work is assigned to the people whose leader apparently is represented as a lamb with "a great horn" (xc. 9). "And I saw till a great sword was given to the sheep (i.e. Jews), and the sheep proceeded against all the beasts of the field to slay them, and all the beasts and the birds of the heaven (i.e. hostile Gentiles) fled before their face" (ver. 19). Their destruction once accomplished, there was to be no more use for the sword; hence it is returned, sealed, and kept as a memorial of the occasion. "And I saw till they laid down that sword, which had been given to the sheep, and they brought it back into the house, and it was sealed before the presence of the Lord" (ver. 34). Then the Messiah now portrayed as "a white bull" brings into conformity to his own likeness all those eligible for membership of his Kingdom. "And I saw till all their generations were transformed, and they all became white bulls" (ver. 38), the Messiah himself hereafter existing among and being distinguishable from them as a "lamb" in their midst. This "lamb" is their old leader, who, while one of them (see above, p. 134), retains his distinctiveness as leader even after the great transformation, he being the first to experience transformation. The reference to "the lamb" in the Test. suggests this identity. It is not, then, "that the writer expected two Messiahs and that the warrior who belongs to this world age, and whose coming is at hand, is to him the more interesting figure" (F. C. Porter, p. 311, note 3). There is no adumbration here of the Talmudic idea,—for which see J. Drummond, I, pp. 356 f., or J.E., vol. viii. pp. 511 f.,—of a Messiah ben Joseph who is slain in preparing the way for the Messiah ben David. Rather, the writer is interested in one Messiah only who, his work on earth done, retains his status as Messiah after the great change in the coming Age.

3. Evidence is abundant that the Messiah was very generally expected to have an active warrior-like part to play. He is not thought of as at once reigning as king in peace, but as first clearing the way that such a reign be possible. For this in Sib. iii, see above, pp. 132 f. But even in Psa. Sol. xvii the prayer concerning the Messiah includes: "And gird him with strength, that he may shatter unrighteous rulers, and that he may purge Jerusalem from nations that trample (her) down to destruction" (vers. 24 f.). The

psalmist retains the idea of Jewish political supremacy, and though he does not say as definitely as do the Test. that the Messiah "shall make war against Beliar, and execute an everlasting vengeance on our enemies" (T.D. v. 10), it is not likely that he thought of him as "wielding only the weapons of spiritual power" (H. E. Ryle and M. R. James, p. lvii). So to think is to read too much into the words italicised in the following, used as they are here of a strictly human Messiah (contrast 1 En. lxii. 2, 4 Ez. xiii. 28): "He shall destroy the godless nations *with the word of his mouth*; at his rebuke nations shall flee before him, and he shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of their heart. . . . All nations (shall be) in fear before him, for he will smite the earth *with the rod of his mouth for ever*. . . . He will rebuke rulers, and remove sinners *by the might of his word*" (vers. 27, 38 f., 41). This writer reveals in true perspective the place of force in the incoming of the Kingdom; according to the thought of the best, it was a regrettable necessity to clear the way for a reign in which force would not be needed to secure the doing of the ruler's righteous mind. Zad., who regards the Hellenisers as the chief obstacles, comes into conformity here: when the Messiah arrives these wicked Hellenisers, "those who proved faithless, shall be delivered to the sword" (ix. 10A).

In A 2 of 2 Bar. the Messiah comes to put an end to the bad government of Rome. "And it will come to pass when the time of its (i.e. Rome's) consummation that it should fall has approached, then the principate of My Messiah will be revealed . . . and when it is revealed it will root out the multitude of its (i.e. Rome's) host" (xxxix. 7). The Messiah comes before the fall of Rome, and takes an active part in securing the destruction of that great opposing world-Empire; no other now seems to be thought equal to, humanly speaking, so colossal a task. "The last leader of that time will be left alive, when the multitude of his hosts will be put to the sword, and he will be bound, and they will take him up to Mount Zion, and My Messiah will convict him of all his impieties, and will gather and set before him all the works of his hosts. And afterwards he will put him to death, and protect the rest of My people which shall be found in the place which I have chosen" (xl. 1 f.). With this should be compared the Eagle Vision of 4 Ez., where the Messiah faces the still existent power of Rome, speaks his mind to that power concerning its iniquities, and then effects its exit from the stage of history: "He shall reprove them for their ungodliness, rebuke them for their unrighteousness, reproach them to their faces with their treacheries. For at the first he shall set them alive for judgment; and when he has rebuked them he shall destroy them" (xii. 32 f.). Similarly A 3 of 2 Bar., though he does not anticipate a complete extermina-

tion, yet thinks that only after the warrior Messiah has put to death his enemies will the peaceful, long-looked for, time begin: "After the signs have come, of which you were told before, when the nations become turbulent, and the time of My Messiah is come, he shall both summon all the nations, and some of them he shall spare, and some of them he shall slay. These things therefore shall come upon the nations which are to be spared by him. Every nation, which does not know Israel and has not trodden down the seed of Jacob, shall indeed be spared. And this because some out of every nation shall be subjected to your people. But all those who have ruled over you, or have known you, shall be given up to the sword. And it shall come to pass, when he has brought low everything that is in the world, and has sat down in peace for the Age on the throne of his Kingdom, that joy shall then be revealed, and rest shall appear" (lxxii. 2-lxxiii. 1; cf. lxx. 9).

The necessity for such action is insisted on, even where the Messiah is not associated with it; for example, in A 1 of 2 Bar. the Messiah rôle is passive, but the order of events is, "the beginning of commotions . . . slayings of the great ones . . . the fall of many by death . . . the sending of the sword," etc. (xxvii. 2-5 ff.). "And it shall come to pass when all is accomplished that was to come to pass in those parts, that the Messiah shall then begin to be revealed" (xxix. 3). Again, in 4 Ez. vii. 27 f.: "And whosoever is delivered from the predicted evils, the same shall see my wonders," i.e. after these terrible happenings, "the Messiah shall be revealed." Where also the idea of the Messiah is kept out altogether, with the possible exception of 2 En., armed force is brought to bear on enemies. In 1 En. xci-civ. one reads: "a sword shall be given to it (i.e. 'the eighth week, that of righteousness') that a righteous judgment may be executed on the oppressors, and sinners shall be delivered into the hands of the righteous" (xc. 12). In Ass. Mos. Rome (the Eagle) has to be brought down, this revolutionary change being accomplished, may be, by Zealot methods (E. Schürer, II, iii. pp. 79 f.) rather than by quietist submission, followed by action on the part of "the eternal God alone" (R. H. Charles, V, pp. li-liv; A.P., vol. ii. p. 411). "Then, O Israel, you shall be happy, and you shall mount upon the neck and wings of the eagle, and they shall be ended" (x. 8).

4. The woes of the Kingdom's incoming are here mostly such as characterise stirring times in which great political changes happen. "But again the kings of the nations shall throw themselves against this land in troops, bringing retribution on themselves. . . . In a ring round the city the accursed kings shall place each one his throne with his infidel people by him. . . . From heaven shall fall fiery swords down to the earth"

(Sib. iii. 663-673). "For calamity follows on calamity, and wound on wound, and tribulation on tribulation, and evil tidings on evil tidings, and illness on illness, all evil judgments such as these, one with another, illness and overthrow, and snow and frost and ice, and fever, and chills, and torpor, and famine, and death, and sword, and captivity, and all kinds of calamities and pains" (Jub. xxiii. 13; cf. vers. 18, 22). "There shall be the beginning of commotions . . . slayings of the great ones . . . the fall of many by death . . . the sending of the sword . . . famine and the withholding of rain . . . earthquakes and terrors . . . a multitude of spectres and attacks of the Shedim (i.e. male demons) . . . the fall of fire . . . rapine and much oppression . . . wickedness and unchastity . . . the mingling together of all those things aforesaid" (2 Bar. xxvii. 2-13; cf. 1 En. xciv. 4-6, c. 1 f.). "And they shall hate one another, and provoke one another to fight. . . And they shall come and make war with the leaders that shall then be left. And it shall come to pass that whosoever gets safe out of the war shall die in the earthquake, and whosoever gets safe out of the earthquake shall be burned by the fire, and whosoever gets safe out of the fire shall be destroyed by famine" (lxx. 3, 8). "And the horns of the sun shall be broken and he shall be turned into darkness, and the moon shall not give her light, and be turned wholly into blood. And the circle of the stars shall be disturbed, and the sea shall retire into the abyss, and the fountains of waters shall fail, and the rivers shall dry up" (Ass. Mos. x. 5 f.; cf. 1 En. lxxx. 2 f., 6).

These are representative, and amount to war and its accompaniments, together with sympathetic happenings in earth and sky such as increase the terror of the times. The latter in this connection suggest poetically that, since God is, the permanence of the existing bad government is only apparent; His power can work a revolution for His people. Often, therefore, it was thought that in the great war to come the people's own resistance would be backed up supernaturally.

5. The issue will be that political supremacy and security are obtained. Much is made of the blessings of peace; henceforth there will be freedom from the alarms of war. The Messiah "shall give every land relief from the bane of war" (Sib. iii. 653), "and there shall be peace in all the earth" (T.L. xviii. 4). "Then shall all the earth rest from trouble, and all the world under heaven from war" (T.S. vi. 4). "And it shall come to pass, when he has brought low everything that is in the world, and has sat down in peace for the age on the throne of his Kingdom, that joy shall then be revealed, and rest shall appear" (2 Bar. lxxiii. 1). The Sibyl well describes that peace: "Good law shall come in its fulness from the starry heaven upon men, and good justice, and

with it the best of all gifts to men, sober concord, and affection, faithfulness, friendship from strangers and fellow citizens too" (iii. 373-376). Jub. anticipates that there will be a very real guarantee of this security: "there shall be no Satan nor any evil destroyer" (xxiii. 29; cf. xl. 9) "on the great day of peace" (xxv. 20). So in the Ass. Mos. one reads: "And then Satan shall be no more, and sorrow shall depart with him" (x. 1). Hence the idea is, as in the prophets, that "the peace that is to reign there is not to arise from weariness of war, or because men love ease and enjoyment, but is to be a peace which results from 'knowing' Jahwe" (W. O. E. Oesterley, III, p. 254). "Seek and choose for yourselves righteousness and an elect life, and walk in the paths of peace" (1 En. xciv. 4). Besides, it is also a "peace of God": "With the righteous He will make peace" (i. 8). Contrast the frequency with which it is said that for the wicked, whether they be men or angels, there shall be "no peace" (e.g. v. 4), "no peace nor forgiveness of sin . . . mercy and peace you shall not attain" (xii. 5 f.).

6. These last quotations lead one to examine in greater detail what the Messiah is thought to be chiefly out for. His political activity is only preliminary,—a necessary clearing of the way for the establishment of a righteous people. This latter is the ultimate aim in relation to which all else is but incidental. Here the Test. and Psa. Sol. xvii are of great service in helping one to fix exactly where the best minds, after admitting or taking for granted the need for political action, really put the emphasis. "And the heavens shall be opened unto him, to pour out the spirit, (even) the blessing of the Holy Father," says the one (T. Jud. xxiv. 2). "God will make him mighty by means of (His) holy spirit," says the other (ver. 42). The following will show how often, and just where these two agree. The better aspects of the character of the Maccabean princes, and a correction of that character where he felt it faulty, has given the author of the Test. no mean ideal. Thus, after being told that "the anointed" is a "High Priest" king, the people are adjured "by the God of heaven to do truth each one unto his neighbour and to entertain love each one for his brother," and "in humbleness of heart" to "receive a blessing from his mouth" (T.R. vi. 8 ff.). Again, "His presence is beloved, as a prophet of the Most High" (T.L. viii. 15; cf. T.B. ix. 2; 1 Macc. iv. 46, xiv. 41). "And his star shall arise . . . lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day" (T.L. xviii. 3).

The psalmist tells how peace once established is not sustained by militarism on the part of the Messiah. "He shall not put his trust in horse and rider and bow, nor shall he multiply for himself gold and silver for war, nor shall he gather confidence from a multitude for the day of battle" (ver. 37). He "is mighty

through (his) hope in God" (ver. 38). "His hope (will be) in the Lord: who then can prevail against him?" (ver. 44). "And he shall have the heathen nations to serve him under his yoke" (ver. 32),—subjection issues in conversion (see above, p. 92). "He shall gather together a holy people, whom he shall lead in righteousness, and he shall judge the tribes of the people that has been sanctified by the Lord his God. And he shall not suffer unrighteousness to lodge any more in their midst, nor shall there dwell with them any man that knows wickedness. . . . (He will be) mighty in his works, and strong in the fear of God, (He will be) shepherding the flock of the Lord faithfully and righteously, and will suffer none among them to stumble in their pasture. He will lead them all aright, and there will be no pride among them that any among them should be oppressed. . . . His words (shall be) more refined than costly gold, the choicest; in the assemblies he will judge the peoples, the tribes of the sanctified. His words (shall be) like the words of the holy ones in the midst of sanctified peoples" (vers. 28 f., 44-46, 48 f.).

No other passage illustrates more fully than this the idea of a progressive removal of sin under the Messiah, to which reference was made in the previous chapter (see above, p. 97). His triumph is thought to be just such as a high-minded scribe-prophet might gain among the people; it is essentially the success of a fine, powerfully subduing, and at the same time uplifting, personal influence,—he is such that his word is gladly taken as law. Again, in the Test. the promise is: "You shall be unto Him sons in truth" (T. Jud. xxiv. 3), "he shall give the majesty of the Lord to His sons in truth for evermore" (T. L. xviii. 8). In the psalm the Messiah sees to the exclusion of wickedness from among his subjects: "for he shall know them, that they are all sons of their God" (ver. 30). The sonship the Messiah in each case secures is a real moral and spiritual kinship with God. So in 1 En. lxxxiii-xc the ultimate satisfaction from the point of view of God "the Lord of the sheep" is that "they were all good and had returned to His house" (xc. 33). Similarly in 1 En. xci-civ at the close of the period of the "sword," "a house (i.e. the temple) shall be built," the influence of which will be great among "all mankind" (xci. 13 f.). The same high interest is seen in the phrase "lamenting because they will not be able to offer sacrifices to the Lord of their fathers" (Ass. Mos. iv. 8), on which R. H. Charles comments: "The writer's view may possibly be explained on the ground that he regarded it as impossible for Israel to render perfect worship so long as they were subject to heathen powers" (V., p. 15; cf. A.P., vol. ii. p. 417). He wants a drastic change in their circumstances for the sake of the worship and the good life which the worship inspires. So in one breath, as it were, Sib. iii voices the

intense desire of our writers for something finer than the mere possession of worldly power for its own sake by Israel, when after stating that "the nation of the Mighty God shall be again powerful" he goes on immediately to say, "that nation which shall be to all mortals the guide of life" (vers. 194 f.).

III. THE SUPERHUMAN MESSIAH.

I. The idea of a superhuman Messiah,—which has very ancient and legendary antecedents,—in our literature is derived chiefly, if not entirely, from the Similitudes of Enoch. At the time of Enoch's vision the "Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days. Yea, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits" (xlvi. 2 f.). He has "been chosen and hidden before Him, before the creation of the world and for evermore" (ver. 6). This "Elect One stands before the Lord of Spirits, and his glory is for ever and ever, and his might unto all generations" (xlix. 2). Everything about him seems shrouded in mystery,—“hidden things . . . who he was, and whence he was, (and) why he went with the Head of Days” (xlvi. 2 f.). He has "his dwelling-place under the wings of the Lord of Spirits" (xxxix. 7A); "for from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden (i.e. belonged to what at present is the unseen universe), and the Most High preserved him in the presence of His might" (lxii. 7).

When Enoch himself passed into the Unseen, his experience is described as a being "raised aloft to that Son of Man and to the Lord of Spirits from amongst those who dwell on the earth" (lxx. 1). So, too, in similar terms Ezra is informed of his translation: "You will be taken up from (among) men, and henceforth you will remain with my Son, and with such as are like you, until the times be ended" (4 Ez. xiv. 9). This style of speaking does not favour the idea that some must have thought Enoch after leaving earth to have been elevated to the rank of Messiah in heaven (see D. W. Boussett, p. 348; G. Dalman, p. 244). The solitary passage in our literature, 1 En. lxxi. 14, "*You are the Son of Man,*" spoken to Enoch, very probably, as R. H. Charles (II, p. 145; A.P., vol. ii. p. 237) suggests, contains a scribe's error, and should read, "*This is the Son of Man.*" The other two references given by D. W. Boussett, namely, 2 En. xxii. 6: "And the chief captain Michael lifted me up, and led me to before the Lord's face. And the Lord said to his servants tempting them: Let Enoch stand before my face into eternity," (lxvii. 2): "And they took Enoch up on to the highest heaven, where the Lord is: and he received him and placed him before His face,"—these can hardly

be pressed into service to mean so much. Moreover, in 1 En. lx. 10, cited by G. Dalman, "Thou son of man" is in Ezekiel's style and meaning. It illustrates, however, how the phrase in its ordinary prophetic meaning could be retained alongside of its use with a Messianic connotation.

As to the nature of the pre-existence of this Messiah one or two of the passages taken alone might with some reason be thought to refer to some human being who ideally was present, that is, in the mind of God was thought of, as the Messiah (thus A. Harnack, see D.B., vol. iii. p. 355), and such a human Messiah might conceivably so speak of himself in expressing his consciousness of being heaven-sent,—compare Moses of himself: "He designed and devised me, and He prepared me before the foundation of the world, that I should be a mediator of His covenant" (Ass. Mos. i. 14). The language in the Similitudes, however, seems too definite to allow of such treatment. "The concealment of the Son of Man . . . implies some sort of pre-existence of the Son of Man with God and the angels before the creation of the world" (C. A. Briggs, p. 27). Besides, where the idea of a human Messiah was dropped altogether, as it was by the writer of the Ass. Mos., the habit of elevating Moses with the use of such language may have been deliberately formed to exclude the idea of a superhuman Messiah. In that book Moses after his death remains the mediator (xii. 6); indeed, by the emphasis on "the Eternal God alone" (x. 7) not only is a human Messiah shut out, but also a superhuman, since God not only clears away Rome, but also "alone" carries through the Judgment which issues in Israel's exaltation to heaven, and the consignment of their enemies to Gehenna (vers. 9 f.).

These Son of Man passages, then, refer to some real pre-existent being who next to God is of supreme significance. "Whose lot has the pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits in uprightness for ever" (1 En. xlvi. 3), means that this Son of Man is a heavenly somebody who, in relation to the past and present, and perhaps future, denizens of this earth and elsewhere, is of much greater significance than any archangel. He is for the faith of one section, at any rate, of God's people a living reality on whom in the providence of God they have set their hearts, believing him capable of doing, yea, more, waiting for him to do all they as the righteous would wish to be done; "the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and righteous" (xlviii. 7), "revealed him to the elect" (lxii. 7). Their hope is grounded on what he will do for them, when he comes out of the Unseen, or becomes at length a living reality for all. "In the Jewish teaching of the time of our Lord there was the expectation, at least in some circles, of a Person who should come in the clouds of heaven to vindicate the ways of God" (A. L. Williams, p. 284),

2. This Messiah's work begins after the resurrection of the dead, both righteous and wicked: "In those days shall the earth also give back that which has been entrusted to it, and Sheol also shall give back that which it has received, and hell shall give back that which it owes" (1 En. li. 1). God has appointed him "a judge for them all" (xli. 9). Then, "the secrets of the righteous (i.e. the blessings in store for them) shall be revealed and the sinners judged" (xxxviii. 3). The resources of the invisible world as they are arrayed against sin, and on the side of righteousness, will become manifestly operative through him,—“This is the Son of Man . . . who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden” (xlvi. 3). Since “he is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness, . . . unrighteousness shall disappear as a shadow, and have no continuance” (xlix. 2); so “the prayer of the righteous” shall not have been “in vain before the Lord of Spirits that judgment may be done unto them, and that they may not have to suffer for ever” (xlvii. 2). The great separation of righteous from wicked takes place; “in those days the Elect One shall arise, and he shall choose the righteous and the holy from among them” (li. 5A, 2). Final punishment falls upon the wicked: “And one portion of them shall look on the other, and they shall be terrified, and they shall be downcast of countenance, and pain shall seize them, when they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. . . . And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth shall fall down before him on their faces, and worship and set their hope upon that Son of Man, and petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands. Nevertheless that Lord of Spirits will so press them that they shall hastily go forth from His presence, and their faces shall be filled with shame, and the darkness grow deeper on their faces. And He will deliver them to the angels for punishment, to execute vengeance on them because they have oppressed His children and His elect” (lxii. 5, 9-11).

Though H. J. Wicks (I.J.A., July 1916, p. 36) brackets the Similitudes with the Test. and Psa. Sol. as setting forth the Messiah not merely as “a great Doomster,” but as “the Saviour and the hope of humankind,” and it must be admitted that there are a few passages (quoted above, p. 94), not very clear, which seem to look that way, the passage just given more truly represents this writer's view, as C. A. Briggs says: “the manifestation of this concealed Son of Man is not for redemption . . . but for the judgment of the world at the universal resurrection” (p. 31). Eternal reward comes to the righteous: the roll of the kingdom, “the books of the living” (xlvii. 3), determines who these are; “and the righteous and elect shall be saved on that day, and they shall never thenceforward see the face of the sinners and un-

righteous . . . the righteous and elect shall have risen from the earth, and ceased to be of downcast countenance. And they shall have been clothed with garments of glory . . . the garments of life " which " shall not grow old " (lxii. 13, 15 f.). With this should be compared the representation in the composite 4 Ez. xiii, where " an innumerable multitude of men " who " make war against the Man (i.e. the Messiah) " are destroyed by him without " any warlike weapon,"—" a fiery stream " out of his mouth gets rid of them ; and " afterwards I beheld the same Man . . . call unto him another multitude which was peaceable " (vers. 5, 9, 12).

This Messianic function of judgment, too, is to be exercised not only in relation to men, but also as regards angels: " And he shall judge all the works of the holy above in the heaven, and in the balance shall their deeds be weighed " (1 En. lxi. 8),—a verse which evidently refers to the righteous angels since they are pleased with the result (ver. 9), the condemnation of the wicked angels before the judgment seat of the Messiah being introduced elsewhere as an indication to the wicked on earth of what their fate shall be: " You will have to behold My Elect One, how he sits on the throne of glory and judges Azazel, and all his associates, and all his hosts in the name of the Lord of Spirits " (lv. 4). This Messiah, then, is distinct from God, and yet is so nearly God that he can act for Him in the high capacity of judge of men and of angels at the last great Assize. He is the heavenly Doomster.

3. The intervention of this Messiah is expected at a time when " the mighty and the kings . . . possess the earth " (lxiii. 1). These are, according to R. H. Charles (II, pp. 72 f. ; A.P., vol. ii. p. 210), the Sadducees and the native rulers. They " deny the name of the dwelling of the holy ones and the Lord of Spirits " (xlv. 1), and have no sense of the divine origin of their rulership,—" they do not extol and praise Him, nor humbly acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them " (xlvi. 5). They " cast down the stars of heaven (i.e. the righteous) . . . all their deeds manifest unrighteousness, and their power rests upon their riches " (ver. 7). They " persecute the houses of His congregations " (ver. 8), even to the point of shedding " the blood of the righteous " (xlvii. 1 f.). The Messiah, " the Righteous and Elect One shall cause the house of his congregation to appear : henceforth they shall be no more hindered in the name of the Lord of Spirits " (liii. 6), executing " vengeance on them " who " have oppressed His children and His elect " (lxii. 11). Such is to be the end of those who said in their hearts, " Our hope is in the sceptre of our kingdom and in our glory " (lxiii. 7), and who " denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed " (xlviii. 10). Nothing illustrates better than this the truth of W. O. E. Oesterley's statement " that, as in the case of the Old Testament prophets, the Apocalyptic

writers often based their eschatological prophecies upon the historical conditions of their times" (IV, p. 81). Enough has not, however, been made of the fact that in the Similitudes the supernatural Son of Man was expected to bring judgment on the native rulers and the Sadducees, whose hand has been against the godly section of the community to the point of shedding innocent blood. What R. H. Charles characterises as "an inconsistent feature introduced by the original writer," or else a "phrase . . . only to be taken in a general sense, as expressing the triumph of the righteous" (II, p. 73; cf. A.P., vol. ii. p. 210), may really signify that a sign of the approach of the final Judgment would be the sudden collapse of the tyranny of these people: "Then shall the kings and the mighty perish, and be given into the hands of the righteous and holy" (xxxviii. 5).

4. Later the close relation to man suggested in the very name he bears has, in some writers, brought this Messiah into closer contact with the lot of God's people in the present world. Thus, in the A 1 section of 2 Bar.: in the one passage (xxix. 3), "the Messiah" or "the principate of the Messiah" is to "be revealed," apparently from heaven; in the other (xxx. 1) he is represented as returning to heaven at the close of his reign: "And it shall come to pass after these things, when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled, that he shall return in glory." Again, the redactor of 4 Ez. considered that the heavenly pre-existent "Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with him (i.e. immortal companions who, though once upon earth, had not yet tasted death), and shall rejoice the survivors four hundred years," and that he and they all at the close of those years "shall die" (vii. 28 f.). This tendency to bring the superhuman Messiah down to be a kind of human Messiah here reveals itself once more in 4 Ez. xii. 32, where the earthly and Davidic Messiah is spoken of as "the Messiah whom the Most High has kept unto the end of the days"; and still more in 4 Ez. xiii, where "the Man" is to be in the manner of his approach and activity supernatural, and in verse 26 is identified as "he whom the Most High is keeping many ages," yet the outcome of his advent is to be just what was generally looked for from the earthly Messiah,—he is to accomplish the destruction of enemies and the establishment of an earthly Kingdom in peace in Palestine to include the long-lost ten tribes, not the setting up of the final Judgment (cf. I.J.A., Jan. 1911, p. 2; also April 1909, pp. 30 f.).

In a word, the superhuman Son of Man was not a very popular, nor, where known, a very stable figure in Jewish thought at the beginning of our era, and for a very obvious reason: he was to come to bring to a close the reign of terror for godly people of the native rulers and the Sadducees. "The Messianic picture

of the Similitudes did *not* represent the broad Jewish view " (G. Friedlander, IV, p. 13). Most people, it seems, chose to forget the distinction between the human Messiah and the superhuman Messiah; they were satisfied to add some supernatural features to the former (cf. V. H. Stanton, I, p. 132), so as to make the object of the coming of that glorified human Messiah the downfall of the great hostile kingdom of this world, Rome. This fusion continued; "in the Talmud the Messiah comes before us, on the one hand, as being born of the seed of David, i.e. as being of purely human origin (Sanhedrin, 97A); on the other hand, he existed before the creation, though himself a created being,—i.e. pure Arianism (Bereshath rabba, C. i.). This fact is interesting as showing that even in purely Jewish literature the idea of a dual nature in the Messiah is not a *wholly* alien thought" (W. O. E. Oesterley, I.J.A., April 1907, p. 8).

5. This God, or angelic, Man after the final Judgment remains as the head of the redeemed community, and dwells in the midst of men, now become angels, as their perpetual guide and inspirer. He secures real progress in the Divine life under ideal circumstances. "His glory is for ever and ever" (1 En. xlix. 2); "with that Son of Man shall they eat, and lie down and rise up for ever and ever" (lxii. 14); "I and My Son will be united with them for ever in the paths of uprightness in their lives" (cv. 2). On the last quotation R. H. Charles (II, pp. 262 f.; cf. A.P., vol. ii. p. 277) remarks, that "the finite duration of the lives of the saints seems to be implied," as in 1 En. i-xxxvi. But since there is no Messiah at all in this book till after that section is passed, and these words introduce again the "Son" after a long section, chapters xci-civ, in which the immortal life in heaven is the idea made prominent, the natural reference is to the only Son of God mentioned in the book, namely, to the Son of Man of the Similitudes who is under God the centre of the heavenly life of the saints. The idea of "I (i.e. God) and My Son" classed together over against "them," the redeemed, seems to be that the close union of the Son with their life in the beyond will make the glorified people aware of their continuous union with God in that blessed state,—a way of trying to conceive what is at present beyond human conception, the angelic—Man *par excellence*, the God-Man dwelling in the midst of men themselves now angelic, as Adam was before his fall (see below, p. 198), in a paradise regained and more.

To summarise conclusions: The term "anointed" or "messiah" from being one of very general application has come in our literature to be technically applied to the ideal ruler who was, by some at any rate, regarded as necessary to the bringing in of the Kingdom of God among men. There are two distinct characters to whom it is so applied, the one human, whose scene of operations was

this world or age, the other superhuman, whose sphere was really the world or age to come. Each was subordinate to and the ambassador of God; even the superhuman Messiah, though conceivably higher than any archangel, was to act all the while under and for God. The two Messiahs are alike in their essential oneness with God in moral character; they stand particularly for the justice of God, being themselves wholly righteous. Their power arises from a divine wisdom in them which makes that righteousness effective on behalf of the righteous and against the wicked. The human Messiah has definite family relations within Israel, not always, but latterly, as in an earlier period, with the house of David. He secures adequate political supremacy over other nations for Israel as the people of God. This entails a woeful period of war, during which the relatively small forces of Israel are supernaturally assisted. There ensues a great world peace whose security is righteousness, not the sword. Under him the work of the removal of sin from the life of the community proceeds, his reign being the continuous triumph of his own righteousness in making all his subjects to be more and more in accordance with it: the real objective is the creation of this perfectly righteous people. The superhuman Messiah is a pre-existent somebody, higher than all angels and very nearly God, who is yet to be revealed from above. He is to intervene, when things are as bad as ever they can be, at the close of the age to set up the final Judgment, and to act for God thereat. His intervention is looked for particularly against the Sadducees and the native rulers of Israel who are persecuting the devout in the community, and have even martyred some of them. This association was not always retained; the tendency was rather to add some of his supernatural features to the idea of the human Messiah, and to think of the mysterious and glorified human Messiah as appearing with powers adequate to accomplishing the downfall of Rome. In the Similitudes this God, or angelic, Man vindicates the persecuted and martyred pious, and then dwells with them as the very power and presence of God in their midst, the source and centre of their glorified life.

B.—JESUS AND THIS TEACHING

THE evidence of the recorded words of Jesus is that he seldom made use of the term "the Anointed," and never apparently in direct reference to himself. In one passage it may be correct to read "my" in front of "name," as Tischendorf does (cf. G. Dalman, pp. 305 f.), though it is not over well attested, thus: "Whoever gives you a cup of water in my name" (Mark ix. 41; cf. Matt. x. 42, "in a learner's name"); and then to take "because you are Anointed's" as a correct gloss. Otherwise one must translate, "in the Name" (see below, p. 154), and take the additional words as an incorrect gloss (cf. E. A. Abbott, p. 34, note 2). "Your guide is one, the Anointed" (Matt. xxiii. 10), may be a similar case, on which A. H. McNeile observes: "It is very improbable that Jesus described Himself, the Teacher, as 'the Messiah,' which meant something quite different both to Him and to the Jews" (p. 332; cf. the silence of Rabbinical literature on his claim to Messiahship, R. T. Herford, II, pp. 349, 379 f.). But the emphasis here on "one" favours the idea that all the three sentences, "One is your teacher . . . One is your heavenly Father . . . your guide is one" (vers. 8-10), refer to God; hence "the Anointed" is again an incorrect gloss. The tendency to insert the term is illustrated by, "For many will come on my name (perhaps originally 'on the Name,' see above) saying, I am the Anointed" (Matt. xxiv. 5), since in the parallels (Mark xiii. 6, Luke xxi. 8) "the Anointed" is wanting. This process of elimination leaves only two recorded instances of its use on his lips, neither of which has a direct reference to himself: "Look! here is the Anointed . . . there will arise false Anointed's" (Mark xiii. 21 f. || Matt. xxiv. 23 f.). "How do the Scribes say that the Anointed is David's son?" (Mark xii. 35 || Matt. xxii. 42, Luke xx. 41). Besides, even when it has been used of him by another, there is a studied avoidance of the term on his part: when Peter says, "You are the Anointed" (Mark viii. 29 || Matt. xvi. 16, Luke ix. 20; cf. John vi. 69), and the high priest asks, "Are you the Anointed . . .?" (Mark xiv. 61 || Matt. xxvi. 63, Luke xxii. 67), he thereupon goes on to speak rather of "the 'son of man'" in the one case, and of "the Son of Man" in the other. (For the difference between these, see below, pp. 171, 175).

For the moment no conclusion should be drawn from this more than that there is revealed on his part some detachment from the popular idea of "the Anointed." It does not settle the question whether he had in some sense clear and satisfactory to his own mind "the Messianic Idea" of himself,—the conception of himself, that is, as "a Saviour, overcoming all that is harmful to man and bringing about for man a state of peacefulness," which W. O. E. Oesterley (III, p. 7) says is the very essence of the idea.

I. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MESSIAH.

i. Consciousness of Messiahship, according to our literature, should mean at least awareness of having been sent as God's delegate in some fashion such as would give one pre-eminence over others. Knowledge of one's pre-eminence over others in some respects is not inconsistent with a sustentation of humility, since the latter quality comes, not from blinding oneself to one's actual pre-eminence, but from consciousness of what one is not yet pre-eminent in, and, may be, can never be. This in the religious sphere means that humility is always to be sustained toward God, and may co-exist with a very pronounced consciousness of pre-eminence among men. Professed sayings of Jesus, therefore, which reveal such consciousness are not to be hastily ruled out as though, to quote C. G. Montefiore, "we shall certainly not admire his character more if he thought himself the 'Son of God' in a special sense" (III, p. 39). In another place that writer, after objecting to "any metaphysical" sense, says, "He could be man, Messiah, Son of God in one" (III, p. 111). Even so; but if the members of the Kingdom are "all sons of their God" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 30), the pre-eminence among such which is indicated by Messiahship cannot be otherwise stated than by saying that the Messiah is "the Son of God," that is, has a consciousness of sonship such as gives him the leadership among these sons of God. The beginnings of such consciousness in Jesus have been rightly put at the opening of the adolescent period of his life (cf. J. A. Robertson, pp. 25, 41); his mother from then onward "kept safe . . . utterances in her heart" of the type: "Did you not know that in my Father's house I must be?" (Luke ii. 49).

The process of growing "in wisdom . . . and in favour with God" (ver. 52) culminated later at a meeting with John the Baptist, at which he, as a would-be candidate for baptism, was interrogated by this new prophet in reference to the sin which he might wish to confess. In the course of this interrogation the Baptist for the first time felt that he had met his superior. With deep emotion again and again he refused (*διεκώλυεν*, Matt. iii. 14) to administer the rite in this case. Jesus, however, insisted on the privilege

being allowed him that very minute (*ἄρτι*, see papyri example, G. Milligan, p. 114), "Allow (it) now (i.e. without further delay),"—since it was fitting John should let him throw in his lot with a movement so evidently expressive of the righteous will of God concerning His people,—“for in this way it is fitting for us to carry out all righteousness” (Matt. iii. 15). As John’s questions about sin evoked no confession from him, the conversation seems to have helped Jesus on to a discovery of himself. During an intense outburst in prayer (Luke iii. 21) after the baptism, the grand terms on which he had been living his life in relation to God, the harmony of the son-mind in him with the Father-will, impressed him as it had not done before. That day it came to him as from God Himself, clear as a “sound . . . out of the heavens”: “You are my Son, the Beloved, in you I have delight” (Mark i. 11 || Luke iii. 22; cf. Matt. iii. 17, John i. 33 f.; cf. J.Q.R., vol. xii., April 1900, pp. 424 f.; D.C.G., vol. ii. p. 810). He felt that he had the leadership in sonship, a relationship to God such as he would do all in his power to bring others into the experience of enjoying. Of the members of the Messianic Kingdom it is said: “And the Lord shall . . . be *well pleased* in His *beloved ones* for ever” (T.L. xviii. 13). Consciousness of leadership in respect to “His beloved ones” in whom God would be “well pleased” marks the emergence of his consciousness of Messiahship. This is confirmed by a comparison of the form in which this episode (Mark i. 10 f. || Matt. iii. 16 f., Luke iii. 21 f., John i. 32–34) is cast with the words concerning the Messiah in the T.L., xviii: “The heavens shall be opened, and from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification, with the Father’s voice as from Abraham to Isaac, and the glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him, and the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him” (vers. 6 f.). “No other point of time has any claim to rank as the commencement of the fully recognised vocation. . . . The vision vouchsafed to Him at the Jordan was such that He Himself must be regarded as the source of the main elements of the narrative. In that hour He knew Himself summoned by the Father to fulfil the Messianic work” (H. R. Mackintosh, p. 17).

In faithfulness to the circumstances of the emergence of Messianic consciousness in Jesus the Fourth Gospel uniformly construes his Messianic function in terms of Divine Sonship. “The preparation for the true Messiahship is the realisation of the true sonship” (W. P. Du Bose, p. 34; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 393; D. W. Forrest, I, p. 73; J. Denney, pp. 205 f.; C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 130; A. L. Williams, p. 40; E. W. Winstanley, p. 202; W. Manson, p. 126). From the first consciousness of sonship, then, he thought of himself as Messiah in the sense of a son-ambassador from the Father; to this work he was consecrated. “Whoever

welcomes me, welcomes not me, but him who delegated me" (Mark ix. 37 || Luke ix. 48). Jesus fully explored the suggestion of Messiah as God's son (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. pp. 131 f.), so that it meant for him "a unique ethical sonship to God,—an incomparable fellowship with the Father" (G. B. Stevens, I, p. 211; cf. T. C. Hall, pp. 53 f.). He did not feel sent, till he felt himself son; and as soon as he felt himself son, he felt himself sent to establish the Kingdom of sons (cf. E. C. Dewick, p. 150; contrast A. Harnack, I, p. 345, note 2), for "the longing of Jesus was for His brethren to share to the utmost of their capacity the filial consciousness which He possessed" (E. W. Winstanley, p. 318; cf. D. W. Forrest, I, p. 107; A. Sabatier, Bk. II, chap. ii. 2). His subordination in all things to God is well illustrated by his remark: "But the sitting on my right or left is not my giving; but—for whom they have been made ready" (Mark x. 40 || Matt. xx. 23, "by my Father"; cf. S. Mathews, III, p. 98).

2. Pre-eminence in righteousness is also by our writers expected of the Messiah, when he comes. The righteousness required for the office is more than met by Jesus as an examination of what he felt God approved in him will show. This comes into view in his defence of his friendship with the despised, unpatriotic tax-gatherers and the like who were to the religious *élite* of his day incurable in sin, a moral and spiritual plague area to be shunned by such as would be healthy-souled. "No need have the healthy of a doctor, but the ill; I have not come to invite righteous, but sinners" (Mark ii. 17 || Matt. ix. 12 f., Luke v. 31 f.). That this apologia rests on his awareness of God's approval is seen in his application of his parables of the lost sheep and the lost piece of silver. The seeking work which he is doing is the work whose success makes God most glad. "I tell you, that similarly there will be joy in heaven over one sinner repenting rather than over ninety-nine righteous, such as have no need of repentance. . . . Similarly, I tell you, there is joy before the angels of God over one sinner repenting" (Luke xv. 7, 10). Contrast from our literature: "And your Creator will rejoice at your destruction" (1 En. xciv. 10), "and the angels of heaven rejoice over your destruction" (xcvii. 2),—a thought which could never have found a place in the mind of Jesus, but which was probably very much in the mind of his critics. That God would be severe with the loveless Jesus verily believed: "In this way also (i.e. as the merciless slave had been dealt with) will my heavenly Father treat you, unless you forgive each his brother from your hearts" (Matt. xviii. 35; cf. v. 7). But yet nothing was clearer to him than that in his own saving activity he was loving as God would have him do: "Similarly (i.e. to the shepherd who did not wish to lose one sheep of his flock) there is no wish before your (or 'my')

Father in heaven that there be lost one of these little ones" (Matt. xviii. 14).

"Jesus was not merely a 'collective' prophet. . . . He was also the individualist prophet—the seeker of souls . . . to *seek out* the sinner, and, instead of avoiding the bad companion, to choose him as your friend in order to work his moral redemption, this was . . . something new in the religious history of Israel. . . . The rescue and deliverance of the sinner through pity and love and personal service,—the work and the method seem both alike due to the teacher of Nazareth" (C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 55–58; cf. T. R. Glover, I, p. 186). He took as his pattern the father who, while the prodigal "was still a distance off . . . was filled with tenderness, and running fell on his neck, and kissed him affectionately" (Luke xv. 20). His own influence he designed to bring another chance to such as were seemingly beyond hope. The passionateness of his interest in redemptive work becomes vocal in: "Sir, leave it also this year, till such time as I dig round it and put in manure" (Luke xiii. 8),—revealing his fixed intention to make a vigorous prophetic appeal to the Jerusalemites. His determination also to carry through this very ministry of seeking love even unto death gave him more than anything else a sense of the approval of God: "For this reason me the Father loves, that I lay down my life" (John x. 17). Nothing short of a sustentation of this seeking love to the very end, and amid the horror of premature and treacherously caused death, could keep safe for him his fellowship with God. Hence, after the prayerful re-enforcement of his momentous decision, the message: "This is My Son, the Beloved, hear him" (Mark ix. 7 || Matt. xvii. 5, Luke ix. 35). This pre-eminence in righteousness as seeking, saving love gave him again his right to the Messiahship.

3. Further, our writers require of the Messiah that he should have in him the wisdom of God; and evidence that Jesus spoke with consciousness of being the very wisdom of God to men is not wanting. With, "Come to me, all toilers and burdened, and I will rest you. Take my yoke on you, and learn from me . . . and you will find rest to your souls. For my yoke is comfortable, and my burden light" (Matt. xi. 28–30; cf. J. A. Findlay, pp. 283 f.), compare, "Turn in unto me, unlearned. . . . Bring your necks under her (i.e. wisdom's) yoke, and your burden let your soul bear. . . . Behold with your eyes I laboured but (little) therein, and abundance of peace have I found" (Sir. li. 23, 26 f.). "Put your shoulder under her. . . . Draw near to her with all your heart, . . . for at length you will find her rest" (vi. 25 f., 28; cf. "the yoke of Thy law," 2 Bar. xli. 3). The Pauline equation, "Christ . . . God's wisdom" (1 Cor. i. 24), and the Johannine phenomena given below may go back to a habit of Jesus in speaking of himself

and his teaching in terms used of wisdom in Sir., a book which A. Plummer (E., Dec. 1908, p. 482) even is willing to admit he read,—may come, that is, “from the self-consciousness of Jesus, expressed in Wisdom language” (J. A. Findlay, p. 286). Thus, with “Whoever drinks of the water which I shall give him will not thirst forever” (John iv. 14), “he who comes to me will not hunger, and he who trusts me will not thirst ever again . . . he who eats this bread will live for ever” (vi. 35, 58); compare, “And she (i.e. wisdom) will feed him with the bread of understanding, and will give him the waters of knowledge to drink” (Sir. xv. 3); “they that eat shall still hunger for me, and they that drink me shall still thirst for me” (xxiv. 21). Again, “If anybody thirsts, let him come to me and drink. He who trusts me, as the scripture-passage has said, rivers out of his belly (i.e. originating from within) will flow,—of living (i.e. fresh and flowing) water” (John vii. 37 f.); compare, “rivers” in the following: “The Law . . . which fills (men) with wisdom, like Pison, and like Tigris in the days of new (fruits); which overflows like Euphrates, with understanding, and as Jordan in the days of harvest; which pours forth, as the Nile, instruction, and as Gihon in the days of vintage. . . . And as for me, I (was) as a stream from the river. . . . And lo, my stream became a river and my river became a (or Syr., ‘reached to the’) sea. . . . Yet again will I pour forth doctrine as prophecy” (Sir. xxiv. 23–27, 30 f., 33; cf. xlvii. 14). (Cf. C. F. Burney, pp. 109 ff.).

This is confirmed by the Synoptic representation of him as demanding a devotion to himself such as men had not been accustomed to be required of them save to the divinest thing they knew (cf. H.J., vol. x. pp. 776 ff.). “Torah . . . to them was wisdom from God, the revelation of all truth, goodness, power, and love” (R. T. Herford, I, p. 110; cf. p. 171). What he asked from them only the Law as the revealed will of God had required: “He who loves father or mother . . . son or daughter, more than me is not worthy of me” (Matt. x. 37). “If anybody comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, . . . he cannot be a learner of mine” (Luke xiv. 26). Compare, “For their anxiety about wives and children as well as about brethren and kinsfolk, weighed less with them than their supreme and chief anxiety about the consecrated sanctuary” (2 Macc. xv. 18). “For the Law ranks above affection for parents . . . and it overrides love for a wife . . . and it governs love for children . . . and it controls the claims of friendship” (4 Macc. ii. 10–12). Again, “Whoever does the will of God, that person is my brother, and sister, and mother” (Mark iii. 35 || Matt. xii. 50, Luke viii. 21). “There is nobody who has left . . . brothers, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children,

. . . on account of me, . . . unless he receive (i.e. without his receiving) hundredfold now in this time . . . brothers, and sisters, and mothers, and children" (Mark x. 29 f. || Matt. xix. 29, Luke xviii. 29 f.). Compare, "For every one that knows the Law of the Lord shall be honoured, and shall not be a stranger whithersoever he goes. Yea, many friends shall he gain more than his parents" (T.L. xiii. 3 f.).

"On" or "in" or "by my name," signifying in general "for honour of me,"—to turn to other data of the same sort,—may represent, according to context, various kinds and degrees of reference to him, thus, "with my meaning" or "intention" (Mark ix. 37 || Matt. xviii. 5, Luke ix. 48), or "mind" (Matt. xviii. 20; cf. John xiv. 13 f., 26, xv. 16, xvi. 23 f., 26), or "authority" (Matt. vii. 22, Mark xiii. 6 || Matt. xxiv. 5, Luke xxi. 8; cf. Mark ix. 39). "On account of me" (Mark viii. 35 || Matt. xvi. 25, Luke ix. 24, Matt. x. 39; cf. || Luke xvii. 23, where it is omitted) represents a phrase (מִשְׁמֵנִי) which is sometimes literally translated "on account of my name" (Luke xxi. 12; cf. || "on account of me," Mark xiii. 9, Matt. x. 18; "because of my name," Mark xiii. 13 || Luke xxi. 17; cf. Matt. xxiv. 9, Matt. x. 22, John xv. 21). Some of these may go back to the form, "on account of righteousness" (Matt. v. 10,— "on account of me," ver. 11; cf. 4 Macc. vi. 23, ix. 6 f., 29 f., xi. 20, xiii. 12, xvii. 7, xviii. 3), or "because of the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. xix. 12), or "on account of the Kingdom of God" (Luke xviii. 29; cf. || "on account of my name," Matt. xix. 29, "on account of me and on account of the good news," Mark x. 29), but hardly all (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 133). The data here should perhaps lead one to suppose that "on account of the Name (i.e. God)" (cf. "the Name," 3 John vii., Lev. xxiv. 11) was later sharpened into "on account of me,"—this, too, in some instances possibly by Jesus himself (cf. E. A. Abbott, pp. 34, 164). Compare above, p. 148, also "I am here in the name of my Father" (John v. 43), "the deeds which I am doing in the name of my Father" (John x. 25), "I have made public Thy name" (John xvii. 6; cf. ver. 26), "I used to watch them in Thy name" (John xvii. 12), "Let Thy name be sacred" (Matt. vi. 9 || Luke xi. 2), "Father, glorify Thy name" (John xii. 28), with the instances of the more personal type just given; and in Rabbinical literature, "in the name or for the honour of Heaven," "the sanctification of the Divine Name through man's moral life" (M. Lazarus, Part I, p. 142; Part II, pp. 13 f.).

Further, "Look! more than Solomon here!" (Matt. xii. 42 || Luke xi. 31), is significant in this association, since Solomon was the favourite name in the wisdom literature, and was regarded as the traditional embodiment of the wisdom of God. If, then, Jesus attained a fuller apprehension and appreciation of God as

indwelling wisdom than ever before,—not to mention “ a complete detailed psychology of His Person ” (W. Temple, p. 86),—a true psychology (contrast E., Oct. 1913, pp. 334-342, Dec., pp. 567 f.) of clear and intense religious conviction might favour in him this very egotism which our records ascribe to him. To quote J. Drummond: “ Disregarding particular views of Christ’s person, can we not conceive a man set apart to be the organ and leader of a world-wide spiritual movement, and becoming conscious in himself that it was so? . . . it seems to me a strangely external way of judging of conceit to be offended at such utterances, without considering the greatness and providential position of him who uttered them, as though self-complacency might not lurk under a careful abstinence from egotism, and the deepest humility accompany the loftiest claims ” (II, pp. 38 f.). What made people “ thunderstruck ” was that he did put himself forward as an “ authority ” for them (Matt. vii. 28 f.; cf. Mark i. 27). In the parable, too, the prophets are the “ slaves,” but he the “ son ” (Mark xii. 2-6 || Matt. xxi. 34-37, Luke xx. 10-13). “ It is not more plain that Christ achieved a unique ethical wisdom than that He ascribed it to His abiding fellowship with God ” (D. W. Forrest, II, pp. 133 f.), and “ if one through perfect actual realization of the divine fatherhood should perfectly realise his own sonship, he would be no longer only a servant in his Father’s house. He would be a son, entitled to speak in his father’s name and with his father’s authority ” (W. P. Du Bose, p. 58; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 113 f.; R. T. Herford, I, p. 131). It is not surprising, then, that the plaint of wisdom should be discernible in his lament, “ Jerusalem, Jerusalem!—the killer of prophets and stoner of (God’s) delegates to her,—how many times did I (i.e. as wisdom) want to gather your children exactly as a bird (cf. wisdom, feminine) gathers her young under her wings, and you didn’t want ” (Matt. xxiii. 37 || Luke xiii. 34; cf. E., Dec. 1915, pp. 493-511).

II. THE HUMAN MESSIAH.

1. The testimony of our literature is that by Jesus’ time popular opinion had settled down again to the idea that “ the Anointed ” would be “ the son of David.” The latter phrase, then, on the lips of men of his time was the equivalent of the former, when that was used of the human Messiah ordinarily expected. “ An earthly king, using worldly means, successful in war, restoring political independence and material prosperity, and bringing about everything ideal in government—this was what the Jews meant by their title ‘ the Son of David,’ and such a Messiah they expected ” (A. L. Williams, p. 259; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 184;

G. Tyrrell, p. 48). There is good reason for assuming the Davidic descent of Jesus (Ib., pp. 260-265; cf. G. Dalman, p. 321; on the Rabbinical statement, "he was near to the Kingdom," see R. T. Herford, II, p. 89), and to see in the fact an occasion of embarrassment to him in his task of re-interpreting the idea of Messiahship. He studiously avoided the term "the Anointed" because of its usual associations (see above, pp. 148 f.), and when spoken of or addressed as "the son of David," as he was at times (e.g. Matt. xii. 23, xv. 22, John vii. 42), he must have felt the wrong direction thus given to the thought of the people in regard to himself. His inattention, at first, to the appeal of Bartimeus may be most easily explained by his annoyance at having repeatedly yelled after him in so public a place "son of David!" (Mark x. 47 f. || Matt. xx. 30 f., Luke xviii. 38 f.; cf. Matt. ix. 27, also John ii. 24, "did not trust himself to them"). The most conspicuous, and also the most embarrassing occasion was at the beginning of the last week of his life, when he rode into Jerusalem, and was greeted with shouts of, "Blessed (i.e. Good luck to) the approaching kingdom of our father David" (Mark xi. 10), "Blessed he who comes, the king in the Lord's name" (Luke xix. 38), "Blessed he who comes in the Lord's name, even the king of Israel" (John xii. 13), "Victory to the son of David" (Matt. xxi. 9),—shouts which the youngsters took up and afterwards sustained as a ditty in the temple courts to the great annoyance of the powers which be (ver. 15).

However the demonstration originated, it is not likely that his riding on an ass into Jerusalem, as many others had done, was designed by him to be a public claim to Messiahship,—“it does not appear that Jesus ever openly claimed to be the Messiah” (K. Lake, p. 36; contrast A. Schweitzer, pp. 391 f.; and cf. G. Friedlander, III, p. 71). On the other hand, when the demonstration did take place, the intention of the demonstrators, whoever they were,—perhaps the disciples led by Judas, and assisted by Galileans—was to proclaim him the Messiah (cf. F. W. Worsley, pp. 308 f.). Later he himself publicly repudiated the conception of Messiah which had given rise to the demonstration. He “went on to say, while teaching in the temple, How do the scribes say that the Anointed is David’s son? David himself said in the holy spirit, The Name said to my Lord, Sit on my right, till I place your enemies underneath your feet. David himself calls him Lord; and how is he (i.e. how can he be) *his* son?” (Mark xii. 35-37 || Matt. xxii. 42-45, Luke xx. 41-44). In a manner which would pass muster in his day, he pointed out the absurdity of “the son of David” idea of the Messiah (contrast, A. Schweitzer, p. 393), cherishing the while an altogether finer conception, according to which David might with propriety acknowledge himself in

the presence of a greater. The latter point he did not elaborate ; enough that he should have openly declared that the ordinary conception of a Davidic Messiah was unsatisfactory, yea, more, to his way of thinking impossible. " He certainly disclaimed any application to himself of the ordinary conception of a Messiah, the Davidic descent of whom he argues against . . . entirely in the Talmudic manner " (J.E., vol. vii. p. 164 ; cf. S. Mathews, III, p. III ; W. C. Allen, II, pp. 207 f.

2. This accords with the evidence of his surrender, much earlier, of the idea of the necessity to the Kingdom of God of such political advantages as would give adequate worldly supremacy to the people of God (cf. the Asidæans, J.L., pp. 87 f.). " It is difficult for us to conceive of the fitness of Jesus to assume the leadership of military adventure ; but, to contemporary Jews, it apparently seemed a feasible project," and, moreover, " men of a deeply religious nature may be successful soldiers. . . . The mystical tempter may be allied to habits of intense practicalness " (W. A. Grist, p. 242). However, he on his part refused to think that " if the sovereignty of God is to appear in all its glory, Israel must be set free from the sway of the peoples, and the Gentile world be subjugated to God " (G. Dalman, p. 98), that is, through a victorious Israel. That he had the very natural patriotic leanings of a devout Jew who thought,—and not without reason,—that after all deductions his nation was the best of nations, and had a good deal to contribute to the others' improvement, need not be doubted. The prophetic ideal of a world-wide empire with his own nation at its centre and others in some degree of subordination, had attractions for him, as it had for most of our writers (cf. A. E. Garvie, p. 136). For the prophetic ideals to be realised would mean a great improvement ; why, then, should not the national aspirations be made the centre of the movement for the Kingdom of God ?

So the temptation : " Again, the devil takes him on to an exceedingly high mountain and points out to him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendour " (Matt. iv. 8 || Luke iv. 5). But the consciousness of the ungodlike limitation, which any identification of his work with Jewish nationalism (cf. G. G. Buckler, pp. 42 f. ; J. Seeley, p. 56) would involve, was enough to deter him from a line of action at first sight so plausible. It became clear to him that such a course would not be service of God, as he had come to conceive that service. For his soul there was Satan in it, saying : " To you all this will I give, if you will fall down and worship me " (Matt. iv. 9 || Luke iv. 6 f.). As there was the tempter in this call of nationalism, he refused obedience : " Then Jesus tells him, Be off, Satan : for it is written, The Lord your God you should worship, and to Him only give divine service " (Matt. iv. 10 || Luke

iv. 8). Jesus, then, rejected an idea which was a favourite among our writers, namely, that the attainment of this supremacy by Israel would be coincident with the defeat of Satan. "He did not conceive of the kingdom as a sort of righteous Jewish Empire" (C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 71). It may have been his rejection of such an idea that gave his opponents their opportunity of suggesting that, whatever of good he might otherwise be doing, his activity was essentially Satanic: they "kept saying, 'He has (i.e. in him) Beelzebul' (cf. above, p. 121), and 'By the ruler of the evil spirits he is throwing out the evil spirits'" (Mark iii. 22 || Matt. xii. 24, Luke xi. 15). How could his works, thought they, be other than a very clever piece of deception, when he was refusing to stand for the only thing which to them would mean the defeat of Satan, namely, the triumph of Israel? Their insinuation notwithstanding, he himself knew how things really stood: "No one can go into the house of the strong, and plunder his property, unless he first binds the strong; and then his house he will plunder" (Mark iii. 27 || Matt. xii. 29, Luke xi. 21 f.),—a reminiscence of what effort had been needed on his part to defeat Satan, and an estimate of the significance of his binding "the strong" (cf. E. G. Selwyn, p. 135).

How habitual this attitude of mind had become to him reveals itself quite incidentally; for example, he says to his disciples: "You know that they who are thought to rule (i.e., but who do not by willing consent rule) the Gentiles overpower them, and their great exercise authority over them. But not in that fashion is it among you" (Mark x. 42 || Matt. xx. 25 f., Luke xxii. 25 f.), and to Pilate: "My Kingdom is not of this world; if of this world was my Kingdom, my vassals would be struggling that I be not delivered up by the Jews: but now my Kingdom is not from that direction" (John xviii. 36),—the sword could not be even in such an extremity an instrument of the Kingdom of God. There must be no "war undertaken for the propagation of His religion" (E. G. Selwyn, p. 99). In this connection also, the Johannine references to "the ruler of this world" should be read, if their original reference is to be appreciated: "Now is a judgment of this world: now the ruler of this world will be thrown outside" (John xii. 31): "the ruler of the world comes, and in me he has nothing" (xiv. 30); "the prince of this world stands judged" (xvi. 11; cf. Mart. Is. ii. 4). The idea of world prince he cast from him (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 131 f.); when it might have gripped his soul most easily, on the night of the betrayal, there was nothing in him the temptation could fasten on to; he condemned the idea outright,—the idea most attractively set forth in Psa. Sol. xvii (cf. H. J., vol. x. pp. 100 f.).

3. The rejection of the assumption that "there must, first of

all, be a political restoration of the theocracy, a restoration which is successfully accomplished by the employment of physical force" (B. Weiss, p. 69; cf. J. Seeley, p. 29), committed him to opposition to the increasing tendency toward the Zealot policy of violence (cf. G. Dalman, p. 137), and "it was in Galilee that the Zealot movement had its rise and its greatest influence" (H. G. Wood, in P., p. 660). He had a very clear conviction not only as to where such policy, if continued in, would land his people, but also of the utter iniquity of it. To his mind only such as were working in the interests of peace among men would secure status as members of God's Kingdom: "Blessed the peacemakers, for they will be acknowledged God's sons" (Matt. v. 9; cf. E., Jan. 1910, p. 45). Compare, "Blessed is he who goes (with others) and brings (others) together in peace" (2 En. lii. 11; cf. Aaron in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, III, p. 240; also A. Büchler, pp. 23 f.). Jesus belonged "to the 'quiet in the land' who relied on God's own wonderful intervention by His Spirit, and not on national and forceful methods, such as those of the old Maccabean deliverers" (J. V. Bartlett, in P., p. 637; cf. p. 667). The divine approval is given to the very antithesis of the policy of the extremists: "Blessed the pitiful, for they will be pitied" (Matt. v. 7). Compare, "Blessed is he whose mouth is mercy and gentleness" (2 En. xlii. 13).

The folly of Zealot propaganda is also in mind, when he says: "Every one who is angry with his brother (D., etc., add, 'for nothing') should be answerable to the judgment (i.e. local court); and whoever says to his brother (i.e. treats him as a) good-for-nothing, should be answerable to the council (i.e. Sanhedrin); and whoever says (i.e. treats him as) hopelessly wicked, should be liable to the Gehenna of fire" (Matt. v. 22). Compare, "The Lord with his hands having created man, in the likeness of his own face, the Lord made him great and small. Whoever reviles the ruler's face, and abhors the Lord's face, has despised the Lord's face, and he who vents his anger on any man without injury, the Lord's great anger will cut him down; he who spits on the face of man reproachfully, will be cut down at the Lord's great judgment" (2 En. xlv. 1-3; cf. lii. 2-4, lx. 5). In the latter, "man in the likeness of his own face," as applied to the ruler, does not favour G. Friedlander's (I, p. 42) interpretation of "brother" in the saying of Jesus as of one's own brother, and not of one's fellow creature. The 2 En. passage has the ruler in view, and Jesus possibly before, but certainly in verses 25 f., is thinking of him, thus: "Be better disposed toward your opponent-at-law quickly, while you are with him on the road (i.e. to court, not yet there), lest the opponent-at-law deliver you up to (i.e. take you before) the judge, and the judge to the officer (i.e. in charge), and you be thrown into prison. Truly I tell you, you will not

come out from there till you pay the last farthing (i.e. of the taxes ; cf. H. E. Savage, pp. 107 f.)" (|| Luke xii. 58 f.).

He gave the warning that Zealot propaganda was not even the way to the success desired ; it was often the road to individual ruin,—the very acme of folly. He also deprecated the association of professions of piety with Zealot double-dealing with the powers which be : " If then you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother (see papyri example of this word used to an official, G. Milligan, p. 123 ; also M.M., p. 9) has anything against you, leave there your gift in front of the altar and be off, first make it up with your brother, and then come and go on offering your gift " (Matt. v. 23 f.). Compare, " If anyone brings any gifts to an earthly ruler, and have disloyal thoughts in his heart, and the ruler know this, will he not be angry with him, and not refuse his gifts, and not give him over to judgment ? Or if one man make himself appear good to another by deceit of tongue, but have evil in his heart, then will not the other understand the treachery of his heart, and himself be condemned, since his untruth was plain to all ? And when the Lord shall send a great light, then there will be judgment for the just and the unjust, and there no one will escape notice " (2 En. xlvi. 1-3). Jesus' advice furthermore was not to make too much of annoying insults (cf. J. A. Findlay, p. 228), small injustices, and tantalising impositions which were so often due to the action of irresponsible individuals, and as often seized upon as occasions of Zealot outbreaks or riots : " Resist not the injury ; but whoever raps you on your right (cf. E., Jan. 1914, p. 89) cheek, turn to him also the other. And as for him who wants you to be tried and your shirt to take, let him (take) also your coat (i.e. if he wants). And whoever compels you for one mile (i.e. to carry soldiers' baggage), go with him two." (Matt. v. 39-41 || Luke vi. 29). Compare again, " Endure for the sake of the Lord every wound, every inquiry, every evil word and attack. If ill-requitals befall you, return them not either to neighbour or enemy, because the Lord will return them for you and be your avenger on the day of the great judgment, that there be no avenging here among men " (2 En. l. 3 f. ; cf. li. 3). The very pronounced Oriental exaggeration of the form of Jesus' words, if it is to be allowed for in estimating his true meaning, is yet to be counted for earnestness on his part in giving such advice.

Besides, he deprecated alike the hypocrisy of the veiled looking for external dominion which characterised even moderate patriotic Pharisaism, and the low, unprincipled time-serving of the Herodians : " He went on to give them instructions saying, Look here, be on your guard against the leaven of the Pharisees, and the leaven of Herod " (Mark viii. 15 || Matt. xvi. 6). He scrapped altogether

the favourite idea of many of our writers, and the popular idea among, at any rate, Palestinians of his time, that Rome must be overthrown (cf. S. Schechter, II, pp. 107 f.), ere the reign of God come in, laying it down that, with perfect consistency, they could "Cæsar's dues pay to Cæsar, and God's to God" (Mark xii. 17 || Matt. xxii. 21, Luke xx. 25). This simple, yet astonishing, solution of the problem raised on the occasion by Pharisees and Herodians jointly, had probably much to do with his being got rid of, popular enthusiasm for the Zealot type represented in Barabbas serving the purpose very well. He "was undoubtedly the very last sort of Messiah that the Jews expected" (M. Arnold, p. 60), and "possibly . . . the choice of Barabbas by the crowd was a movement towards Zealotism in preference to Quietism" (K. Lake, p. 36). "He had made it clear that he had no sympathy with the nationalistic aspirations of the common people, though they had welcomed him under the impression that he was about to realise their hopes" (J.E., vol. vii. p. 165). This knowledge of the drift of popular desire made him speak regretfully and yet with some certainty, if things did not alter, about the fate of Jerusalem: "Where the body (lies), there, too, the eagles (i.e. of Rome) will be gathered" (Luke xvii. 37 || Matt. xxiv. 28; cf. Ass. Mos. x. 8, quoted above, p. 137).

4. The woes of the Kingdom's incoming were for him not the suffering, so often accidental, such as wars bring, but the voluntarily accepted agonies of martyr-men in their devotion to God as sons, he himself being chief of these. "He demanded that men should believe that the kingdom would come, not because of their fighting, but because of their suffering" (K. Lake, p. 30). The substantial agreement of Matthew and John on what was said to Peter, when he struck off the ear of Malchus, not only shows how consistently Jesus held to the idea that the sword must be kept out, but also reveals that the agony in which he was then, and about to be still more, involved, had some divine necessity attached to it, being consistent with the finest revelation of the past, and with his own conception of the Father's will: "Put back your sword into its place: for all who take sword by sword will be destroyed" (Matt. xxvi. 52). Compare, "Put the sword into its sheath: the cup which the Father has given me, should I not drink it?" (John xviii. 11). "Are you wondering why (δοκεῖς ὄτι) I cannot call on my Father, and He will (i.e. that He may) supply to me at once more than twelve legions of angels?" (Matt. xxvi. 53),—compare 2 En. on "incorporeal forces" (xx. i), "the heavenly troops" (ver. 3; cf. xxx. 6, xxxix. 8), "the incorporeal *ten* troops of angels" (xxix. 3),—is directed against the delusion which the disciples were under at the moment, that supernaturally Rome would be defeated and the Kingdom

thereupon established (cf. Luke xxiv. 21, Acts i. 6). "Twelve" seems to refer to the "eleven" disciples,—Judas having gone over to the other side,—and himself, therefore, more than a legion apiece, rather than, as A. H. McNeile (p. 395) would have it, to "the perfect completeness of the heavenly host," since, if 2 En. is to be taken as guide, for the latter "ten" not "twelve" would have been used. "How then would the Bible be fulfilled, that in this way it must happen" (Matt. xxvi. 54),—their expectation was contrary to divine revelation. Not until they had this clear indication that armed resistance would not be accompanied or followed immediately by such supernatural intervention (contrast A. Loisy, vol. i. p. 214; and cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 134 f.), as would place them at the head of legions of heavenly troops for which the legions of Rome would be no match, was it that they all "left him and fled" (Matt. xxvi. 56 || Mark xiv. 50). The words of surrender spoken to his captors have the same import: "But this is your hour, and the influence of darkness" (Luke xxii. 13). There was no resistance; no intervention from on high to back up a struggle for freedom was thought of.

In the place of the woes of a great war and its supernatural accompaniments (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, IV, p. 129), he puts the suffering of himself and his disciples under persecution even unto death in the course of the divinest service to men in the present world. The idea of "the new covenant" was in the air at the time (see Zad. viii. 15, ix. 28B, 37; cf. ix. 15B). At the last supper with his followers he connected this idea with his conception of his own utmost sacrificial service: "This is my blood of the (new) covenant which is being poured out for many" (Mark xiv. 24 || Matt. xxvi. 28, Luke xxii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 25; cf. J. K. Mozley, pp. 50-53). "Covenant" here should be understood in a general way,—"religion" (see below, pp. 225 f.). The new fellowship with God could not be established short of such sacrifice on his part; it was "for many" in that his own sacrifice in fellowship with, and obedience to, God would be the beginning of the same profound fellowship and obedience in others. He put fellowship with God "for many" entirely on the basis of sacrifice; that is, by his death he laid the foundation of the new religion of self-sacrifice. For a while before this he could not get away from the conviction, distressing as it was, that nothing short of that would make his mission effective: "A baptism I have to be baptised with; and somehow I am being urged on, till it has been performed" (Luke xii. 50).

His language on the subject has sometimes associations with the martyr passages in our literature: "The 'son of man' has not come to be waited on (by others), but to wait on (others), and to give his life a ransom for (*ἀντὶ*) many" (Mark x. 45

|| Matt. xx. 28 ; cf. Luke xxii. 27 ; cf. J. K. Mozley, pp. 46-50). Compare, "Make my blood their purification, and take my life to ransom their souls (*ἀντίψυχον*)" (4 Macc. vi. 29), "they (i.e. the martyrs) having as it were become a ransom (*ἀντίψυχον*) for our nation's sin" (xvii. 22). What seems absent from his mind, however, is any thought such as the last of the martyr brothers in 2 Macc. expresses: "I, like my brothers, give up body and soul for our fathers' laws, calling on God to show favour to our nation soon . . . to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and in my brothers" (vii. 38). Such an idea was excluded for him by his conception of the region in which God's justice must hold good (see above, p. 67 ; cf. C. H. Toy, p. 330, note), and besides, the tendency of the time was against it,—“it is significant that the merits of the martyrs were not exploited in the Judaism of the first centuries” (A. Marmorstein, p. 57). Rather, “He came to found the Kingdom of God in the world. He died in the achievement of that result, and his death was a potent means to its achievement. He came to die, if his death was necessary to that result, as it proved to be. But the direct aim of his coming is uniformly represented as the recovery of men to sonship to God” (G. B. Stevens, III, p. 48). His death is just service of the Kingdom carried to the necessary uttermost, the tragic means of liberating “many” from that bondage which held them from living as if greatness were entirely a matter of the quality and extent of service which one might render, “the very extremity of *human* self-sacrifice,—the boundless self-surrender of a human soul to the will of the Father in the service of man” (D. W. Forrest, II, p. 39 ; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 234 ; P., p. 668).

At the moment when he had an acknowledgment of himself as “the Anointed,” the necessity for the shedding of blood for the divine community's sake had already become a settled conviction with him: “Upon this rock (i.e. of my Messiahship, cf. ‘rock’ of Abraham, in Rabbinical literature, J.Q.R., vol. xii, April 1900, pp. 428 f.) I will build my community; and Hades' gates (i.e. the fact that death awaits me,—cf. ‘the gates of Hades,’ meaning ‘death’; 3 Macc. v. 51 ; Wisd. xvi. 13 ; Ps. Sol. xvi. 2 ; cf. Isa. xxxviii. 10) will have no power against it (i.e. will not make ineffective my Messiahship)” (Matt. xvi. 18). Messiahship, as he conceived it, was consistent with martyrdom, though in and before his time it was not thought to be (cf. I.J.A., Jan. 1912, pp. 18-20 ; G. Friedlander, IV, pp. 146 f. ; J.Th.S., XIII, pp. 328 f. ; E. F. Scott, II, p. 215, 223, 235) ; it was a sonship which could only retain its validity in martyrdom, if martyrdom be the form of devotion to the Father's will which alone will secure him leadership of others in the experience of sonship. Preparedness to be

the martyr son *par excellence* seems to have been very early considered by him (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. pp. 219 ff.), and resolved upon with a sad suspicion that it may be necessary: "But there will come days, when there will be taken away from them the bridegroom, and then they shall fast,—on that day" (Mark ii. 20 || Matt. ix. 15, Luke v. 35. Compare, a case where thus "the marriage was turned into mourning," 1 Macc. ix. 37-42). Indeed, in one who thought as intensely and as clearly as he did, the form in which his consciousness of sonship, and therefore of Messiahship, emerged, namely, as "the Beloved" in whom God has "delight" (Mark i. 11 || Matt. iii. 17, Luke iii. 22; cf. Isa. xlii. 1, and J. A. Robertson, p. 157; W. Manson, pp. 127 f.; A. E. Garvie, p. 125), may have had associations for him from the first with the idea of the Suffering Servant, since the unity of the Servant pieces of the prophecy could hardly have been missed by him.

The term 'Servant of Jahveh' in the 'Songs' "denotes an ideal personification, which is already partly embodied in the pious minority of the people, and is more exactly conceived of as made up of a band of religious teachers and pastors" (G. H. Box, III, p. 197; cf. M. Joseph, pp. 161 f.; P. Goodman, 50 f., 213-216; G. A. Smith, Book III). That he so often drew a picture of the disciples' experience parallel to his own accords, then, with the idea of the prophet concerning a Suffering Servant community, which would be capable of accomplishing Jahveh's purpose. "Jesus died for righteousness' sake in accordance with a law applicable to all who are loyal to the divine interest in the world" (A. B. Bruce, II, p. 382). Preparedness to be martyr followers of him was clearly urged by him on the attention of his disciples: "And brother will deliver up brother to death, and father child; and children will rise against parents, and put them to death" (Matt. x. 21 || Mark xiii. 12, Luke xxi. 16). "Do not suppose that I came to drop a peace on the earth; I did not come to drop a peace, but a sword (cf. 'fire,' Luke xii. 49)" (Matt. x. 34 || Luke xii. 51; cf. xxii. 36). Compare, "Cursed is he who speaks peace with his tongue, while in his heart there is no peace but a sword" (2 En. lii. 14). "And do not fear those who kill the body, but the soul cannot kill" (Matt. x. 28 || Luke xii. 4 f.). Compare, "Therefore, if you have any engine of torment, apply it to this body of mine; for my soul you cannot touch, not if you would" (4 Macc. x. 4; cf. xiii. 13 f.; Mart. Is. v. 10). "And he who does not take his cross, and come along after me, is not worthy of me" (Matt. x. 38 || Luke xiv. 27). Compare, "He nobly endured the torment, saying, 'Follow my example, O brothers. Do not for ever desert me, and don't forswear our brotherhood in nobility of soul'" (4 Macc. ix. 22 f.). On the Suffering Servant idea applied to the disciple, see further above, pp. 121 ff. In Jesus,

then, the warrior Messiah vanished in the martyr Messiah, and the members of his community who follow him consistently are to refuse the rôle of warrior, though it be at the price of accepting the rôle of martyr. Face to face with all the destructive forces of the powers of this world, his death was to be the norm of the new community's surrender to the will of the Father (cf. P. Goodman, pp. 271-273, also p. 282, note 1).

5. The association of the Messiah with the cause of peace among men is constant in our literature. The interest of Jesus in the creation of friendly relations between individuals and between groups of men may be inferred from the evidence already adduced concerning his anti-Zealotism and his anathematising of the sword. "O that to-day you too recognised (i.e. as I do) the conditions of peace! but now (alas!) they have been hidden from your eyes" (Luke xix. 42), is an utterance of regret that his people were following a policy which was leading inevitably to a disastrous war: "For days will come on you when your foes will throw up a rampart beside you, and will surround you and hem you in from every side, and dash to the ground you and your children in you, and not leave stone on stone in you" (vers. 43 f.). If ever that sad catastrophe came about, it would be the outcome of their neglecting the opportunity of knowing better and acting accordingly: "because you did not recognise the opportunity of your visitation (i.e. divinely given privilege)" (ver. 44). The insertion of the saying on "salt" in Luke xiv. 34 f. favours the idea that the parable of the "king, marching to attack in battle a (very) different king," who "having first sat down will carefully consider whether he is able with ten thousand (as e.g. Judas Maccabeus against Lysias, 1 Macc. iv. 29) to meet him who is coming against him with twenty thousand" (which may have been the traditional number of Lysias' men actually engaged on the occasion, cf. 1 Macc. iv. 28), was originally spoken in favour of delegating "an embassy" to ask "the conditions of peace" (vers. 31 f.). Compare the Maccabeans' negotiations with Rome, S. Mathews, II, pp. 33, 44, 55. The saying of good-bye to "all his belongings" of the next verse may then have reference in this connection to the consequences of disbanding the "ten thousand,"—that is, the cost to the disciple is the outcome of his following out the principle of non-resistance already enunciated. The Zealot programme was to him the project of those "wanting to erect a tower" without "first" considering "the cost"; they could never "carry it out" (vers. 28-30).

"It is probable . . . that the preservative qualities of salt were held to make it a peculiarly fitting symbol of an enduring compact . . . sealing an obligation to fidelity" (E.B., 4250; cf. A. M. Ribhany, p. 137). To eat salt together signified to make

peace; hence, the eating of salted food constitutes a sacred bond among the Arabs. In this light the passages on "salt" should be carefully read and compared. "Salt (i.e. the peace-making quality) is fine. . . . Have salt among you, that is, (*κάλι*) keep the peace with one another" (Mark ix. 50). "You are the salt (i.e. the peace-making element) of the land" (Matt. v. 13). "Salt, then, is fine: but supposing the salt has been made useless, by what will (the land) be preserved? Neither on the land nor in manure is it fit for anything; people throw it away. He who has ears to hear, let him hear" (Luke xiv. 34 ff.). Jesus was very insistent on their being peaceable, even in details, as his workers among the people. "Into whatever town or village you go, make inquiries as to who in it is worthy, and there stay till you go out. And on going into the house greet it. And if the house is worthy, let your peace come on it (i.e. well and good): but if the house is not worthy, let your peace turn back to you (i.e. retain, notwithstanding the treatment you get in this case, your peaceful and peacemaking attitude of mind)" (Matt. x. 11-13 || Luke x. 5 f.; cf. in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 150). He deprecated the manner of spirit such as would "bid fire to come down from heaven and annihilate" (Luke ix. 54) those whose prejudices for the time being made them inhospitable. While, therefore, as has been already shown, he refused to "make a solitude" and "call it peace" (see Tacitus, *Agricola*, XXX),—the method in some measure of even the best of the kingdoms of this world,—he still appreciated to the full the desire for peace among men, which is so common among our writers.

If there be a difference here between him and them, it is that, while they regarded peace with God as that which would sustain the peace among men once it had been established by the victory of arms, he was convinced that complete reconciliation of men with God could be left, unassisted by operations of war, to work itself out in life to the bringing of peace among men (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, III, pp. 254, 257 ff.). To get the wrong righted between God and man, the sin removed, he trusted would lead to the righting of wrongs between man and man such as would reconcile them. "My lad, your sins are forgiven" (Mark ii. 5 || Luke v. 20, Matt. ix. 2), is one of the most reliable recollections of the words of Jesus. Wherever he went he brought to the penitent soul, without further to do, the "good cheer" of the forgiveness of God. The impression which the Gospels give of him is that he put his whole life, even unto death, into the declaration of "remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28, Luke xxiv. 47). His leadership in the experience of sonship gave his word on Divine forgiveness an air of "authority" (Mark ii. 10 || Matt. ix. 6, Luke v. 24), which even devout people among his contemporaries found it hard to understand. To this

work of higher reconciliation he gave himself without reserve; to this all else was secondary. Be his failure in other respects what it may, he judged himself successful when he gave to men his own experience of peace with God: "Peace I leave you; my peace I give you: not as the world gives, do I give you" (John xiv. 27). Compare, "I will rest you . . . you will find rest for your souls" (Matt. xi. 28 f.); that is, peace "as the realised confidence of faith and fellowship with God" is the legacy to them of his life's service and sacrifice, though "peace . . . regarded on its outward side as the blessedness of the Messianic Kingdom," freedom from the alarms of war, such as was always expected of the Messiah, he has not been able to give them (cf. B. F. Westcott, p. 209). "By me peace you may have. By the world distress you have: but cheer up! I have got the victory over the world" (John xvi. 33),—the obvious message of which is, 'And you, too, with that consciousness of peace with God can overcome, be supreme in every circumstance, even when the world is most hostile, as I have been,—I pray God you may!' (cf. John xvii; cf. F. G. Peabody, I, p. 191). As Messiah he was out to create that victorious mind which was in himself through his unbroken fellowship with the Father, and which emerges in the experience of his disciples with their reconciliation to such a God as he had taught them to think of, that is, with their first repentantly giving promise of becoming "sons of" their "Father in heaven" (Matt. v. 45). He has here worked out thoroughly the idea suggested in our literature, that the members of the divine community shall all be known to be sons of their God. He relied on those who were themselves reconciled to God to slay enmity between man and man (cf. F. G. Peabody, I, p. 36).

6. From first to last, then, his conception of his vocation was prophetic; it was *superlatively* prophetic, too, since his appeal as prophet had for its basis his own experience of sonship. "His call to his work was the true prophetic call, his inspiration was the prophetic type of inspiration, taking the latter in its best and highest sense" (C. S. Macfarland, p. 178; cf. A. Menzies, pp. 63, 65; J. Seeley, p. 76; D. W. Forrest, II, p. 73; W. O. E. Oesterley, III, pp. 192, 232; F. W. Worsley, p. 259; E. C. Dewick, pp. 113 ff.). In taking John the Baptist as illustration when his "authority" was challenged (Mark xi. 29-33 || Matt. xxi. 24-27, Luke xx. 3-8), he hints that it was prophetic authority which he would claim for himself; it was to "preach" he came out (Mark i. 38 || Luke iv. 43). He was prophet become son, and as son he was the Father's prophet making appeal to his brothers to be reconciled to God. "In the teaching of Jesus there seemed nothing between him and God. . . . He spoke the message, he gave voice to the teaching, which the holy spirit of God had placed in his mouth. . . . Its

touch of personal authority is an element in its originality" (C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 113 f.). References to himself as a prophet are well authenticated: "A prophet is not unhonoured except in his native place, and among his kinsmen, and in his home" (Mark vi. 4 || Matt. xiii. 57, Luke iv. 24; cf. John iv. 44); "How-ever I must to-day and to-morrow and the next day travel on: for it is impossible a prophet perish outside Jerusalem" (Luke xiii. 33). The remark, "To-day there has been carried out this passage of Scripture (read) in your hearing" (Luke iv. 21), together with the illustrations which were used by him on the occasion, namely, Elijah and Elisha, shows that it was the rôle of prophet (cf. H. R. Mackintosh, p. 18) *par excellence* which he appreciated in the words: "Lord's spirit is on me, wherefore He anointed me to bring good news to poor: He has delegated me to proclaim to captives release, and to blind sight, to set crushed free, to proclaim the Lord's delightful year" (ver. 18).

He often gave the impression of being a prophet (cf. J.L., p. 288); hence the following testimonies from people of very diverse types and outlooks: "A prophet, like one of the prophets!" (Mark vi. 15 || Matt. xiv. 4, Luke ix. 8); "A great prophet has been raised up among us: and God has visited his people" (Luke vii. 16); "Sir, I see that you are a prophet" (John iv. 19); "This is in fact the prophet" (vii. 40; cf. ver. 52); "He is a prophet" (ix. 17); "This is the prophet Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee" (Matt. xxi. 11); "Jesus of Nazareth who was a prophet, an able man in action and speech in the eyes of God and all the people" (Luke xxiv. 19). That is, to quote W. H. Bennett: "He had succeeded in teaching the people that He was not the mere conqueror and king of the vulgar imagination; but He had failed to convince them that they ought to change their ideas of the Messiah, and that the true Messiah would be a spiritual hero and redeemer" (II, p. 108). In this connection it should be noted, that the language in which his determination to go to Jerusalem is given indicates that the purpose of his going was thought to be prophetic: "he set his face (*τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν*) to travel to Jerusalem" (Luke ix. 51). Compare, "Son of man, set your face (*στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου*) towards Jerusalem, and drop your word toward the sanctuaries, and prophecy against the land of Israel" (Ezek. xxi. 2), in which book, also, "set your face towards" is frequently the form assumed by the command to the "son of man" to take up a prophetic attitude in respect to a place or people (vi. 2, xiii. 17, xx. 46, xxv. 22, xxviii. 21, xxix. 2, xxxv. 2, xxxviii. 2). This association with Ezekiel it will be important to remember later. "At least toward the close of His ministry, Jesus appeared as a prophet of judgment against Jerusalem and the Jewish nation" (L. A. Muirhead, p. 127). Jesus' demeanour, too, at the time seems to

have suggested prophetic sternness to the mind of some of his followers; they felt no impropriety in suggesting that he should do as Elijah did (ver. 54; cf. 2 Kings i. 10, 12). As prophet he emphasised things old and said some things that were new: "every scribe (i.e. scribe-prophet, a scribe with the prophetic spirit, as sometimes there was) . . . is comparable to an ordinary master of a household, such as produces from his store new and old" (Matt. xiii. 52),—a *logion* which originally may have been a reference to characteristics of his own teaching (cf. L. E. Browne, p. 60). "Pity I want, and not sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7), was one of the "old" things which he was in the habit of bringing out, when necessary.

His "I tell you" may sometimes mark his consciousness of going beyond the "Thus saith the Lord" of any other; it is expressive, therefore, of his conviction of his own prophetic inspiration (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 119). The difference between the two formulæ seems to be one of form rather than of content: the latter is in the style of the ancient prophets, the former probably in that of the more modern prophet-scribe of Jesus' own day, when making some relevant, not necessarily brand-new, application of a passage in the Torah (cf. J.Q.R., vol. xii, April 1900, pp. 427 f.; C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 82; I. Abrahams, pp. 16 f.; also E., April 1908, pp. 361, 365; J.L., pp. 412, 416). This was sometimes Jesus' own use of it, after he had called attention to some dictum, thus: "You have heard that it was told," with or without "to the ancients" (Matt. v. 21, 27, 33, 38, 43). It was also the formula used by John the Baptist in introducing strong utterances which were likely to contradict received notions and for which he claimed the validity of inspirations from God (Matt. iii. 9 || Luke iii. 8; cf. for Philo's use of it, G. Friedlander, IV, p. 122); and, generally speaking, this is how it occurs in the recorded words of Jesus. There are most instances of it in Matthew, and in the other three Gospels it occurs with considerable frequency.

In form, then, his authority was such as a prophet claimed in speaking for God; in substance, it was such as came from his leadership in the experience of divine sonship. The substance of his Messiahship was fixed for him by his consciousness of sonship (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 191), the form of it was prophetic (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 188; G. Tyrrell, pp. 49, 82). This accords with one side of the Messianic office, as it is expounded by our writers. That there was for Jesus no other side marks his departure even from the best ideas of Messiahship held by these (cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 68; V. H. Stanton, I, 127; P., p. 637; J.Th.S., vol. xiii. p. 323; J.L., pp. 404 ff.). It may be, then, that "in truth there can be no greater contrast than that of the prophetic consciousness, as we discern it from the Old Testament,

and the consciousness of Jesus as it is revealed in the Sermon on the Mount" (J. Denny, p. 245; cf. S. Mathews, III, p. 127). But that "He was not simply a prophet like those who had gone before" (Ib., p. 299), does not alter the fact that he belongs to the category of prophetic men (cf. F. W. Newman, pp. 29 f.; H. J., vol. v. pp. 136-155). As Messiah he trusted entirely to the prophetic appeal of his sonship.

III. THE SUPERHUMAN MESSIAH.

1. On no occasion had Jesus any idea of asserting his own actual pre-existence; he had no consciousness of such pre-existence. To quote W. Beyschlag: "There is no trace of such a consciousness in His testimony about Himself as recorded in the Synoptists, and we may even say that there is no room for it" (p. 73). With this datum the originals of what in the Fourth Gospel seem to say otherwise may be reconciled. Omitting the weakly attested phrase, "who is in heaven" (see E.G.T., vol. i. p. 715), the idea of coming down from heaven in the words, "And no one remains up in heaven, unless he who came down out of heaven, the 'son of man'" (John iii. 13), if they represent anything Jesus said, "cannot mean the having come out of a pre-existent life in heaven, but only the being filled with a supernatural life granted by God, and belonging to the heavenly nature of God" (H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 166). The thought then is practically the same as in i. 51, for which see below, p. 175. The next saying of moment here may have been a reference to the difficulty in the way of faith in him as Messiah which his death would occasion them. The crucial phrase (*ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον*) is usually translated "where he was before." The whole clause of which this phrase forms part might, however, be rendered: "Supposing then you should see the 'son of man' going up to where there has been (i.e. prepared) what is superior (i.e. 'paradise,' Luke xxiii. 43; 'many rooms,' John xiv. 2)" (John vi. 62). It may then be a relic of his first introduction of the idea of his death, an hypothesis which, he suggests, they may yet have to take seriously. Again, the rejoinder, "Truly, truly, I tell you, Before Abraham came to be, I am" (John viii. 58), may be the beginning of an explanation of "my day" (ver. 56) over which "Abraham was jubilant." Compare, Jub. xv. 17: "And Abraham fell on his face and rejoiced." An interruption may have taken place as soon as "I" was uttered, and the explanation may never have been completed, or may have been lost in the uproar. Otherwise, 'I am' may mean 'God' (see below, pp. 286 ff.); and then it must be understood that he was trying to turn the conversation from the subject of Abraham to that of God, and in doing so, with

a view to conciliating his audience, he dropped for the moment his favourite name for God.

The other relevant verses belong to one class. "The glory which in Thy sight I had (i.e. was destined to) before the world was (i.e. an accomplished fact) in Thy presence" (John xvii. 5), refers to what was God-intended for such as he. "Thou lovedst me before the world's foundation" (ver. 24), signifies no more than the eternity of God's love toward him, a statement said to be as true of the disciples as it was of himself: "Thou . . . lovedst them, in the same manner (or 'degree') as me Thou lovedst" (ver. 23). This interpretation accords with the use of similar language in our literature, and even in Matthew's Gospel. The case of Moses set apart in the purpose of God "before the foundation of the world" has been noted already (see above, p. 142). In the same chapter Jerusalem is referred to as "the place which He made from the beginning of the creation of the world" (Ass. Mos. i. 17). Compare, "the Kingdom made ready for you from the world's foundation" (Matt. xxv. 34). In Tob. the angel says to young Tobias concerning his bride: "She was set apart for you before the world was" (vi. 18). In Sir. Wisdom also says of herself: "He created me from the beginning, before the world" (xxiv. 9). This last probably throws most light on the passages under consideration. They were originally the outflow of his consciousness of being the very wisdom of God to men (see above, p. 152 ff.), and were in perfect accord with "the early Rabbinical doctrine" which "seems merely to have taught an ideal, not a real, pre-existence of the Messiah, that is to say, He pre-existed in the sense that His coming had from eternity been divinely predestined and prepared" (H. St. John Thackeray, p. 47; cf. G. Friedlander, IV, pp. 17 f.; H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 169).

2. The Son of Man (cf. on the linguistic problem, J.Th.S., vol. ii. pp. 350-358; E. F. Scott, II, pp. 190-196; W. Manson, pp. 145-154; also E. C. Dewick, pp. 153-162; S. Mathews, III, pp. 102-106), in the capacity of judge at the end of the present age appears with some frequency in the teaching of Jesus. Here the reference might be made clearer, if the term were put in inverted commas, thus, "the Son of Man," the connection of thought being with the Book of Enoch rather than the Book of Daniel. "And then they will see 'the Son of Man' coming in clouds with the Power and the Great Glory (see above, p. 59)" (Mark xiii. 26 || Matt. xxiv. 30, Luke xxi. 27). Again, to the high priest, he said: "And you will see 'the Son of Man' sitting on the right of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven" (Mark xiv. 62 || Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xxii. 69). With one other passage allusions in Mark to the apocalyptic Son of Man are exhausted: "Whoever

is ashamed of me and my words in this generation that is adulteress and sinner, 'the Son of Man' also will be ashamed of him, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark viii. 38 || Matt. x. 33, Luke ix. 26; cf. Matt. xvi. 27). Taken by themselves these amount to little more than an assertion that in the providence of God things will not be allowed to drift,—there will be a great day of reckoning. Three passages common to Matthew and Luke have the same reference: "For just as the lightning comes out from the East and is seen as far as the West, so will be the arrival of 'the Son of Man'" (Matt. xxiv. 27 || Luke xvii. 24); "And just as the days of Noah (cf. Noah fragments in I En., see above, p. 28), so will be the arrival of 'the Son of Man'" (Matt. xxiv. 37; cf. ver 39 || Luke xvii. 26 f.; cf. ver. 30); "On this account you too get ready; for in an hour which you do not think likely, 'the Son of Man' comes" (Matt. xxiv. 44 || Luke xii. 40). Here expectation of it at any moment is emphasised. A passage peculiar to Matthew seems to make it not to be long delayed: "You will not have finished the towns of Israel, till 'the Son of Man' comes" (Matt. x. 23, but see above p. 106). Passages most peculiar to Luke have in view rather the trial which comes to the faith of hard-pressed saints, when the Divine interposition seems long in coming. "There will come days when you will long one of the days of 'the Son of Man' to see, and you will not see" (Luke xvii. 22); "But then, when 'the Son of Man' comes will he find this (cf. above, p. 68) faith on earth?" (Luke xviii. 8; cf. E., Oct. 1914, pp. 289, 299). "But be wide awake on every occasion requesting that you may have strength to escape all this which is about to happen, and to stand in front of 'the Son of Man'" (Luke xxi. 36).

There can be little doubt that these represent the true place of the apocalyptic Son of Man in the teaching of Jesus, and this "eschatological outlook only becomes prominent . . . after Cesarea Philippi" (H. T. Andrews, III, p. 88); that is, at the very time he seems to have begun to prepare the minds of his disciples for his death. He does not appear to identify himself with this Son of Man; rather, he himself has faith in "the Son of Man" such as his followers are to sustain amid trials which may tend to beget impatience. He looks for the day of Judgment which he felt must come without great delay (cf. E. G. Selwyn, p. 175). His faith in "the Son of Man" was just the form which his faith in God as Vindicator of the righteous took. (Contrast G. Dalman, p. 257.)

3. That this faith on his part should take this particular form is explained by the fact, that in the Similitudes "the Son of Man" comes to vindicate the righteous against the native rulers and the Sadducees, who have persecuted the godly minority, making

martyrs of some of them. Jesus may have been impressed with the parallel with his own case in relation to the civil and religious rulers, a parallel, too, which he felt sure was likely to recur in the experiences of his followers. His references to "the Son of Man" were of the nature, either of assurance to his disciples, or of warning to others, and especially to the powers which he, and assume "that popular acquaintance with the term *bar-nasha* in the Messianic sense was even greater than we should infer from the apocalyptic literature" (W. Manson, p. 149; cf. p. 152). On the one hand, he heartens those to whom he has just said: "They shall deliver you up to Jewish councils; and in synagogues you will be flogged; and before governors and kings you will stand on account of me, for witness to them" (Mark xiii. 9 || Matt. x. 17 f., Luke xxi. 12 f.),—people who may have to forfeit their lives (Mark viii. 35 || Matt. xvi. 25, Luke ix. 24; cf. Matt. x. 39, Luke xvii. 33); on the other, he warns such as the high priest of the consequences of the unworthy intrigue in which he as chief Jewish ruler—"a judge who God was not reverencing, and man was not respecting" (Luke xviii. 2; cf. John xi. 49 f.),—is taking not an insignificant part (Mark xiv. 61 || Matt. xxvi. 63, Luke xxii. 66). With this should be connected the nature of the all determinative test of "the Son of Man"; men are to be approved or condemned according as they have or have not relieved the necessity of the persecuted when "hungry" or "thirsty," or "a stranger" (perhaps, "a fugitive"), either "in his shirt," or "ill," or "in prison" (Matt. xxv. 34-36, 41-43; cf. T. Jos. i. 5 f.). It accords also with the context of the idea in the Similitudes, that the collapse of the Jewish state should in Jesus' mind be a sign of the coming Judgment. Such was a legitimate application, to the situation then present, of the suggestion given in 1 En. of "the Son of Man" coming to judge the once persecuting and now collapsed Jewish authorities.

"When you hear of wars and rumours of wars, do not be agitated; it must be so, but not yet the End!" (Mark xiii. 7 || Matt. xxiv. 6, Luke xxi. 9). First disturbances would not be accompanied by the opening of the final Judgment. They would "see the loathsome sight of the desolator standing where he should not (i.e. already set foot on the holy land)" (Mark xiii. 14 || Matt. xxiv. 15, Luke xxi. 20),—a general reference to the Roman armies in Palestine, for "standing in the holy place" of Matthew probably means "in the holy land" (cf. 2 Macc. ii. 18), and the masculine participle "standing" (*ἑστηκότα*) in Mark should be taken with "desolation" (*ἐρημώσεως*) used for "desolator" (*ἐρημωτοῦ*), since at the close of Dan. ix. 27, *דְּרִשׁ*, "desolator," is in the LXX wrongly translated (cf. J.E., vol. i. pp. 80 f.) *ἐρήμωσιν*, "desolation," and appears again in the Hebrew of Dan. xii. 11, where occurs in the

LXX the exact Greek phrase used in Mark and Matthew, with which should be compared Heb. and LXX in Dan. viii. 13, xi. 31 (cf. E.B., 23; B.D.B., p. 1031; D.B., vol. i. pp. 12 f.; D.C.G., vol. i. p. 7). There is still time to "flee to the mountains" (Mark xiii. 14 || Matt. xxiv. 16, Luke xxi. 21), and it will be necessary, "For those days will be an affliction, such as has not happened from the beginning of creation which God created till now (cf. Ass. Mos. viii. 1, 'such as has not befallen them from the beginning until that time')" (Mark xiii. 19 || Matt. xxiv. 21; cf. Luke xxi. 23, also xxiii. 28-31). He does not expect this period of affliction to be unduly long: "And unless the Lord cut short the days (cf. 1 En. lxxx. 2, 'And in the days of the sinners, the years shall be shortened'), nobody would be saved, but on account of the Elect whom He has chosen, He has cut short the days" (Mark xiii. 20 || Matt. xxiv. 22). They will be followed by signs of the break up of the present order: "In those days, after that affliction the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give her light, and there will be stars falling from heaven, and the powers in the heavens will be dislodged" (Mark xiii. 24 f. || Matt. xxiv. 29, Luke xxi. 25 f.). Compare Ass. Mos. x. 5 f.: "And the horns of the sun shall be broken, and he shall be turned into darkness; and the moon shall not give her light, and be turned wholly into blood. And the circle of the stars shall be disturbed. And the sea shall retire into the abyss" (Luke, "sea's sound and swell").

This feature accords with "the custom of the prophets, when they depict the woe which hangs over some city or nation, to give the historical event a cosmic setting" (E. G. Selwyn, p. 39; cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, IV, pp. 20, 25; L. A. Muirhead, pp. 138 f.; F. W. Worsley, p. 148). To sum up: "Now from the fig tree learn the parable (i.e. lesson): when now at length her branch is become tender, and puts out its leaves, you recognise that summer is near; so you too, also, when you see this happening recognise that he (i.e. the Son of Man, or 'it,' i.e. the final Judgment) is near,—at the doors! Truly I tell you, This generation will not disappear, till all this has happened. Heaven and earth will disappear; but my words will not disappear" (Mark xiii. 28-31 || Matt. xxiv. 32-35, Luke xxi. 29-33; cf. Matt. xxi. 43, xxiii. 36). Hereupon are given the significant words: "But about that day or the hour (i.e. of the day) nobody knows,—not even the angels in heaven,—(cf. 2 En. xxiv. 3, 'Not to My angels have I told My secrets,' xl. 3, 'not even the angels see their number') . . . except the Father" (Mark xiii. 32 || Matt. xxiv. 36). The impression thus given is that he was quite certain that that generation would see the downfall of the hostile Jewish rulers and their accomplices, but that for the rest he himself was not at all clear. A thorough-going apocalypticist would hardly have made such an

admission (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, I, pp. 98 f.). "Apocalyptic fixes, sometimes in mechanical and artificial modes, the details of the consummation to which a given process is leading . . . whereas in prophecy only the consummation itself is fixed as certain" (H. R. Mackintosh, E., April 1914, p. 301; cf. E. C. Dewick, p. 226).

"The Son of Man," therefore, does not seem to have been for him more than a literary figure; and by means of it, with some faithfulness to its context in the Similitudes, he encouraged or warned people by bringing to their minds the reality of the coming Judgment of God in human life. Though he recognised that the precise "when" of the Judgment was God's own secret, yet like all prophets he felt it could not be long delayed (cf. A. L. Williams, pp. 364 f.; H. H. Wendt, vol. ii. p. 344; E. W. Winstanley, p. 141), and, like both the prophets of the O.T. and our apocalypticists, he connected it with the only historical situation he knew. It should, however, be borne in mind, that "when a prophet declared that an object of faith and hope was just about to appear, he really meant that he saw it with vividness and that its coming was sure" (J. H. Leckie, p. 60; cf. I.J.A., July 1912, p. 53).

4. Other instances of the phrase "the Son of man" in his recorded words belong to a different cycle of ideas altogether. Here again inverted commas might with propriety be used, thus, "son of man" without any capitals, the reference this time being to the Book of Ezekiel (cf. F. W. Worsley, pp. 67, 99, 257), where it is a term for the prophet as "a man" who "though weak and liable to suffering, may yet be so much in touch with Divine power, even while he is on earth, as to be able to be a medium of communication between the higher and lower forms of human existence, and convey to other persons on earth spiritual privileges and experiences, which they, from some lack in their religious life, are not able to obtain themselves" (A. L. Williams, pp. 302 f.; cf. L. A. Muirhead, p. 192; E. A. Abbott, Book I, chap. vi, also p. 46). His prophetic advance against Jerusalem, it has been seen, is described in terms which have been taken from that book (see above, p. 168). He seems to have accepted the idea of himself as "the prophet" under the name of "the 'son of man'." The latter was, then, his pet name for himself in the prophetic office according to his own high conception and fulfilment of it. It is Ezekiel's idea elevated to the highest that he gives in the words: "You will see the heaven remain open and the angels of God going up and coming down on the 'son of man'" (John i. 51; cf. iii. 13, for which see above, p. 170; and for Gen. xxviii. 12, as applied to Moses in Rabbinical literature, see G. Friedlander, III, p. 86; cf. P. I. Hershon, p. 45).

It is as such a prophet that he declares forgiveness of sins,—"Authority has the 'son of man' to forgive sins on earth (cf. E. A. Abbott, p. 144)" (Mark ii. 10 || Matt. ix. 6, Luke v. 24; cf. C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 904), a prerogative which his followers, having his spirit, should share with him: "Whatever you bind on earth will remain bound in heaven: and whatever you loose on earth will remain loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19; cf. xviii. 18; cf. E.B., 574 f.; N. Schmidt, p. 107; and in the Jewish Prayer Book, S. Singer, p. 298), which in its probable original reference, being interpreted, is: "Receive holy spirit: if the sins of any you take away, they are taken away for them; if (the sins) of any you let remain, they are let remain" (John xx. 22 f.; cf. D.C.G., vol. i. p. 10; J.E., vol. iii. p. 215; E. A. Abbott, pp. 142 f.); acts with unwonted freedom in regard to the sabbath, "the master is 'son of man,'—even of the sabbath!" (Mark ii. 28 || Matt. xii. 8, Luke vi. 5); is homeless or without settled home,—“the 'son of man' has nowhere to rest his head" (Matt. viii. 20 || Luke ix. 59); puts himself about to get into touch with the, so-called, undesirables, and is maligned for it,—“there has come the 'son of man' eating and drinking, and people say, Look! a man, glutton and drunkard, tax-gatherers' friend and sinners'!" (Matt. xi. 19 || Luke vii. 34); understands how sincere people may not find him acceptable,—“whoever voices a reason against the 'son of man'” (Matt. xii. 32 || Luke xii. 10; cf. Mark iii. 28), something which he thought quite forgivable,—compare, “Blessed (i.e. lucky, or fortunate) is he whoever does not tumble over (something) in me” (Matt. xi. 6 || Luke vii. 23); can give no other sign than what is involved in his prophetic appeal, “A generation, mean and an adulteress, sign inquires about, and sign will not be given it except the sign of Jonah the prophet . . . so will be the 'son of man'” (Matt. xii. 39 f. || Luke xi. 29 f.; cf. ver. 32); can do no other than live for the recovery of the sinner,—“The 'son of man' has come to search for and to save what seems to have perished” (Luke xix. 10); and feels his betrayal keenly,—"Judas, with a kiss the 'son of man' are you delivering up" (Luke xxii. 48).

This idea of him is retained in the interpretative sentence: "The sower of the good seed is the 'son of man'" (Matt. xiii. 37); again, if Matthew's version of the question could be accepted as a correct interpretation, "Whom do people make out (lit.: 'say') the 'son of man' to be? . . . And you,—whom do you make me out to be?" (Matt. xvi. 13, 15; cf. Mark viii. 27, 29, Luke ix. 18, 20), then on that occasion Jesus practically invited them to give Messianic value to him as "the prophet" (cf. W. C. Allen on "Hear him," Mark ix. 7; II, p. 123); and most remarkably, finding the man who had been excommunicated, and had boldly

given his opinion when asked, "He is a prophet" (John ix. 17), Jesus said to him, "Do you trust the 'son of man'? . . . He who talks with you is that person" (vers. 35, 37; cf. "prophet," John iv. 19, and "Messiah," vers. 25 f.). Hence, to contrast "a mere prophetic" with "the Messianic consciousness" (W. Beyschlag, p. 58), or to speak of his going "beyond the prophetic calling to the Messianic" (B. Weiss, p. 76; cf. P. Wernle, pp. 37, 45), is at any rate to suggest an antithesis which seems to have had no existence for Jesus.

It is also as this prophet of God *par excellence* that he expects to suffer most,—“the 'son of man' must suffer much, even be treated as a fraud by the elders, and the high priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days (i.e. very soon; cf. Hos. vi. 2, also G. Friedlander, IV, chap. v) rise” (Mark viii. 31 || Luke ix. 21; cf. Matt. xvi. 21; also Mark ix. 9 || Matt. xvii. 9; cf. Luke ix. 36); and feels himself, as prophetic sufferer, the Messiah whom Elijah, John the Baptist, has introduced,—“Elijah, having come first, puts all in order again; and how is it written on the 'son of man'? That much he should suffer and be despised. . . . Elijah has come” (Mark ix. 12 f. || Matt. xvii. 11). The frequency of the phrase in this association is impressive, and also confirmatory of its prophetic connotation: “The 'son of man' is (i.e. as good as) delivered up into men's hands, and they will kill him; and having been killed after three days (see above) he will rise” (Mark ix. 31 || Matt. xvii. 22 f., Luke ix. 44). “Look! we are going up into Jerusalem; and the 'son of man' will be delivered up to the high priests and the scribes; and they will condemn him to death, and will deliver him up to the Gentiles; and they will make fun of him, and spit on him, and flog him, and kill, and after three days (see above) he will rise” (Mark x. 33 f. || Matt. xx. 18 f., Luke xviii. 31 ff.; cf. Luke xxiv. 7); “the 'son of man' has not come to be waited on (by others), but to wait on (others), and to give his life a ransom for many” (Mark x. 45 || Matt. xx. 28); “You know that after two days the passover takes place, and the 'son of man' is (i.e. by then) delivered up to the extent of being crucified” (Matt. xxvi. 2); “the 'son of man' goes off, just as it is written about him; but woe to that man through whom the 'son of man' is delivered up” (Mark xiv. 21 || Matt. xxvi. 24, Luke xxii. 22); “there has struck (lit.: 'come') the hour; look! the 'son of man' is delivered up” (Mark xiv. 41 || Matt. xxvi. 45).

This chain of references to his death, growing in clearness as the time approaches, has every link of it stamped with the 'son of man,' that is, 'the prophet,' and the deepening red of the chain is the glow of his coming martyrdom. (Contrast A. Schweitzer, pp. 389 f.) The oft-occurring “'deliver up' might be used in

the Gospels to represent more than one Hebrew word or phrase in Isaiah's prophecy about the Suffering Servant" (A. E. Abbott, p. 688). This association becomes explicit in a logion peculiar to Luke: "For I tell you, that this which is written must be performed in me, namely, 'And with law-breakers he was classed'; for even my end it (i.e. Scripture) has (i.e. in it)" (Luke xxii. 37). In our Gospels there are other references to the same section of Isaiah which are probably "due to the evangelists rather than to Jesus," but, this admitted, "it would be a fair inference that their partiality for Isaiah reflects a trait of the religious character of their Master" (A. B. Bruce, II, p. 363).

In the Fourth Gospel the sayings, "the food which continues into eternal life . . . the 'son of man' will give you. . . . Unless you eat the flesh of the 'son of man' and drink his blood, you have no life in you" (John vi. 27, 53), are to be interpreted by "the utterances which I have spoken to you are spirit and are life . . . utterances of eternal life" (vers. 63, 68). What he has in view is his message from God, which is so thoroughly part of himself; he would have them take it all in, and make it part of themselves. When he is being more than rejected,—persecuted, he speaks as a prophet who is being wronged: "But now you are seeking to kill me, a man who the truth has talked to you, which I heard from God" (John viii. 40). Hence in the following: "so must the 'son of man' be lifted up" (John iii. 14), "when you lift up the 'son of man'" (John viii. 28), "And I (cf. ver. 34, "the 'son of man'"),—if I am lifted up from the ground, all I will draw to me" (John xii. 32), "lifted up" has the same prophetic associations as the Synoptic "delivered up" (see A. E. Abbott, pp. 454 f.). This writer sees a halo on this end,—compare, "Now has the 'son of man' been clothed with splendour (i.e. by 'perfect self-sacrifice, even to death,' B. F. Westcott, p. 196), and God has been clothed with splendour in him" (John xiii. 31); "The hour is come, that the 'son of man' be clothed with splendour. Truly, truly, I tell you, Unless the grain of corn, having fallen into the ground, dies, it continues there by itself; but if it dies, much fruit it bears" (John xii. 23 f.).

If, then, "the typical Christian is the martyr, the man who lays down his life in the cause which is identical with Jesus" (J. Denney, p. 234), the at-one-ment with God which is discoverable in Jesus may, in truth, be said to be his complete martyr devotion to the Kingdom of God. He expected that his example would show the way to "many," would inspire them to the same method of at-one-ment with God,—the only valid method. The evidence, Synoptic and Johannine, is all in favour of supposing that such was indeed Jesus' own thought about his death; it was voluntarily undertaken, out of obedience to the will of God (cf. T. R. Glover,

II, p. 67), and from his unquenchable desire to be only of the utmost service to men.

5. The very noticeable tendency in Jewish thought of the time to connect the human Messiah and the superhuman Messiah, would of itself facilitate an association between the few apocalyptic and really literary references to "the Son of Man," and the many references to himself as the prophet, "the 'son of man.'" This very process has left its mark on our Gospels. Jesus was wont to say as "the prophet" that his witness for or against a man at the last day would be decisive: "Everybody then who will publicly declare for me (i.e. by martyrdom, if necessary) in front of men, I too will publicly declare for him in front of my Father in heaven. But whosoever will disown me (i.e. by refusing martyrdom, presumably) in front of men, I too will disown him in front of my Father in heaven" (Matt. x. 32 f. || Luke xii. 8 f.). Again, in Luke he asks: "And why are you addressing me, Sir, Sir, and not doing what I say?" (Luke vi. 46), and to such, on one occasion, he indicates dramatically the consequences in the far end,—"the master of the household . . . will say . . . I do not know from what part you are; go out of my sight all you workers of injustice" (Luke xiii. 25 ff.). This latter takes shape in Matthew as a Judgment scene proper with Jesus as "the Son of Man," the Judge, that is, at the last great Assize: "Many will say to me on that day (i.e. of Judgment), Sir, Sir, in your name did we not prophesy and in your name evil spirits throw out, and in your name many powerful deeds do? And then I will publicly declare to them, Not at any time did I know you: depart from me, workers of lawlessness" (Matt. vii. 22 f.). Compare, how "the Son of Man" . . . on the throne of his glory . . . shall . . . say also to them on the left, Go from me under a curse" (Matt. xxv. 31, 41; cf. "And for you the godless there shall be a curse . . . and on you all shall abide a curse," 1 En. v. 6 f.; cf. also xxvii. 2, xcvi. 4; 2 En. x. 5; 4 Macc. xviii. 22; John vii. 49); and still more definitely, the prophetic "son of man," "the sower of the good seed," is deliberately identified with the apocalyptic "Son of Man" who "will delegate his angels" (Matt. xiii. 37, 41); as also elsewhere is he who "first must suffer much, and be treated as a fraud by this generation" (Luke xvii. 25; cf. ver. 26). Similarly, "till they see the Kingdom of God actually come with power" (Mark ix. 1 || Luke ix. 27), becomes in Matthew "till they see 'the Son of Man' coming in his kingdom" (Matt. xvi. 28); and "I also will to you, just as my Father willed to me, rulership (i.e. to be leaders of men), that you may eat and drink at my table (i.e. the table of the leaders) in my Kingdom" (Luke xxii. 29), is re-written: "You who accompanied me, in the new world, when 'the Son of Man' will sit on the throne of his glory, you too will sit . . . ruling" (Matt. xix. 28).

Matthew represents the meaning usually read into Jesus' words of warning by the early disciples ; " primitive exegesis, in localities and communities under the influence of a Jewish-Christian religious atmosphere of an apocalyptic type " tended " towards the ascription to Jesus of an authority to pronounce sentence which He had at least not claimed in any direct manner for Himself " (cf. E. W. Winstanley, p. 165 ; also pp. 160, 313 ; E., March 1913, pp. 225-241 ; J. Denney, p. 226 ; W. Fairweather, pp. 276, 294). Jesus did say, then, that he as son-prophet would have the determinative word as regards entrance into the fellowship of the Kingdom hereafter, that the relationship now established between him and them would be enduring : " Truly I tell you, I will not again drink (i.e. with you) of the fruit of the vine, till that day when I drink it (i.e. with you) in a new sense in the Kingdom of God " (Mark xiv. 25 || Matt. xxvi. 29, Luke xxii. 18 ; cf. ver. 16), that is, the fellowship now to be broken for a while will be renewed again. But he does not seem to have claimed that the Father " assigned to him authority to pass judgment (i.e. at the last day), because he is ' Son of Man ' " (John v. 27 ; cf. " the sum of judgment was given unto the Son of Man," 1 En. lxix. 27). " That he supposed himself to be designated to that high office, and expected after death to take his seat at God's right hand, and descend thence amid the angelic throng to summon the world to his great assize, appears to pass the bounds of likelihood " (J. E. Carpenter, pp. 106 f.).

To summarise what has been claimed for Jesus under this head : Because its popular associations were not at all to his mind, he seldom referred to " the Anointed," and never used the term directly of himself. He was, however, conscious of possessing leadership in the experience of divine sonship among men. This gave him awareness of Messiahship, and filled in the content of that Messiahship for him. He was son-ambassador from the Father sent to establish a community for each individual of which his experience as son would be the norm. This emerges very distinctly in the kind of righteousness to which he conforms his life, namely, a righteousness which is wholly a seeking, serving love. It also accounts for how he regards himself as the very wisdom of God to men, and expects supreme devotion from them. He exhibits, therefore, all the essentials of Messiahship. Yet he deliberately dissociates himself from " the son of David " idea of Messiah, as unsatisfactory and impossible to him. For one thing he saw no necessity for seeking to make his own nation supreme in the political world, that the divine community be set up among men. The sword even in, humanly speaking, the direst extremity, he thought, could not help on the divine interests in the world ; there was for him no imaginable situation where military opera-

tions could benefit the Kingdom of God. Not in the crash and slaughter attending a great war, but in men's devotion to God as faithful sons to the point of martyrdom would that Kingdom come. As martyr, not warrior, Messiah he fixed what must be the type to which each member of the divine community should be prepared to conform his conduct, when face to face with the horror of hostile world powers; for him the warrior was nothing, the martyr everything. He approached the cause of peace among men, so common an interest of the human Messiah in our literature, entirely from the side of reconciliation to God; there was nothing else to be tried but peace with God,—only the reconciled to God could slay enmity between man and man, and that, too, only by reconciling each to God. He regarded himself as superlatively the prophet, and relied entirely on the prophetic appeal of divine sonship in him. Never did he claim actual pre-existence for himself, but in language used in our literature to express the divine intention concerning a person or place, he expressed his conviction that none was so fully God-sent as he. He makes a literary use of the apocalyptic figure "the Son of Man," but does not take the name to himself. Since the situation in the Similitudes of the native rulers and the Sadducees persecuting and even martyring the godly of the community was being paralleled in his own case, and was likely to be paralleled again in the experience of his devoted circle of followers, this was just the form his faith in God as Vindicator of the righteous assumed. He associated the fall of Jerusalem with the final Judgment in accordance with the prophetic manner of linking the latter closely with the only historical situation known. "The 'son of man,'" without the article borrowed from Ezekiel, was his favourite name for himself as "the prophet," expressing as it did his consciousness of being a man capable of making supreme divine communications to other men. It is of himself as this prophet of God *par excellence* that he thinks, when he sets himself to pay the full price of martyrdom, which his will both to obey the Father and to be of supreme service to men seems to have committed him to pay. He so far made himself judge of men that he often warned them, that their reception or rejection of him would have a very significant effect on the fellowship possible to them in the Hereafter. His early disciples in substantial, but not in formal, faithfulness to his teaching,—since they seem to have confused his very frequent use of "the 'son of man'" with his few but impressive literary uses of the apocalyptic figure, "the Son of Man,"—made this side of his teaching rather more prominent than he himself did. He gloried much more in assuring his followers that their fellowship with him, which had begun here, would be renewed in the Hereafter.

CHAPTER IV
THE DOCTRINE OF MAN

A—THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE

OUR writers shared in the general rise in the appreciation of the individual which Hellenistic influence had prompted (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, I, p. 102), and which the real congregational worship of the synagogue had done so much to foster. "There had never been in the world's history any form of congregational worship till the synagogue appeared. . . . The idea of the synagogue was twofold; it was a place of worship, i.e. congregational worship, and it was a place of teaching, i.e. religious teaching" (R. T. Herford, I, pp. 79 f.). The latter refers particularly to the Torah in its widest meaning, which "made the religion of Israel personal and individual to a far greater degree than it had been before" (Ib., p. 73). The subject of investigation in this section of our chapter is, then, what, taking our literature as guide, was this member of the synagogue congregation supposed to think of himself.

I. MAN AS BODY AND SPIRIT.

1. This common-sense division is practically the only division which concerns our writers. According to R. H. Charles (I, p. 241) a trichotomous view of man as spirit, soul and body,—not spirit or soul and body,—appears in our literature in four places. It is, however, difficult to discern a real trichotomy in such passages as: "When the dead is at rest, let his memory rest, and be consoled when his soul departs" (*ἐν ἐξόδῳ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ*) (Sir. xxxviii. 23); "the dead that are in the grave (or 'Hades,' or 'Sheol'), whose breath (or 'spirit') is taken from their bodies," (1 Bar. ii. 17); "command my spirit to be taken from me . . . let me go to the everlasting place" (Tob. iii. 6); and "there shall not be lacking of his men one person (*σὰρξ μία*) nor one life (*πνεῦμα ζωῆς*)" (Jud. x. 13), which means "no one shall be taken prisoner or killed" (cf. A.P., vol. i. p. 259). But yet it may be agreed that these writers have not, in their thought, entered the period of the apocalypists.

2. Spirit (*πνεῦμα*) and soul (*ψυχή*) are often equivalents, and "what is predicated of 'soul' can be predicated also of 'spirit'" (E.B., 1360). Thus, "the soul which was lent him" (Wisd.

xv. 8),—compare, “one whose own *spirit* is borrowed” (ver. 16), also how God “inspired into him an active *soul*, and breathed into him a vital *spirit*” (ver. 11). So even in a section of one of the books which R. H. Charles claims for the tripartite view: “the *soul* in anguish, the troubled *spirit*” (1 Bar. iii. 1),—compare, “(God) has poured into him a living *soul*, and a pure *spirit* from Himself” (Test., Naph. I, x. 8). Passages referring to the Here-after exemplify the same equivalence; e.g. “the souls of men” (1 En. ix. 3),—compare, “the spirits of men” (xx. 3). Sometimes ‘heart’ is interchangeable with “spirit,”—“and do not think in your spirit nor say in your heart” (1 En. xcvi. 7), and sometimes with “soul,”—“as his soul, so also is his word” (T.N. ii. 6), where some MSS., have an additional and equivalent clause, “and as his heart, so also is his mouth.” Sometimes “mind” is interchanged with “soul,” as in Wisd. ix. 15, quoted in the next paragraph below; sometimes there is a redundancy like “the spirits of the souls” (1 En. xxii. 3); and so forth,—but nothing to show that there is ever in contemplation a tripartite view of man’s nature. This conclusion is confirmed even by a consideration of 2 Macc. vii. 22 f. (cf. xiv. 46), where in the juxtaposition of “spirit” and “life” R. H. Charles (I, p. 288) sees “a syncretism of the two psychologies.” Elsewhere in that book, as he admits, “the ordinary dichotomy of soul and body is found.” It is not, however, absolutely necessary to accuse this author of having “no consistent psychology.” The phrases referred to may be taken as instances of elaboration of terms for the sake of emphasis, or for fulness of expression, lest the one term alone be felt to be inadequate or ambiguous. They might be rendered “the spirit, i.e. (*καί*) the life,” “the life, i.e. (*καί*) the spirit”; the former is rendered by J. Moffatt (A.P., vol. i. p. 141) “the breath of life,” not, as R. H. Charles, “your spirit and your life.”

3. The idea of the body in our literature is the healthy one native to the O.T. (see A. B. Davidson, chap. vi. 2, and cf. M. Joseph, p. 364),—this, too, notwithstanding the Greek influences of the period, and a certain similarity of language, now and then discernible and almost unavoidable, to that of the Greek writers who held the body to be the seat of evil. “Ethical dualism of soul and body is remote from Hebrew thought. . . . Greek metaphysic is chiefly dualistic, contrasting spirit and matter; Hebrew is theistic, contrasting God the creator and man the created, and deriving soul and body from a single source” (H. W. Robinson, pp. 25, 153). Our writers are here unanimously Hebrew, the writer of Wisdom being no exception. As to Wisd. ix. 15, “A corruptible (*φθαρτόν*) body weighs down the soul, and the earthy frame lies heavy on the mind (*νοῦν*) that is full of cares,” the associations of “corruptible” in our literature,—e.g. “the world of corruption”

(2 Bar. xl. 3), "the consummation of that which is corruptible, and the beginning of that which is not corruptible" (2 Bar. lxxiv. 2), "a mortal in a corruptible (*corruptio*) world" (4 Ez. iv. 11), "corruption (*corruptela*) is passed away" (4 Ez. vii. 114),—exclude the meaning "polluted." The intention is to say rather that the body belongs to, is the instrument of the spirit's expression of itself in, this present fleeting world. The writer is impressed, as all are at times, with the insufficiency of the body to accomplish all one would; it is often weak, but not itself a fountain of pollution. This interpretation harmonises with the optimistic view of this world's arrangements in general which characterises this book; God's "incorruptible spirit is in all things" (xii. 1), "the products of the world are healthsome" (i. 14), "the world fights for the righteous" (xvi. 17), "the creation, ministering to Thee its maker, strains its force against the unrighteous" (xvi. 24). The body need not be in every instance, if it is in some, "a body held in pledge by sin" (i. 4,—compare, "I came into a body undefiled (*ἀμίαντον*)" (viii. 20), where "he seems to be denying the Platonic doctrine of the body being a hindrance" (W. O. E. Oesterley, I, p. 82; cf. pp. 84 f.).

In the Test. the conception of the body as suited to the spirit which dwells in it is stated with singular clearness and beauty of expression: "For as the potter knows the vessel, how much it is to contain, and brings clay accordingly, so also the Lord makes the body after the likeness of the spirit, and according to the capacity of the body He implants the spirit. And the one does not fall short of the other by a third part of a hair; for by weight and measure and rule was all the creation made. And as the potter knows the use of each vessel, what it is meet for, so also the Lord knows the body, how far it will persist in goodness, and when it begins in evil" (T.N. ii. 2-4). The flesh may be the most conspicuous tool of either the evil will or the good; hence, wicked men are "the flesh which has aroused Thy wrath," and good men are "the flesh of righteousness and uprightness" (1 En. lxxxiv. 6). Not even in the case of those monstrous beings, the giants, is the flesh thought of as essentially sinful, the evil being connected with the spirits, not with the bodies; thus, "And now, the giants who are produced from the spirits and flesh shall be called evil spirits upon the earth, and on the earth shall be their dwelling. Evil spirits have proceeded from their bodies; because they are born from men and from the holy Watchers is their beginning and primal origin; they shall be evil spirits on earth, and evil spirits shall they be called" (1 En. xv. 8 f.). Again, "man, who (has) the inclination of flesh and blood" (Sir. xvii. 31), which the Syriac version rightly paraphrases, "man, who, being flesh and blood, does not control his inclination," does not refer to a

corrupted and corrupting body, but, in contrast to God, as F. R. Tennant would put it, to "the creaturely weakness, the natural infirmity, of a being such as man, attaching to him in virtue of his finiteness and temporariness" (p. 102). So, too, there is no premeditated disparagement of the body as such in the phrase, "this vessel of mortality" (4 Ez. vii. 88).

Moreover, only once, namely, in the independent appendix to 1 En., is there any elaborate reference to an Essene asceticism which implies such disparagement: "those who have afflicted their bodies, and been recompensed by God . . . who love God, and loved neither gold nor silver, nor any of the good things which are in the world, but gave over their bodies to torture. Who, since they came into being, longed not after earthly food, but regarded their bodies (or 'everything') as a passing breath, and lived accordingly," etc. (cviii. 7-9; cf. Wisd. iii. 12 f., iv. 1; 1 En. lxxxiii. 2; Psa. Sol. iii. 7-9; also W. O. E. Oesterley, I, p. 101). The remark, also, of 4 Macc. on the desires, "Of the desires some are mental and some physical" (i. 32), is but a transcript from ordinary human experience, and has no dualistic conception in view. That writer, indeed, excludes such a notion, when he ascribes to the creation of God both "the senses" and "the mind" (ii. 21 f.).

4. The soul or spirit is no longer conceived after the manner of ancient psychology, where "the idea of the soul is not that of a metaphysical entity, or even of an x in the equation of life," but "is that of a quasi-physical *something*, frequently identified (as, for example, by the Hebrews) with the breath" (H. W. Robinson, p. 6). One is not to say: "What is my soul among the mass of the spirits of all the children of men?" (Sir. xvi. 17). God is the "God of the spirits of all flesh" (Jub. x. 3). The soul or spirit now connotes personality. The influence of the Greek idea of the pre-existence of souls is traceable (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, I, pp. 80-83), but whether any of our writers completely took over that idea is very debatable. Thus, on: "Now I was a good child by nature and a good soul fell to my lot" (Wisd. viii. 19 f.; cf. 4 Macc. xviii. 23), F. C. Porter (I.J.A., April 1912, pp. 33 f.) denies it, whereas N. Forbes commenting on, "All souls are prepared to eternity, before the formation of the world" (2 En. xxiii. 5), affirms it (A.P., vol. ii. p. 444), while S. Holmes takes a middle position, saying: "Probably the writer of Part I (i.e. of Wisdom) adopted the idea of the pre-existence of the soul without asking himself whether he was thinking of a mere vague general notion of existence, or a definite idea of self-conscious existence" (A.P., vol. i. p. 531). S. A. B. Mercer (I.J.A., April 1916, p. 20) admits it in the 2 En. passage, but denies it elsewhere. It seems safe, therefore, to say that the Greek idea of the pre-existence of souls, though

now and then glanced at, is of itself of no importance in the thinking of the people represented in our literature.

In the solitary reference in the O.T. (Job xiv. 22) to the departed as a "soul" or "self" (נִשְׁמָה) may be seen the beginning of a tendency which culminates in the departed being regarded as "souls" (cf. B.D.B., p. 659), not "shades." The impact of the Greek idea on the Hebrew mind facilitated this tendency, and secured, or nearly so, just what the later theory of Creationism stood for, namely, each soul a creation of God. This may be what is meant by "having received pure and immortal souls from God" (4 Macc. xviii. 22), that is, without any implication that very different souls were given to others (cf. A.P., vol. ii. p. 685). This soul comes to consciousness in this life, and exhibits here the essential qualities of personality. The human soul, also, is thought of as more than the animal soul, even when a most liberal view of the latter is taken, as e.g. in 2 En., where the soul of the beast survives for a while to accuse the soul of man at the Judgment day,—“And as every soul of man is according to number, similarly beasts will not perish, nor all souls of beasts which the Lord created, till the great judgment, and they will accuse man, if he feed them ill” (lviii. 5 f.). In the Beyond the soul is still a separate self,—“there has been previously prepared a place for every soul of man” (2 En. xlix. 2; cf. lxi. 2). The spirits of the departed still feel, and know, and perhaps will (see further below, pp. 313 f., 315 f., 325 f.), though indeed they await the fulness of life at the resurrection. “The soul is no longer regarded as cut off from God and shorn of all its powers by death” (E.B., 1345).

II. MAN AS A MORAL BEING.

I. The idea of man's creation in the image of God (Gen. i. 26 f., v. 1, ix. 6) does not often appear on the surface. The few direct references thereto are, however, worthy of special notice. In a section in Sir. on God's gifts to man, after a recognition of man's physical mortality, the writer goes on to say, in language reminiscent of Gen. i, that God gave men “authority over all things on the earth. He clothed them with strength like unto Himself, and made them according to His own image. He put the fear of them upon all flesh, and caused them to have power over beasts and birds” (xvii. 2-4). The “image” here is man's rulership over all other creatures on earth after the likeness of God's governorship of the whole universe (cf. A. and E., xiii. 2, xv. 2, xxxvii. 3, xxxix. 1; Apoc. Mos., x. 3, xii. 1). Ben Sira then goes on, almost studiously, to contradict the non-priestly sections of Gen. (cf. ii. 17, iii. 22) on the origin of man's knowledge of good and evil:

“ With insight and understanding He filled their heart, and taught them good and evil ” (Sir. xvii. 7), a thought which leads him to speak ultimately of the revelation given to Moses : “ He set before them the covenant ; the law of life He gave them for a heritage.

. . . And He said unto them, Beware of all unrighteousness ; and He gave them commandment, to each man concerning his neighbour ” (vers. 11, 14). Similarly, in 2 En. God tells Adam, “ This is good, and that bad ” (xxx. 15), in a context where the idea of the “ image ” is prominent : “ I appointed him as ruler to rule on earth and to have My wisdom ” (ver. 12).

Elsewhere there is the same association of moral insight with rationality sufficient for rulership, where the “ image ” is in mind, though not directly mentioned : “ And by Thy wisdom (Thou) formedst man, that he should have dominion over the creatures that were made by Thee, and rule the world in holiness and righteousness, and execute judgment in uprightness of soul ” (Wisd. ix. 2 f.). For the writer of the first part of Wisdom the image of God and the immortality of the soul are brought together : “ There is a prize for blameless souls. Because God created man for incorruption, and made him an image of His own proper being ” (Wisd. ii. 22 f.). There seems to be no tendency among our writers to weaken the idea of creation after the image of God into creation after the image of angels as in some of the Targums, nor yet with Philo to make “ the distinction between a celestial Adam, made in the image of God, and the earthly Adam,” who “ only bears the image ‘ after a manner,’ or, as is more often asserted, not at all ” (F. R. Tennant, pp. 134, 149). “ There is no inclination or thought which the Lord does not know, for He created every man after His own image ” (T.N. ii. 5). In the idea of the “ image ” rationality for the governance of the lower creation is prominent. To our writers this rulership, however, if not exactly unthinkable apart from a revelation of moral capability, was not, without that, after God’s likeness. The tendency was to see the likeness in man’s moral nature rather than in the circumstance of his being the ruling creature on the earth (cf. J.L., p. 39). The moral capability of man, here taken so seriously, assumes the ideas of obligation and freedom.

2. The idea of obligation assumed by these writers is not an empty categorical imperative ; it is very fully filled in (see below on righteousness, pp. 227 ff.). Conscience with some of them is a familiar, if not yet a fully developed, conception. It is sometimes, as commonly, an experience after the event, but is not unrecognised on occasions as the light casting the shadow before. So Reuben is made to say : “ Until my father’s death I had not boldness to look in his face, or to speak to any of my brethren, because of the reproach (i.e. of adultery with Bilhah). Even until

now my conscience causes me anguish on account of my impiety" (T.R. iv. 2 f.); Judah tells how "two spirits wait upon man—the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit. And in the midst is the spirit of understanding of the mind, to which it belongs to turn whithersoever it will. . . . And the spirit of truth testifies all things, and accuses all; and the sinner is burnt up by his own heart, and cannot raise his face to the judge" (T.Jud. xx. 1 f., 5); and Gad remarks: "He that is just and humble is ashamed to do what is unjust, being reproved not of another, but of his own heart, because the Lord looks on his inclination. . . . For fearing lest he should offend the Lord, he will not do wrong to any man, even in thought" (T.G. v. 3, 5). Without doubt, "the Jewish conception of God as a lawgiver and judge . . . had brought about a moral fervour, a tenderness of conscience, a keenness of self-examination unheard of in olden times" (Carl Clemen, E., Oct. 1909, p. 302). The existence of this higher self-reproving the lower is very vividly realised in Wisdom: "Wickedness in itself is a coward thing, and witnesses its own condemnation, and, being hard pressed by conscience, always forecasts the worst; for fear is naught but a surrender of the succour which reason offers; and when from within the heart the expectation thereof is o'erthrown, it reckons its ignorance worse than the cause that brings the torment," (xvii. 11-13) (cf. A. Dougall, p. 25).

Here, too, no limitation of race comes in or need have come in. The natural conscience is recognised: as, for example, where, on the one hand, the early Chaldeans "diligently practise justice and virtue, and not covetousness, which is the source of myriad ills to mortal man, of war and desperate famine . . . fulfilling the command of the Mighty God, the ever abiding strain" (Sib. iii. 234-6, 246); and on the other, "the Phœnicians, Egyptians, and Latins, and spacious Hellas, and many nations of other men, Persians and Galatians and all Asia" are said to be "transgressing the holy law of the immortal God which He ordained" (or, "they were under," Sib. iii. 597-600; cf. 4 Ez. vii. 72; 2 Bar. xviii. 40). The dulling of conscience among the heathen was judicial and deserved: "Having passed wisdom by . . . were they disabled from recognising the things which are good" (Wisd. x. 8; cf. T.R. iii. 8),—with which, if some degree of allegory be presumed, compare: "Well did the Egyptians deserve the loss of light and imprisonment in darkness" (Wisd. xviii. 4; cf. in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, III, p. 162), also, "the wisdom of the wise nought can take away, save the blindness of ungodliness and the callousness (that comes) of sin" (T.L. xiii. 7). Where this is not stated in so many words, it is to be assumed; hence in Sir. wisdom is "poured . . . out . . . upon all flesh in measure, but without measure . . . to them that love Him" (i. 9 f.); in

Jub. the fact that the Gentiles are placed under "spirits in authority to lead them astray from Him" (xv. 31), is not their misfortune, but their punishment; in the Similitudes the Gentiles refused wisdom, when the chance was given them, preferring the folly of sin,—“Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the children of men, and found no dwelling-place. . . . And unrighteousness went forth from her chambers . . . and dwelt with them” (1 En. xlii. 2 f.). This judicial darkening is not always regarded as final; so “the light of the Law . . . was given for to lighten every man” (T.L. xiv. 4); the Jews are those “through whom the incorruptible light of the Law was to be given to the race of men” (Wisd. xviii. 4); the Messiah in particular is to “be the light of the Gentiles” (1 En. xlvi. 4); “lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day” (T.L. xviii. 3). Nowhere else in ancient literature is the reality of the light of conscience so fully recognised, and the obligation to be true to that light so much insisted on as here.

3. In all this human freedom is taken for granted. Determinism and free will are usually left side by side. “Hear, Abraham,” says the Divine speaker, “As the counsel (i.e. will) of your father is in him, and as your counsel (i.e. will) is in you, so also is the counsel of My will in Me ready for the coming days, before you have knowledge of these, or (can) see with your eyes what is future in them” (Apoc. Abr., xxvi). The writer is clear on the existence of will both in God and in man; so indeed all our writers. What varies is the amount of emphasis put on the one or the other; there is never an actual denial of either. In B. of 1 Bar. the note of despair is struck with regard to the Gentiles; but it is going too far to say that “so far as the great mass of men is concerned his outlook is purely determinist” (H. M. Hughes, p. 236). Thus, “These did not God choose,” is balanced in the next verse by, “They perished through their own foolishness” (iii. 27 f.). A darker pessimism affects the outlook of 4 Ez., and yet human freedom is never called in question. To take but one passage: “This is the condition of the contest which (every) man who is born upon earth must wage; that, if he be overcome, he shall suffer as you have said: but if he be victorious, he shall receive what I have said” (vii. 127 f.),—obviously, it rests ultimately with every man to choose to be overcome or to be victorious.

Where the emphasis on the Divine sovereignty is at a maximum as in Ass. Mos., and at a minimum as in 2 Bar., there is agreement on the point here under consideration. The former speaks of the reward of “those . . . who do and fulfil the commandments of God,” and of the punishment of “those who sin and set at nought the commandments” (xii. 10), just as the latter says:

Those who were born from him (i.e. Adam) each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come, and again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come" (liv. 15). Man is not, then, merely a part of the fixed and unalterable course of nature. "All His works (i.e. of nature) go on thus from year to year for ever, and all the tasks which they accomplish for Him, and their tasks do not change, but according as God has ordained so is it done. . . . But you,—you have not been steadfast nor done the commandments of the Lord, but you have turned away" (1 En. v. 2-4),—in a word, it lay within the power of men to obey or to disobey, and they had done the latter, an opportunity which nature had not been given (cf. J. H. Hertz, p. 262). This opportunity resided in the gift of will: "So sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man of himself has created it" (1 En. xcvi. 4). As the author of the Test. would put it, sin arose from man's choice of "the works of Beliar" rather than "the law of the Lord" (T.L. xix. 1). This assumption of the gift of will is behind every appeal for repentance, as well as the whole system of retribution so verily believed in by practically all our writers. Moreover, such beliefs and theories as are to be treated below in the next division of this chapter leave the conclusion unaffected that "our works are subject to our own choice and power to do right or wrong in the works of our hands" (Psa. Sol. ix. 7).

4. The treatment of man in 4 Macc. is worthy of special notice as illustrating man's obligation and man's freedom, as these were worked out in some detail by a Jew of liberal culture and unimpeachable orthodoxy, and of the time practically identical with that of Jesus. The lower self, though not the whole, is yet part of what this writer calls the "passions and inclinations" (ii. 21). "Of the desires some are mental and some are physical" (i. 32). God "set the mind on a throne amidst the senses to be his sacred guide in all things" (ii. 22), and both orders of desires may be "controlled by Reason" (i. 32). This "Reason" is "the mind preferring with clear deliberation the life of wisdom" (i. 15). This wisdom he takes "to be the culture acquired under the Laws through which we learn with due reverence the things of God and for our worldly profit the things of man" (i. 17). "Overruled by the Law . . . Reason is in the position of master over the passions or affections" (ii. 9). This mastery is most certainly "over . . . the body" (iii. 2),—"the propensions of our appetites are checked and inhibited by the temperate mind, and all the movements of the body obey the bridle of Reason" (i. 35). "Over the passion, or moral defects that are adverse to justice and manliness and temperance and judgment . . . its action . . . is not to extirpate the passions, but to enable us to resist them successfully" (i. 6). Reason, that is, will keep one safe in the hour of temptation. This

mastery extends to thoughts and purposes: "Reason is proved to subdue the impulse not only of sexual desire, but of all sorts of covetings" (ii. 4). Not only are gormandising, greed and drunkenness mastered, but to this governing Reason "the Law ranks above affection for parents . . . overrides love for a wife . . . governs love for children . . . controls the claims of friendship. . . . Reason through the Law is able to overcome even hatred" (ii. 10-14).

He has in mind, however, some limitation to the power of this Law-directed Reason: for while he says, "The temperate mind is able . . . to win the victory over the passions, modifying some, while crushing others absolutely" (ii. 18), later, on the mastery "of forgetfulness and ignorance" (compare the Platonic identification of evil with ignorance), he comments: "Reason is not shown to be master over passions or defects in itself, but over those of the body. For example, none of you is able to extirpate our natural desire, but the Reason can enable him to escape being made a slave by desire. None of you is able to extirpate anger from the soul, but it is possible for the Reason to come to his aid against anger. None of you can extirpate a malevolent disposition, but Reason can be his powerful ally against being swayed by malevolence. Reason is not the extirpator of the passions, but their antagonist" (iii. 2, 5). This passage is very popular in style, —at any rate, if carefully chosen, the precise connotation of some of the writer's terms is not now clear,—and perhaps is hardly in strict consistency with what he seems to say, e.g. about overcoming even hatred; but man's freedom to let his reason be directed by the Law, and his obligation to do so are clearly implied throughout, though the result he expects to accrue therefrom seems to be something short of a thorough regeneration,—not more than a self-control in which pleasure, and especially pain, are not entirely determinative either of action or of disposition.

III. MAN'S EARLY HISTORY.

1. The first line of thought to be traced here is that which connects with the opening verse of Gen. vi. Josephus refers to it thus: "Many angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength, for the tradition is, That these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call giants" (Ant., Bk. I, ch. iii. 1). How ancient and prevalent was this notion is proved by the way in which it comes out incidently in certain books which have no interest in it for its own sake; as, for example, in the following passages: "He forgave not the giants (LXX) of old, who revolted in their

might" (Sir. xvi. 7); "Those who aforetime did iniquity, among whom were giants trusting in their strength and boldness" (3 Macc. ii. 4); "There were giants born that were famous of old, great of stature, and expert in war" (1 Bar. iii. 26); "In the old time also when proud giants were perishing" (Wisd. xiv. 6). In 1 En. vi.-xxxvi. the writer gives it very considerable prominence, and in some detail. "The children of men had multiplied," and there "were born unto them beautiful and comely daughters. And the angels, the children of the heaven, saw and lusted after them, and said to one another: Come, let us choose us wives from among the children of men and beget us children" (vi. 1 f.; cf. in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, III, p. 270). This course was agreed upon under oath: "Then they all swore together and bound themselves by mutual imprecation" (ver. 5), "not to abandon this plan, but to do this thing" (ver. 4; cf. 1 En. xii. 4).

Here Jub. supplies the idea that the mission of these angels or Watchers to earth was, to begin with, a beneficent one in accordance with God's good purpose for man: "the angels of the Lord descended on the earth, those who are named the Watchers, that they should instruct the children of men, and that they should do judgment and uprightness on the earth" (iv. 15). It is later found that "these had begun to unite themselves, so as to be defiled, with the daughters of men" (ver. 22; cf. 1 En. cvi. 13 f.). This according to the Similitudes was due to "their unrighteousness in becoming subject to Satan" (1 En. liv. 6; cf. lxix. 4-8; 2 En. xviii. 3-5),—a way of putting the matter which arose when this tradition, formerly closely related to nature worship, had latterly to be brought into relation with the later doctrine of Satan (cf. liii. 3, xl. 7). They fell through yielding to the evil inclination (Zad. iii. 2, 4), as did men (iv. 1, 9). The Test. are acquainted with a form of the tradition in which the first approaches were made by the women: "Thus (i.e. by adorning 'their heads and faces to deceive the mind') they allured the Watchers who were before the flood; for as these continually beheld them, they lusted after them, and they conceived the act in their mind; for they changed themselves into the shape of men, and appeared to them when they were with their husbands. And the women lusting in their minds after their forms, gave birth to giants, for the Watchers appeared to them as reaching even unto heaven" (T.R. v. 6 f.).

After the event the women were thought to be very different from what they were before it. The Watchers "took unto themselves wives, and each chose for himself one, and they began to go in unto them and to defile themselves with them, and they taught them charms and enchantments," etc. (1 En. vii. 1; cf. Jub. v. 1-3). The offspring of this union were terrible monsters: "the women have borne giants, and the whole earth has thereby

been filled with blood and unrighteousness" (1 En. ix. 9). This has resulted from "all the secret things that the Watchers have disclosed and have taught their sons" (1 En. x. 7; cf. xvi. 3, lxiv. 2, lxv. 6; Jub. viii. 3). Their chief, variously named, "showed . . . all the weapons of death to the children of men" (1 En. lxix. 6; cf. viii. 1, ix. 6, xiii. 2); "to him ascribe all sin" (1 En. x. 8; cf. c. 4). All this is set forth in queer symbolism in another section of 1 En. together with the fact that the sin of the giants brought the great judgment of the deluge which destroyed them: "And behold a star (i.e. Azazel, the chief) fell from heaven, and it arose and ate and pastured amongst those oxen (i.e. men) . . . And behold I saw many stars (i.e. the Watchers) descend, and cast themselves down from heaven to that first star, and they became bulls (i.e. took human form) amongst those cattle and pastured with them . . . and began to cover the cows of the oxen (i.e. the women), and they all became pregnant and bare elephants, camels, and asses (i.e. three classes of giants; cf. Jub. vii. 22). And all the oxen feared them and were affrighted at them, and began to bite with their teeth and to devour, and to gore with their horns. And they began, moreover, to devour those oxen" . . . Archangels "seized that first star . . . and took all the great stars . . . and bound them all hand and foot and cast them in an abyss of the earth"; . . . and as Noah's "vessel floated on the water . . . all the oxen and elephants and camels and asses sank to the bottom" (1 En. lxxxvi. 1, 3-6, lxxxviii. 1, 3, lxxxix. 6; cf. Jub. vii. 21).

The end of the trouble, however, was not yet. The fallen angels are safe out of the way, at all events, for the time being (cf. 1 En., i. 5, xiii. 10, xiv. 1, 3, xv. 2, xci. 15); the huge bodies of the giants lie dead; but "evil spirits have proceeded from their bodies; . . . they shall be evil spirits on earth, and evil spirits shall they be called. . . . And the spirits of the giants afflict, oppress, destroy, attack, do battle, and work destruction on the earth, and cause trouble" (1 En. xv. 9, 11; cf. xcix. 7; Tob. vi. 14). These are the demons living on earth, who "assuming many different forms are defiling mankind and shall lead them astray . . . till the day of the great judgment" (1 En. xix. 1). Noah even perceived that in his day immediately after the flood they have begun their work, as he says to his sons: "For I see, and behold the demons have begun (their) seductions against you and against your children, and now I fear on your behalf, that after my death you will shed the blood of men upon the earth" (Jub. vii. 27). Hence his prayer, when his sons came later telling him "concerning the demons which were leading astray and blinding and slaying his sons' sons": "Let Thy grace be lift up upon my sons, and let not wicked spirits rule over them lest they should destroy them from the earth.

. . . And Thou knowest how Thy Watchers, the fathers of these spirits, acted in my day" (Jub. x. 2, 3, 5). The righteous man's prayer availed to get the peril reduced to one-tenth of what it had been (ver. 9). This writer also stands alone in supposing that Israel was immune from the attacks of these demons, while the Gentiles, he thought, had utterly succumbed to them (Jub. xv. 32; cf. xix. 28). These demons, too, are referred to, though less directly, in such passages as: "Going a-whoring after women of the lawless one, while with all wickedness the spirits of wickedness work in you" (T.D. v. 5); "you shall understand how . . . to cast away the will of Beliar. . . . The Gentiles . . . obeyed . . . spirits of deceit . . . as Sodom which changed the order of nature. In like manner the Watchers also changed the order of their nature, whom the Lord cursed at the flood, on whose account He made the earth without inhabitants and fruitless" (T.N. iii. 1, 3-5). In the Kingdom of God this influence is to be mastered: "Then shall all the spirits of deceit be given to be trodden under foot, and men shall rule over wicked spirits" (T.S. vi. 6). It is to be part of the work of the Messiah to bring about this victory: "Beliar shall be bound by him, and he shall give power to His children to tread upon the evil spirits" (T.L. xviii. 12).

The context of this last quotation reveals, however, that by the writer's time the centre of interest in this connection was moving from the Watchers further back to Adam and Eve. The reference given above to 2 En. manifests that writer's acquaintance with this view of things; but for him it had an altogether subordinate place (see next section). Similarly the old legend is familiar to the writer of one stratum of 2 Bar., but again he, too, makes no use of it: "He (i.e. man in his physical nature) became a danger to his own soul: even to the angels he became a danger. For, moreover, at that time when he was created, they enjoyed liberty. And some of them descended, and mingled with the women. And then those who did so were tormented in chains. But the rest of the multitude of the angels, of which there is (no) number, restrained themselves. And those who dwelt on the earth perished together (with them) through the waters of the deluge" (lvi. 10-16). In 4 Ez. there is not even a passing allusion to the Watchers. So this legend tends to recede.

2. The second and apparently later line of thought, not always kept apart from the legends of the Watchers (cf. e.g. 1 En. lxix. 6; T.L. xviii. 10-12), connects with Gen. ii. and iii. There is evidence of the existence at one time of a very considerable literature relating to Adam (see M. R. James, pp. 1-8). Again, too, as in the previous instance, some writers betray knowledge of the legends without utilising them in the service of any theory (cf. e.g. Tob.

viii. 6; 1 En. xxiv-xxv; 4 Ez. viii. 52, for the tree of life; 1 En. xxxii. for the tree of knowledge). Our literature supplies very distinct glimpses of the ideas entertained on the subjects, and the use made of the incidents of that early period to explain things, as they were found to be with men of later generations. In 2 En., for example, life in paradise before the fall is in view: "Adam has life on earth, and I created a garden in Eden in the east, that he should observe the testament and keep the command. I made the heavens open to him, that he should see the angels singing the song of victory, and the gloomless light. And he was continuously in paradise, and the devil understood that I want to create another world, because Adam was Lord on earth, to rule and control it" (xxx. 1-3; cf. 2 Bar. iv. 3). The lordship of Adam and the reference to the devil are explained elsewhere. God "created man from invisible and from visible nature, . . . and . . . placed him on earth, a second angel, honourable, great and glorious, and . . . appointed him as ruler to rule on earth and to have" His "wisdom, and there was none like him on earth of all . . . existing creatures" (2 En. xxx. 10-12). "But above every living thing was the beauteous glory of Adam" (Sir. xlix. 16). "For men were created exactly like the angels, to the intent that they should continue pure and righteous, and death, which destroys everything, could not have taken hold of them" (1 En. lxix. 11).

This angelic man had from the first knowledge of good and evil (cf. above, p. 190), and was endowed with freedom to follow either. "I called his name Adam, and showed him the two ways, the light and the darkness, and I told him: 'This is good, and that bad'" (2 En. xxx. 15). The variety possible in the details of the tradition is well illustrated by the divergence in view concerning the duration of this unfallen state: in Jub. one is told that "Adam and his wife were in the garden of Eden for seven years tilling and keeping it" (iii. 15); but in 2 En. that "Adam was five and a half hours in paradise" (xxxii. 1A). From the human point of view the probability of sin is due to inexperience: "I have seen his (i.e. Adam's) nature, and he has not seen his own nature, therefore through not seeing he will sin worse" (2 En. xxx. 16),—a reference probably to the Yetzer or inclination which will form the subject of the next section. The envy of Satan supplied the enticement which constituted temptation to this inexperienced man.

In one place the devil tells his own story, and reveals what his mind is toward man: "And with a heavy sigh, the devil spoke: O Adam! all my hostility, envy, and sorrow is for you. . . . When God blew into you the breath of life, and your face and likeness was made in the image of God, Michael also brought

you and made (us) worship you in the sight of God; and God the Lord spoke: Here is Adam, I have made you in our image and likeness. . . . And since Michael kept urging me to worship, I said to him, . . . I will not worship an inferior and younger being (than I). I am his senior in the Creation. . . . It is his duty to worship me. When the angels, who were under me heard this, they refused to worship him. . . . And God the Lord was wrath with me and banished me and my angels from our glory. . . . And straightway we were overcome with grief, since we had been spoiled of so great glory. And we were grieved when we saw you in such joy and luxury" (A. and E. xii. 1, xiii. 2, xiv. 3, xv. 1, xvi. 1-3; cf. xv. 3; 2 En. xxix. 4 f.). The devil got his chance when the two angels were off duty. "God the Lord gave us two angels to guard us," so Adam tells his children. "The hour came when the angels had ascended to worship in the sight of God; forthwith the adversary . . . found an opportunity while the angels were absent and the devil led your mother astray to eat of the unlawful and forbidden tree" (A. and E. xxxiii. 1 f.). There is general agreement that Eve was the first sinner. So she herself confesses when later she sees Adam in pain: "'O Lord, my God, hand over to me his pain, for it is I who sinned.' And Eve said to Adam, 'My Lord, give me a part of your pains, for this has come to you from fault of mine'" (A. and E. xxxv. 2 f.; cf. xxxvii. 1 f.).

There is a very distinct tendency among some writers to make the first sin identical with fleshly union. Eve's account is: "And instantly he (i.e. Satan) hung himself from the wall of paradise, and when the angels ascended to worship God, then Satan appeared in the form of an angel and sang hymns like the angels. . . . And I opened to him and he walked a little way, then turned and said to me: 'I have changed my mind and I will not give you to eat until you swear to me to give also to your husband.' . . . And when he had received the oath from me, he went and poured upon the fruit the poison of his wickedness, which is lust, the root and beginning of every sin, and he bent the branch on the earth and I took of the fruit, and I ate" (Apoc. Mos. xvii. 1, xix. 1, 3; cf. 2 En. xxxi. 6). So the Lord afterwards words her confession for her: "You shall confess and say: 'Lord, Lord, save me, and I will turn no more to the sin of the flesh'" (Apoc. Mos. xxv. 3; cf. 4 Macc. xviii. 7). Hence, the picture of the first sin in Apoc. Abr.: "And I looked into the picture, and my eyes ran to the side of the Garden of Eden. And I saw there a man very great in height and fearful in breadth, incomparable in aspect, embracing a woman, who likewise approximated to the aspect and shape of the man. And they were standing under a tree of (the Garden of) Eden, and the fruit of this tree was like

the appearance of a bunch of grapes of the vine, and behind the tree was standing as it were a serpent in form, having hands and feet like a man's, and wings on its shoulders, . . . and they were holding the grapes of the tree in their hands, and both were eating it whom I had seen embracing." The identification of the forbidden tree with the vine is noteworthy in this connection. The picture is explained thus: "This is the human world, this is Adam, and this is their desire upon the earth, this is Eve; but he who is between them represents ungodliness, and their beginning (on the way) to perdition, even Azazel" (Apoc. Abr. xxiii). In accordance with this notion the outcome of the first transgression is that not only "untimely death . . . grief . . . anguish . . . pain . . . trouble . . . disease," but also "the begetting of children was brought about, and the passion of parents produced" (2 Bar. lvi. 6).

This view was not, it seems, universally held, and where it was held, the reference to the vine in this association should perhaps be taken as a clue to what was really in mind, viz., sexual intercourse resulting from drunkenness. What, therefore, F. R. Tennant says of the Rabbis possibly is not far off the truth with respect to our writers,—noting, of course, very specially the reference to abuse of the vine: "The view that the Fall consisted in the union of Adam and Eve is on the whole foreign to the Rabbinical way of thinking. There was a widely current haggada to the effect that Adam and Eve enjoyed a period of married life in Eden, and that it was this that made the serpent envious. . . . Moreover, the sin of partaking of the forbidden fruit . . . is not unfrequently associated in the midrash with abuse of the vine" (p. 155). That is, what they seem to have in view is covered by the phrase, "wine and women" (cf. in Rabbinical literature: "Noah found a vine and its clusters which had been thrown out of Paradise," G. Friedlander, III, p. 43).

The chief consequence of sin to the race is death; on this there is pretty unanimous agreement, physical death being for the most part intended, though there is not wanting a leaning toward the profounder interpretation of death, or even that it was premature death which was meant. "From a woman did sin originate (or 'was) the beginning of sin,' cf. Apoc. Mos. xxxii. 1 f.), and because of her we all must die (lit.: 'we die altogether')" (Sir. xxv. 24). "After sin what is there but death?" (2 En. xxx. 16). "Death . . . come to him by his wife" (ver. 17). So in Apoc. Mos. Adam, in speaking to Seth of Eve, says: "When God made us, me and your mother, through whom also I die" (vii. 1). Within three days of the death of Adam, "Seth and Eve came to the hut where Adam was laid. And Adam says to Eve: 'Eve, what have you wrought in us? You have brought upon us great

wrath which is death' " (xiv. 1 f.). So in B 2 of 2 Bar. of Adam it is said that " the multitude of time that he lived (i.e. 930 years) did not profit him, but brought death and cut off the years of those who were born from him " (xvii. 3) ; " Adam sinned and death was decreed against those who should be born " (xxiii. 4 ; cf. probably Sir. xiv. 17). Compare 4 Ez., " And Thou ledest him (i.e. Adam) into Paradise, . . . and to him Thou commandest one only observance of Thine, but he transgressed it. Forthwith Thou appointedst death for him and for his generations " (iii. 6 f.). The last two quotations reveal the tendency in later Jewish Theology to drop reference to Eve in connection with the subject of the entrance of sin and death into human experience. Some passages which refer to death merely describe it as it now is, without thought of any theory of its origin ; e.g. Sir. xvii. 1 f., xl. 11, xli. 3.

On the other hand in Wisdom the references to death are best understood as meaning ethical or second death : " Count not death in the error of your life ; neither draw upon yourselves destruction by the works of your hands ; because God made not death . . . righteousness is immortal (but the gain of unrighteousness is death). . . . Because God created man for incorruption (i.e. a blessed immortality), and made him an image of His own proper being ; but by the envy of the devil death entered into the world, and they that belong to his (i.e. the devil's) realm experience it " (i. 12 f., 15, ii. 23 f. ; and for a Rabbinical reference, see G. Friedlander, III, p. 27). In accordance with this, physical or bodily death alone is thought of simply as the common lot of the sons of Adam, not as an outcome of his sin ; so Pseudo-Solomon says : " I myself also am mortal, like to all, and am sprung from one born of the earth, the man first formed " (vii. 1). Otherwise, the former passages must be taken as including physical death, which in the good is ultimately annulled by eternal life hereafter, and the latter, as similar Sirach passages referred to above, simply recognised what now is. It has been seen that B 2 of 2 Bar. does not subscribe to the view of ordinary death as a natural incident ; possibly, however, though not certainly, spiritual death is hinted at in the phrase " death was decreed against those who transgress " (xix. 8) ; but if not, then, as F. R. Tennant says : " we may have a compromise with the common view which attributes death to individual sin, notwithstanding Adam's fall and its necessary consequences " (p. 214). The reference to fire, however, in the following from the same stratum makes clear that the idea of spiritual death was sometimes in the mind of that author : " O Adam, what have you done to all those who are born from you ? And what will be said to the first Eve who hearkened to the serpent ? For all this multitude are going to corruption,

nor is there any numbering of those whom the fire devours" (xlviii. 42 f.).

Whether or not there is any evidence for the view that man was mortal by nature, and that what the Fall brought on was premature death, depends on the interpretation of two passages in A 3 of the same book, where "untimely death" is specified as the outcome of Adam's transgression (liv. 15, lvi. 6). R. H. Charles (see VI, p. 91; A.P., vol. ii. p. 495) favours such an idea, but H. St. John Thackeray apparently not: "In some parts of this book the view seems to be taken that man was not originally created immortal, and that Adam's sin only brought *premature* death upon himself and his descendants. . . . Still it is possible that 'untimely' is here nothing more than a standing epithet for death, and does not imply that man was originally created mortal" (p. 32, note 2).

Beyond what has already been given in respect to the entrance of death, and what will come up immediately in connection with the Yetzer, there is little else said concerning the effects of the Fall of any moment here. In the following passage "ruin" may mean more than physical death, viz., moral ruin; if so, and if it is not a later interpolation (cf. I.J.A., Jan. 1910, p. 18), then it contains the earliest reference to inherited depravity resulting from Adam's sin: "And I saw all forefathers from all time with Adam and Eve, and I sighed and broke into tears and said of the ruin of (i.e. caused by) their dishonour (or 'wickedness'); 'Woe is me for my infirmity and for that of my forefathers,' and thought in my heart and said, 'Blessed is the man who has not been born, or who has been born and shall not sin before the Lord's face, that he come not into this place, nor bring (or 'have borne') the yoke of this place'" (2 En. xli. 1 f.; cf. ? 3 Macc. iii. 22; Wisd. xii. 10; contrast viii. 19). This passage stands alone in our literature (but compare S. Levy, p. 47; F. R. Tennant, p. 232), and that only in the A recension of the book. One's own guilt and sin is still regarded as the result of one's own action: "Of those that were born from him (i.e. Adam) each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come, and again each of them has chosen for himself glories to come. . . . Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul" (2 Bar. liv. 15, 19). The power, also, of example for good or evil is recognised, the fact that bad example has been mostly followed being especially noted: "He that lighted (i.e. Moses) has taken from the light (i.e. the Law), and there are but few that have imitated him. But those many whom he has lighted have taken from the darkness of Adam, and have not rejoiced in the light of the lamp" (2 Bar. xviii. 1 f.). Besides, actual cases of sinless-

ness (cf. p. 190) are admitted to have been, and are expected to be (cf. in Rabbinical literature, F. R. Tennant, p. 175). So, e.g., Jeremiah is referred to as one "whose heart was found pure from sins" (2 Bar. ix. 1); repentance has not been appointed "unto the righteous, unto Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob, who have not sinned against Thee" (P. Man., 8 f.; Zad. iv. 2-3); and the human Messiah will be "pure from sin" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 41). There does not, then, seem to be much, *if any*, idea of an inherent incapacity for righteousness on man's part resulting from the fall of Adam. 1 En. xcvi. 4 is fairly representative of our literature as a whole: "Sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man of himself has created it, and under a curse shall they fall who commit it."

3. There remains the doctrine of the *Yetzer* in our literature. The term *Yetzer* is exceedingly difficult to translate. M. Lazarus says that it refers to "'the instinct,' that is, the instincts collectively" (Part II, p. 106). Perhaps "impulse" or "inclination" represents as near as possible what was meant; the reference is to something "formed" in man from the beginning,—an inability to remain for long morally neutral, and therefore due to the action of the Divine Potter who mixed the clay of human nature. "God created man from the beginning and placed him in the hand of his *Yetzer*" (Sir. xv. 14). "There is no inclination or thought which the Lord does not know, for He created every man after His own image" (T.N. ii. 5),—a statement which winds up a paragraph in which God is represented as the Potter making each vessel to His liking. In 4 Ez., if the *Yetzer* be what is intended, it is not said to be "the evil heart" which God put into Adam, but "the evil heart" with which Adam could clothe himself, and with which in sinning he did clothe himself,—“for the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart (*cor malignum*), transgressed and was overcome" (iii. 21). This is description highly coloured by experience after the event, and is not, therefore, to be taken too literally as setting forth the view generally held. Again, it is "a grain of evil seed (*granum seminis mali*) . . . sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning" (iv. 30). The simile of seed is very suggestive here. In so far as it suggests an evil that was destined to grow, it also is too strong. What is intended is just something which lies dormant, a possibility till something else happens.

The something else really necessary to make the *Yetzer* an experience for evil is the will of man. Then is it that it emerges, and is known, as having become so often an evil "impulse" or "inclination" in man. A distinction must be drawn between the *Yetzer* as a possible human experience, and the *Yetzer* as an actual human experience. It seems to have been thought to have no potency for good or ill, till choice had taken place. What is in

view is an aspect of the subconscious life,—cf. 2 En. xxx. 16, quoted above, p. 198. The *Yetzer* was regarded as that which gives the experience of being urged on to choice or action of some sort,—that in man which God has implanted to secure that man does not remain morally inactive. So it is really a beneficent element in human nature; itself neutral, but not letting man be for long a neutral (cf. S. Levy, p. 11). S. Schechter says: “The *Evil Yetzer* has . . . little in common with the evil principle of theology, but is reduced to certain passions without which neither the propagation of species nor the building up of the proper civilisation would be thinkable. They only become evil by the improper use man makes of them” (II, p. 267; cf. J.E., vol. xii. p. 601). One would prefer to put it that it is the character of man’s choice which makes the *Yetzer* emerge in experience as either *yetzer hara*, i.e. the evil yetzer, or *yetzer hatob*, i.e. the good yetzer (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, V, p. 124).

This seems to be the suggestion of the close association in T.A. i. of the two *ways* and the two *yetzers*: “Two ways has God given to the sons of men, and two inclinations, and two kinds of actions, and two modes (of action), and two issues. Therefore all things are by twos, one over against the other. For there are two ways of good and evil, and with these are the two inclinations in our breasts discriminating them (or, ‘and these the two inclinations in our breasts discriminate’)” (vers. 2–5). The ambiguity of the last sentence on the two inclinations is removed, if in the next verse “way” is supplied after “good,” and not “inclination,” as R. H. Charles does: “Therefore if the soul take pleasure in the good (way), all its actions are in righteousness” (ver. 6). The emphasis in the previous verses has been on “two ways,” and so presumably in this verse. Because of his supplying “inclination” here, R. H. Charles in ver. 8 had to depart from the text and read: “But if it (i.e. the soul) incline to the evil inclination.” One is now free, however, to follow the text supplying “way” again, or without supplying it to take “evil” with that reference: “But if the inclination (i.e. followed by the soul) incline to evil (way), all its actions are in wickedness.” This accords with the statement made immediately about the inclination, when a man is pursuing what is unworthy: “the treasure of the inclination is filled with an evil spirit” (ver. 9). That same treasure of the inclination could have quite another kind of inspiring spirit (cf. below, p. 254). Hence, the idea that the *Yetzer* is something to be possessed or controlled: compare, e.g. the Syriac of Sir. xvii. 31, “man, who . . . does not control his *Yetzer*,” with Sir. xxi. 11, “He that keeps the Law controls his *Yetzer*.” According as the *Yetzer* is thus uncontrolled or controlled is it “evil” or “good.” Hence, too, the sustentation of the

emphasis on man's responsibility: "Say not, From God is my transgression, for that which He hates He did not make" (Sir. xv. 11). That the character of the *Yetzer* rested with man is implied by such passages as, "In various ways He comforts, (though) for a little space He departs to try the inclination (*Yetzer*) of the soul" (T.Jos. ii. 6); "the Lord rewarded me according to the imagination (*Yetzer*) of my heart" (T.Jud. xiii. 8; cf. xviii. 3).

It should be added, however, that it was through the *Yetzer* that spiritual influences, good and bad, were thought to get to work on the mind of men. "The inclination (*Yetzer*) of the good man is not in the power of the deceit of the spirit of Beliar, for the angel of peace guides his soul" (T.B. vi. 1); "the good inclination does not receive glory nor dishonour from men, . . . for the Lord dwells in him and lights up his soul" (ver. 4); "the purpose of his soul admits no evil desire. . . . For if fornication does not overcome your mind, neither can Beliar overcome you" (T.R. iv. 9, 11). "The spirits of deceit" (see above, pp. 196 f.) operated through the *Yetzer*; the *Yetzer* of the good man was closed against them, or rather was so tenanted by the spirit of truth that these could not find admission. "Blessed is the man who does not defile the holy spirit of God which has been put and breathed into him" (Test., Naph. x. 9). The opposite outcome is mostly contemplated, and is regarded as more general by 4 Ez.; this author thinks that it is in the *Yetzer* that the results of sin have so accumulated that there is now an all but irresistible bias to wrong-doing in human nature. The first Adam transgressed, "and was overcome, and likewise also all who were born of him. Thus the infirmity became inveterate" (iii. 21 f.); "in all things doing even as Adam and all his generations had done" (ver. 26); "the evil heart has grown up in us which has estranged us from God, . . . and that not a few only, but wellnigh all that have been created" (vii. 48); the few exceptions are they "that have striven much and painfully to overcome the innate evil thought" (ver. 92), for whom in Paradise "the (evil) root is sealed up" (viii. 53); "O Adam, what have you done! For though it was you that sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants" (ver. 118); "and how much fruit of ungodliness has it produced, . . . and shall yet produce . . ." (iv. 30). The *Yetzer* doctrine reveals that these people were not without knowledge "that the outward violation of the law depended upon an inward tendency" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 521).

To summarise conclusions; A devout and attentive reader of our literature would be encouraged to think of himself in the common-sense way as body and soul. Spirit, heart, and mind represent aspects of the latter. The body is the instrument of

the soul, and as such, on occasions, reveals its natural frailty, but is not of itself a source whence the soul is corrupted. The soul is that God-given personality, which once it has been given, lives through all changes of this life, and survives the experience of death. He would be led to regard himself as belonging to the governing species of the earth,—so far a ruler like God, and, above all, under obligation to be God-like in the use which he made of His superior position. He would be made to feel that he should have a clearly conceived conception of his duty, and should assume in every situation his own moral freedom. It was his part to let the supremacy of his higher self be seen in a fine self-control, which at least would help him not to be carried away in action, or determined in disposition, by the senses uncontrolled. The legend of the Watchers, and the ideas and phraseology which resulted therefrom, would help to remind him of an actual or possible source of pollution to human personality. The Adam and Eve legends would, at least, afford him some explanation of physical death, or, if on other grounds he had come to think of death as a natural incident, he would be likely to gather therefrom that sin had brought a second or spiritual death to be experienced hereafter, the antithesis of the God-intended blessed immortality. For the rest, he might well up to this point assume that he himself had not been seriously incapacitated for the attainment of righteousness by anything which may have happened in the past. The *Yetzer* doctrine would probably lead him to more thorough introspection. The very foundation of his being was such that he could not remain a moral neutral. His will might determine that the basal "impulse" or "inclination" might enter him as a power for evil, or a power for good. By way of the basis of his personality the powers of darkness might make their approach to him,—so also the spirit of light. He might reasonably hope with care to let the spirit of truth so indwell his *Yetzer* that the spirits of deceit would be kept out altogether. Yet, again, he might feel warned that the effects of sin would be registered in that *Yetzer* so as to give a distinct bias to sin. From what he saw around him, too, he might be led to suppose that such were the accumulated effects of past sin in the *Yetzer* that only with a desperate effort on his part, or by a power not his own, or by co-operation with such a power, could he hope to be one of the few who would rise above the strong bias toward sin to a life of real righteousness.

B—JESUS AND THIS TEACHING

I. MAN AS BODY AND SPIRIT.

1. JESUS is at one with our apocalyptists in thinking of man as body and soul. Those who are able to "kill the body," he believes have no power to "kill the soul" (Matt. x. 28 || Luke xii. 4). This simple division is constantly met with in his teaching,—he is interested in no other; this emphasis, too,—that what may terminate life in the present body by no means brings life for man to a close. While, therefore, the soul (*ψυχή*) is sometimes regarded in the widest sense as "the vital force of the external life which animates the body, and distinguishes man and other animals from lifeless nature," so far "as the idea of continued existence after death was thought of, the *soul* appears to have been regarded as the seat of the Ego, which is not subject to the conditions of earthly life, and which eventually becomes the subject of the higher heavenly life" (H. H. Wendt, vol. i. pp. 156 f.).

2. "Spirit" and "heart" are used to represent some aspect of the self of man, and in not a few instances "soul" might be substituted as a freer and yet, for us, more accurate and forceful rendering of the original. So the use of "spirit" in "poor" (i.e. dependent on God) in spirit" (Matt. v. 3; but cf. E., July 1916, p. 78); "spirit eager" (Mark xiv. 38 || Matt. xxvi. 41); also "the genuine worshippers will worship the Father in (or 'with') spirit, that is (*καί*), genuinely" (John iv. 23). Similarly, the use of "heart" in reference to *either* qualities of the soul, "the clean in heart" (Matt. v. 8), "gentle and humble in heart" (Matt. xi. 29), "out of the generous storehouse of the heart . . . out of the heart's overflow" (Luke vi. 45; cf. Matt. xii. 34), "with a heart good and generous" (Luke viii. 15); *or* faults of the soul, "has committed adultery . . . in his heart" (Matt. v. 28), "thinking over mean things in your hearts" (Matt. ix. 4), "comes out of the heart . . . out of the heart come mean thoughts" (Matt. xv. 18 || Mark vii. 21), "your heart petrified" (Mark viii. 17), "hesitate in his heart" (Mark xi. 23), "your hearts . . . burdened with indulgence" (Luke xxi. 34), "slow in heart to trust" (Luke xxiv. 25); *or* any other variety of the experiences of the soul, "there will be also your heart" (Matt. vi. 21 || Luke xii. 34),

“sown in his heart” (Matt. xiii. 19), “forgive . . . from your hearts” (Matt. xviii. 35), “says in his heart” (Matt. xxiv. 48 || Luke xii. 45), “does not go into his heart” (Mark vii. 19), “debate in your hearts” (Luke v. 22; cf. xxiv. 38), “God recognises your hearts” (Luke xvi. 15), “fix in your hearts” (Luke xxi. 14), “Don’t let your heart be disturbed” (John xiv. 1; cf. ver. 27), “pain has filled your heart” (John xvi. 6), “your heart will rejoice” (John xvi. 22). Compare, where “soul” is actually used: “you will find rest for your souls” (Matt. xi. 29), “Deeply pained is my soul even to the point of death” (Mark xiv. 34 || Matt. xxvi. 38). “Spirit” and “heart,” then, represent aspects of the self-same soul (cf. H. W. Robinson, p. 78, note 1; J.E., vol. vi. p. 296). H. H. Wendt says, that, when “heart” is used the soul’s inwardness is in view, when “spirit,” its divine origin, and on Mark xii. 30 (|| Matt. xxii. 37, Luke x. 27; cf. Deut. vi. 5), “And you should love the Name (see above, p. 58) your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength,” remarks that “heart and soul do not denote two distinct spiritual faculties. But only in order to bring out as strongly as possible the completeness with which all departments of man’s inner life must be brought under the sway of the love of God, the inner nature is pleonastically denoted by different expressions. Under the first of these the *inwardness* of the spiritual life is emphasised, by the second its *individuality*, by the third (i.e. *διανοία*) its faculty of *intelligent thought*, and by the last (*ἰσχύς*) its *strength and intensity*” (vol. i. p. 159; cf. S. R. Driver, pp. 91 f.).

3. There is agreement, also, with our writers in the wonderfully sane view which is taken of the body (cf. J. Seeley, p. 116; J.E., vol. iii. p. 283). It is morally and spiritually neutral: “what is born of the flesh is flesh” (John iii. 6), “flesh does not help at all” (John vi. 63). None of the higher impulses or inspirations can be traced thereto: thus, in a figure, suitably, “flesh and blood has not revealed to you” (Matt. xvi. 17). The worst to be said of it is, that it is not always equal to the demands of the occasion: “flesh weak” (Mark xiv. 38 || Matt. xxvi. 41). True, “all your body” may be “bright” or “gloomy” (Matt. vi. 22 f. || Luke xi. 34); but, remembering the metaphorical use of “the eye” in this saying,—namely, as “the lamp of the body,” really the soul,—obviously the difference between brightness and dullness is not here to be ascribed to any condition of the body. Moreover, the body is to be altogether subordinated to the purposes of the soul. All other things being equal, one may rightly make it the full instrument of ordinary human fellowship which makes possible, for example, the family circle: “Have you not read . . . the two should be one flesh? So that no longer are they two, but

one flesh" (Matt. xix. 4 ff. || Mark x. 6 ff.). Higher interests in some cases may, indeed, impose severe limitations, but then the virtue is not in the limitation itself,—as if life without that limitation were in all circumstances less worthy,—but in the motive prompting one to sacrifice some region of experience open to one through the body: "there are eunuchs such as have eunuchised themselves because of the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. xix. 12),—a transcript of his own choice. In that eventuality men to his mind "are no more holier than men who have sacrificed other individual desires and goods for the common weal" (S. Mathews, I, p. 93). "There is no suggestion that celibacy is a higher estate than marriage" (E. G. Selwyn, p. 108); and, moreover, it should be remembered, that even "the Rabbis tolerated some exceptional cases of celibacy" (J. Abelson, II, p. 30; cf. A. Büchler, p. 72). It may even be one's duty to surrender life in this body; hence his words in explanation of the symbolism of the broken bread, "This is my body" (Mark xiv. 22 || Matt. xxvi. 26, Luke xxii. 19).

Limitation or surrender of the ordinary functions of the body, however, is never put forward with the suggestion that the bodily activities thus limited or sacrificed are so dealt with, because they are in themselves evil. If there is any suggestion at all here to the point it is: the pity of it that any limitation or surrender of what was in itself at least innocent enough should ever have become necessary! (cf. F. G. Peabody, I, p. 175). Legitimate concern on his part for the body comes out sometimes very incidentally: "they haven't anything to eat; and if I dismiss them unfed to their home, they will drop on the road; and some of them are from a distance" (Mark viii. 2 f.; cf. Mark vi. 37 || Matt. xiv. 16, Luke ix. 13, John vi. 5). The ever-present hungry moved him deeply: "at all times the poor you have with you" (Mark xiv. 6 || Matt. xxvi. 11); "give to the poor" (Mark x. 21 || Matt. xix. 21, Luke xviii. 22); "when you hold a party, invite poor, maimed, lame, blind" (Luke xiv. 13). The pain and poverty of the beggar tribe he felt should not be: Lazarus, "ulcerated and eager to have his fill from the refuse from the rich man's table" (Luke xvi. 20 f.), was to his mind a travesty of the God-intended condition of the body. The destitute widows had so much of his sympathy that he openly attacked "the eaters-up of the houses of widows" (Mark xii. 40 || Matt. xxiii. 14, Luke xx. 47). The benefaction of "a cup of water" (Mark ix. 41 || Matt. x. 42), was fully appreciated by him. Besides, he had no use for mere asceticism (cf. T. C. Hall, pp. 63 f.); he tells his critics plainly that his disciples under the circumstances "cannot fast" (Mark ii. 19 || Matt. ix. 15, Luke v. 34).

4. The soul, as the self, is hardly ever out of his mind; it is indeed all the while his chief concern. In a whole series of sayings

it is very difficult to tell whether the correct translation of the original should be "life" or "soul." It is safe to say that, even where "life" must be retained as the more fitting rendering, the idea of the "soul" is yet underlying and determining very largely the content of his utterances. The life in man God values more than the life in "the birds of the heaven,"—"Do you not very much surpass them (i.e. in value)?" (Matt. vi. 26 || Luke xii. 24). So the exhortation: "Don't be harassed about your life (? soul), what you eat, or what you drink; nor about your body, what you put on. Is not the life (? soul) more than the nourishment, and the person (lit. : 'body'; cf. A. Deissmann, I, p. 160) than the dress?" (Matt. vi. 25 || Luke xii. 22 f.). The context both in Matthew and Luke has the life beyond in view,—compare, "stores in heaven" (Matt. vi. 20), "lavishing wealth on God" (Luke xii. 21),—hence man's chief anxiety is not to be concerning living on here (cf. E., May 1911, p. 433). It is suggested, too, that the soul is not dependent on food or drink for the continuance of its existence. Only when this idea is accepted, can the reasonableness of the closing sentences of the paragraph, as in Matthew, be appreciated: "Do not then be harassed over to-morrow, for to-morrow will be harassed over (i.e. will look enough after) its own sufficiency (N.B., placing the stop after ἀρκερόν, and following the suggestion of "What is given to me will be sufficient for me," Psa. Sol. xvi. 12; cf. v. 18, 20; "Happy is he whom God remembers in (granting to him) a due sufficiency. . . . Sufficient are moderate means with righteousness,"—there being here in the words of Jesus other points of contact with the latter psalm, see below, pp. 278 f.). "To the day (be) its trouble!" (Matt. vi. 34; cf. E., Dec. 1919, pp. 469-472, April 1920, p. 289 ff.; also in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 15). Again, "Whoever wants to save his life (? soul) will lose it. . . . What does it help a man to gain the whole world, and inflict loss on his soul?" (Mark viii. 35 f. || Matt. xvi. 25 f., Luke ix. 24 f.).

Such a man may well feel that when death comes, he is being penalised; he meets death not in surrender of his soul to God at the close of this stage of life, but as one from whom his soul was demanded to be given up: "'Soul, you have many goods in store for many years; rest, eat, drink, be jolly.' But God said to him, 'Ignoramus! on this very night your soul is being asked back from you (cf. Wisd. xv. 8, 16, quoted above, pp. 185 f.); and what you have got ready, whose will it be?'" (Luke xii. 19 f.). Conversely, "Whoever loses his life (? soul) on account of me and the good news will save it" (Mark viii. 35 || Matt. xvi. 25, Luke ix. 24). This is the man who gives his "soul" to and for a great cause,—"his life (? soul) a ransom for many" (Mark x. 45 || Matt. xx. 28). The supreme example of this is Jesus himself in his

experience of facing death as he did : " I put down my life (? soul), that again I may get it. No one takes it from me, but I put it down of myself. Privilege I have to put it down, and privilege I have again to get it. This direction I got from my Father" (John x. 17 f.). Jesus in facing death cannot be understood, unless it be borne in mind that, as he gave his soul unto death, he felt in the experience of the surrender that it was a surrender here to live hereafter. Right strenuously, too, did he try to show his followers this other side of their own coming martyr surrender. To lay down the soul was for him the antithesis of forfeiting it ; for the righteous soul, even in the experience of martyrdom, there was and there could be nothing penal in death.

II. MAN AS A MORAL BEING.

I. The idea of the image of God in man is the basis of those sayings of Jesus which imply the unique value of man to God. " Many sparrows do you surpass (i.e. in value) " (Matt. x. 31 || Luke xii. 7), taken alone and in its own context, could be interpreted as signifying the worth of the faithful disciple to God, especially when his faithfulness brings him in martyrdom to the ground like a sparrow falling ; but the expression cannot be confined to so limited an application, when other passages are read with it. " What do you think ? if any man has a hundred sheep, and there wanders *one* of them, will he not leave the ninety-nine on the mountains, and, having taken his departure, does he not search for the wandered ? " (Matt. xviii. 12 || Luke xv. 4), puts a similar value on the wayward, since he is a man. So if the stiffness of an institution like the Sabbath has to yield to the need of a distressed animal, much more should it for the relief of an afflicted man. " What man will there be of you, who will have one (or ' a ') sheep, and if this falls on the Sabbath into a hole, will he not lay hold of it and lift it out ? How much, then, does a man surpass (i.e. in value) a sheep ! " (Matt. xii. 11 f. ; cf. Luke vi. 9). The very institution in question had specially in view those needs of man arising out of his distinctiveness : " The Sabbath because of man came into existence " (Mark ii. 27).

Moreover, he refuses to write down certain people as insignificant, and of lesser worth to God than others ; to his mind so-called insignificance may belong to the exterior or outward appearance of human life, but has no meaning when the interior fact of the make-up of man's life in likeness to God's is considered. " Look here ! do not scorn one of these little ones . . . there is no purpose before your Father in heaven (such as) that one of these little ones be lost " (Matt. xviii. 10, 14). The supreme value of child-life lies in the consideration, that such life is the priceless raw material

for the divine fellowship: "Let the boys come to me; don't stop them; for of such is the Kingdom of God" (Mark x. 14 || Matt. xix. 14, Luke xviii. 16). Besides, there is no trace in him of that frame of mind which would thank God for not being a woman, if that carries with it any suggestion that woman were of less value than man (cf. the Jewish Prayer Book, S. Singer, p. 6; C. G. Montefiore, V, p. 29); or would go out of its way to make her out to be a creature that man must ever be on his guard against, the fountain of all iniquity to him: "There are forgiven—her many sins" (Luke vii. 47), "Neither do I condemn you; go and do not hereafter sin (see below, p. 276)" (John viii. 11), "Mary the generous part has chosen, such as will not be taken from her" (Luke x. 42), "A lovely deed has she done to me" (Mark xiv. 6), reveal his habitual attitude of respect toward woman, and his high estimate of her capability (cf. T. R. Glover, I, p. 301 f.; L. Dougall, pp. 133 f.). For him, too, a person's profession or sin in no way cancels this basal value; his whole soul leaps for joy in saying that the despised Zacchæus "even is Abraham's son" (Luke xix. 9), and in promising the guilty-minded thief a place with him "in paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43). It was his distinction, also, to define this value clearly as capacity for divine sonship (cf. H. W. Robinson, pp. 80 f.); hence, to "become sons of your Father in heaven" (Matt. v. 45), is his characteristic epitome of man's obligation (Ib., p. 83 f.). Prodigality of whatever degree it might be, he thought, could never annul either the capacity or the obligation: "Father . . . no longer am I worthy to be acknowledged your son" (Luke xv. 21), is met by, "This my son was dead, and has come to life again, he was lost and has been found" (ver. 23).

2. This sharpening of the idea of the image, till it is focussed distinctly as sonship, is felt throughout his teaching. The awakened conscience he hails with delight: "God have mercy on me a sinner" (Luke xviii. 13; compare, "Thou hast appointed repentance unto me a sinner," P. Man, ver. 8), says the tax-gatherer; "This went down acquitted to his home rather than that" (ver. 14), comments Jesus. What he means by a fully wakened conscience he gives in the immortal picture of the filial-self of the prodigal gradually re-asserting itself after much unfilial conduct: "But having recovered himself, he said, How many hirelings of my father's have abundance of bread. . . . I will get up and travel back to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and before you. No longer am I worthy to be acknowledged your son; make me as one of your hirelings. And he got up and came to his father" (Luke xv. 17-20). That this experience was sometimes called forth by adversity, he admitted; what he would not admit, however, was that the same emergence

of higher obligation might not be, though perhaps more difficult, when there was no such adversity to call it forth: "In the sight of men an impossibility! but not in the sight of God; for all things are possible in the sight of God" (Mark x. 27 || Matt. xix. 26, Luke xviii. 27). With the image conceived as sonship obligation should lose all vagueness that, from whatever cause, it may have had. Where there is absent this sense of obligation something is seriously the matter; they are not "healthy,"—they are "ill," (Matt. ix. 12 || Luke v. 31). Health or sickness, too, is the outcome of previous conduct: hence, the paradox, "He who has,—there will be given him: and he who has not,—even what he has will be taken from him" (Mark iv. 25; cf. below, p. 301), is often the subject in mind in the parables (cf. Luke xix. 26, Matt. xxv. 29). He is always pressing home the obligation of each to be a strong son of God, and the blameworthiness of so many for not turning out such.

3. Hence the earnestness with which he appeals to men to take themselves seriously in hand. "No aspect of the teaching of Jesus is more significant than this appeal to the will" (F. G. Peabody, I, p. 99). For him the shadow even of determinism never falls across the path of man's freedom. The very use of "make" (*ποιήσατε*) in, "Either make the tree sound and its fruit sound; or make the tree rotten and its fruit rotten" (Matt. xii. 33), implies that there is no ultra-human necessity determining that in one case the tree must be a good one, and in the other a bad one. "How can you speak generous things,—being mean?" (ver. 34), does not imply any necessity to be as these people were, nor does the terrible mode of address, "Offspring of vipers!" borrowed from John the Baptist. "The generous man" and "the mean man" (Matt. xii. 35 || Luke vi. 45) do not represent types arbitrarily made up, but distinctions between men which have come about according as the will has been given a good or a bad direction. Humanity, in his thought of it, is just the very place where the good seed of the word of God should be able to grow: "Of its own accord the earth bears fruit" (Mark iv. 28). Whether or not it does grow depends on whether one lets "affliction or persecution . . . the harassments of life (lit. : 'the age'), and the pleasure (*ἀπάτη*; cf. A. Souter, p. 29) of wealth, and the cravings for the rest (i.e. for more)" (Mark iv. 17, 19 || Matt. xiii. 21 f., Luke viii. 13 f.), do what they are capable of doing in the way of hindering the growth of the good. So with the type from whose soul "Satan . . . lifts away the word which lies sown on them" (Mark iv. 15 || Matt. xiii. 19, Luke viii. 12): what he portrays is not what has to be, but just what is; compare, also, the parables of the wheat and the tares (Matt. xiii. 24–30), the sound and the rotten fish (vers. 47–50), and the sensible and the

silly maidens (Matt. xxv. 1-13). These descriptive parables should be read alongside the many words of his, in which he deprecates any slackness on man's part and encourages energetic decision; for example, "Struggle to go in" (Luke xiii. 24 || Matt. vii. 13), "chop it off" (Matt. v. 30; cf. xviii. 8), "he who is not with . . . is against" (Matt. xii. 30 || Luke xi. 23). He is not at all alarmed, if this energy of will for good things develops so as to present a violent aspect (Matt. xi. 12 || Luke xvi. 16). There is real personal responsibility for one's own dullness, or shallowness, or worldliness. Where there has been a drifting into sin, it has come by relaxing effort (cf. T. R. Glover, I, p. 136), from not exercising will energetically for the good which has been made known. "And you didn't want" (Matt. xxiii. 37 || Luke xiii. 34), gives not only the case of the Jerusalemites, but of all such everywhere. With him also the lost may always be found, and the finding is the evoking of repentance in them (see, e.g., Luke xv. 3-7, where "till he find it" corresponds to "one sinner repenting").

4. Here passages in the Fourth Gospel are of special value, in comparison with the not unexalted teaching of 4 Macc., in revealing at least the fine idea of man which was mediated through the essentially human experience of Jesus. There he describes himself as "a man who the truth has talked to you, which I heard from God" (viii. 40). It is through the process of experience he has been taught: "Of myself I am doing nothing, but according as the Father taught me,—this I keep speaking" (viii. 28); and by the same experience of obedience others may come to view life as he does: "The deeds which I keep doing in the name of my Father, these are evidence concerning me" (x. 25); "If anyone wants to do his will, he will come to know about my teaching, whether it issues from God, or whether I from myself am speaking" (vii. 17). "What he looks on the Father doing" (v. 19), is for him determinative of all things. The reality of freedom he feels consists in his own liberty of mind in doing the Father's will: "I am not seeking my will, but the will of Him who sent me" (v. 30; vi. 38). There is no ungoverned impulse, and the governing element is always the same: "Not of myself am I here now" (vii. 28; cf. viii. 42), "I am here now in the name of my Father" (v. 43), "I know Him, and His word I keep" (viii. 55), "What pleases Him I am doing at all times" (viii. 29). This amounts to a marvellous capacity for love: to keep the "Father's commandments" is to "remain in His love" (xv. 10); "his commandment is eternal life" (xii. 50); it is "to have life in himself" (v. 26). In him, then, is revealed the ability of human nature to be sinless: "Who of you will show me guilty of sin?" (viii. 46), is an incidental revelation of his awareness of unbroken fellowship with the will of love in God, his child-like obedience to the fully appreciated

love of God which was signified by God's Fatherhood, as that Fatherhood had come to be conceived by him.

"The subject of all these declarations is not the pre-existent Logos or eternal Son, but the man Jesus as he sojourned among men . . . if people continue to protest excitedly that a man would not say such things of himself . . . the offence springs solely from the confusion of the ordinary concept man as known in experience, with the Biblical idea of man which posits the image of God as the ideal of humanity, and therefore exhibits the true God-man in the man who is the real ideal; and who realises the idea in perfect communication with God" (W. Beyschlag, pp. 245, 249). While also, very naturally, he was conscious of his own leadership here, yet the following he required was nothing short of entrance into his own experience: "If my commandments (which are of course the Father's) you keep, you will continue in my love" (xv. 10), that is, they would be given the experience of "eternal life" such as he had,—to "recognise . . . the only genuine God" (xvii. 3). His own experience gave him a very exalted conception of the capacity of human nature for the higher life. In his own soul there was revealed in full the true human relation to God. Out of this came his conviction of the ability of human nature to express most fully the divine on earth. His daring appeals to classes so often neglected as being beyond hope, and his expectation of large results therefrom, arose out of his conviction that his own experience of being "born from above" (iii. 3) was the opportunity of all.

III. MAN'S EARLY HISTORY.

1. There are no very distinct traces in his teaching of the Watchers. This is in accordance with the tendency for these to recede, which has been already noticed. That he should be entirely silent on stories which gave so much space to suggesting that woman had played a vile part in human life is what might have been expected from what has been seen to be his real thought of woman (cf. A. Dougall, pp. 66-70). That he still gave some countenance,—exactly how much can hardly be said,—to popular ideas of possession by evil spirits, does not alter the impression of the relative unimportance of such conceptions in his teaching. Besides, effects on vocabulary often remain, when the legends to which they are owing have been forgotten or nearly so, and the theories which they may have at one time carried with them have been abandoned. In such connection, besides Luke x. 18 (quoted above, with 1 En. lxxxvi. 1, p. 72), the following should probably be considered: "By the ruler of the evil spirits he throws out the evil spirits. And he . . .

said, How can Satan Satan throw out? " (Mark iii. 22 f. || Matt. xii. 24, 26),—compare, " And the chief of the spirits (i.e. demons) Mastema, came and said, Lord, Creator, let some of them remain . . . to execute the power of my will on the sons of men . . . for corruption and leading astray before my judgment " (Jub. x. 8); " And not one of them perished, but the son of perdition, that the passage of Scripture be illustrated " (John xvii. 12),—compare, " And hast not caused me to perish as Thou didst the sons of perdition " (Jub. x. 3), which is part of Noah's prayer against " the demons which were leading astray and blinding and slaying his son's sons " (ver. 2); " And the birds came and devoured it " (Mark iv. 4 || Matt. xiii. 4, Luke viii. 5), also " immediately there comes Satan, and lifts away the word which lies sown on them " (Mark iv. 15 || Matt. xiii. 19, Luke viii. 12),—compare, " And the prince Mastema sent ravens and birds to devour the seed which was sown in the land " (Jub. xi. 11); " Look! I have (perhaps ' I am,' i.e. God, ' has,' see below, pp. 286 f.), given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and on all the power of the enemy . . . the spirits are submitting to you " (Luke x. 19 f.),—compare, " Then shall all the spirits of deceit be given to be trodden under foot, and men shall rule over wicked spirits " (T.S. vi. 6), also, " And he shall give power to His children to tread upon the evil spirits " (T.L. xviii. 12); " more bearable for . . . Sodom " (Matt. x. 15 || Luke x. 12; cf. Matt. xi. 24),—compare, " Sodom . . . changed the order of nature. In like manner also the Watchers also changed the order of their nature " (T.N. iii. 4 f.). These relics notwithstanding, there is no trace in his teaching that human nature has been supernaturally polluted. It has been well said, that " in the New Testament the demons are already beginning to recede from the first line of interest. . . . The Gospel did not in so many words deny their existence, but first degraded them and broke their hold, and at last annihilated them. . . . Jesus is allied with the powers of the mind, and his gospel naturally militates against ' imaginations and every high thing that thrusts itself up,' as Paul said " (T. R. Glover, II, pp. 6-9).

2. There are also in his recorded words some echoes of the Fall stories. He quotes from the Genesis version (Mark x. 7 || Matt. xix. 5; cf. Gen. ii. 24). The very mention of " paradise " (Luke xxiii. 43) would be sufficient to suggest to the popular mind what had been lost. Satan figures as the tempter of the soul: " Be off, Satan " (Matt. iv. 10). " Be off behind me, Satan " (Matt. xvi. 23); " Simon, Simon, look! Satan has procured you (fellows) to sift you like corn " (Luke xxii. 31). But here again the old literal meaning is observed to be receding and giving place to the figurative. The proverbial deceit of the devil is alluded to: " You

are of the father, (I mean) the devil. . . . He . . . in the truth does not stand, for there isn't truth in him. When he talks lies, from his own (nature) he talks; for liar he is, and the father of him (who is a liar)" (John viii. 44 f.). Compare, "This spirit goes away with lying at the right hand of Satan, that with cruelty and lying his works may be wrought" (T.D. iii. 6). A hint at the responsibility of the devil for the human experience of death in some sense is given in: "The devil . . . was a murderer from the beginning" (John viii. 44). Compare, "By the envy of the devil death entered into the world" (Wisd. ii. 24). Apart from the Johannine references, he is silent on the entrance of sin into the world, and he has not a word to say on the effect of the first sin on the race. Here, at any rate, Paulinism has not been allowed to modify his sayings. In accordance with this silence, and though among other sins he is set against drunkenness and impurity (c.f. e.g. Luke xxi. 34, Matt. v. 32), the remarkable absence of any reference to "wine and women" as sin *par excellence* should be noted. There is, of course, abundant evidence of his recognition of evil in man, but "there is nothing . . . in our Lord's recorded dealings with sinners, whether by word or deed, which necessarily implies that the individual's sinfulness is due to anything but his own acts and the habits thereby established, or to his voluntary reception of the influences of sinful society around him" (F. R. Tennant, pp. 248 f.).

When he speaks of "the righteous" in contrast with "sinners" (Mark ii. 17 || Matt. ix. 13, Luke v. 32), he is using terms as his critics and other Jews of his day used them (see note on *ἀμαρτωλός*, W. C. Allen, II, pp. 205 f.), and is not to be taken as granting the existence of a class from his point of view "righteous" (cf. E., July 1913, p. 60).—a supposition the parable of the Pharisee and Publican (Luke xviii. 9-14) is sufficient to contradict. Rather, he suggests that his opponents, who "rely on themselves that they are righteous, and are despising other folk," class themselves with the "righteous" patriarchs (compare P. Man., ver. 8, quoted above, p. 203). That he was often the critic of those whom, not without a little sarcasm, he styled the "righteous" is well attested; some of them he most certainly regarded as "hypocrites" and comparable to "tombs whitewashed" (Matt. xxiii. 27; cf. Luke xi. 44). On the other hand, he admits that his work lay definitely among such as are commonly dubbed "sinners," and does not deny the legitimacy of this description as his parabolic figures, the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the prodigal son (Luke xv.) witness. But yet men, the so-called righteous and sinners alike, though "being mean" (Matt. vii. 11 || Luke xi. 13, and see next section below), are never by him thought to be hindered by some insuperable inability not due to themselves from being "clean in heart"

(Matt. v. 8). In making nothing of inherited depravity resulting from Adam's sin he takes his stand with the large majority, if perhaps not quite all, of our writers rather than with Paul.

3. There is also some evidence that at times he had in mind the *Yetzer*, and the distinction between the evil *Yetzer* and the good *Yetzer*. Some of his contrasts would almost certainly be understood to have a reference, direct or indirect, to these: "the road which leads right on to Destruction" and "the road which leads right on to Life" (Matt. vii. 13 f.), for example, as also: "Still a little time the light in you continues. Walk as you have the light, that darkness may not overtake you" (John xii. 35). Compare the association of the two inclinations with the two ways as "the light and the darkness" in 2 En. xxx. 15, quoted above, p. 198. Dr. Taylor has suggested that *διαλογισμὸς πονηρός*, "evil thought" (Matt. xv. 19 || Mark vii. 21), is probably one of the N.T. equivalents of *Yetzer hara*, the evil inclination (see F. R. Tennant, p. 169, note). "Treasure" or "store-house" in the saying, "The good (or 'generous') man from his good (or 'generous') treasure brings out good (or 'generous') things: and the evil (or 'mean') man from his evil (or 'mean') treasure brings out evil (or 'mean') things" (Mark xii. 35 || Luke vi. 45), should be understood as "the treasure of the inclination" and read in the light of: "If the soul take pleasure in the good (inclination), all its actions are in righteousness. . . . But if it incline to the evil inclination, all its actions are in wickedness. . . . seeing that the treasure of the inclination is filled with an evil spirit" (T.A. i. 6, 8 f.). "House" in Matt. xii. 44 should be taken in the same sense, "the dirty spirit" being then the "evil spirit" which inhabits "the treasure of the inclination" when the inclination is evil. The return of the evil inclination much intensified is then portrayed thus: "Then it (i.e. the dirty spirit) goes and takes with itself seven different (types of dirty) spirits more evil (or 'mean') than himself, and they having gone in dwell there; and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first" (Matt. xii. 45 || Luke xi. 26; cf. Mark xvi. 9). Compare, "And the devil shall make (*ὀικειοῦνται*, or 'dwell in') him as his own peculiar instrument (*σκεῦος*, or 'vessel')" (T.N. viii. 6), also "what things I saw concerning the seven spirits of deceit, when I repented. Seven spirits, therefore, are appointed against man, and they are the leaders in the works of youth" (T.R. ii. 1 f.).

In advocating the honesty, or reverence of the "Yes (means) yes; No (means) no," he remarks: "And the excess of this issues from the evil (inclination)" (Matt. v. 37). He is shocked that certain people, who are prominent in the religious life of the community, should so often yield to this evil inclination: "Why are you contemplating evil in your hearts" (Matt. ix. 4); indeed,

he is very indignant that they should: "Offspring of vipers! how can you talk good,—being evil? for from the overflow of the heart the mouth talks" (Matt. xii. 34),—an outburst the Orientalism of which C. G. Montefiore (III, p. 519) seems to have overlooked, and the spirit of which he has certainly misinterpreted (see above, p. 65). Compare, "This generation (or 'kind') is a generation (or 'kind') evil" (Luke xi. 29) in its inclination, unresponsive to the call to repentance. The evil inclination is made a subject of prayer, "And carry us not into trial, but rescue us from the evil (inclination)" (Matt. vi. 13; cf. C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 535; W. C. Allen, I, p. 60; J.E., vol. viii. p. 184; also in the Jewish Prayer Book, S. Singer, p. 7). "I do not ask that Thou shouldest lift them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil (inclination)" (John xvii. 15). This evil inclination is "a rotten tree" which can only "produce evil (i.e. undesirable) fruit," as the good inclination is "a good tree" which can do no other than "produce good (i.e. desirable) fruit" (Matt. vii. 17 f. || Luke vi. 43 f.). Those who are ruled by the latter are, also, the "good (i.e. desirable) ground" (Mark iv. 8; cf. ver. 20 || Matt. xiii. 8; cf. ver. 23, Luke viii. 8; cf. ver. 15), the "good (i.e. desirable) seed" (Matt. xiii. 24, 27, 37 f.). "A man's actions result from the state of his mind; . . . if that is healthy, they will be right, and if not, they will be wrong" (J. Seeley, p. 144).

So, then, "God's" or "holy spirit" is, both in the words of Jesus and in our literature, the inspiring spirit of "the good inclination," God Himself as He dwells in "the treasure of the inclination" when it is good; thus, "But if by God's spirit I am throwing out evil spirits," etc. (Matt. xii. 28 || Luke xi. 20) means, 'But if I am actually a good man at work in this way' etc. Compare, "Now Joseph was a good man, and had the spirit of God within him" (T.S. iv. 4); also, "He has no defilement in his heart, because the spirit of God rests upon him" (T.B. viii. 2; cf. Wisd. i. 5). In this connection, too, the passages in which "heart" occurs in the words of Jesus (see above, pp. 207 f.) should be re-read, since in Rabbinical literature "heart" is often the equivalent of "inclination"; thus, "the stony heart" is "the evil inclination," and "the thoughts," the "heart and reins" and "the inclinations" occur in close association (see G. Friedlander, III, pp. 210, 231). On the persistency of the good inclination they were to rely, when hard pressed by the persecutor: "for the holy spirit shall teach you in that very hour what you ought to say" (Luke xii. 12 || Matt. x. 20; cf. Mark xiii. 11 || Luke xxi. 15), that is, as H. C. King comments: "The best preparation for the hour of crisis is the true, faithful, Spirit-guided life, which shall fruit naturally into speech in that hour" (p. 76). Compare, "His lips

spoke with the holy spirit until he was sawn in twain" (Mart. Is. v. 14), also in Rabbinical literature, "Grant that the good inclination may uphold us" (M. Joseph, p. 351). The greatest sin was to go against it, "against the holy spirit" (Mark iii. 29 || Matt. xii. 32, Luke xii. 10). See also above, p. 76, on the wisdom of God as the inspiring spirit of the good inclination. It is "the spirit of truth" (John xv. 26), which "will rebuke the world concerning sin, and righteousness, and judgment" (John xvi. 8). Compare, "Know, therefore, my children, that two spirits wait upon men—the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit. . . . And the spirit of truth testifies all things and accuses all; and the sinner is burnt up by his own heart, and cannot raise his face to the judge" (T. Jud. xx. 1, 5; cf. A. Büchler, pp. 55, 59).

He himself claimed to have always followed the good inclination, when he said: "Glory from men I do not receive" (John v. 41). Compare, "The good inclination does not receive glory . . . from men" (T. B. vi. 4). His chief complaint, too, as regards his opponents was that they went against it; "glory from one of another receiving, the glory from the only God (or 'One') they are not even seeking" (John v. 44). His greatest hope, moreover, is that it may more and more prevail in his followers: "the spirit of truth . . . continues with you, and will be in you" (John xiv. 17). He expects in them the triumph of the good inclination, even as he had experienced it in himself,—“the divine inspiration” not as “special ecstasies of revelation,” but as “the calm continuous stream” (cf. C. S. Macfarland, p. 194).

To summarise what has been claimed for Jesus under this head: He is entirely at one with our apocalyptists in thinking of human nature as a dichotomy of body and soul. With them, also, he makes free use of such terms as 'spirit' and 'heart' to signify particular aspects of the life of the soul. He has in mind often the frailty of the body, and the fact of its being the instrument of many sacrifices in this life; but on no occasion does he depart from the fine Hebrew conception of the body to think of it as being in any sense essentially evil, the fount of sin. He also belongs to the period of the apocalyptists in his thought of human personality as surviving the experience of death. He leaves them behind, however, when he so clarifies the idea of the image of God in man that it means sonship to God or capacity therefor. This capacity provides for him the content of the idea of man's obligation, and he saw no insuperable barrier in human nature itself to man's fulfilment of this obligation. This optimistic view rested securely on his own fine experience of God, which he judged might become the experience of every human soul. In his language there are some very slight traces of the legends of the Watchers, but they do not in any way affect his view of the ability of human nature

in respect to goodness. He seems, too, to have been well acquainted with stories of the first parents, and what the devil was supposed to have done for them; but, again, no use is made of them in the interests of any theory concerning human depravity. The *Yetzer*, both as evil and as good, he often had in mind. In his consciousness that he had always followed the good inclination, he realised how far he was removed from people about him who were so often swayed by the evil inclination. His own activity among men was expressly directed towards the encouragement of a following of the good inclination, as that had come to have in it, as its inspiring spirit, the spirit of sonship to God in the fullest sense of the term.

CHAPTER V

THE WAY OF SALVATION

A—THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE

THE subject here to be investigated is salvation in so far as it was, or might be, present and individual and spiritual. "The root idea in salvation is *deliverance*. In every case some danger or evil is presupposed, in rescue from which salvation consists. . . . With the deepening sense of moral evil, 'salvation' acquires a more profound ethical and spiritual meaning. It includes deliverance from sin itself as well as from the various evils which are the consequence of sin, and so comes to stand in the spiritual realm as well as in the temporal, for a present experience as well as for a future expectation" (D.B., vol. iv. p. 358). How far had this deepening gone during our period, and what had brought it about? What was the present experience of salvation known to the devout soul, and by what means or upon what conditions was it experienced? To answer such questions an investigation of the life of the individual soul under the Law must be undertaken.

I. THE IDEA OF THE LAW.

I. Our writers are all men of the Torah, of "the eternal law" (1 En. xcix. 2), "the law of God" (T. Jud. xviii. 3). Amid all their differences they stand loyally to Judaism (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, I, pp. 99 f., 260-267). "Covenant," where there is no definite historical allusion in the context, or where the reference is made simply to God's covenant, has become a quasi-technical term for the Law (cf. E.B., 935). This is seen particularly in Jub. in such expressions as "the festivals of My covenant" (i. 10), "forsaken His covenant" as the parallel and equivalent of "turned aside from His word" (xv. 34), "break the covenant" as meaning "commit sin" or "transgress the ordinances" (xxx. 21; cf. 1 Macc. ii. 21, 50), and "your father obeyed My voice, and kept My charge and My commandments, and My laws, and My ordinances, and My covenant" (xxiv. 11), where "My covenant" in the climax summarises all that comes in front of it. So its meaning in the description of Moses as "the mediator of His covenant" (Ass. Mos. i. 14),—compare "His commandments, in the which he was a mediator unto us" (iii. 12); similarly in Zad., "the statutes of the covenant of God" (vii. 12), "all the ordinances, the covenant

of God" (viii. 21), "the covenant that Moses established with Israel—the covenant to re(turn to the Law of M)oses" (xix. 8). No longer is "covenant" thought of as a favouritism on God's part which nothing could possibly affect (cf. M. Joseph, p. 152); the emphasis now is on the human obligations,—what God does for them is dependent on how they treat "the law" or "commandments of the Lord" (T.Z. x. 2; T.D. v. 1). Here, therefore, as in "all late writings *berith* is used in a general way, not of the act of agreement, but of its conditions or any one of them, and thus of the religion of Israel as a whole" (D.B., vol. i. p. 514).

Zad. affords important evidence of the wide range of interest signified by the Torah; the prophets, if not on the same level as the Law, are regarded as valuable in the exposition and illustration of the Law; and other books, extra-canonical, some of them known and some unknown, are similarly used. (For particulars see A.P., vol. ii. p. 790.) Moreover, "the children of the covenant" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 17) do not appear to feel the covenant as oppressive; exactly otherwise. An evidence of the mercy of God is found in the Law: "the testimony (i.e. witness to God's mercy) (is) in the Law of the eternal covenant" (Psa. Sol. x. 5). The Law is Israel's supreme privilege: "To you and to your fathers the Lord gave a Law more excellent than to all peoples" (2 Bar. lxxvii. 3); "Shepherds and lamps and fountains come from the Law; and though we depart yet the Law abides" (ver. 15); "The Law is life" (xxxviii. 2); "the light in which nothing could err" (xix. 3; cf. xv. 3-5). Here the essential unity of the mind of our writers becomes singularly clear; a Palestinian says: "The light of the Law . . . was given for to lighten every man" (T.L. xiv. 4); an Alexandrian speaks of "the incorruptible light of the Law . . . to be given to the race of men" (Wisd. xviii. 4). The figure of a well would hardly be used by an Eastern, if legalism was essentially arid: "A well the princes digged, the nobles of the people delved it by the order of the Lawgiver. The well is the Law" (Zad. viii. 5 f.). The very thought of the Law inspires joy: "This is the book of the commandments of God, and the Law that endures forever. All they that hold it fast are appointed to life; but such as leave it shall die. Turn yourself, O Jacob, and take hold of it; walk towards her shining in the presence of the light thereof. Give not your glory to another, nor the things that are profitable unto you to a strange nation. O Israel, happy are we: for the things that are pleasing to God are made known unto us" (1 Bar. iv. 1-4). Hence, of each of these people, as of the author of Psa. cix, it may be said: "There is not the faintest trace of any feeling of oppression, as if he were burdened by the precepts; and, for what is not precept but simply instruction, he received it with devout rapture as being a precious gift

which God had been pleased to bestow" (R. T. Herford, I, pp. 290 f. ; cf. J. H. Hertz, pp. 241, 295 ; S. Schechter, II, pp. 136 f.).

2. Righteousness and holiness represent the essential ideas for which the Law stood ; righteousness is the substance of the Law, holiness its form. Neither idea is ever really absent. To speak of a "prophetical wing" and a "legalistic wing" in classifying writers according to their main emphasis may be allowed, if it be understood that a righteousness ideal is not being placed over against a holiness ideal. For all the ideal embraced both conceptions ; righteousness was the ethical, holiness the ceremonial aspect of the acceptable life. Though often confused, the two ideas were never really separated by any of our writers. Thus in 1 En. God's people, the Elect, are "the righteous" (e.g. i. 8), or "the righteous and holy" (e.g. xxv. 5). It is not without significance, however, that they are perhaps never spoken of as "the holy," for xxxix. 4 is not an instance, since "the holy" in the first line has "the righteous" in the second line as its parallel and complement (cf. xli. 2). "The holy" are the angels (cf. xlvii. 4) ; when used for God's people "elect" either precedes or follows it to make the reference clear. The only exception has an alternative reading "righteous" for "holy" (xliii. 4 ; cf. xlviii. 9). The emphasis in "righteous" is probably the people in the right for whom the providence of God must ultimately here or hereafter reveal itself as working ; in "holy," the people separated from what is common or profane in life. The election of God was for righteousness, and with a view thereto it was thought that in this world, as it was, a definite measure of separation was necessary (cf. M. Joseph, pp. 182, 189). So, then, holiness in practical life signified the enclosure or method of enclosure, righteousness that for which the enclosure was made or the method of enclosure adopted. "To guard themselves and their children from the depravity and vice of the mixed populations amid which they lived, the 'Holy Community' fenced the life of the individual and family by ceremonial regulations resulting in, and intended to result in, the isolation and seclusion of the religious Jew . . . it is exceedingly doubtful whether we would know anything about a prophetic ethics had it not been conserved for us in the midst of this very legalism" (T. C. Hall, pp. 39 ff. ; cf. E.B., 4177 ; also J. H. Hertz, p. 200, 268 ; W. O. E. Oesterley, I, p. 28 ; S. Schechter, I, pp. 294 f. ; R. T. Herford, I, pp. 11, 14 f., 26 f.).

II. THE IDEA OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

1. Righteousness included justice, but justice by no means exhausted its content ; a righteous man under the Law was expected to be more than a rigidly just person for whom no one would ever

think of dying. Our writers extol justice, a fine testimony to the fact that the great pre-exilic prophets had not laboured in vain (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, I, p. 96; A. Sabatier, Book II, chap. i.; H.J., vol. x. p. 86). How genuinely prophetic in spirit are the following! "Defraud not the poor of his sustenance. . . . Despise not the needy soul. . . . Hurt not the feelings of the afflicted. . . . Make yourself beloved in the assembly. . . . Deliver the oppressed from his oppressions, and let not your spirit hate just judgment. Be as a father to orphans, and in place of a husband to widows" (Sir. iv. 1-10); "Truth with just dealing is good and well-pleasing to God" (T.D. i. 3); "Honour righteousness and oppress no man" (Sib. iii. 630; cf. 2 Bar. xiii. 11). Philanthropy under the Law may be well illustrated by another passage from Sib.: "These diligently practise justice and virtue, and not covetousness . . . they have just measures in country or city, . . . nor does a man of much wealth vex his lesser brother, nor does anyone afflict widows but rather assists them. . . . And always the wealthy man among the people sends a portion of his harvest to those who have nothing, but are in want" (iii. 234-245; cf. 4 Ez. xii. 32). This kinship with the prophets (cf. I.J.A., July 1914, p. 66) is discernible everywhere; e.g. "Destroy all wrong from the face of the earth and let every evil work come to an end: and let the plant of righteousness and truth appear" (1 En. x. 16); "And work uprightness and righteousness before Him" (Jub. xx. 9); "And there will be no pride among them that any among them should be oppressed" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 46); "But (i.e. in contrast with ritual matters) adorning their conversation by the good practice of righteousness they were established in the good report of all" (3 Macc. iii. 5). So the voice of prophetic denunciation is heard: "Being officers of his kingdom you did not judge aright, neither did you keep the Law, nor walk after the counsel of God" (Wisd. vi. 4); "Devourers of the goods of the (poor) saying that they do so on the ground of their justice, but in reality to destroy them . . . filled with lawlessness and iniquity from sunrise to sunset" (Ass. Mos. vii. 6 f.). The attitude of 1 and 2 Macc. where the interest is so very legalistic, and the lapse in Judith (cf. Tob. v. 13, xii. 15) where the end justifies the means, are not really exceptions (see F. C. Burkitt quoted below, p. 250).

Not unnaturally, too, such righteous conduct is recommended on occasions as being very often good policy, its opposite not paying; e.g. "Support your neighbour in his poverty, that in his prosperity you may rejoice; remain true to him in the time of his affliction, that you may be heir with him in his inheritance" (Sir. xxii. 23); "Don't do evil, and evil will not overtake you" (vii. 1; cf. Tob. xii. 7); "Do acts of kindness to the righteous and find recom-

pense; if not from him, from Jahveh" (xii. 2), and so on, very frequently. This is only a prudentialism into which the finest minds at times drop in their effort to be severely practical, and is more often a revelation of the speaker's estimate of what his audience for the moment will respond to than of what is the all-in-all to himself (cf. Tob. iv. 14; also see M. Joseph, pp. 141 f.). For Ben Sira even such prudentialism was not everything; he abhors it when it becomes mere subtlety (xix. 23 f.; contrast vi. 32, xx. 27), and falls into line with those who recognise that righteousness is also a matter of the thoughts of a man (see below, pp. 231 f.). In such a mood, then, he is not to be taken as representative of the mind of our period.

2. A better idea of that mind is obtained by noting the virtues most frequently emphasised, and most earnestly commended, together with the precise range of their exercise. Take such a group as longsuffering, patience, or endurance, and meekness: "He that is patient controls himself until the (proper) time (i.e. for its exercise is past), and afterwards joy springs up for him" (Sir. i. 23); "Faith and meekness are all-pleasing unto Him" (ver. 27): "Set your heart aright and endure firmly, and don't be fearful in time of calamity" (ii. 2); "In ten temptations He showed me approved, and in all of them I endured; for endurance is a mighty charm, and patience gives many good things" (T.Jos. ii. 7); "You see, therefore, my children, how great things patience works" (x. 1; cf. Jub. xix. 4); "Blessed is he in whose mouth is mercy and gentleness" (2 En. xlii. 13); "Now therefore, my children, in patience and meekness spend the number of your days, that you inherit endless life" (l. 2). On occasions this attitude is recommended to the point of non-retaliation and non-resistance: "The holy man is merciful to his reviler, and holds his peace" (T.B. v. 4; cf. Psa. Sol. xii. 6); "And if any one seeks to do evil unto you, do well unto him, and pray for him, and you will be redeemed of the Lord from all evil" (T.Jos. xviii. 2); "Endure for the sake of the Lord every wound, every injury, every evil word and attack. If ill-requitals befall you, don't return them either to neighbour or enemy, because the Lord will return them for you and be your avenger on the day of great judgment, that there be no avenging here among men" (2 En. l. 3 f.; cf. in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 6); "Walk, my children, in longsuffering, in meekness, honesty, in provocation, in grief, in faith, and in truth, in reliance on promises, in illness, in abuse, in wounds, in temptation, in nakedness, in privation, loving one another, till you go out from this age of ills, that you become inheritors of endless time" (lxvi. 6); "We are ready to die rather than transgress the commandments of our fathers. For we should be putting our ancestors also to shame, if we did not walk in obedience

to the Law and take Moses as our counsellor. . . . For we esteem thy mercy, giving us our life in return for a breach of the Law, a thing harder to bear than death itself" (4 Macc. ix. 1 f., 4); "Let us fast (i.e. in desperate resolution, not repentance), for the space of three days, and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field (i.e. in the hope of escaping from the persecutor) and (i.e. if we do not succeed in so doing) let us die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of Lords, the God of our fathers" (Ass. Mos. ix. 6; cf. actual instances, 1 Macc. ii. 37; 2 Macc. vi. 19, vii. 2).

Equally imposing is the more active group, mercy, love, forgiveness, set forth most impressively in such scripture as: "And now, my children, I bid you to keep the commands of the Lord, and to show mercy to your neighbours, and to have compassion *towards all*, not towards men only, but also towards beasts. . . . Have, therefore, compassion in your hearts, my children, because even as a man does to his neighbour, even so also will the Lord do to him" (T.Z. v. 1-3; cf. Jub. vii. 20); "I adjure you by the God of heaven to do truth each one unto his neighbour and to entertain love each one for his brother" (T.R. vi. 9; cf. Jub. xxxvi. 4); "Do you also, my children, love each one his brother with a good heart, and the spirit of envy will withdraw from you" (T.S. iv. 7; cf. iii. 4, 6; T.Z. viii. 5); "And now, my children, I exhort you, love each one his brother, and put away hatred from your hearts, love one another in deed, and in word, and in the inclination of the soul. . . . Love one another from the heart; and if *any man* sin against you, speak peaceably to him, and in your soul hold not guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him, lest catching the poison from you he take to swearing and so you sin doubly. . . . And though he deny it and yet have a sense of shame when reproved, give over reproving him. For he who denies may repent so as not again to wrong you; yea, he may also honour you, and be at peace with you. And if he be shameless and persist in his wrongdoing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging" (T.G. vi. 1, 3 f., 6 f.; cf. vii. 5; Zad. viii. 17); "Put away, therefore, jealousy from your souls, and love one another, with uprightness of heart" (vii. 7; cf. Tob. iv. 15); "Do you also, therefore, love one another, and with longsuffering hide one another's faults" (T.Jos. xvii. 2; cf. T.B. iii. 3 f.); "Love the Lord and your neighbour" (T.Iss. v. 2; cf. Jub. xx. 2); "I loved the Lord, likewise also *every man* with all my heart" (vii. 6; cf. Wisd. xii. 19); "Love the Lord through all your life, and one another with a true heart" (T.D. v. 3); "The spirit of love works together with the Law of God in longsuffering unto the salvation of men" (T.G. iv. 7). In commenting on these

passages here, reference to man's love to God is passed over, since that subject is to be dealt with later. Love is seen in desire for and readiness to sustain, or where broken renew, communion with other souls. Mercy is that loving-kindness which will not let one sustain an attitude of repulsion in the face of the repentant soul. Forgiveness, where that repentance is present, is full restoration of communion with the one who has done the wrong ; where that repentance is wanting, it is the exclusion of any unworthy feeling, such as bitter spite or hatred, from one's own soul.

It is important to decide the range within which such virtues were to be exercised. Ben Sira says : " Forgive your neighbour the injury (done to you), and then, when you pray, your sins will be forgiven " (xxviii. 2) ; but he specifies clearly the limitation, when he speaks approvingly of " a man that has joy of his children, who lives to see his enemy's fall " (xxv. 7), that " against enemies . . . has left behind an avenger, and to friends one that requites favour " (xxx. 6). Enemies are not for him included among neighbours to whom forgiveness is a duty. But, then, forgiveness is of a low order in Sir., namely, a refraining from taking vengeance. Sometimes, however, the enemy is put side by side with the neighbour, as, for example, in 2 En. l. 3 quoted above, p. 229 ; such endurance has to be shown all round. With the emergence of so sublime a conception of forgiveness as is to be found in the Test. one naturally asks : Was the old limited idea of " neighbour " retained ? It has been usual to say, that " it was alien to the modes of thought of antiquity, and perhaps was impossible to the Hebrews under the peculiar limitations of their national economy, to give to this pregnant term ' neighbour ' a universal application " (D.B., vol. iii. p. 156). One does not press for any wider interpretation of " brother " and " neighbour " in the Test. ; it would not do to leap too readily at such phrases as " towards all," " any man," and " every man " which one has italicised in the passages quoted above. The universal outlook of this writer, however, seen in his passion for the conversion of the Gentiles (see above, p. 91), disposes one to suppose that for him at any rate the old limitation was crumbling, if it indeed had not utterly fallen away. His soul was preparing for the removal of the limitation, though perhaps not quite altogether ready for it.

3. The only other thing that need be said here of righteousness under the Law is that it was an inward righteousness (cf. C. H. Toy, pp. 183 f. ; C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 483). There are indications of this even in Sir. : on the one hand, Ben Sira prays : " O that one would set scourges over my mind, and a rod of correction over my heart, that they spare not their errors, and overlook not their sins " (xxiii. 2) ; and, on the other hand, he recognises that " many a man there is that slips, though unintentionally "

(xix. 16). He is not without regard for "man's thought" which depends "upon his nature"; the latter has to be cultivated, "upon the cultivation of the tree depends the fruit" (xxvii. 6). The same thing peeps through in Jud., as where Oziás compliments the heroine, on her "understanding, because the disposition of" her "heart is good" (viii. 29); also, where she reveals her true mind in her song of thanksgiving, in course of which she says: "All sacrifice is little for a sweet savour, and all the fat is very little for a whole burnt offering to Thee; but he that fears the Lord is great continually" (xvi. 16; cf. 2 En. xlv. 3). The other precise ceremonialist (see e.g. Jub. xxi. 16) is also in line here, wording God's promise, thus: "They will turn to Me . . . with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their strength" (Jub. i. 15; cf. 2 En. xlvi. 1-3, lxi. 4 f.), and making Moses pray: "Create in them a clean heart and a holy spirit, and let them not be ensnared in their sins from henceforth until eternity" (ver. 21). That there was such a line for him to be in may be seen from the following, as well as from other passages already made use of in this section: "And now, my children, make your hearts good before the Lord, and your ways straight before men" (T.S. v. 2); "Anger and unreasoning wrath put far from me. Murmuring, and impatience in affliction, remove far from me . . . with goodwill and cheerfulness support my soul" (Psa. Sol. xvi. 10-12; cf. vi. 7 f., xiv. 5); "Not the growth of earth's fruits nourish a man, but Thy word which preserves them that trust Thee" (Wisd. xvi. 26); "Let all your works be done in order with good intent in the fear of God" (T.N. ii. 9; cf. T.Jos. xvii. 3); "Fearing lest he should offend the Lord, he will not do wrong to any man, even in thought" (T.G. v. 5; cf. T.Z. i. 4); "The Lord sees all the imaginings of man, how they are vain, where they lie in the treasure-houses of the heart" (2 En. liii. 3); "And He will assuredly examine the secret thoughts, and that which is laid up in the secret chambers of all the members of man" (2 Bar. lxxxiii. 3; cf. xlvi. 39).

Another glance at some of the vices condemned, most of which by implication have been already touched on, or have been incidentally referred to, increases the impression of the attention accorded to inwardness in the formulation of the ideal under the Law. Hypocrisy,—“My son, do not disobey the fear of the Lord, and don't approach it with a double heart. Don't be a hypocrite in the sight of men” (Sir. i. 28 f.; cf. xix. 26 f.; T.A. iii. 2, vi. 2; 1 En. xci. 4). Pride,—“Don't walk in the way of pride. Pride is hateful to the Lord and to men” (Sir. x. 6 f.; cf. 2 En. lxiii. 4). Jealousy,—“In fornication there is neither understanding nor godliness, and all jealousy dwells in the lust thereof” (T.R. vi. 4). Deceit and envy,—“Beware of the spirit of deceit (cf. 1 En. xci. 8,

xciii. 4, xciv. 6, civ. 10) and envy. For envy rules over the whole mind of a man" (T.S. iii. 1 f.; cf. T.G. vii. 6; Wisd. vi. 23; Sib. iii. 662; also passages on the "evil eye," especially Sir. xiv. 3, 8 ff., xxxi. 13; contrast "good eye," xxxv. 8-10). Anger,— "Anger is blindness, and does not suffer one to see the face of any man with truth" (T.D., ii. 2); "Anger is an evil thing, my children, for it troubles even the soul itself. And the body of the angry man it makes its own, and over his soul it gets the mastery" (T.D. iii. 1 f.; T.G. iii. 1; Sir. i. 22; 2 En. xlv. 1-3, lii. 2-4). Hatred,— "It fills the heart with evils and devilish poison" (T.G. v. 1; cf. vi. 2). Such give some idea of the depths to be shunned. Compare, too, examples in 2 En. x. 4-6, xxxiv. 1 f.; and contrast Wisd. viii. 7; 4 Macc. i. 18. In further contrast, the following give glimpses of the heights which could be in view to be scaled: everything must be done in "humility of heart" (T.Jos. x. 2; cf. Sir. iii. 17 f, x. 28; Azar., vers. 15 ff.; T.A. v. 3); one is to be "great-souled" (4 Macc. xv. 10); the virtue of virtues is "singleness of heart" (T.R. iv. 1; cf. T.Iss. iii. 4, 7 f., iv. 1, 6, v. 1, 8, vi. 1; T.A. iv. 1, v. 4, vi. 1; T.B. vi. 7; Jub. xli. 28; Wisd. i. 1). To be righteous, then, according to the ideal of the Law, as it was expounded by these more spiritual and refined people (cf. H.J., vol. x. pp. 85, 88, 105; J.L., p. 127), was not only to be just and kind in one's dealings with one's fellows, but in mind humble and aspiring, loving and pure.

4. A few aspects or applications of this righteousness deserve special attention.

(1) *The Sin of Adultery*.—The peril of the lovely woman is recognised: "Hide your eye from a lovely woman, and don't gaze upon beauty which is not yours; by the comeliness of a woman many have been ruined, and this way passion flames like fire. With a married woman don't sit at table, and (don't mingle) wine in her company; lest you incline your heart towards her, and in your blood (descend) to the Pit" (Sir. ix. 9; cf. Sus., vers. 7, 12, 31 f.). It is laid down that "A man that goes astray from his own bed . . . shall be punished in the streets of the city, and shall be taken (i.e. to the public place of scourging) where he does not suspect it. So also a wife that leaves her husband and brings in an heir by a stranger. For, firstly, she is disobedient to the Law of the Most High; and secondly, she trespasses against her own husband; and thirdly, she commits adultery through (her) fornication, and brings children in by a stranger. She shall be led (i.e. for punishment) into the assembly" (Sir. xxiii. 18, 21-24; cf. Sus., vers. 32, 34). Man and woman alike are to be punished, though not perhaps with death, unless one has to assume what is not specified. In the detailed reference, however, to the woman's sin there seems to be present a tendency to take the

woman's sin rather more seriously than the man's,—though, again, perhaps not. If, may be, Sir. reveals a tendency towards a milder view which latterly secured in reference to this sin the entire abolition of the death penalty,—“it is not probable that the death penalty for adultery was inflicted at all in the age of Jesus” (I. Abrahams, p. 73),—Jub. keeps to the more vigorous view which classed this crime with murder, preferring, however, death by burning to death by stoning (xx. 4, xli. 26). “Shun adultery” (Sib. iii. 764), is an exhortation every writer would join in making. (Cf. A. Büchler, pp. 45–48.)

The obligation to avoid the impure thought is also felt by some; so Issachar is made to say: “Except my wife I have not known any woman. I never committed fornication by the uplifting of my eyes” (T. Iss. vii. 2; cf. T. B. vi. 3; Zad. iii. 2). Joseph narrates: “And often she (i.e. Potiphar's wife) sent unto me saying: ‘Consent to fulfil my desire, and I will release you from your bonds, and I will free you from the darkness.’ And not even in thought did I incline unto her” (T. Jos. ix. 1 f.; contrast Psa. Sol. iv. 4 f.); and Benjamin remarks; “He that has a pure mind in love, does not look after a woman with a view to fornication; for he has no defilement in his heart, because the spirit of God rests upon him” (T. B. viii. 2; cf. T. R. vi. 1). The sanctity of marriage is upheld (Jub. iii. 6 f.); men are commended who “are mindful of the purity of marriage” (Sib. iii. 594); they have also to be watchful that there be not “in wedlock profligacy” or “intemperance” (T. A. v. 1). (See further, I. J. A., Jan. 1909, pp. 16 f.) Only in Zad., if S. Schechter is to be followed rather than R. H. Charles (A. P., vol. ii. p. 810), does divorce come up, and then only to be forbidden: he refers adversely to those who “are caught by fornication in taking two wives (i.e. either at the same time, or after divorcing one) during their lifetime, “then very significantly comments: “But the fundamental principle of the creation is ‘Male and female He created them’” (vii. 1 f.).

(2) *Duty to Parents.*—The reverence due to them, and the care to be taken of them, are praised in a beautiful passage in Sir., from which here it is necessary to take but a line or two: “He that fears the Lord honours his father, and serves his parents as masters. My son, in word and in deed honour your father. . . . Don't glorify yourself in the dishonour of (i.e. when you dishonour) your father, for that is no glory to you. A man's glory is the glory of his father, and he that dishonours his mother multiplies sin. My son, help your father in his old age, and don't grieve him all the days of his life. . . . Benevolence (lit.: ‘righteousness,’ i.e. alms-giving) to a father shall not be blotted out. . . . As one that acts presumptuously is he that despises his father” (iii. 7 f., 10–12, 14, 16; cf. vii. 27 f.). The very earnestness of the appeal,

however, makes one suspect that in certain quarters there had been very considerable declension from the ideal in the treatment of parents. The ideal certainly was "honour Him alone who reigns for ever, the Eternal, and after Him . . . parents" (Sib. iii. 593 f.; cf. Jub. vii. 20); and the paucity of the references to the subject probably should warrant the inference that usually there was a fair effort made towards approximation to the ideal.

(3) *Wealth*.—Wealth which is honourably obtained is looked upon as something to be desired, whereas the state of poverty when brought on by oneself is a disgrace. "Wealth is good if it be without sin, and evil is poverty which is due to presumption" (Sir. xiii. 24). Poverty in itself is no disgrace; if it be a condition of one's independence (cf. in Rabbinical literature, A. Edersheim, I, pp. 200 f.), it is to be preferred: "Better the life of the poor under a shelter of logs, than sumptuous fare in the house of strangers" (Sir. xxix. 22). Covetousness is condemned outright as "the corruptor of life" and "the source of myriad ills to mortal men" (Sib. iii. 189, 235 f.; cf. Tob. v. 19). In the Psa. Sol. poverty and goodness are so much together, that the poor are regarded as the people of God: "The hope and refuge of the poor art Thou, O God" (xv. 2; cf. v. 2); "Thine ears listen to the hopeful prayer of the poor" (xviii. 3; cf. x. 7). Not that poverty is loved; the Psalmist rather desires a sufficiency and no more: "Happy is he whom God remembers in (granting to him) a due sufficiency; if a man abound overmuch, he sins. Sufficient are moderate means with righteousness, and hereby the blessing of the Lord (becomes) abundance with righteousness" (v. 18-20).

Of course, a man loyal to the Torah should never be found with unrighteous gains; to "exalt themselves to deceit and wealth" (Jub. xxiii. 21), is instanced as undoubted disloyalty thereto, and yet the warnings under this head are frequent, revealing consciousness of the reality of the peril. "Don't trust in unrighteous gains, for they shall profit (you) nothing in the day of wrath" (Sir. v. 8; cf. 1 En. lxiii. 10, xcvi. 10, c. 7). Zad. is very emphatic; thus he enumerates "the three nets of Belial," i.e. the three deadly sins: "The first is fornication, the second is the wealth (of wickedness), the third is the pollution of the Sanctuary" (vi. 10 f.); consequently, one must "hold aloof from the polluted wealth of wickedness under a vow and a curse" (viii. 12), and must not exalt oneself with "a view to wealth and unjust gain" (ix. 17.) The Test. note the connection with wine: "Observe, therefore, my children, the (right) limit in wine: for there are in it four evil spirits—of lust, of hot desire, of profligacy, of filthy lucre" (T. Jud. xvi. 1; cf. Tob. iv. 15 f.). The anxieties which wealth so often brings are dwelt upon: "Watchful care over wealth wastes the flesh, and anxiety about it dissipates slumber" (Sir. xxxi. 1).

The folly of constantly scraping riches together with a view to arrival at a time when one "says, 'I have found rest, and now I will enjoy my goods'" is vividly put: "He does not know what lot shall befall; he shall leave them to others and die" (Sir. xi. 19; cf. xiv. 3-19). Over against this there is the duty of liberality, not to speak of justice; "Better . . . alms with righteousness than riches with unrighteousness" (Tob. xii. 8, and frequently). Wealth, too, destroys the common bond there should be between men: "What peace (can) rich (have) with poor? . . . an abomination to the rich are the poor . . . a rich man speaks and his helpers are many; . . . a poor man speaks and they jeer at him" (Sir. xiii. 18, 20, 22). The chief peril of wealth, however, is, that it may become for the soul a substitute for God: "Don't trust in your wealth, to walk after the desire of your soul. Don't say, 'Who shall have power over me?' For Jahveh is an avenger of the persecuted" (Sir. v. 1-3; cf. 1 En. xlvi. 7, xcvi. 3); "Gold has made many reckless, and wealth has led astray the hearts of princes" (viii. 2). Hence the woe and the beatitude with respect to the rich: "Woe to you, you rich, for you have trusted in your riches" (1 En. xciv. 8; cf. xcvi. 4, xcvi. 8 ff.); "Happy is the rich man that is found blameless, and that has not gone astray following mammon!" (Sir. xxxi. 8). (Cf. Hillel, A. Büchler, p. 27.)

(4) *Lex talionis*.—Jub. approves it. "With a stone he (i.e. Cain) had killed Abel, and by a stone he was killed in righteous judgment" (iv. 31); "Whoever sheds man's blood by man shall his blood be shed" (vi. 8); "And take no gifts for the blood of man, lest it be shed with impunity, without judgment; for it is the blood that is shed that causes the earth to sin, and the earth cannot be cleansed from the blood of man save by the blood of him who shed it. And take no present or gift for the blood of man: blood for blood, that you may be accepted before the Lord, the Most High God; for He is the defence of the good: and that you may be preserved from all evil, and that He may save you from every kind of death" (xxi. 19 f.; cf. E., July 1918, p. 62, note 1). "And all the peoples whom he brought to pursue after Israel, the Lord our God cast them into the midst of the sea, . . . even as the people of Egypt had cast their children into the river" (xlvi. 14; cf. Wisd. xi. 6). This approval was very general; possibly in spite of what has been said on non-retaliation and on forgiveness (see above, pp. 229 ff.) was universal. One does not, of course, forget the elementary, if crude, idea of justice which underlies this law; also that noble minds in desperate straits may voice it as a curse, though, if they had the chance, they would not live it out in deed. Neither does one forget that "'eye for eye' was never applied in practical Jewish law. . . . The Talmud is emphatic that the retaliation was not by mutilation of the offender

but by the exactment of compensation by fine" (I. Abrahams, p. 154; cf. P. Goodman, I, 241). But yet in the time of Jesus "the literal interpretation of this precept . . . was championed by both the Shammites and Sadducees" against the Hillelites, who "sanctioned a modification of the enactment which allowed money compensation as an equivalent" (G. H. Box, E., April 1918, pp. 61 f.).

The test case is the attitude taken up to enemies; was it in accordance with righteousness under the Law to hate them, in the sense of not merely not liking their deeds and state of mind, but of desiring vengeance on them? (cf. T.G. iv. 6). The following quotations will give the answer: "Cursed be the Philistines . . . may God make them a derision and a curse" (Jub. xxiv. 28); "The Lord delivered them (i.e. the Shechemites) into the hands of the sons of Jacob that they might exterminate them" (xxx. 6); "Many in killing the wicked do two works, of good and evil; but the whole is good, because he has uprooted and destroyed that which is evil. One man hates the merciful and unjust man, and the man who commits adultery and fornication: this, too, has a twofold aspect, but the whole work is good, because he follows the Lord's example, in that he does not accept the seeming good as the genuine good" (T.A. iv. 2 f.; contrast, "And there is a man that loves him that works evil, because he would prefer even to die in evil for his sake; and concerning this it is clear that it has two aspects, but the whole is an evil work," ii. 3); "His (i.e. Judas Maccabeus') memorial is blessed for ever. And he went about . . . and destroyed the ungodly" (1 Macc. iii. 7 f.); before the murder Judith prays to be able to do it, "Strengthen me, O Lord God of Israel, this day" (xiii. 7),—after it the high priest approves, "You have done with Israel the things that are good, and God is pleased therewith" (xv. 10); "Blessed for all things be our God who gave the impious doers for a prey. . . . Torment them that oppress us and in arrogance shamefully treat us" (2 Macc. i. 17, 28); the martyrs say: "War, a holy and honourable warfare on behalf of righteousness, through which may the just Providence that watched over our fathers become merciful unto His people and take vengeance on the accursed tyrants" (4 Macc. ix. 24); "In the armour of virtue I go to join my brothers in death, and to add in myself one strong avenger more to punish you, O deviser of the tortures and enemy of the truly righteous" (xi. 22 f.); "Your enemy has persecuted you; but shortly you will see his destruction, and will tread upon their necks" (1 Bar. iv. 25); "You will look from on high and will see your enemies in Gehenna, and you will recognise them and rejoice, and you will give thanks and confess your Creator" (Ass. Mos. x. 10). (Cf. C. G. Montefiore, I, pp. 486 f.)

There is, then, absolutely no love for the enemy, but only an enthusiasm to make him pay. That the Test., though apparently with some hesitation, joins the others here is very significant, and that 2 and 4 Macc. also come in, reveals how loveless as regards their enemies their attitude of non-resistance was. Pharisaic Quietism was in that respect a very loveless affair. (Cf. L. Dougall, pp. 141 f.) Zad. puts it very plainly, that while a man is not to avenge himself or bear a grudge against his neighbour, the enemy has to have no such consideration: "And as for that which he has said; 'You should not take vengeance nor bear a grudge against the children of your people,' every man of those who have entered into the covenant, who brings a charge against his neighbour whom he has not rebuked before witnesses, and yet brings it in his fierce wrath or recounts (it) to his elders in order to bring him into contempt, is taking vengeance and bearing a grudge. But naught is written save that, 'He takes vengeance on His adversaries, and he bears a grudge against His enemies'" (x. 2 f.; cf. Sir. xxvii. 30, xxviii. 7; Psa. Sol. iv. 16-22). The Apoc. Abr. reveals this spirit at its worst: "they (i.e. the righteous) shall destroy those who have destroyed them, and shall insult those who have insulted them, and of those who defamed them they shall spit in the face, scorned by Me" (xxix).

The spirit of *lex talionis* is, then, everywhere,—an enthusiasm for restitution, an insistence on full reparation in some form. It seems, also, that inability to make such restitution or reparation would be allowed to bar the way to reconciliation; so S. Schechter, "all those sins which concern a person and which fall mostly under the heading of moral laws could not be atoned for without proper restitution . . . in matters between man and man the Day of Atonement loses its atoning power until proper restitution is made to the wronged person" (II, pp. 296, 303). That is, where there is no restitution or reparation, there can be no forgiveness,—such is the Law. To have vengeance on the enemy, and to exact compensation as a condition of reconciliation is the orthodoxy of the Torah. This, as *Imitatio Dei*, incidentally confirms conclusions, previously arrived at, with regard to God's love (see above, p. 42 ff.). Man's love to man was like unto it; affectionate approval of those who, in accordance with the view taken of what was right, were well-pleasing,—fierce disapproval of the opposite sort of people, including the desire and obligation to take revenge; and within the circle of "neighbours," of Israelites or quasi-Israelites, an active endeavour to evoke in the wrongdoer a repentance which must be perfected in compensation, ere reconciliation take place.

III. THE IDEA OF HOLINESS.

1. Speaking of the restrictions by which this idea of holiness was expressed, R. T. Herford says: "Their purpose was to set up the Jews as a closed corporation, distinct from the surrounding people, and to provide for the maintenance of the Jewish cultus. Within the limits thus drawn, this enclosure marked off from the Gentile world, the Jew was to live his whole life, and the Torah was to be his guide in doing so. . . . And therefore, when Ezra prevailed on the Jews to become a separate community, he was not condemning them to a life of barren legalism, cutting them off from a free communion with God; he was providing for them a means whereby they could enjoy free communion, defended against the dangers which, in the past, had been so disastrous to the religious life of the people" (I, pp. 67-69). One can understand, then, why among our writers there is not one who takes up the attitude of entire nonconformity to some such limitations; they vary, of course, in degrees of strictness, but none supposes that there is no necessity in some measure for the hedging-off method. Sirach, according to the LXX, definitely mentions "the ordinances of the Lord" (vi. 37); even if this reading be not adopted, it is probably the meaning of the text here as on occasions elsewhere. He would regret as much as the writer of 1 Bar., or of Wisd., any dealing unrighteously (1 Bar. ii. 13), any lawlessness (Wisd. iv. 20, v. 7) in respect to them. Here, too, the conservative editor of Jub. and the more liberal-minded writer of the Test. join hands as regards the principle,—the former, however, standing alone in this, that in his enthusiasm he traces the various enactments back to the patriarchal age, much as the editor of 1 and 2 Chronicles takes everything, which he thinks should be, back to the days of David and Solomon. To catalogue their differences in detail would not carry one far in an endeavour to appreciate the essential attitude of mind here taken up with unanimity.

2. It will be more to the point to concentrate attention on the two cardinal commands, viz., those concerning the Sabbath and circumcision, linking up with the latter an inquiry into their mind on the distinction between the clean and the unclean.

(1) *The Sabbath*.—The central position accorded to the observance of the Sabbath is well illustrated by a passage in Jub., where not only does God, as was usually thought, keep "Sabbath on the seventh day" (ii. 1; cf. 2 En. xxxii. 2), but also the two chief orders of angels in heaven keep it: "And He gave us a great sign, the Sabbath day, that we should work six days, but keep Sabbath on the seventh day from all work. And all the angels of the presence, and all the angels of the sanctification, these two great classes—He has bidden us to keep the Sabbath with

Him in heaven and on earth . . . on this we kept Sabbath in the heavens before it was made known to any flesh to keep Sabbath thereon on the earth" (ii. 17 f., 30). The emphasis, too, is "that they may keep it holy and not do thereon any work, and not to defile it, as it is holier than all other days" (ver. 26). That is, the philanthropic idea of the Sabbath,—the Sabbath as a humane institution,—for these writers, as for post-exilians generally, had gone into the background,—not, of course, let it be noted, before it had done much of its work as such in humanising the relations of man to man. It had become now an outward ordinance "by which the Israelite could . . . show his fidelity to Yahwe and mark his separation from the heathen" (E.B., 4177). It stands foremost among those regulations which have in view no direct benefit that may accrue from them to the worshipper, but the honour to the will of God which their observance signifies (cf. J.L., p. 60). In ordinary human relationship love-tokens often have nothing to justify them, save that they *are* love-tokens,—they are understood and appreciated as such; in terms of common usefulness they cannot always be evaluated, or perhaps even justified. The observance of the Sabbath was a love-token given to God,—an act done just because it met what they believed was His will, which on other grounds they knew to be just and generous. With the world shut out as much as possible, they felt themselves more with God that day than on others.

How far the shutting off was carried is a matter of detail; the mind supposed to be behind it is the important thing. The mind to give no uncertain token of loyalty or love to God explains and helps one to understand everything. This gives a new meaning to the cessation from work and other ordinary activities and relationship, and lets one see how natural it is for a devout mind to carry it as far as possible. "It is not lawful to do any work thereon which is unseemly, to do thereon their own pleasure, and . . . they should not prepare thereon anything to be eaten or drunk . . . which they had not prepared for themselves on the sixth day in their dwellings. And they shall not bring in nor take out from house to house on that day" (Jub. ii. 29 f.). This same writer puts the case more elaborately in endorsing the idea that habitual Sabbath-breaking is a capital offence: "And the man that does any work on it shall die: whoever desecrates that day, whoever lies with (his) wife, or whoever says he will do something on it, that he will set out on a journey thereon in regard to any buying or selling; and whoever draws water thereon which he had not prepared for himself on the sixth day, and whoever takes up any burden to carry it out of his tent or out of his house shall die. . . . And every man who does any work thereon, or goes a journey, or tills (his) farm, whether in his house or any other

place, and whoever lights a fire, or rides on any beast, or travels by ship on the sea, and whoever strikes or kills anything, or slaughters a beast or a bird, or whoever catches an animal or a bird or a fish, or *whoever fasts* or makes war on the Sabbath: The man who does any of these things on the Sabbath shall die" (l. 8, 12 f.).

With this it is well to read the statement of a writer who represents a circle which in its outlook in many respects differed from the editor of Jub. ; amid the agreements and differences there is to be discerned the common motive, namely, so to do the will of God that day as to be farthest from the ordinary material concerns of human life ; for one day they tried fully to honour God by shutting the world out as completely as possible. "And on the Sabbath day no man shall utter a word of folly and vanity. No man shall lend aught to his neighbour. None shall dispute on matters of wealth and gain. None shall speak on matters of work and labour to be done on the following morning. No man shall work in the field to do the work of his business. On the Sabbath day none shall walk outside his city more than (two) thousand cubits. No man shall eat on the Sabbath day aught save that which is prepared or perishing (in the field). Nor shall one eat or drink unless in the camp. (If he was) on the way and went down to wash he may drink where he stands, but he shall not draw into any vessel. No man shall send the son of a stranger (i.e. non-Jew) to do his business on the Sabbath day. . . . *No man shall fast* of his own will on the Sabbath day. No man shall walk after the animal to pasture it outside his city more than two thousand cubits. None shall lift his hand to smite it with (his) fist. If it be stubborn he shall not remove it out of his house. No man shall carry anything from the house to the outside or from the outside into the house, and if it be in the vestibule he shall not carry anything out of it or bring in anything into it. None shall open the cover of a vessel that is pasted on the Sabbath. No man shall carry on him spices to go out or come in on the Sabbath. None shall lift up in his dwelling house rock or earth. Let not the nursing father take the sucking child to go out or to come in on the Sabbath. No man shall provoke his manservant or his maidservant or his hireling on the Sabbath. No man shall help an animal in its delivery on the Sabbath day. And if it falls into a pit or ditch, he shall not raise it on the Sabbath. No man shall rest in a place near to the Gentiles on the Sabbath. No man shall suffer himself to be polluted for the sake of wealth or gain on the Sabbath. And if any person falls into a place of water or into a place of . . . he shall not bring him up by a ladder or a cord or instrument. No man shall offer anything on the altar on the Sabbath, save the burnt offering of the Sabbath, for so it is

written, 'Excepting your Sabbaths'' (Zad. xiii. 2-II, 13-27; cf. viii. 15). This passage reveals the tendency to increase strictness in the observance and some items given were doubtless at the time the subject of controversy. Only a demoniac, however, can be altogether excused "profaning the Sabbath" (Zad. xiv. 6); in a presumably sane individual it was a clear and public evidence of apostasy (1 Macc. i. 43).

How differently observance might work itself out in detail is well illustrated by incidents in 1 and 2 Macc., where the making of war on the Sabbath comes up. A thousand extremists submit to being massacred rather than fail in their strict observance of the Sabbath; they preferred death to withholding the supreme public token of their loyalty to God (1 Macc. ii. 32-38; cf. 2 Macc. v. 25 f., vi. 11, xv. 1-3; also "a Sabbath of the land," 1 Macc. vi. 49, 53),—with them it was the will of God they must obey rather than the will of man; believing God required it of them, they could do no other. In the decision of Mattathias and his men to fight on the Sabbath, if attacked, a concrete case is supplied of how experience gave rise to Oral Law modifying the Written Law (1 Macc. ii. 40 f.). On the Sabbath day Jonathan and his company fight their way through (1 Macc. ix. 43-49). That such action must have been felt as a regrettable emergency is seen from the fact that there was preparedness to sacrifice some advantage in deference to the Sabbath: the pursuit of the enemy is given up, because of the approach of the Sabbath, and the division of the spoil is left till the Sabbath is over (2 Macc. viii. 26-28). Not to be able to keep the Sabbath was looked upon as the greatest hardship (2 Macc. vi. 5); treaties, it was known, would not be considered satisfactory which did not secure conditions in which it could be observed (1 Macc. x. 34).

This brings one to emphasise the joyful character of the Sabbath. Scholars have spent too much time in giving information about the minutæ of the Sabbath regulations to do justice to this, the supreme characteristic of the Sabbath on its human side. W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box rightly begin their chapter on the Sabbath with these words: "It is a mistake to suppose that the Sabbath rest of the Jews is to them a rigorous and exacting observance, so austere in its demands as to kill out all joy and loveliness. On the contrary, it appeals to the real Jew as a divinely given rest from the turmoil and bitter opposition of a hostile world. It is—and always has been among the Jews—essentially a festive observance" (I, p. 344; cf. M. Joseph, pp. 206 f.; J. H. Hertz, p. 192; A. Edersheim, II, p. 174; D.B., vol. iv. p. 321). Precisely; and in nothing is the evidence of our literature clearer than on this joyfulness of the Sabbath. The Sabbath is associated with feasts (cf. D.B., vol. i. p. 859), never with fasts (cf. in the

Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 123); "And the holy festivals were fulfilled with blessedness and in much joy" (2 Bar. lxi. 5). So, e.g., the letters of Antiochus order the profanation of "the Sabbaths and feasts" (1 Macc. i. 45); and the hardship of enforced Hellenisation is, for one thing, that "a man could neither keep the Sabbath, nor celebrate the feasts of the fathers" (2 Macc. vi. 5). King Demetrius, also, makes promises in reference to "all the feasts and the Sabbaths" (1 Macc. x. 34). Compare in Rabbinical literature: "And thy humiliation on a fast-day is not more acceptable to Him than is thy gladness on a Sabbath or Festival" (M. Joseph, p. 370). The words italicised in quotations above from Jub. and Zad. forbidding fasting on the Sabbath reveal an agreement between these two writers which was not accidental, but fundamental. Of this there is ample proof. Judith "made her a tent upon the roof of her house, and put on sackcloth upon her loins; and the garments of her widowhood were upon her. And she fasted all the days of her widowhood, *save the eves of the Sabbaths and the Sabbaths*, and the eves of the new moons, and the new moons, and the feasts and the joyful days of the house of Israel" (Jud. viii. 5 f.; cf. in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, pp. 129 f.). It was a day upon which the sorrow of widowhood even was to be laid aside in the joy of the Lord. That the shadow of death was not to be let fall across the Sabbath is beautifully put in the Apoc. Mos. in connection with the death of Eve: "And Michael came and taught Seth how to prepare Eve for burial. . . . And . . . he says to him: 'Don't mourn beyond six days, but on the seventh day, rest and rejoice on it, because on that very day, God rejoices (yea) and we angels (too) with the righteous soul, who has passed away from the earth'" (xliii. 1, 3; cf. A. and E. li. 1 f.). The joy in the Lord, that is, reached its climax in the joy of the Sabbath rest away from the world and with God in a manner which it was believed was His will; the joy of the Sabbath observance was the joy of doing the divine will.

(2) *Circumcision,—the Clean and the Unclean.*—The real origin of this rite or of these distinctions is of little interest here. In the case of the former there may be some truth in any or all the "five theories: that it was a tribal mark, that it was of the nature of an offering to the deity, that hygienic motives lay at the root of it, that it was done to secure life in the world to come, and that it was a necessary preliminary to marriage." (W. O. E. Oesterley and G. Box, I, p. 408); and in the case of the latter, a relation to taboos may be traceable. Not their remote origins but what these had become to the devout mind of our period is the question. The writer of Jub. (xv. 11, 14; cf. xvi. 14, xx. 3) may be taken as authoritative, when he comments thus on the rite: it has been divinely appointed and is to be observed in

perpetuity: "This law is for all the generations for ever, and there is no circumcision of the days, and no omission of one day out of the eight days; for it is an eternal ordinance, ordained and written on the heavenly tablets" (Jub. xv. 25); to refuse to observe it is to remain outside the covenant,—“And every one that is born, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised on the eighth day, does not belong to the children of the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham” (ver. 26); such are doomed, they belong “to the children of destruction; nor is there, moreover, any sign on him that he is the Lord’s, but (he is destined) to be destroyed and slain from the earth, and to be rooted out of the earth, for he has broken the covenant of the Lord our God” (ver. 26); to have this sign of public committal to the covenant is to become as the angels always have been, that is, they are set apart as fit to keep company with God and the angels,—“For all the angels of the presence and all the angels of sanctification have been so created from the day of their creation, and before the angels of the presence and the angels of sanctification He has sanctified Israel, that they should be with Him and with His holy angels” (ver. 27); to neglect this sign of the covenant is to prove themselves “sons of Beliar” (ver. 33), compare Zad. viii. 12, xvi. 7, where the uncircumcised are “the children of the pit”; to be uncircumcised indeed is to be guilty of the unpardonable sin,—“And there will be no more pardon or forgiveness unto them (i.e. uncircumcised Jews) for all the sin of this eternal error” (ver. 34; cf. 1 Macc. i. 15; Add. Esth. xiv. 15; Ass. Mos. viii. 3; 2 Bar. lxvi. 5). This explains the hardship they felt when it became for a time a punishable offence (1 Macc. i. 48; 2 Macc. iv. 6), the martyrdoms endured for it (1 Macc. i. 60; 2 Macc. vi. 10; 4 Macc. iv. 25), and the forcible circumcision imposed by extremists (1 Macc. ii. 46),—it was the good pleasure of God that this should be the sign of the covenant, the token to be given of one’s life-long committal to observance of the Law; and in view of that a devout soul could do no other (cf. the school of Shammai, J.Th.S., vol. xiii. p. 324; also J.L., p. 44).

From this angle, too, one must approach their observance of a distinction between the clean and the unclean; “though not precise, the distinction between what is holy and what is unclean is real; in rules of holiness the motive is respect for the gods, in rules of uncleanness it is primarily fear of an unknown or hostile power, though ultimately, as we see in the Levitical legislation, the law of clean and unclean may be brought within the sphere of divine ordinances, on the view that uncleanness is hateful to God and must be avoided by all that have to do with Him” (W. R. Smith, p. 153). Our writers uphold the Levitical legislation here referred to. Zad., of all our writers, gives the greatest

amount of detail under this head, probably in his enthusiasm to combat some laxity in the unreformed party which he has left: the priests in the sanctuary are "to make a difference between the clean and the unclean and to make men discern the holy and the profane" (viii. 14); "As to being cleansed in water: No man shall wash in water (that is) filthy or insufficient for a man's bath. None shall cleanse himself in the waters of a vessel. And every pool in a rock in which there is not sufficient (water) for a bath, which an unclean person has touched, its waters shall be unclean like the waters of the vessel" (xii. 1-2); "No man shall put on garments that are filthy or were brought by a Gentile unless they were washed in water or rubbed with frankincense" (xiii. 12); "No man shall send to the altar burnt-offering or meat-offering or frankincense or wood through the hand of a man (that is) unclean through any of the uncleanness allowing him to defile the altar. . . . And none of those who enter into the house of worship shall enter when he is unclean even though washed" (xiv. 1 f.; cf. vers. 12-16, vii. 8; cf. *Psa. Sol.* viii. 13); he believes in the "regulation of the dwellers in the cities of Israel, according to these judgments, that a difference may be made between the unclean and the clean, and to make known (the difference) between the holy and the common" (xv. 1). The worst he can say of those whom he regards as desperately wicked, he says in the style of Ezekiel: "their deeds were uncleanness before Him" (i. 17).

The writer of 4 Macc., so different in many respects from Zad., agrees with him in the legitimacy of making a distinction, and is of special interest in that he deals particularly with unclean meats, and among our writers supplies the clearest exposition of the subject from the point of view of Judaism. "Tempted towards forbidden meats. . . . Is it not that Reason has power to repress the appetites? In my opinion it is so. Accordingly when we feel a desire to eat water-animals and birds and beasts and meats of every description forbidden to us under the Law, we abstain under the predominance of Reason" (i. 33 f.; cf. xiii. 2, v. 3). The exposition referred to is put into the mouth of Eleazar, who was being "urged by the tyrant to the unlawful eating of unclean meat" (v. 14): "Don't think it, then, a small sin for us to eat the unclean thing, for the transgression of the Law, be it in small things or in great, is equally heinous; for in either case equally the Law is despised. . . . Therefore we eat no unclean meat; for believing our Law to be given by God we know also that the Creator of the world, as a Law-giver, feels for us according to our nature" (v. 19 f., 25).

This is precisely the same position as that already seen to be taken up with regard to Sabbath observance; it is the will of God, and God is good. "If you came to believe that a good and

wise God who loves you, and whom you love, had ordained a certain ceremonial, would you not logically be impelled to execute the rite, even although you knew nothing of its reason, to execute it gladly, for God's sake, because His revealed will must be wise and must be good?" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 534). Hence, justice is not done to the idea of holiness in the religious experience of our writers, when the rites which express it are regarded solely as means of separation. That they certainly were, and the fact must not be minimised; but to the devout mind of our period they had a value for their own sake as expressive of reverence for or love to God.

IV. THE FEAR OF GOD.

I. The fear of God arises from "the sense of the nearness of some higher and holier being. . . . To fear the Lord . . . means rather to feel awe of what He is, than fear of what He might do. It is fear of a Person, . . . of His character, dignity, and holiness, rather than of His power or works" (D.B., vol. i. p. 858). This reverence for a divine presence in life is the corollary of the idea of God's nearness which has been already observed, and amid differences is a real bond making our writers one in their religious conception of life. This fear of God is really at the bottom of everything, its natural association, too, being with joy, not sorrow (cf. C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 541; J.L., p. 61). "The fear of the Lord is glory and exultation, and gladness, and a crown of rejoicing" (Sir. i. 11; cf. xl. 26 f.). Ben Sira waxes eloquent on this subject: "The fear of the Lord is life" (l. 29); "To fear the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (i. 14), i.e. "is the 'head' or highest form of Wisdom, not the commencement of Wisdom" (W. O. E. Oesterley, I.J.A., Jan. 1912, p. 4); "To fear the Lord is the fulness of wisdom" (i. 16; cf. ver. 27, xxv. 11); "The crown of wisdom is the fear of the Lord" (i. 18); "To fear the Lord is the root of wisdom" (i. 20); "all wisdom is the fear of the Lord" (xix. 20; cf. T.L. xiii. 7). The second line of the last verse quoted clears up what content is given to wisdom: "And all wisdom is the fulfilling of the Law" (cf. T.Jud. xvi. 2 f.). His work abounds in passages which prove the true Jewish character of his idea of wisdom: "He that fears the Lord does this (i.e. wisdom), and he that takes hold of the Law finds her (i.e. wisdom)" (xv. 1; cf. xxi. 11, xxxiv. 8); "All these things (i.e. in which wisdom resides) are the book of the covenant of God Most High, the Law which Moses commanded (as) an heritage for the assemblies of Jacob" (xxiv. 23; cf. x. 19). So, then, to keep the Law was wisdom, and the highest form of wisdom was the fear of God

(cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, I, p. 78). At its highest everything was the outcome of respect for God.

That such respect or reverence at its best was a form of love, and with good reason could be so named, was also recognised (cf. S. Schechter, II. p. 72; M. Joseph, pp. 327, 336); so the parallelism of the following: "They that fear the Lord will not be disobedient to His words, and they that love Him will keep His ways. They that fear the Lord will seek His good pleasure, and they that love Him will be filled with (His) Law" (Sir. ii. 15 f.). The habit of the writer of the Test. is to use *fearing* God (T.Z. x. 5; T.D. vi. 1; T.Jos., xi. 1) and *loving* God as equivalents, thus: "Fear the Lord, and love your neighbour . . . he that fears God and loves his neighbour" (T.B. iii. 3 f.); compare, "Love the Lord . . . and one another" (T.D. v. 3). In Wisd. there is the same idea: "Her (i.e. wisdom's) true beginning is desire of instruction; and the care for instruction is the love of her; and love of her is the observance of her laws" (vi. 17 f.). That way one may "obtain friendship with God, commended to him by the gifts (i.e. graces) which come through discipline . . . passing into holy souls she makes them friends of God and prophets" (vii. 17, 27); "If a man loves righteousness, the fruits of wisdom's labours are virtues, for she teaches self-control and understanding, righteousness, and courage" (viii. 7). The phraseology here is different, but what is in mind is the fear or love of God whose will has been made known and character revealed in the Law, the embodiment of Divine Wisdom.

2. How this regard for God might become associated in particular with the ceremonialism of their religion is seen even in Sir.: "Meditate in the fear of the Most High (LXX: 'the ordinances of the Lord'), and think upon His commandments continually" (vi. 37; cf. xxxiii. 2 f.). The right spirit in their ceremonialism was only present, when it was the expression of this fear or reverence or love of God; and it might very readily be thought to be specially present there. "It was precisely the ceremonial law which was most of all performed for its own sake and for the love of God. Clothe the naked . . . and the end lies partly in the subsequent effect; but say the Sabbath blessing . . . and the end and the joy lie purely in the acts themselves" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 535). Only when this is remembered, can the soul be understood and appreciated who prays: "O Lord our God, we have sinned, we have done ungodly, we have dealt unrighteously in all Thine ordinances . . . for this cause Thou hast put Thy fear in our hearts, to the intent that we should call upon Thy name" (1 Bar. ii. 12, iii. 7). This godly fear forms the atmosphere of such expressions as: "Bless God, you that fear the Lord with wisdom, for the mercy of the Lord will be upon them that fear

Him, in the Judgment" (Psa. Sol. ii. 37); "Blessed is the Lord, who shows mercy to those who love Him in sincerity" (vi. 9); "And the mercy of the Lord (is) upon them that love Him in truth" (x. 4). The test, too, of sincerity or truth in this love of God was probably ritual conformity,—not entirely so, of course, but in the sense that the love of man without this would hardly have been felt as convincing evidence of genuine respect for God. How love of God and one's neighbour would be interpreted by a contemporary of Jesus is well illustrated by a few verses in 2 En., the different manner of expressing the two, and also the premier place given to the former as expressed in ritual practices being observable: thus, for evidence of love for God, note,—"Blessed is he who fears God and serves Him. And you, my children, learn to bring gifts unto the Lord, that you may enjoy life" (xlii. 6), the joy referred to being the reward of one who gives freely and without ulterior motive to the object of his love; and thus, for evidence of love to man: "Blessed is he who judges a judgment justly to the widow and orphan, and helps every one that is wronged, clothing the naked with garments, and to the hungry giving bread" (vers. 7-9).

A reference to the section above (p. 227) on righteousness will be sufficient to convince one that the value of this regard for God as a moral dynamic was not readily forgotten; most of our writers probably thought that the love of God concentrated or focussed in their ceremonialism was not *in vacuo*,—rather just because it was so concentrated or focussed it affected all the more powerfully and for good the atmosphere of ordinary human relationships. The Test., of course, are our clearest proof; but they do not by any means stand alone: e.g., "Walk in singleness of heart in the fear of the Lord" (T.R. iv. 1; cf. Wisd. i. 1); "Fear the Lord your God with your whole heart, and walk in simplicity according to all His Law" (T.L. xiii. 1); "Have the fear of God in all your works before your eyes, and honour your brethren" (T.Jos. xi. 1); "deliverance from envy comes by the fear of God" (T.Sim. iii. 4). Compare elsewhere, e.g., Sir. x. 20, 22, 24, xxi. 6, xxxii. 16, xxxiii. 1, xxxiv. 14; Tob. iv. 21; Psa. Sol. iv. 26; 2 En. xliii. 2 f. These people are only understood aright, when it is kept in mind constantly, that this outcome, almost this by-product, in life and conduct did not exhaust for them the whole value and importance of their regard for God which their ceremonial so disinterestedly expressed.

This ceremonial expression of love for God had a value of its own, independent of any such effect,—its supreme value, indeed, was in what it was over and above result in improved human relationship, so much so that the latter without it was thought to be altogether unsatisfactory. Hence, the devout soul of our

period, on the one hand, could not feel that all that was required of him was so to live that he would be put down as one who loved his fellow Jew or even his fellow-man, and, on the other, it was possible for him on occasion without any feeling of inconsistency to allow scrupulous care in regard to ceremonial to exist alongside of neglect of the ordinary moralities, as in the case of the creator and admirers of the heroine Judith. In view of the religious value of his ceremonialism, if there was any tendency to let one of the two things go, that one was humanitarianism. Love to God came before and was more than love to man, and though the best usually would not permit any contrast as to their relative importance, where such contrast was forced upon them, the bent probably was in the direction of thinking more of the ritual in honour of God than of the kindness in relief of man. They did not suppose that the kindness might be as good a token of love to God as the ritual,—that it might be a better token was almost unthinkable to them; this, too, notwithstanding the fact that, as will be seen later, almsgiving was always assigned an important place. In tithes the two probably combined as a single custom, since these had in view both the sanctuary and the poor; again, however, with preference for the sanctuary (see "Tithes" in D.B., and E.B.), Jub. in particular revealing the tendency to increase the demand on its behalf, e.g. the tithes mentioned in xxxii. 15, which were unknown to Nehemiah and by later Rabbis confined to yearly increase: "And all the tithes of oxen and sheep shall be holy unto the Lord, and shall belong to the priests, which they shall eat before Him from year to year" (cf. vers. 4-15, xiii. 25-27; 1 Macc. x. 31). Tob. gives a concrete instance where the first tenth is given "to the priests, the sons of Aaron, for the altar, and to the sons of Levi, who ministered at Jerusalem," and "the second tenth . . . unto the orphans and the widows and the proselytes who attached themselves to the children of Israel" (i. 6-8).

V. THE TREATMENT OF SIN.

I. W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box write: "What we now designate moral delinquencies were not necessarily sins in the eyes of early Israel; and in almost every case ritual offences were regarded as more grievous than moral ones. If one man sinned against another, it was a legal offence, and the Law provided a remedy; but the idea that a sin against one's neighbour was also a sin against God was unknown in early Israel. It is only in the prophetic period that a clear conception of sin arises" (I, p. 232). The permanent effect of the prophetic activity on the minds of our writers in bringing to the front moral obligations, also the

persistence—from a higher point of view it is admitted—of the distinction between ritual conformity and moral conformity of life to the will of God have been already remarked upon. It was a gain that moral transgression in the one respect as well as in the other had come to be regarded as sinful; but the stress was still apt to be put on the sinfulness of ritual offences, rather than on the sinfulness of moral delinquencies,—and in actual life the former were more obvious and usually more felt as sins than the latter. One is not unmindful of possible exceptions, nor of the very sane words of F. C. Burkitt: “that we wrong the Jews, if we think of their great struggle against Hellenisation as merely a blind preference for their ancestral ceremonial. The Law of the Lord was a canon of family and social life as well as a ritual system, and the pious Martyrs . . . laid down their lives for an ethical and social ideal quite as much as for a food law” (I, p. 36). But what F. C. Burkitt says of the second century B.C. and of Palestine holds good for the whole of our period and for Egypt as well, viz., “the two things, to us so different, were inseparable,”—with this addition, that very often, if not always, for serious already given, ritual offence was still regarded as the more serious (cf. J.L., pp. 68 f.). At any rate, both kinds of sin had to be faced, when the problem of the removal of sin was up for consideration (cf. T. R. Glover, II, pp. 61 f.).

2. Very naturally, therefore, there were certain ceremonial rites whose observance was intended to take away sin, in so far as sin took the form of offences against the holiness of God; any unintentional lack of observance of the restrictions imposed, or any such failure to carry out a commandment, and also any contraction of impurity were to be treated in this way. This was now the recognised purpose of some at any rate of the sacrifices and of the ablutions; they were performed in regard to sins which were first and foremost “impious deeds” (3 Macc. vi. 10). So, for instance, the use of blood in daily sacrifice is spoken of in connection with the command not to eat blood, thus: “supplicating on your behalf with blood before the altar; every day and at the time of morning and evening they shall seek forgiveness on your behalf perpetually before the Lord” (Jub. vi. 14); also of the Day of Atonement it is said: “If they turn to Him in righteousness He will forgive all their transgressions and pardon all their sins. It is written and ordained that He will show mercy to all who turn from all their guilt once each year” (v. 17 f.). It was a comparatively easy matter to deal with sin from this point of view; this, also the inadequacy of such a removal of sin without removal of it as a moral offence, is recognised in the words of Sir.: “The sacrifice of the unrighteous man is a mocking offering, and unacceptable are the oblations of the godless. The Most Hig

has no pleasure in the offerings of the ungodly, neither does He forgive for a multitude of sacrifices" (xxxiv. 18 f.; cf. xxxv. 12). It is noticeable that our chief ceremonialist joins Ben Sira here, though with his own accentuation,—sacrifices will not cover the sin of mixed marriages; "And there will be no respect of persons, and no receiving at his hands of fruits and offerings and burnt offerings and fat, nor the fragrance of sweet savour, so as to accept it: and so fare every man and woman in Israel who defiles the sanctuary" (Jub. xxx. 16; cf. xxii. 14).

That, however, Ben Sira even thought a ceremonial treatment of sin against holiness was required is evident from the illustration he uses later: "He who washes after (contact with) a dead body and touches it again, what has he gained by his bathing?" (xxxiv. 25); and in the next chapter he says definitely: "He that keeps the Law multiplies offerings. . . . Don't appear with empty hands in the presence of the Lord, for all this (shall be done) because it is commanded" (xxxv. 1, 4 f.). From a very different writer, the author of 2 En. the same may be gathered, namely, that words with regard to the inadequacy of the sacrifices taken by themselves, were not intended to be interpreted as enjoining their annulment, or as implying a disparagement of them in their proper place. Thus, in xlv. 3 one reads: "When the Lord demands bread, or candles, or flesh (i.e. cattle), or any other sacrifice, then that is nothing; but God demands pure hearts, and with all that only tests the heart of man"; but in lix. 2 B: "He who brings sacrifice of clean beasts, cures his own soul, and he who brings an offering of clean birds, cures his own soul." The author of the Test. joins them here (T.L. ix. 7-14), and speaks also of "archangels who minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous; offering to the Lord a sweet smelling savour, a reasonable and bloodless offering" (T.L. iii. 5). People, too, who could not offer sacrifices at the Temple, as the Jews outside Palestine for the most part, or folk who would not do so though they could, as the Essenes, yet sent offerings to the Temple and did not drop, rather sometimes reinforced, the observance of practices for avoiding or removing uncleanness.

The seriousness of ceremonial sin unatoned for, that is, left unremoved by the means prescribed for its removal, is best illustrated from our literature by that part of Judith's speech in which she assures Holofernes that his victory is certain, since the inhabitants of the besieged town through famine had set themselves to eat unclean food: "And now, that my lord be not defeated and frustrate of his purpose, and that death may fall upon them, their sin has overtaken them, wherewith they shall provoke their God to anger, whensoever they shall do wickedness. Since their victuals failed them, and all their water was scant, they took counsel to

lay hands upon their cattle, and determined to consume all those things, which God charged them by His laws that they should not eat," etc. (xi. 11 ff.). Even on her dark errand to the pagan camp she herself was careful not to contract any uncleanness, or incur any guilt in that matter; in refusing the provision made for her, she said, "I will not eat thereof, lest there be an occasion of stumbling: but provision shall be made for me of the things that are come with me" (xii. 2). The precision with which the process of cleansing from sin of this sort was carried through may be illustrated from Zad. (xii. 1 f., quoted above, p. 245; cf. T.L. ix. 11; Judith, xii. 7). Since these sins against holiness were particularly sins against God, one can understand how seriously ceremonial freeing of oneself from any such sins by oblation or ablution was taken by these people.

3. Repentance and reformation were also required (cf. in Rabbinical literature, "I only judge man according to his present deeds," G. Friedlander, III, p. 66). So even in the treatment of the ceremonial sins,—there was behind all the means to cleansing the regret in some degree that one was unclean and the intention to avoid being so for the future (cf. P. Goodman, p. 354). And much more in regard to other sins, it was assumed that a man should and could repent, and thereafter attain righteousness which he had failed to reach, when he was sinning. Here, too, of course, a repentant mind might express itself in gifts to the sanctuary, i.e. to God, but a real reformation of life and conduct was the vital thing, the supreme, if not the only, *bona fide* proof of sincerity which made a person acceptable to God (cf. C. G. Montefiore, I, pp. 510, 522). This explains Ben Sira's insistence on sacrifices as we have seen, and yet on something more: e.g., "He that practises kindness offers fine flour, and he that does mercy sacrifices a thank-offering. A thing well-pleasing to the Lord it is to avoid wickedness, and a propitiation to avoid what is wrong" (xxxv. 2 f.). He is not deluded by any false doctrine of atonement: "Do not wickedly continue in sin, for in respect of one (sin) you are not without guilt. Don't say, He will look upon the multitude of my gifts, and when I offer (them) to the Most High God He will accept (them)" (vii. 8 f.). Here at any rate Ben Sira may be taken as typical. "The sacrificial system as a means of reconciliation with God is in part advocated, but belief in its efficacy *per se* is no more firmly held; this is a point of supreme importance" (W. O. E. Oesterley, II, p. 47). He warns against any presuming on the long-suffering of God: "Don't count upon forgiveness, that you should add sin to sin. And don't say, His mercies are great, He will forgive the multitude of mine iniquities" (v. 5 f.). "My son, have you sinned (then) don't add thereto; and pray concerning your former (sins)" (xxi. 1). "Don't be

ashamed to confess (lit. : ' to turn from ') (your) sins " (iv. 26). " Turn unto the Lord, and forsake sins ; supplicate before (His) face, and (so) lessen offence. Turn unto the Most High, and turn away from iniquity, and vehemently hate the abominable thing. . . . How great is the mercy of the Lord, and His forgiveness unto them that turn unto Him " (xvii. 25 f., 29 ; cf. Zad. ii. 3). " In the time of (committing) sins, show forth repentance " (xviii. 21 ; cf. xvii. 24). (Cf. A. Büchler, pp. 74 f.)

Everywhere in Sir, this note is heard,—repentance and reformation ; and in this he is representative of the best in the popular mind of our period. So, too, Wisd. declares that the object of the exercises of Divine mercy is the production of the repentant mind in men : " Thou hast mercy on all men, because Thou hast power to do all things and Thou overlookest the sins of men to the end they may repent " (xi. 23) ; " judging them little by little Thou gavest them a place of repentance " (xii. 10 ; cf. 1 En. xl. 9) ; " Thou didst make Thy sons to be of good hope, because Thou givest repentance, when men have sinned . . . giving them times and place to escape from their wickedness " (xii. 19 f.). In the Test. references to repentance are fairly frequent ; the following indicate their tone and teaching : " And I knew, my children, that because of Joseph this had befallen me, and I repented and wept ; and I besought the Lord God that my hand might be restored, and that I might hold aloof from all pollution and envy and from all folly " (T.S. ii. 13) ; " These things I learnt at last, after I had repented concerning Joseph. For true repentance after a godly sort drives away the darkness, and enlightens the eyes, and gives knowledge to the soul, and leads the mind to salvation. And those things which it has not learnt from man, it knows from repentance " (T.G. v. 6-8 ; cf. T.Jos. vi. 6). One gets the same thing in Zad. ; e.g. where he speaks of the apostates as those who " entered into the covenant of repentance, and yet have not turned from the way of traitors " (ix. 15 B) ; and where he says that the unrepentant sinner is a character not to be trusted as a witness,— " None shall be believed as a witness against his neighbour who transgresses a word of the commandment with a high hand until they are cleansed through repentance " (x. 16).

This evidence should make one hesitate before agreeing that " there is nothing to suggest that Judaism during this period endured travail of soul in its effort to escape from sin " (H. T. Andrews, II, p. 78). It is well to recall here that men of this period secured for us the Psalms and the Prophets ; but, that apart, what our literature itself supplies demands some modification of the " nothing to suggest." There does seem to be a good deal to suggest that not a few minds took sin seriously, and made escape from it of supreme importance. " He cleanses from sin a soul

when it makes confession, when it makes acknowledgment; for shame is upon us and upon our faces on account of all these things. . . . Thy goodness is upon them that sin, when they repent" (Psa. Sol. ix. 12 f., 15). "Thou, O Lord, according to Thy great goodness hast promised repentance and forgiveness to them that have sinned against Thee; and in the multitude of Thy mercies hast appointed repentance unto sinners, that they may be saved. . . . Thou hast appointed repentance unto me that am a sinner; for the sins I have sinned are more in number than the sands of the sea. For my transgressions were multiplied, O Lord; my transgressions were multiplied, and I am not worthy to behold and see the height of heaven by reason of the multitude of mine iniquities. . . . I have sinned, O Lord, I have sinned, and I acknowledge mine iniquities. But, I humbly beseech Thee, forgive me, O Lord, forgive me" (P. Man, vers. 7-9, 12 f.; cf. 1 Bar. iii. 1 f.).

4. The grace of God helps the soul to repent and to reform. A re-reading in this connection of some of the things our literature says about prayer (see above, pp. 52-55) and wisdom (see above, pp. 49 ff.), will probably convince most that it was thought that through prayer the divine spirit of wisdom took up its abode, or gained power in the human mind (cf. T. Rees, I, pp. 31 ff., 47 f.; G. Friedlander, IV, p. 72; I.J.A., July 1910, p. 62). Repentance let go Godward in prayer opened the door to the entrance of such regenerative influence. In addition, some of the functions of angels (see above, pp. 47 ff.) should be noted in this connection. They bring revelation, i.e., they enlighten the mind of man, e.g. "an angel of God revealed to my father" (T.R. iii. 15; cf. Jub. xxxii. 21, ii. 1); "the angel of the Lord showed me" (T.Jud. xv. 5; cf. T.R. v. 3). They give guidance: "an angel of the Lord shall guide them both" (T.D. v. 4; cf. T.B. vi. 1). They help one to remember what has come to one in a period of vision; when Jacob feared that he might not be able to remember all, the angel "said unto him, I will bring all things to your remembrance" (Jub. xxxii. 25). They give strength to prevail: "an angel of might followed me everywhere, that I should not be overcome" (T.Jud. iii. 10); after repentance "the very angel of peace shall strengthen Israel, that it fall not into the extremity of evil" (T.D. vi. 5; cf. T.A. vi. 6); and this very "angel of peace" is the inspiring spirit of "the inclination of the good man" (T.B. vi. 1). (See further above, p. 204.)

Accordingly, the doctrine of the grace of God helping men to be good is clearly taught. This is the assumption which prompts the prayer of Ben Sira: "Turn away concupiscence from me . . . and don't give me over to a shameless soul" (Sir. xxiii. 5 f.). So Jub.'s belief is given in the promise, "I will create in them a holy spirit" (i. 23; cf. ver. 21), and in the prayer, "May the God

of all bless you and strengthen you to do righteousness" (xxii. 10; cf. 2 En. ii. 3). The Test. excel in giving concrete instances: see T.S. ii. 13, quoted above, p. 253,—so, too, Joseph says: "I struggled against a shameless woman, urging me to transgress with her; but the God of Israel my father delivered me from the burning flame" (T.Jos. ii. 2; cf. Psa. Sol. xvi. 7). In 1 En. xxxvii-lxxi the righteous are those "whose elect works hang upon the Lord of Spirits" (xxxviii. 2; cf. xl. 5, xlvi. 8), who "strengthened the spirits of the righteous, in the name of His righteousness" (xli. 8). It is probably experience of such divine grace, and nothing more, that is referred to in Wisd. viii. 19 f., 4 Macc. xviii. 22, quoted above, pp. 188 f. Thus it was that "Abraham . . . did not chose the will of his own spirit" (Zad. iv. 2); Isaiah to the last in the experience of martyrdom "spoke with the holy spirit" (Mart. Is. v. 14; cf. i. 7); Joseph "has no defilement in his heart, because the spirit of God rests upon him" (T.B. viii. 2; cf. Jub. xl. 5); and even the Gentiles "shall be . . . enlightened through the grace of the Lord" (T.L. xviii. 9). No one either realises the need for this helping grace, this divine dynamic, more than the writer of S. in 4 Ez., whose pessimism rests on the fact that man, if left to himself, is helpless to rise above the evil in his nature. The normal notion is, therefore, the one implied in the prayer: "May He give you all a heart to worship Him and do His pleasure with hearty courage and a willing soul; may He give you an open heart for His law and for His statutes" (2 Macc. i. 3 f.). God through or as an angel (cf. J.L., p. 286), or God as the holy spirit of Wisdom, in response to prayer gives the penitent soul the power to become good: "In His name they are saved" (1 En. xlvi. 7).

5. This brings one to consider the subject of atonement. Already it has been noted that sacrifices and ceremonial washings of themselves, without repentance and reformation, were of no avail (cf. the Rabbinical conception, J.Q.R., vol. xvi, Jan. 1904, pp. 209-257). Fasting should probably be treated in the same way. Psa. Sol. says: "He (i.e. the righteous man) makes atonement for (sins of) ignorance by fasting and afflicting his soul" (iii. 9). This, however, does not exhaust the function of fasting. "In its religious use such a mute expression of sorrow would be an act of contrition for sin, or appeal for heavenly aid in distress" (D.B., vol. i, p. 855). Both these uses may be illustrated from our writers. As the ritual of repentance and confession it is met with in the following: "And wine and strong drink I did not drink, and flesh did not enter into my mouth, and I ate no pleasant food; but I mourned over my sin, for it was great, such as had not been in Israel" (T.R. i. 10; cf. T.Jud. xv. 4); and as the preliminary of some deliverance or revelation in such as: "with great earnestness did they humble their souls . . . and . . . put sackcloth upon their

loins . . . and . . . continued fasting many days" (Jud. iv. 9 f., 13; cf. 2 Macc. xiii. 12), "we (i.e. Baruch and Jeremiah) rent our garments, we wept, and mourned, and fasted seven days. And it came to pass after seven days, that the word of God came to me" (2 Bar. ix. 2, x. 1; cf. v. 7; 4 Ez. vi. 31, etc.). Its close association with prayer is well illustrated by a passage in 1 Macc.; "They gathered themselves together, and came to Mizpeh . . . aforetime a place of prayer for Israel. And they fasted that day" (iii. 46 f.). Indeed, fasting was ideally prayer, when prayer had become an agonising. It was inconsistent with the sinful practice or mind: "God loves him who . . . combines fasting with chastity" (T. Jos. ix. 2); contrast, "the man who commits adultery and fasts" (T.A. iv. 3; cf. ii. 8); "Two years therefore I afflicted my soul with fasting in the fear of the Lord" (T.S. iii. 4). Compare, "if you follow after chastity and purity with patience and prayer, with fasting in humility of heart," etc. (T. Jos. x. 2). There was a disposition, therefore, to avoid the error of the formalist. Its association with the giving of charity emerges in the words of Joseph: "Nor for three days did I take my food, but I gave it to the poor and sick" (T. Jos. iii. 5). (Cf. A. Büchler, pp. 139 f., 215 f.)

Repentance, prayer, fasting and almsgiving were then very closely joined together in the practice of these people. In another connection we have shown the important place given to prayer (see above, pp. 52 ff.); all therefore we need add here is, that the devout soul felt that regular times of prayer should be practised,—“It is good to go morning, midday, and evening into the Lord’s dwelling (i.e. the Temple), for the glory of your Creator” (2 En. li. 4),—and probably explained its efficacy in securing benefits to himself and others in accordance with his doctrine of works and merit, which was really the only doctrine of atonement he had; that is, he thought that, when God had kept him long enough, or he had travailed sufficiently to merit, according to God’s mercy,—not His justice,—an answer, the answer came. This seems to hold whether prayers be for forgiveness of the past (Sir. xxi. 1), deliverance in the present (xxxv. 16), or guidance for the future (xxxvii. 15). This certainly is from their point of view the *rationale* of intercessory prayer, whether of the living for the living (T.R. i. 7, iv. 4; T. Jud. xix. 2; T.N. vi. 8; T.G. v. 9; T.B. iii. 6, x. 1), or of the living for the dead (2 Macc. xii. 42-45). Fasting as a mark of intensity increased the merit, so it seems, and hastened therefore the Divine response. Almsgiving had peculiar value as evidence that the prayerful frame of mind was not transitory; it was sufficiently sincere to affect conduct for good. Hence, the statements: "A flaming fire water quenches, so almsgiving atones for sin" (Sir. iii. 30); "Give alms of your substance: don't turn away your face from any poor man, and the face of

God shall not be turned away from you . . . for you lay up a good treasure for yourself against the day of necessity: because alms delivers from death, and does not suffer to come into darkness" (Tob. iv. 7, 9 f.); "almsgiving delivers from death, and it purges away all sin. They that do alms shall be fed with life" (xii. 8 f.). These seem to embody the prevailing notion; compare how pardon of sins appears in the middle of a section in Zad. on systematic almsgiving (xviii. 1-10).

The tendency, indeed, was to make this the "righteousness" *par excellence*,—e.g. "Benevolence (lit.: 'righteousness,' i.e. almsgiving) to a father shall not be blotted out, and as a substitute for sins it shall be firmly planted" (Sir. iii. 14; cf. ver. 3, xvii. 22; xxix. 8 ff.),—the right spirit in giving not being forgotten, but rather the merit of the gift in the sight of God being done away with, if an unworthy spirit were manifested: "Just as the rain makes burning heat to cease; so a word changes (the character) of a gift. For there is a good word (i.e. of encouragement and cheer to the recipient) which is better than a gift, and both belong to a saintly man. A fool (i.e. a man of unworthy soul and unacceptable to God, in giving) upbraids ungraciously" (Sir. xviii. 16-18; cf. in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 11). On the latter, W. O. E. Oesterley remarks, "He is a 'fool' because the efficacy of the gift in the sight of God is done away by the churlish remark which accompanies it" (A.P., vol. i. p. 380; cf. VI., p. 124). Compare, "He who defrauds his neighbour provokes God, and swears falsely against the Most High, and yet pities the poor; the Lord who commands the Law he sets at nought and provokes, and yet he refreshes the poor. He defiles the soul and makes gay the body; he kills many, and pities a few; this, too, has a twofold aspect, but the whole is evil" (T.A. ii. 6 f.). This reveals that the merit of a work was qualitatively, rather than quantitatively, determined—a distinction never to be forgotten. But to do our writers justice here, one must go into this doctrine of works more fully and endeavour to appreciate it at its best. (Cf. A. Büchler, p. 18.)

6. The saved are "those who have now been justified in My law, who have had understanding in their life, and who have planted in their heart the root of wisdom" (2 Bar. li. 3; cf. Psal. Sol. iii. 10), or to put it rather more definitely, "those who have been saved by their works, and to whom the Law has been now a hope, and understanding an expectation, and wisdom a confidence" (ver. 7; cf. lxvii. 6; T.N. viii. 5). "In their heart" in the first passage quoted, and the reference to "understanding" and "wisdom" in both verses bring to one's notice the fact that works of the Law were not exterior deeds, whose merit was determined without consideration of the mind behind them. Only when a man felt himself thus right with God did he feel it was

any use his approaching God in intercessory prayer: "Hezekiah trusted in his works, and had hope in his righteousness, and spoke with the Mighty One, and said: 'Behold, for lo! Sennacherib is prepared to destroy us, and he will be boastful and uplifted when he has destroyed Zion.' And the Mighty One heard him, for Hezekiah was wise, and He had respect unto his prayer, because he was righteous" (2 Bar. lxiii. 3-15); again, "Righteous men and holy prophets . . . interceded for us with Him who made us . . . and the Mighty One heard their prayer and forgave us" (lxxxv. 1 f.; cf. ii. 2). It was a great disadvantage when there were no such,—to be living "now the righteous have been gathered and the prophets have fallen asleep" (ver. 3). This seems to be shutting out intercession after death; that does not, however, shut out the fact that the works of the righteous were expected to have a significance after their departure: it was thought that "it was due to Zion, that on account of the works of those who wrought good works she should be forgiven, and should not be overwhelmed on account of the works of those who wrought unrighteousness" (2 Bar. xiv. 7; cf. Tob. xiii. 8). In this way the favour of God to Solomon is explained: "And for his (i.e. David's) sake there stood up after him a wise son who dwelt in safety" (Sir. xlvii. 12). Hence, too, the advice: "At all times make request perseveringly and pray diligently with your whole heart that the Mighty One may be reconciled to you, and that He may not reckon the multitude of your sins, but remember the rectitude of your fathers" (2 Bar. lxxxiv. 10).

The emphatic reference to the mercy of God in the verse following the last quoted brings to view a point which is often overlooked, namely, that this doctrine of works was understood to be in accordance with the mercy of God: "For if He does not judge us according to the multitude of His mercies, woe unto all us who are born" (ver. 11); cf. in Rabbinical literature, A. Marmorstein, pp. 11-15; (also see S. Levy, pp. 31 f.). Works were not thought to buy the mercy of God, but the presence of works in some measure made the situation hopeful enough to warrant God, who is just, showing mercy. The doctrine should never be set forth as an equation x of works equalling y of mercy (cf. in Rabbinical literature, "The world must abide and justice also; for unless Thou wilt be indulgent, the world cannot last" (G. Friedlander, III, p. 60; and see S. Levy, pp. 40 f.). Salvation was not strictly speaking by works; salvation was by the mercy of God (cf. C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 528). The words of the following prayer in 1 Bar. are not rejection *in toto* of the merit of righteousness in the sight of God; rather, the soul here realises the tendency to think in equation style, and resists it, and in so doing expresses in extreme fashion that salvation cannot be strictly by merit: "We do not

present our supplication before Thee, O Lord our God, for the righteousness of our fathers and of our kings. . . . Thou hast dealt with us . . . according to all that great mercy of thine. . . . Hear, O Lord, and have mercy; for Thou art a merciful God; yea, have mercy upon us, because we have sinned before Thee" (ii. 19, 27, iii. 2). He simply feels there is no merit of the kind to plead: "all the iniquity of our fathers" (iii. 8) he reiterates, —demerit outweighs merit hopelessly. He would be more comfortable in his plea for mercy were the scale otherwise; but, even so, with no merit to plead, there is the mercy of God to be appealed to (cf. S. Schechter, II, p. 61).

How that a sense of merit might be consistent with the consciousness of ultimate demerit, and therefore with reliance on the grace and mercy of God is shown most by passages from Ass. Mos.; thus—"Now therefore, my sons, hear me; for observe and know that neither did the fathers nor the forefathers (or 'neither did I nor the fathers') tempt God, so as to transgress His commands. And you know that this is our strength, and thus we will do" (ix. 4 f.); contrast, "Not for any virtue or strength of mine, but of His good pleasure have His compassion and longsuffering fallen to my lot. For I say unto you, Joshua: it is not on account of the godliness of this people that you will root out the nations" (xii. 7 f.),—words followed immediately by some on the need for work: "Those, therefore, who do and fulfil the commandments of God shall increase and be prospered; but those who sin and set at naught the commandments shall be without the blessings before mentioned" (vers. 10 f.). The same emerges when one considers the idea of individual merit. So Ben Sira often strikes the note: "Every one that does righteousness shall secure his reward, and every man shall find (his reward) before Him, according to his works" (xvi. 14; cf. iii. 3-15); but he is very careful at times to warn against what, perhaps, was too often a popular conception, that so many sins could be balanced (cf. 1 En. xli. 1) by so many good works: e.g., "So a man fasting for his sins and again doing the same—who will listen to his prayer? And what has he gained by his humiliation?" (xxxiv. 26). That the mercy of God, not the equating of merit and demerit, was the fundamental matter may be seen from another passage in Sir., viz., v. 5 f. quoted above, p. 252 (cf. J. H. Hertz, p. 270).

This probably affords the clue to the conception of faith in our literature. Where faith occurs alone, it may be, that fidelity to the Law is its meaning, that is, the reference is general and comprehensive, thus, "the land be barren of faith" (4 Ez. v. 1; cf. vi. 28, vii. 34, xi. 4; 2 Bar. liv. 21; Ass. Mos. iv. 8); so what in one place is called "the treasures of faith" (4 Ez. vi. 5; cf.

1 En. lviii. 5, lxi. 4), in another appears as "a treasure of works" (4 Ez. vii. 77; cf. 2 Bar. xiv. 12). But where faith and righteousness or works occur together one may take it that some differentiation is intended. The heavenly Messiah, for example, is described as "the Elect One of righteousness and of faith" (1 En. xxxix. 6); the work of the earthly Messiah is said to be "shepherding the flock of the Lord *faithfully* and righteously (*ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνη*)" (Psa. Sol. xvii. 45), where "faith" probably refers to "the fear of God" and "righteousness" to "his works" in the previous line. The saved in 4 Ez. are those "who shall be able to escape on account of his works or his faith by which he has believed" (ix. 7); compare, "such as have works and faith toward . . . the Mighty One" (xiii. 23; cf. Zad. ix. 37). In elucidation of what is here meant by faith the following should be considered together as examples: "They trusted in God throughout the period that Israel trespassed and polluted the Sanctuary" (Zad. ix. 47); "God will pardon them and they shall see His salvation; for they trust in His holy name" (Zad. ix. 54); "the noble mother willingly surrendered them through faith in God" (4 Macc. xv. 24; cf. xvii. 2); "them that believe the promise of their reward" (2 Bar. lix. 2; cf. lvii. 2). Hence, while R. H. Charles (A.P., vol. ii. p. 311) has bracketed the line in 2 Bar. liv. 5, "who in faith have submitted themselves to Thee and Thy Law," one fails to see anything un-Jewish in it (cf. J. H. Hertz, p. 203; R. T. Herford, I, pp. 218 f.).

This trust was an essential constituent of the piety of our writers; in conjunction with righteousness it brought to the front the right attitude of mind to God required under the Law (cf. the faith of Abraham in Rabbinical literature, A. Marmorstein, p. 37), and in association with works it denied that merit could ever be fully adequate to cancel sin, and therefore to rely on the mercy of God was in the end the only thing one could do (cf. I.J.A., April 1905, pp. 38 f.). What emerges so sadly yet delightfully in 4 Ez. was not really anything new in Judaism; it was just a clear expression by a sensitive soul of what was in varying degrees then in the minds of the best, and too often, without due appreciation, taken for granted by the commoner sort of people: "Thou, because of us sinners, art called compassionate. For if Thou hast a desire to compassionate us who have no works of righteousness, then shalt Thou be called 'the gracious One.' For the righteous, who have many works laid up with Thee, shall out of their own deeds receive their reward. But what is man that Thou shouldst be wroth with him? Or what is a corruptible race that Thou canst be so bitter towards it? For in truth there is none of the earth-born who has not dealt wickedly, and among those that exist who has not sinned. For in this, O Lord, shall Thy righteousness and

goodness be declared, if Thou wilt compassionate them that have no wealth of good works" (viii. 31-36).

To summarise conclusions : These people knew very well that on the human side the obligations to be met were not by any means small, if a man were to be acceptable to God. To seek to fulfil these obligations was the delight of the devout soul. One part of his duty was to hedge himself off from the pagan world around him. Within that enclosure he might hope to go on to be in thought and practice a man after God's own purpose concerning him. To be righteous he must be just and kind in his activity. These and other virtues he must show in relationship to any of his own people at least. He was to be loving and pure in his disposition,—ever humble and ever aspiring. In particular, the sin of adultery, even in thought, was condemned ; duty to parents was placed in the forefront of one's duty to men ; the peril of wealth was often felt ; and the *lex talionis* was very generally allowed to stand, the duty of forgiveness being limited by the limitation which still adhered to the term "neighbour." Not only was ceremonialism an insurance against contamination by the outside world, but it was often thought of as, in a special sense, an expression of love to God ; so the Sabbath was a love-token to God, with its many restrictions joyfully kept in the way it was thought most pleasing to Him ; so, too, with the rite of circumcision, and the distinction between clean and unclean,—these things had a peculiar Godward reference. Indeed, reverence for God as it was required by the Law was the highest wisdom. Both worship and philanthropy were required,—the former having the preference, and neither of itself being estimated as sufficient. Sin might, then, be directly and only against God ; or it might be of the nature of injury to oneself or another, and in that way contrary to God's intention. There was a tendency still to stress the former, and the sacrifices and ablutions had these sins *par excellence*, sins of holiness in view. To make these ceremonies valid, however, repentance, and at least the intention to reform were required. So, too, in the case of all other sins,—the power to repent being one's own and yet sometimes recognised as God-given, and reformation being due to the entrance into one of Divine wisdom as it is in the Law. Repentance, prayer, fasting, and almsgiving were thus very intimately connected, and only when so found in conjunction did they give any satisfaction to God. This satisfaction, too, could never be an altogether adequate satisfaction ; a man might rightfully feel that he had some things to his credit in the sight of God, but never to the point of forgetting what he still owed, and always must owe, to the mercy of God. His wealth of good works could never be such that in his case there was no need to commit his soul, by faith, to a compassionate God.

B—JESUS AND THIS TEACHING

I. THE IDEA OF THE LAW.

I. JESUS regarded himself as a man of the Torah; with our writers he fully appreciated the fine sense of human obligation, Godward and manward, which the Law had succeeded in developing. As a good Jew (cf. J. H. Hertz, p. 183) he quoted the *Shema* (Deut. vi. 4 f.) as the summary of man's right attitude to the Divine existence: "Hear, O Israel, the Name (see above, p. 58) our God, the Name is one: and you should love the Name your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength" (Mark xii. 29 f. || Matt. xxii. 37; cf. Luke x. 27), and gave Lev. xix. 18, "You should love your neighbour as yourself" (Mark xii. 31 || Matt. xxii. 39; cf. Luke x. 27), as an epitome of man's duty to his fellows arising out of his reverence for God. This latter is given again elsewhere with a fine and very suggestive positiveness: "All, then, whatever you desire that people do for you, just so also do for them" (Matt. vii. 12 || Luke vi. 31; compare, "And what you yourself hate, do to no man," Tob. iv. 15; also Hillel similarly, see J. H. Hertz, p. 279; also A. Büchler, pp. 12, 23). The questions, "In the Law what is written? how do you read?" (Luke x. 26), "Did not Moses give you the Law? And nobody among you is doing the Law. Why are you after me to kill?" (John vii. 19), reflect the truth with regard to his attitude toward the Law. On one occasion he runs over some of the commandments in detail: "The commandments you know, Do not murder, Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not be a lying witness, Do not defraud, Honour your father and mother" (Mark x. 19 || Matt. xix. 18 f.; Luke xviii. 20).

When, also, a more liberal position than usual was rightly detected in his attitude, and consequently some had raised the cry that the tendency or purpose of his teaching was as destructive of what was distinctively Jewish as was that of the Hellenisers in Maccabean times, he blankly denied the charge: "Do not suppose that I have come to destroy the Law (*καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον*) or the Prophets: I have not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. v. 17). "Fulfil" should probably be interpreted *quite simply*

in the light of such a very ancient prayer from the Jewish morning service as, "O put it into our hearts to understand, and to discern, to mark, learn, and teach, to heed, to do and to fulfil in love all the words of instruction in Thy Law" (cf. P. Goodman, p. 301; S. Singer, p. 39); compare, "Those . . . who do (*facientes*) and fulfil (*consummanles*) the commandments of God" (Ass. Mos. xii. 10; cf. F. W. Worsley, p. 121), also "all wisdom is the fulfilling (LXX, *ποιήσις*) of the Law" (Sir. xix. 20). His words here would be taken, and were indeed given, as an assurance on his part that his teaching did not mean the recrudescence of a Hellenism such as the Maccabeans, to begin with, fought against, and the martyrs of that period died to save their people from; compare. "the laws which were on the verge of abolition" (*καταλύεσθαι*) (2 Macc. ii. 22), "seeking to overthrow the Lawful (*τὰς . . . νομίμας καταλύων*) modes of life" (2 Macc. iv. 11), "to break the Law" (*καταλύσαι νόμον*) (4 Macc. v. 33), "desiring to destroy (*καταλύσαι*) the Hebrew nation" (4 Macc. xvii. 9), which suggest the atmosphere in which Jesus was at the time when he had to make this defensive statement. "The picture of Jesus' life and his discourses stand in no relation with the Greek spirit" (A. Harnack, II, p. 33).

He believed, then, in the permanent value of much in his ancestral religion; whatever modifications or developments might come, the essential matters would not be altered,—“For truly I tell you, Till there has disappeared heaven and earth, a dot or a dash will not disappear from the Law,—till all has happened” (Matt. v. 18 || Luke xvi. 17). That he used Torah in the broad sense customary among his people,—that is, as embracing more than the contents of the so-called books of Moses, is also evident. Not only does he refer to the rule concerning the shewbread (Lev. xxiv. 5–9), and to what the priests did on the Sabbath (Num. xxviii. 9 f.), as being there for them to read “in the Law” (Matt. xii. 5 f.), but he also quotes psalms as from “the Law,” thus: “Does it not stand written in your (probably read, ‘the’) Law, ‘I said, Gods you are’” (John x. 34; cf. Ps. lxxxii. 6); and again, “that there may be fulfilled (i.e. illustrated) the word written in their (probably read ‘the’) Law, They have hated me gratuitously” (John xv. 25; cf. Ps. xxxv. 19, lxix. 4). In a passage where Matthew gives “all the Prophets and the Law,” Luke has “the Law and the Prophets” (Matt. xi. 13 || Luke xvi. 16), and the latter phrase, which was the more usual (cf. 2 Macc. xv. 9), seems to have been frequently on Jesus' lips: “this is the Law and the Prophets” (Matt. vii. 12), “on these two commandments the whole Law hangs and the Prophets” (Matt. xxii. 40).

He appears, also, to have taken full advantage of the fact that in his time the canon of Scripture, though in many respects

already fixed, was not yet authoritatively defined and closed. "Ecclesiasticus seems at one time to have been included in the Hagiographa" (M. Joseph, p. 18; cf. E., July 1916, p. 7; also P. I. Hershon, pp. 147 f.). Already one has noted possible references in his recorded teaching to this book (see above, p. 153), also to Jub. (see above, p. 76), as "scripture." There may be added the evidence of the possibility that at the last supper, and in Gethsemane, the passage on the traitor-friend in Sir. xxxvii. 1-4 was in his mind determining the form of his remarks on those occasions. Sir. reads: "Every friend (*φίλος*), says, I am a friend; but there is a friend (*φίλος*) who is (only) friend (*φίλος*) in name. Is there not a sorrow (*λύπη*) that comes nigh unto death (*ἔως θανάτου*), a deeply loved friend (*ἑταῖρος καὶ φίλος*) who changes to an enemy? O base nature! why then were you created to fill the world's face with deceit? Base is the friend (*ἑταῖρος*) who has regard to one's table, but in the time of stress stands aloof (*ἔσται ἀπέναντι*)"; cf. also Sir. vi. 9 f., 12: "There is a friend (*φίλος*) that turns to an enemy . . . a table-friend. . . . If evil overtake you, he will turn against you." Note, "He who has dipped with me his hand in the dish, this (i.e. is the kind of fellow who) will me deliver up" (Matt. xxvi. 23 || Mark xiv. 20, Luke xxii. 21; cf. A. M. Ribhany, p. 44), "good were it for him, if there had not been born (at any rate) that man" (Matt. xxvi. 24 || Mark xiv. 21; cf. 1 En. xxxviii. 2); "Deeply pained (*περίλυπος*) is my soul—unto death (*ἔως θανάτου*)" (Matt. xxvi. 38 || Mark xiv. 34; cf. LXX, Psa. xliii. 5); "Friend (*ἑταῖρε*), for what you've come (? get on with)" (Matt. xxvi. 50). The apparently studied transition in the Sir. passage from *φίλος* = *נָהֵב*, "lover" or "friend," to *ἑταῖρος* = *נָח*, "companion" or "fellow," is significant; and in view of what Jesus had said previously, his use of a term to Judas which was equivalent to *ἑταῖρε* would almost have the force of "Traitor-friend!" Other evidence of the possibility of reminiscences in his teaching of the contents of extra-canonical books may be gathered, for example, from the following pages of this thesis: pp. 121, 153, 162 f., 171, 173, 270, 278 f., 279, 280 f., 290, 332 f.

But to return to the main subject: that Jesus shared in the joy of religion so characteristic of the experience of the best minds under the Law may also be claimed; he knew and spoke of the bliss of those "who are hungering and thirsting for righteousness" (Matt. v. 6; cf. W. Bousset, pp. 130 f.). Thus far, then, the Judaism of Jesus cannot be called in question. "If you want to go into (eternal) life, keep the commandments" (Matt. xix. 17; cf. Luke x. 28). "No one, having drunk old wants new; for he says, The old is palatable (*χρηστός*)" (Luke v. 39).

2. Furthermore, Jesus never seems to have intended any violent

abrogation of those customs of his own people, which had done so much to keep them unspotted from the world. In youth he speaks of the Temple as his "Father's house" (Luke ii. 49); so also, if the chronology of the Fourth Gospel is to be followed, at the outset of his public ministry (John ii. 16). (See further above, p. 63.) Whatever else, too, is obscure in the Matthean story about payment to the Temple, this much is clear, that in reference to the "half a shekel for an offering to the Lord" due from "everyone . . . from twenty years old and upwards" (Ex. xxx. 13 f.), he gave the instruction to Peter, "Give to them for me and you" (Matt. xvii. 27). How scrupulous he was over the observance of the Levitical law concerning a cleansed leper, that lepers go to the priest to have their cleanness properly certified, and, in the event of a declaration of complete recovery, to make the prescribed offerings, is carefully noted: he says to a recovered leper, "Be off, show yourself to the priest, and offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded for evidence to them (i.e. of recovery)" (Mark i. 44 || Matt. viii. 4, Luke v. 14), and to ten such, "Go and show yourselves to the priests" (Luke xvii. 14). One of his last acts, also, was to make at least preparation for the holding of the Passover with his more immediate friends in Jerusalem: he "says to them, Be off into the city, and there will meet you a man carrying a water-pitcher; accompany him; and wherever he goes in, say to the head of the household, 'The teacher inquires (i.e. through us, lit., 'says'), Where is my lodging, where the passover with my disciples I may eat?'" (Mark xiv. 13 f. || Matt. xxvi. 18; Luke xxii. 8, 10 f.).

Premeditated laxity in these matters did not, then, commend itself to him: this is probably what is at the back of such sayings as, "Whoever, then, breaks one of these very small commandments, and teaches people (to do) so, very small will he be acknowledged in the Kingdom of Heaven: but whoever does and teaches them, this (i.e. is the sort who) will be acknowledged great in the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. v. 19); "On Moses' seat sat down the scribes and the Pharisees: all, then, whatever they tell you, do and keep" (Matt. xxiii. 2 f.). He had a great regard, too, for the most distinguished prophet of the Torah, Ezekiel (cf. e.g. Luke xix. 10 with Ez. xxxiv. 16; also see above, p. 175; E. A. Abbott, Book I, chap. vi); and yet he was against all attempts to make outward observances a burden by emphasis on detail as an end in itself: "they tie up heavy packages and put (them) on people's shoulders, and they themselves with their finger do not want to move them" (Matt. xxiii. 4 || Luke xi. 46). "In all probability he observed the Mosaic Law himself, and did not directly urge or desire his disciples to break any definite injunction" (C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 489; cf. II, p. 80; cf. D. W. Forrest,

I, p. 45). On the evidence as it stands in the Gospels, there can hardly be any other conclusion.

2. THE IDEA OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

1. Jesus put great emphasis on "righteousness"—it was supremely important (cf. T. C. Hall, pp. 62 f.), and to determine precisely what meaning the term conveyed to his mind is our task here. He himself wished "to fulfil (cf. above, p. 262) all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15). "Those who are hungering and thirsting for righteousness" would "have their fill" (Matt. v. 6). They were in the succession of "the prophets" who "have been persecuted on account of righteousness" (Matt. v. 10; cf. ver. 12). With earnest seeking after "the Kingdom" of God he always associated "his (i.e. God's) righteousness" (Matt. vi. 33 || Luke xii. 31). He observes that "John came . . . in the way of righteousness" (Matt. xxi. 32). The function of the holy spirit in the soul of man is, for one thing, to clear up what is meant by "righteousness" (John xvi. 8, 10).

He was profoundly influenced by the prophets of the O.T. (see e.g. above, pp. 175-179), and often quoted them or allowed his language to be deeply coloured by them (for particulars, see C. S. Macfarland, chaps. ii, iv). That his people had had the guidance of a succession of prophetic men, he considered was an inestimable privilege: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them listen to them" (Luke xvi. 29), that is, 'What better opportunity of attaining righteousness could they have?' "If Moses and the prophets they do not listen to" (ver. 31), he feels that their case is hopeless. This has been, with some reason, thought to be the main point of the parable (cf. L. E. Browne, pp. 43 ff.). He himself consciously joined the prophets, when he urged justice for the poor. He had no soft words for "those who eat up the houses of widows" (Mark xii. 40 || Luke xx. 47; cf. A. Edersheim, I, p. 212), who benefit "by rapacity and self-indulgence" (Matt. xxiii. 25). With some reason his words on oaths, "But let your word be, Yes, yes; No, no" (Matt. v. 37; cf. xxiii. 16-22), may be interpreted as a plea as much for honesty as for reverence (cf. E., Feb. 1912, pp. 186-192; C. Gore, p. 81; F. C. Burkitt on 1 En. lxix. 9 f., I, p. 69; and in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, III, p. 200).

The enumeration of "justice, and pity, and faithfulness" as "the weightier things of the Torah" (Matt. xxiii. 23), and the exhortation not to "judge according to appearance," but to "judge just judgment" (John vii. 24), represent clear and unmistakable notes in his preaching. He was out against "the workers" or "the doers of lawlessness" (Matt. vii. 23; xiii. 41), spoke plain words of sincere and not uncalled-for wrath to those who "are full

of . . . lawlessness " (Matt. xxiii. 28), and was horrified to think of a time when "lawlessness will be increased" (Matt. xxiv. 12). The stress he laid on philanthropy is seen particularly in the place which he gave, again in oneness with our writers, to almsgiving (see below, pp. 302 f.). Besides, he joins our writers in bringing to the front at times the necessity for prudence in the determination of one's course: "the sons of this age are more sensible (*φρονιμώτεροι*) than the sons of light in their treatment of their contemporaries" (Luke xvi. 8); "Become then sensible (*φρόνιμοι*) as serpents" (Matt. x. 16); "Every one, then, who hears these words of mine and does them, will be comparable to a sensible (*φρονίμω*) man, who built his house upon a rock" (Matt. vii. 24; cf. Luke vi. 47 f.); compare also, "the reliable and sensible (*φρόνιμος*) slave" (Matt. xxiv. 45 || Luke xii. 42), and the "sensible" (*φρόνιμοι*) young ladies (Matt. xxv. 2, 4, 8; cf. Luke xii. 35-39; cf. in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, pp. 141 f.). In all this he does not advance beyond them.

There is, however, evidence that he had the feeling, on occasions, that he was adding to the meaning of righteousness as it was then understood (cf. A. Harnack, II, Lecture IV, iii). Hence his words, "the Law and the Prophets as far as John!" (Luke xvi. 16 || Matt. xi. 13). "No one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old coat; otherwise, the patch pulls away from it, the fresh (piece) from the old, and a worse tear results. And no one puts new wine into old wineskins; otherwise, the wine will split the wineskins, and the wine is lost, and the wineskins. But new wine into new wineskins!" (Mark ii. 21 f. || Matt. ix. 16 f., Luke v. 36 ff.). This new content can best be appreciated by a study of what he said God required of the disciple. "Good deeds" must be so good that they will shed light into the minds of other men by suggesting the Fatherhood of God; they must "bestow glory on your Father in heaven" (Matt. v. 16). This can only be done by a seeking love, such as is capable in extremity of sustaining a prayerful interest in the souls of the spiteful: "Love your enemies, and pray on behalf of those who are persecuting you; that you may become sons of your Father in heaven" (Matt. v. 44 f. || Luke vi. 27 f., 35),—the enemies here in mind being those who are ostracising one, the persecutors those pests who delight in passing one in the streets with their heads in the air: they "love" and "greet (i.e. say, 'Good day' to)" only those of their own set (Matt. v. 46 f. || Luke vi. 32 f.). To sustain a generous open-souled attitude toward such is what is demanded: "You, then, should be mature (i.e. not babies), as your heavenly Father is mature" (Matt. v. 48). "Full-grown, mature, complete" (*τέλειος*), here looks back to "unless your righteousness is something over and above that of the scribes and Pharisees" (ver. 20), that is,

shall go beyond that righteousness not at its worst, but *at its best* (cf. A. Büchler, p. 37).

This meaning is confirmed by a consideration of the only other instance in the Gospels of this word, *τέλειος*. It was used to a young man who was the embodiment of this class at its finest: "The youth tells him, All these things (i.e. the commandments just named) I have been watchful over: what still am I short of? Jesus told him, If you want to be mature (i.e. in righteousness), be off, sell your belongings, and give to the poor . . . and come on! accompany me" (Matt. xix. 20 f.). Just where the immaturity lay is shown by the Lukan form of the command to be mature, which A. Harnack (I, pp. 63, 129) thinks is nearer the original: "Become pitiful as your Father is pitiful" (Luke vi. 36; cf. in Rabbinical literature, M. Lazarus, Part I, pp. 113 f.). That this was the real point of the conversation comes out in the opening talk on the word "good" (*ἀγαθός*), better, "generous" (cf. E., March 1914, p. 281, note 1). Mark and Luke probably are more accurate historically: "Generous Teacher, what am I to do that eternal life I may inherit? And Jesus said to him, Why do you call me generous? Nobody is generous, except one—God!" (Mark x. 17 f. || Luke xviii. 18 f.), that is, "What precisely in me do you call generous? For in truth the only completely generous person who gives all and gets nothing in return, is God." Matthew's manner of narration, however, even more clearly fastens on the fact that the issue raised is concentrated in the word "generous": "Teacher, what generous thing am I to do that I may get eternal life? And he said to him, Why do you ask me about generosity? One (i.e. God) is the Generous" (Matt. xix. 16 f.), that is, the absolutely generous thing is only possible to God. What that generosity would mean, when worked out in the inquirer's case, was the being "mature," i.e. merciful, an accomplishment hardly possible to a very rich person without a considerable unloading of his wealth,—the unloading, however, being but preliminary to following Jesus in his generous minded enterprise of being sociable with the worst with the hope of redeeming them. The real "end is not restraint, but generosity" (F. G. Peabody, I, p. 95; cf. A. Büchler, p. 72).

Though in our literature God is "the Merciful" (Sir. I. 19), and "their merciful God and Father" (3 Macc. v. 7), and, therefore, one would demur to such generalisations as "the uncertainty about God in Judaism reacted on life and made it hard" (T. R. Glover, I, p. 71), yet the best Judaism of his day fails to be, in the fine sense here intended, "kind toward the ungrateful and mean" (Luke vi. 35); it was deficient in the most redeeming of virtues, the quality of mercy as it should reveal itself in positive efforts to save (Matt. ix. 13; cf. xii. 7, xxiii. 23). I. Abrahams makes

the admission, "We do not find in the Rabbinic literature a parallel to the striking paradox *Love your enemies*" (p. 164; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 112 f.; J.L., p. 261; J.E., vol. v. p. 159). That this deficiency was radical, not accidental, is what Jesus' startlingly qualified eulogy of John means: "Truly I tell you, There has not been raised up among women's offspring a greater than John the Baptist; yet the smallest (i.e. one at the stage at which you are now) in the Kingdom of Heaven (i.e. the present divine community on earth) is his greatest (*μείζων*, i.e. his equal when at his greatest)" (Matt. xi. 11 || Luke vii. 28; and see for other instances of *μείζων* in N.T. as superlative, Matt. xviii. 1, 1 Cor. xiii. 13; and J. H. Moulton, p. 78; cf. T. R. Glover, I, pp. 149 f.; M. Manson, pp. 85 f.). He who succeeds, if only in a small way,—as part of God's missionary community,—in making real to another God's large love, is not less than that great prophet at his best. "There is no learner above his teacher; but every one thoroughly equipped shall be as his teacher" (Luke vi. 40); and every one is under the same obligation as he himself was, not to stop at the stage of being "the smallest," but to be thoroughly furnished for service, to have charity, mercy, seeking, yea, suffering love. In being a disciple of the teacher *par excellence* of the seeking love of God, each must learn to "carry his cross" (Luke xiv. 27).

Hence, the deficiency which he saw even in the finest Pharisaism was, that it might be, that a man become so much a prodigal that the obligation to take a loving, and often expensive, interest in him as a "brother" need no longer continue. So the appeal in, "Your *brother* has come . . . your *brother* . . . has been found" (Luke xv. 27, 32). The ordinary business of being good includes, indeed as things are, should be very largely, a loving search for those who in their sin are away from their divine home. "What is new and striking in the teaching of Jesus is that . . . man is bidden not merely to receive the penitent gladly, but to seek out the sinner, to try to redeem him, and *make* him penitent" (C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 679; cf. J.L., p. 79). The ideal of righteousness must have this climax, if it is to be according to the mind of Jesus,—enthusiasm "to search out and to rescue the lost" (Luke xix. 10). Fellowship with God in his seeking, saving love is for him a necessary mark of true righteousness. "Love, then, is righteousness" (G. B. Stevens, IV, p. 132). "The only true zeal for God, the only right or righteousness, is love" (W. P. Du Bose, p. 106; cf. F. G. Peabody, I, p. 121; T. C. Hall, p. 63).

2. The virtues which, he urges, should be cultivated are much the same as those put forward by our writers. He expresses his dissatisfaction with those who "are transitory," who continue till "affliction or persecution happens" (Mark iv. 17 || Matt. xiii. 21, Luke viii. 13), and puts it plainly that "he who endures to the

End, this (is he who) will be saved (or 'rescued')" (Mark xiii. 13 || Matt. xxiv. 13; cf. x. 22). "By your endurance you will get your souls" (Luke xxi. 19). This "endurance" is necessary, if "the word" is to be held fast so as to bring about good result in the soul (Luke viii. 15). He had no place, also, in the Kingdom for him who could not respond properly to the appeal, "Be patient over me" (Matt. xviii. 29; cf. Luke xviii. 7), for him, that is, who could not be "filled with tenderness" (ver. 27). On gentleness toward men carried under certain circumstances to the point of non-retaliation, see above, pp. 159 f. The bliss of "the pitiful" (Matt. v. 7) was in fact often brought to mind by him, and what he says on love and forgiveness is at points so close to what some of our writers say, that R. H. Charles with some reason cannot think them independent. On T.G. vi. 3-7 (quoted above, p. 230) he remarks, "So perfect are the parallels in thought and diction between these verses and Luke xvii. 3, Matt. xviii. 15, 35, that we cannot but assume our Lord's acquaintance with them" (VII, p. 154; E., Dec. 1908, p. 503). "Take care of yourselves: if your brother sins, rebuke him; and if he repents, forgive him" (Luke xvii. 3); "And if your brother sins against you, be off, reprove him between you and him only; if he listens to you, you have gained your brother" (Matt. xviii. 15); "In this fashion also (i.e. like the merciless slave was treated) my heavenly Father will treat you, unless you forgive each his brother from your hearts" (ver. 35); "And when you stand praying, forgive, if anything you have against anyone, that even your Father in heaven may forgive you your lapses" (Mark xi. 25; cf. Matt. vi. 14 f.); "And forgive us our debts, as even we have forgiven our debtors" (Matt. vi. 12). His last farewell to his disciples was a reiterated "love one another" (John xiii. 34 f., xv. 12, 17). All this, then, when compared with the teaching of our writers, may, so far, reveal nothing new or original.

The originality of Jesus emerges, however, when the range of the exercise of these virtues is considered. So the significance of love of enemies treated of in the previous section. So, too, when Peter in a generous mood went beyond the Rabbinical "three" times (cf. C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 684), saying, "Lord, how often should my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times," the importance of Jesus' reply, "I do not tell you till seven times, but till seventy-seven times" (Matt. xviii. 21 f.; cf. J. H. Moulton, p. 98). It may be that in "seventy-seven times" there is a definite allusion to Gen. iv. 24; but Ass. Mos. iii. 14, "Who shall be also in bondage about seventy and seven years," shows that "until seventy-seven times" may also have had another association, namely, that which would suggest the meaning "to the end of the present age," when, with the opening

of the new Age, presumably, there would no longer be a call on one's readiness to forgive. The version of Luke may then be taken as an accurate interpretation of his meaning: "And if seven times a day he sins against you and seven times returns to you, saying, 'I repent,' you should forgive him" (Luke xvii. 4). To quote J. Seeley, "This is Christ's most striking innovation in morality . . . the most *distinctive* feature . . . *characterising* Christian morality more than any other doctrine of it" (pp. 288 f.). In a similar way, also, Jesus definitely removes all class or racial limitation from the familiar term "neighbour" (cf. P., p. 621), so that henceforth it must mean without distinction any one who may be in need of one's pity, and help, and love: "who, of these three, seems to you to have become neighbour to him who fell into the hands of brigands. And he said, He who had pity on him. And Jesus said to him, Go, and you—do similarly" (Luke x. 36 f.). So it may be said not only with reference to him who sins against one (Matt. xviii. 21; cf. ver. 15) that "'brother' is generally equivalent to neighbour" (C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 685), but also that in his teaching "neighbour" has definitely taken on the meaning of "brother" (cf. H. W. Robinson, pp. 87 f.), and that that fact of one's brotherly relation to any man is unaltered by the circumstances of his either making one angry (Matt. v. 22), or having "the bit of sawdust" in his eye (Matt. vii. 4), or having been a prodigal (Luke xv. 27, 32).

Again, "that you love one another" is preceded by "a fresh commandment I am giving you" (John xiii. 34); and as there was nothing in "love one another" taken by itself which had not been given before, the freshness of the commandment must be discovered in the addition, "as I have loved you" (John xiii. 34; cf. xv. 12). "The commandment is thus enforced by the example: 'I enjoin the precept . . . even as up to this last moment I loved you, in order that you also, inspired by me, may imitate my love one towards another'" (B. F. Westcott, p. 198). He commended a love which no limitation, or misunderstanding, or shortcoming, or treachery could stifle,—a missionary love bent ever in evoking love from others (see above, pp. 122 f.), their mutual love must be "according to the standard which He has set" (P., p. 759). There is no evidence that such teaching in its wide range and fine intensity was commonplace under the Law during our period. That something like this "graciousness . . . the unrestrained expression of the kindly self-forgetting and tranquil mind" (F. G. Peabody, I, p. 193; cf. G. H. Dalman, pp. 46 f.) may be found occasionally in later Rabbinical literature, one need not deny; but in the absence of evidence to the contrary, one may well believe that the influence of the teaching of Jesus on the Rabbis has been greater than they themselves ever thought (cf. H. Rashdall, p. 93,

note 1; and see A. L. Williams, p. 217, note 1; A. Neumann, p. 97; also R. T. Herford, II, pp. 348 f., 359; D.C.G., vol. i. pp. 368 f.).

3. These findings reveal the nature of the inwardness which was required by Jesus. It is not in the *fact* but in the *nature* of the inwardness that a contrast with our writers is to be discerned. "He goes beyond His contemporaries in that the righteousness He requires is closely bound up with a conception of the relation between man and God as son to father which, prominent indeed in Jewish thought, is removed by Him from the circumference and placed in the very centre of religion" (H. L. Jackson, p. 295). Here, then, it is not a question of one's sincerity, but of that in regard to which one has to be sincere. The antithesis, "Attend to conduct! . . . Attend to the feelings and dispositions whence conduct proceeds!" (M. Arnold, p. 68), is a false antithesis. It is not to the point to remark that "attending to conduct had very much degenerated into deadness and formality"; it is very much to the point that our writers knew what "inward personal religion" was (cf. T. C. Hall, pp. 61 f.). Here Jesus joins them heartily, as his use of "heart" in reference to qualities of soul abundantly witnesses (see above, pp. 207 ff.; also H. W. Robinson, p. 78, note 1). So, too, he says very much what they say on the following: hypocrisy—in almsgiving, prayer and fasting "you should not be as the hypocrites (or 'actors')" (Matt. vi. 5), even though sometimes "scribes and Pharisees" (Matt. xxiii. 13, 15, etc.) furnish examples of astounding insincerity; pride—which he singles out (Mark vii. 22), the most abominable form of which he pillories—"God, I thank Thee that I am not . . . even as this tax-gatherer" is the attitude of all others in which a man cannot be "acquitted" by God (Luke xviii. 11, 14); anger and hatred—"every one who gets angry" and treats "his brother" as "a good-for-nothing," or as one "beyond redemption," is himself on a dangerous downward road (Matt. v. 22); singleness of heart—"your eye" is to be "single (i.e. directed towards one object)" (Matt. vi. 22 || Luke xi. 34; cf. E., March 1914, pp. 275-288), "become . . . pure (*ἀκέραιοι* lit.: 'unmixed') as doves (i.e. as the humblest offering to God must be; cf. Luke ii. 24; A. Plummer, II, p. 65)" (Matt. x. 16). In the desire, then, for inwardness he and they are at one.

That the inwardness which he required was, however, a deeper inwardness than theirs can scarcely be doubted, if it be true, as follows from what has been contended above, that it meant sincerity in a love so profound that no limitation could be set to the desire to help the needy and save the sinner—"a free and glad fulfilment of love in the spirit of a son in the Father's house" (N. Smyth, p. 125; cf. A. Harnack, II, Lecture IV, iii). Love

our writers required, but scarcely a love like this. For him, "Duty is but the habit of the filial spirit" (A. M. Fairbairn, I, p. 448). It was the distinction of Jesus in the name of the Father in heaven to require and to be satisfied with nothing less than this sincerity in redemptive love which knows no let or hindrance—sincerity in "a burning and consuming passion of benevolence, an energy of self-devotion, an aggressive ardour of love" to the power of which in "the restoring and converting" of others it is not "possible to set bounds" (J. Seeley, p. 254; cf. J.Th.S., vol. xiii. p. 335). Sincerity in love had been required before, but scarcely sincerity in such love as this (cf. F. G. Peabody, I, p. 151; H. C. King, pp. 274 f.; A. L. Williams, p. 175). His own "consciousness of harmony with God, of union with the Father's will, of the interaction of love, of inward peace and outward rectitude . . . was undoubtedly desired by Jesus for all, and set before them as their ideal" (E. W. Winstanley, p. 386; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 333).

4. One has now to compare his teaching with the teaching of our writers on some particulars.

(1) *The Sin of Adultery*.—Nowhere does Jesus dilate on the peril of a lovely woman, but in expounding the seventh commandment he does say, "that every one who looks on a (? married, cf. E., Jan. 1915, pp. 93. f) woman to long for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matt. v. 28; cf. Mark vii. 21 f. || Matt. xv. 18 f.),—with the main thought of which, it has been seen, our writers are in perfect accord, whether or not they would have called the "lust" "adultery," as he did (cf. J.Q.R., vol. x., Oct. 1897, p. 11; J. Foakes Jackson, pp. 96 f.; also in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 135). In this context, too, the words, "And if your right eye entraps (σκανδαλίζει) you, pull it out, and throw it from you" (Matt. v. 29),—a very forceful figure,—may well be interpreted by Sir. ix. 5, "On a maiden don't fix your gaze, lest you be entrapped (σκανδαλισθήης) in penalties with her" (cf. Psa. Sol. xvi. 7, σκανδαλιζούσης in the same association); or else this verse, as certainly the following, "And if your right hand entrap you, chop it off, and throw it from you" (Matt. v. 30), should be taken as having the eunuch specially in view; compare, "He sees it with his eyes and sighs, as a eunuch that embraces a maiden" (Sir. xxx. 20), "And happy is the eunuch who has wrought no lawless deed with his hands" (Wisd. iii. 14). He was also with our writers on the sanctity of marriage, and seems to have agreed with the sect of the Zadokites "which forbade divorce, or at all events remarriage" against both the school of Hillel, which "gave the husband the legal right to divorce his wife for any cause," and the rival school of Shammai, which "limited the right to the case in which the wife was unchaste" (I. Abrahams, pp. 66, 71).

If the Matthean version is to be followed, as R. H. Charles

(VIII, p. 24) contends it should, then the issue raised with Jesus was the popular one, "Is one allowed to dismiss his wife *for any reason?*" (Matt. xix. 3), and Jesus virtually throws in his lot with the Shammaites, at any rate as far as the main conclusion goes (cf. C. G. Montefiore, III, pp. 235-242; H. Rashdall, pp. 102-106; M. Joseph, p. 413; E., Oct. 1910, pp. 295-300; N. Smyth, pp. 412 ff.). In Matt. v. 32, "But I tell you that every one who dismisses his wife, *without fornication* (or 'unchastity,' cf. E., June 1916, pp. 438-446) *as a reason* makes her commit adultery: and whoever marries one dismissed commits adultery," the crucial limiting clause may have been intended at least "to allow the dissolution of the marriage and the remarriage of the innocent husband," and possibly that "the woman who had been divorced for adultery could be allowed to contract a new marriage,—i.e. the old marriage would be dissolved," though it should not be overlooked that "the earliest commentators understood the limiting clause to justify the separation of husband and wife in one special case, viz., the proved adultery of the wife; but in any case remarriage on either side was forbidden" (G. H. Box, IV, pp. 46 f.; cf. C. Gore, pp. v-viii, 72-78, 227-230; E., Nov. 1918, pp. 361-366). If, however, the Markan and Lukan versions be taken as the more accurate representation of Jesus' position on the subject, as, for example, does G. H. Box (IV, p. 38), the prohibition of divorce is made absolute (cf. W. Bousset, p. 144). "It was a time when in Rome the domestic integrity, which had been the foundation of the State, was corrupted by ostentation and extravagance; a time when in Judea the teachings of Scripture were being learnedly interpreted so as to permit the very license which they were written to forbid" (F. G. Peabody, II, p. 158; cf. A. Harper, chap. xxii.; I. Abrahams, pp. 71 f.).

He therefore straight away opposes the recognised right of the husband under Jewish law—"he tells them, Whoever dismisses his wife, and marries another, commits adultery over her" (Mark x. 11),—and so, not only sharply arrested the decline in woman's status which, it is admitted, was resulting from Hillel's teaching, but also raised that status perhaps higher than any before him had ever thought of raising it (cf. H. C. King, p. 69; C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 44 f.). He condemns likewise the growing custom "based on Roman law . . . that the woman also can put away her husband" (E.B., 1851), which was actually illustrated in his day by the notorious instance of Salome, and probably, or at any rate substantially, in that also of Herodias: "And if she herself having dismissed her husband marries another, she commits adultery" (ver. 12; cf. F. G. Burkitt, II, pp. 100 f.). The circumstance that "Moses allowed one to write a bill of divorcement, and to dismiss her" (ver. 4 || Matt. xix. 7), he brushed

aside as a concession to human weakness. "With reference to your hardheartedness he wrote you this commandment" (ver. 5 || Matt. xix. 8), an "arrangement . . . well suited for the 'hardheartedness' of a semi-barbarian age, but . . . no longer justifiable" (J. Seeley, p. 182). Like the Zadokites, his mind saw an ideal suggested in the Genesis story: "But from the creation's beginning, 'Male and female he made them'" (ver. 6 || Matt. xix. 8). Marriage is a case of one personality forming the necessary complement of another,—a tie to which all other human ties are secondary, and for the breaking of which no conceivable reason can be found. "Hence a man should leave his father and mother, and the two be as one flesh: so that no longer are they two but one flesh. What then God has yoked together, let not man separate" (vers. 7-9).

The Lukan form of his words on the subject, "Every one who dismisses his wife, and marries another, commits adultery; and he who marries one dismissed by her husband commits adultery" (Luke xvi. 18), rightly suggests that he had most of all in mind the right of the husband under Jewish law to effect a divorce (cf. for Scriptural instances in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, III, pp. 67, 135), that, in forbidding divorce and the probable re-marriage of one or of both the parties concerned, he had in view the possibility of a reconciliation and the duty of constantly working to bring that about. This is finely in accord with his insistence on sincerity in the sustentation of redeeming love under all circumstances in respect to such as have gone astray. He may even have felt that here was, perhaps, the fullest possible human opportunity for its exercise, to "go after the lost, till he find it" (Luke xv. 4). K. Lake, indeed, reads the Matthean addition in the light of Hermas, and holds that "it enjoins on the husband of an unfaithful wife the duty of separating from her, but does not set him free to marry again"—"the person offended against must remain single in order to be able to receive back the guilty party in case of repentance" (E., Nov. 1910, pp. 425 f.; contrast E., Jan. 1911, pp. 68-74). Jesus himself did not give up as hopeless a woman who had had "five husbands," and of whom it could then be said that he whom she had was "not" her "husband" (John iv. 18). On another occasion (John vii. 53-viii. 11), in reference to a case which must have been of some public interest at the time, he so far sets himself on the woman's side that at least he does not abandon her to her accusers.

There are even some things in the latter narrative which seem to favour the idea that he regarded the woman as, on this occasion at any rate, another Susanna (see Sus., vers. 14, 28) falsely accused perhaps by her would-be adulterous assailants. This woman, so it was said, "had been arrested in the act of committing adultery"

(ver. 4), and yet people concerned in the case "went off one by one," a departure which "began with the elders (i.e. Sanhedrin members, judges)" and extended "to the last (i.e. prosecutors)" (ver. 9); when they were told, "Let the sinless of you first throw stone on her" (ver. 7); and thereupon Jesus "said to her, Madam, where are those accusers of you? Has no one condemned you? And she said, No one, sir. And Jesus said, And I don't condemn you" (ver. 10 f.). If her trial had already taken place, as G. H. Box suggests (IV, p. 33), and she had been divorced under "the Rabbinic method of compulsory divorce," which had been substituted "for the death penalty in such a case," then on the view advocated here, Jesus' last words to the woman must have had reference entirely to her future thus: "Go and do not hereafter sin (*μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε*)" (ver. 11; cf. v. 14), that is, by taking advantage of the divorce to re-marry—a plausible interpretation, since the negative present imperative may refer to what one is in danger of doing or may attempt to do (cf. J. H. Moulton, p. 125), and the reading *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*, "from henceforth" shows that *μηκέτι* by itself was not sufficient to give the verb an unmistakable reference to the past. His words are, then, an exhortation to an innocent woman in accordance with his teaching on divorce as given elsewhere than in Matthew; and if the story is of Lukan authorship," as H. McLachlan (pp. 94-112, 115-120) has on linguistic grounds so ably contended,—and "in one important group of Greek cursives . . . is found attached to Luke xxi. 37" (P., p. 765),—then it is a splendid illustration of that evangelist's form of Jesus' word on the subject, which has been shown above to place all the emphasis on not re-marrying.

(2) *Duty to Parents*.—In quoting the commandments Jesus never omits, "Honour your father and mother" (Mark x. 19 || Matt. xix. 19; Luke xviii. 20). This duty, as his quotation from Genesis shows (see previous sub-section), he put next to duty to a wife; where there was no wife, presumably, it was the foremost human obligation. What precisely this meant for him it is important to decide. He agreed with our writers that it should mean benevolence; and when he "came in contact with some Rabbis who held that, even when the Law directly affected the parents, it must nevertheless be upheld, and that even here it could not be annulled" (C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 166; cf. F. C. Burkitt, II, pp. 173 f.), he strenuously opposed them: "Finely do you ignore the commandment of God, that you may keep your tradition" (Mark vii. 9 || Matt. xv. 3). Since "according to the Rabbinic law as codified in the Mishnah, and commented on in the Talmud, the Rabbis are on the side of Jesus and take his very line," it seems likely that Jesus was deliberately taking the liberal side on the question of the annulment of vows at a time when such

annulment was still a recent and not altogether unopposed innovation (see C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 165). Hence he opposed the non-annulment of the vow which had been made with the "Corban" oath (cf. R. T. Herford, I, p. 161 note), when such non-annulment would entail suffering for the parents; he held that Rabbinical law (cf. J.L., p. 114; R. T. Herford, I, p. 48) should never be an infringement of the spirit and intention of the original commandment: "For Moses said, Honour your father and your mother; and, Let the abuser of father or mother certainly die: but you say, If a man says to father or mother, Corban . . . is whatever by me you might benefit, no longer do you let him do anything for father or mother, cancelling the word of God by your tradition, which you have had handed down; and many such like you are doing" (Mark vii. 10-13 || Matt. xv. 4-7). So one of his own last thoughts, before he bowed his head in death, was concerning the future guardianship of his widowed mother; when he "saw his mother and the learner standing by, whom he loved, he says to his mother, Woman, see, your son! Then he says to the learner, See, your mother!" (John xix. 26 f.).

His words to her at the marriage at Cana (John ii. 4) are perfectly respectful; they were uttered in a playful mood. "There was no rudeness in the appellation, 'woman.' It was frequently employed in situations which demanded not merely courtesy but reverence, corresponding nearly to 'lady.' Nor was it incompatible even with tender affection" (D. Smith, p. 53; cf. A. M. Ribhany, pp. 239 ff.). The phrase, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*, so lamentably misrepresented by the translation, "What have I to do with thee?" is used in the LXX (e.g. Judg. xi. 12; 3 Kingd. xvii. 18) always with the meaning, "Why do you interfere with (or 'trouble' or 'bother') me?" The remainder of his remark on the occasion, "Not yet has there come my hour," seems to have been a favourite saying of his, whose precise meaning had to be gathered from the circumstances in which it was used, but which has tended in the mind of the evangelist to assume a stereotyped form and significance (John vii. 30, viii. 20). The whole saying under discussion may then be rendered, "Why do you bother me (i.e. with wedding arrangements), my dear? Not yet has there come my time (i.e. to take on such responsibilities)." His mother understood his humorous reference to himself as the head of the household, now that his father Joseph was dead, and left him, knowing very well that he could help her out of the difficulty (ver. 5). (Cf. Rabbis at weddings, A. Büchler, pp. 85 f.)

On the sayings, "Who is my mother,—and brothers? . . . See, my mother and my brother! Whoever does the will of God, that person is my brother, in another case (*κἀί*) sister, in another (*κἀί*) mother" (Mark iii. 33 ff. || Matt. xii. 48 ff., Luke viii. 21),

C. G. Montefiore (II, pp. 107 ff ; III, p. 634) goes out of his way to remark on their "un-Jewish" character, as also when, on Matt. viii. 22 || Luke ix. 60 ; cf. Matt. x. 37 || Luke xiv. 26, etc., he says that "the honouring of parents is so deeply rooted in the Jewish consciousness that these sayings of Jesus, though explicable and even justifiable, have a not wholly Jewish ring" (III, p. 564). It has been shown (see above, p. 153) that practically the same thing is required under the Law. H. C. King has aptly gathered up the import of such passages: "every soul must come into a moral and spiritual life of *his own*, be absolutely true to his own best light. . . . Jesus here plainly indicates that spiritual dictation by another may become a sore temptation, but it must be resisted at any cost" (p. 36). It would scarcely be insisted on by a Jew of the type of M. Joseph that "respect for the doctrine, the wishes, the person of the parent," which is "the child's duty," is to be carried to the extent of ignoring "the process of development" which "could not logically be limited to any one century or period," or of refusing to follow some Rabbi who in his doctrine was but affirming Judaism's "right to adjust itself to the requirements of a new generation" (pp. 407 f., 30 ; cf. S. Schechter, I, p. xxiii ; R. T. Herford, II, pp. 10 f.). Any who, in the event of difference with parents on such matters, chose to make sacrifices for progress, and to hold that such sacrifices were a supreme duty to God to which all other duties were subordinate, could hardly be found guilty of unfilial conduct. There is no case, then, for ascribing to Jesus an un-Jewish attitude towards parents, or for his advocating this on the part of others.

(3) *Wealth*.—Again, there is a noticeable parallelism here between his teaching and that of our writers. "Blessed the poor!" (Luke vi. 20), makes it impossible for any of his listeners to suppose that he thought that being poor was evidence of being accursed. That, however, a man "began to be in want" through squandering "his property by living prodigally" (Luke xv. 13 f.) was disgraceful. He singles out "greediness" for special mention among the evils which proceed "from within" (Mark vii. 22), and is never more serious and in earnest than when he says, "See and guard yourselves against all greediness; for not even when there is plenty for one does one's life issue from one's belongings" (Luke xii. 15). He has a fine eye for goodness amid poverty—a "poor widow" who "put in more than all" (Mark xii. 43 || Luke xxi. 3), a "poor man named Lazarus" who is so worthy that at death he is "carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom" (Luke xvi. 20, 22).

His words on almsgiving, (see below, pp. 302 f.), reveal that he loved poverty no more than did our writers, and perhaps the following parallelism between his words and those of Psa. Sol. v.

may argue that he would prefer a sufficiency for all (cf. S. Schechter, II, p. 110): "And who of you by harassing can add to his height half a yard" (Matt. vi. 27 || Luke xii. 25), compare Psal. Sol., ver. 6, "For man and his portion (lie) before Thee in the balance; he cannot add to, so as to enlarge, what has been prescribed by Thee" (cf. Wisd. xi. 20); "Look at the birds of the heaven . . . your heavenly Father nourishes them" (Matt., ver. 26 || Luke, ver. 24; cf. in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, I, pp. 191 f.), compare Psal. Sol., ver. 11, "Birds and fish dost Thou nourish"; "the wild lilies of the country . . . grow . . . the grass of the country" (Matt., vers. 29, 30 || Luke, vers. 27 f.), compare, Psal. Sol., ver. 11, "In that Thou givest rain to the steppes that green grass may spring up." The use of "Solomon" (Matt., ver. 29 || Luke, ver. 27) as illustration here may be due to the fact that his mind was on the occasion going over a psalm of "Solomon"; "Your heavenly Father knows that you need all these" (Matt., ver. 32 || Luke, ver. 30), compare Psal. Sol., ver. 16, "And he whose hope is (set) on Thee shall have no lack of gifts"; "But seek first His Kingdom and righteousness; and all these will be set before you" (Matt., ver. 33; cf. Luke, ver. 31), compare Psal. Sol., ver. 21, "And Thy goodness is upon Israel in Thy kingdom"; "Do not then harass over to-morrow" (Matt., ver. 34), compare, Psal. Sol., ver. 15, "Man's goodness is bestowed grudgingly for the morrow (i.e. with his eye on the morrow)," emending the meaningless *καὶ ἡ αὔριον* into *κατὰ αὔριον*. See also above, p. 210.

That there was too much worry over the questions, "What are we to eat? or What are we to drink? or What are we to put on?" (Matt. vi. 31 || Luke xii. 2 f.), he, as also the best of the Rabbis (cf. J.E., vol. iii. p. 364), was never tired of saying; and on one occasion he was deeply impressed with how much anxiety might spoil home-life, "Martha, Martha, you are harassed and put about over many things; it is an occasion for few" (Luke x. 41 f.). In a parable, which may even rest on Sir. xi. 19 (quoted above, p. 236), he exhibits the folly of a life lived to obtain a sufficiency to be spent on oneself: "And I will tell my soul, 'Soul, you have many good things in store for many years: rest, eat, drink, be jolly.' But God told him, 'Ignoramus! on this very night your soul is being asked back from you: and what you have got ready, whose will they be?'" (Luke xii. 19 f.). He advocated the utmost liberality of treatment: "lend, expecting nothing (i.e. in interest)" (Luke vi. 35; cf. Matt. v. 42 || Luke vi. 30), he says, all the while aware of the possibility of abuse by people who only thought of "loaves," and who worked for nothing higher than "perishing food" (John vi. 26 f.). His horror at the severance of the bond of common human interest between rich and poor is vividly signified in the portrait of the

“rich man . . . enjoying himself every day in fine style,” while “Lazarus . . . at his gate” pined to death (Luke xvi. 19 f.). “Woe to you, rich! for you are being paid your demand. Woe to you, glutted now! for you will hunger” (Luke vi. 24 f.).

It is, however, when he concentrates on the peril of wealth to the soul that he becomes eloquent with concern for men. Again, he is at one with our writers, but, if anything, rather more serious; and this extra seriousness on his part has a profounder source in him than a bias against the rich, which C. G. Montefiore, in several places, stops to emphasise. He would have men pray, “The on-coming day’s bread give us to-day” (Matt. vi. 11 || Luke xi. 3); and whatever the solution of the linguistic puzzle (see D.B., vol. iii. p. 143; vol. v. p. 36; also G. A. Deissmann, I, p. 214; D.B., vol. iv. p. 497), which is involved in ἐπιούσιον, the reference, if really to material things, seems to be to the manna which, by falling day by day, the Rabbis show, resulted in all turning “their hearts to their Father in Heaven (day by day)” (cf. G. Friedlander, III, p. 186). It was the cultivation of great faith in God’s providence, a spirit of dependence thereon, which mattered. His injunction, “Do not store up for you stores on earth, where there is moth, and rust disfigures, and where thieves dig through (i.e. the wall) and steal” (Matt. vi. 19 || Luke xii. 33), when he sent his early disciples out to mission Galilee, became a specific instruction to them not to make material gain out of their gospel errand: “Gratis you received, gratis give. Do not get (i.e. gather as fees) gold, or silver, or copper into your purses,—not a collecting bag for the road, nor two shirts, nor shoes, nor walking-stick” (Matt. x. 8 ff. || Mark vi. 8, Luke ix. 3; cf. x. 4, xxii. 35). Compare how the best Rabbis had a “horror of trafficking with the Law, and using it either ‘as a crown or as a spade’” (A. Edersheim, I, p. 187). They may take bare sustenance only: “for the worker is worth his food” (Matt. x. 10), that is, the accumulation of money and clothes was forbidden. “For what does it benefit a person to gain the whole world and inflict loss on his soul” (Mark viii. 36 || Matt. xvi. 26, Luke ix. 25).

The growth of a soul who is capable of “lavishing wealth on God” (Luke xii. 21) cannot take place, if there is obsession by material prosperity. Such obsession, too, was so easy; hence, “Alas, with difficulty will those who have property go into the Kingdom of God! . . . My lads, how difficult is it to go into the Kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through needle’s eye than rich man to go into the Kingdom of God” (Mark x. 23–26 || Matt. xix. 23 f., Luke xviii. 24 f.; cf. A. M. Ribhany, p. 94; also in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 17),—with which should be compared, “Hardly shall the merchant keep himself from wrongdoing, and a huckster (κἀπηλος) will not be acquitted of sin. Many

have sinned for the sake of gain ; and he that seeks to multiply (gain) turns away his eye " (Sir. xxvi. 29 ; xxvii. 1). It is very suggestive that in this Sir. passage there is a reading *κάμηλος* (" camel ") for *κάπηλος* (" huckster ") (cf. H. B. Swete, II, vol. ii. p. 698). If the Talmud is to be taken as guide, the more usual form of the proverb spoke of an elephant passing through the eye of a needle (cf. A. Plummer, II, p. 425 ; also " elephant " in an Arabic song, D.C.G., vol. i. p. 267) ; and if the alternative reading in Sir. means that " camel " was a nickname for merchant, then Jesus very effectively substituted " camel " for " elephant," having the merchant class in view.

The salvation of the money-making class he was specially interested in, as the trouble he goes to with them on occasions shows. He urges on their attention the following : that they must with their wealth heal the divisions of human society, and thus lay the basis for their own participation in the eternal fellowship of the good poor people whom they have helped, " For yourselves make friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness (i.e. ' riches of this world,' cf. E., Dec. 1915, p. 568) ; that, when it fails (i.e. when you die), they may welcome you into the eternal tents " (Luke xvi. 9) ; that the details of conduct in this matter are revelations of the great facts about oneself, " The reliable in very little, also in much is reliable ; and the unjust in very little, also in much is unjust " (ver. 10) ; that faithfulness in the earthly or material trust is the only way to the obtaining of the heavenly or spiritual trust, " If then with unjust mammon (i.e. wealth so-called) you have not become reliable, the real thing who will entrust to you ? " (ver. 11) ; that faithfulness in what is never fully your own, but which you have so soon to part with, must precede the experience of what will be so fully your own, that you will never be asked to give it up, " And if with another's (i.e. God's, hence, what is given you to use for a time) you have not become reliable, what is for yourself (i.e. life in yourself, cf. John v. 24, 26) who will give you ? " (ver. 12 ; cf. H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 236).

He hails with delight the words of Zaccheus, " Look ! the half of my property, sir, to the poor I give ; and if from anyone I have got anything wrongly, I pay back fourfold " (Luke xix. 8), as a sure sign of his " deliverance," his recovery of health of mind (ver. 9). He distinguishes, however, between such an instance of real release from the habits of the past and that of " lovers of money " who go about camouflaged as philanthropists : " You are they who discharge your obligations in the eyes of men (i.e. by almsgiving) ; but God recognises (i.e. has his eye on) your hearts (i.e. on the fact that ' where your store is, there too your heart will be,' Luke xii. 34 || Matt. vi. 21) ; for the supreme

(ὕψηλός) matter among men (i.e. the almsgiving) is abomination in the eyes of God (i.e. when, as in the case supposed, the love of money is still there)" (Luke xvi. 15). As money is the master of the soul, God cannot be: "No one to two masters can be slave (i.e. attached), for either the one he will hate and the other love; or the one he will stick to (i.e. through thick and thin), and the other insult (i.e. on the least pretext). You cannot to God be attached and to mammon" (Matt. vi. 24 || Luke xvi. 13). He recognises the undivided heart in the "fine act" which goes lavishly beyond the relief of "the poor" (Mark xiv. 6 f. || Matt. xxvi. 10 f.; John xii. 8; cf. Luke vii. 37 f.).

There may be nothing quite original in all this; yet it must be admitted that alike the peril and trust of wealth have never been more forcefully put. Hence his command to "one who had much property" (see above, p. 268). The tyranny in human life of things material was, to the mind of Jesus, simply appalling—"the pleasure of wealth and the desires for the rest (i.e. more) . . . choke the word" (Mark iv. 19 || Matt. xiii. 22, Luke viii. 14). It may be claimed that our writers hardly realised this tyranny as fully as he did, and that his words bear witness not so much to a bias against the rich as to an enthusiasm for the deliverance of their souls from the thralldom of mammon. "He taught that earthly goods were insignificant in value compared with the interests of man's inner life, and that any sacrifice of the former should be freely made when demanded for the protection or promotion of the latter. . . . He did not, however, condemn the rich *as such*, nor did he regard worldly possessions as *necessarily* evil. They may, on the contrary, be made a powerful instrument of good" (G. B. Stevens, IV, p. 123; cf. A. Harnack, II, Lecture V (1) (2); S. Mathews, I, chap. vi.), and in a matter where so many are cowards, he expected his followers to be brave men,—capable of heroism in their use of wealth (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 106 f.).

(4) *Lex talionis*.—The essence of this law has been seen to be reparation before reconciliation, compensation before restored communion,—this in the case where there was a profession of repentance; and where there was no such repentance, a continuance of the hostile attitude, an enthusiasm to make the enemy pay to the last farthing. Jesus will not so much as look at "eye for eye, and tooth for tooth" (Matt. v. 38), as the principle which should govern the relationship of the injured man to his repentant or unrepentant fellow. With an exaggeration characteristic of an Eastern preacher, he tells his followers to drop out of their lives altogether mere zeal to get their own back from others who may have wronged them: "Resist not the injury; but whoever raps you on your right cheek, turn to him also the other. And if anyone wants you to be prosecuted and to take your shirt, leave

him also your coat. And whoever forces you to go one mile (i.e. carrying soldiers' baggage), be off with him two" (Matt. v. 39-41; cf. Luke vi. 29). Such episodes in life should not stir up the spirit of revenge; and the rise of that spirit must be vigorously checked by a practical demonstration of its opposite in the superlative degree.

Concerning his word, "You have heard that it has been said, . . . you should hate your enemy" (Matt. v. 43; cf. J. Seeley, p. 159), it is not enough to show that the Jews often manifested "the ingrained weakness of human nature, the desire for revenge against an enemy," for which, indeed, they were rebuked by the best of their Rabbis, and very pointedly by the great Pharisee, Samuel ha-Qatan, of the end of the first century (cf. I. Abrahams, p. 150). The subject of inquiry is not the practice of a few or any number of the Jewish people, any more than it is the practice of a few or any number of Christian people. It concerns ideals on both sides, and ideals only (cf. W. Temple, p. 23; contrast C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 1019). Is, then, Jesus' word here a fair representation of the idealism of the Judaism of his day? This question has sometimes been answered in the negative by Jewish scholars, while a subterfuge has been sometimes sought by Gentile scholars in the facts of Jewish practice. The latter course is an error of method, the former an error of understanding. "Hate" has been given the fullest possible connotation, whereas it should be given a meaning such as it has in Luke xiv. 26, "If anyone comes to me, and does not hate his father," etc., where the reference is to a man's so thorough disapproval of his father's non-disciple attitude as to cut himself off from his father in that particular. (For the loose Oriental use of "love" and "hate," see A. M. Ribhany, pp. 70-77.) Jesus, then, represents the orthodoxy of his day by, 'You should cut yourself off entirely from your enemy.' This is the attitude of repulsion, the driving away in their approaches to us of those that have first driven us away from them,—the spirit of tit-for-tat, retaliation, the meeting of like by like. If a stronger meaning is to be given here to "hate," then probably Jesus had in view "the spirit of some contemporary Shammites, who were fanatical and bigoted in their attitude to opponents, and later took the lead with the zealots in uncompromising and passionate hatred of Rome" (G. H. Box, E., July 1918, p. 62; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 81). W. O. E. Oesterley thinks that "the words are clearly a quotation, with which Christ's hearers were familiar," and that "it is . . . in the highest degree probable that they had been embodied in the Oral Law" (in F. G. Foakes Jackson, p. 97).

Jesus gave no countenance to such an idea of duty to an enemy. He insisted on the sustentation of seeking love toward him (see above, p. 269, and cf. J.L., pp. 289 f.). When also the enemy

became repentant, he would have reconciliation forthwith. His note is, "As they were unable to pay, both he freely let off" (Luke vii. 42),—act like that toward the penitent! Throw the idea of reparation, restitution, compensation to the winds, and take the contrite man unconditionally into your fellowship again! (cf. G. H. Dalman, pp. 42-45). That is the annulment of *lex talionis*,—a full treaty of peace, one devoid of all indemnity clauses, with your one-time enemy. There must be no withholding of forgiveness, till he can meet the indemnity; the Father in heaven, to the mind of Jesus, was against the man who would not forgive, but who, so to speak, would cast his fellow "into prison till he pay the debt" (Matt. xviii. 30); against him, who would not receive a returned prodigal, because the "property" which he had "squandered by living prodigally" (Luke xv. 13) he could never restore to the estate. The *lex talionis* was to Jesus the one great obstacle to that fulness of human forgiveness such as he required men to show to one another; hence it had to go in all shapes and forms. He would have none of it, and so he broke the fetter which bound men down to a very faulty ideal of forgiveness as between man and man. He intended that "a righteous indignation should be converted into enthusiasm for the larger end" (R. J. Fletcher, p. 23; cf. H. C. King, pp. 263-265); whereas the Rabbis "were, perhaps, more keen to teach that the doer of a wrong should beg pardon and seek reconciliation than that the recipient should forgive" (J.L., p. 77).

3. THE IDEA OF HOLINESS.

1. To begin with, some points which are very relevant here have been already elucidated, and need only to be recapitulated as introductory to other material of a similar character. Jesus held the Pharisees in honour in so far as they rightly interpreted the spirit of the Mosaic legislation, but when he found them contradicting that spirit by their tradition he was against them. It was no set part of his programme deliberately to upset prevailing relationships with the priests and the Temple. Of the adequacy of Moses and the prophets to the task of the moral and spiritual guidance of the sincere mind, he had no doubt whatever. For the evidence for these statements, see above, pp. 262-266. He was freely approached with "Moses wrote us" (Mark xii. 19 || Matt. xxii. 24, Luke xx. 28), or "in the Law Moses commanded us" (John viii. 5); and it was as natural for him to say, "Have you not read in Moses' book?" (Mark xii. 26 || Luke xx. 37; cf. Matt. xxii. 31), or to refer to "the Moses' Law" (John vii. 23; cf. ver. 19). How that in practice one law was allowed to modify the operation of another, he illustrates by the case of circumcision

and the Sabbath: "Moses' has given you circumcision . . . and on the Sabbath you circumcise a person" (John vii. 22). His own freedom from the bondage of the letter has already been illustrated by his words on divorce and *lex talionis* (see above, pp. 273-276 282 ff.). He claimed that he was so accurately re-interpreting the spirit of the great legislator to his age, that people who professed loyalty to the Mosaic Law should have recognised the fine service which he was rendering by so doing; but alas! they did not, hence his words: "Your prosecutor is Moses, on whom you have relied. For if you were trusting Moses, you would be trusting me. But if his writings you do not trust, how my utterances will you trust?" (John v. 45 ff.; cf. ix. 28 f.).

His oral teaching drew its inspiration from the written Law. More precisely, in the style of Wisd. (see above, p. 54), the nourishment of divine revelation and guidance was given in the time of Moses: "Our fathers the manna (i.e. spiritual food) ate in the desert; as it is written, 'Bread from heaven he gave them to eat'" (John vi. 31); but the revelation of Moses was not final and entirely sufficient for subsequent days: "Truly, truly, I tell you, Moses has not given you the bread from heaven,"—rather the divine source behind Moses remained in their day,—"but my Father is giving you the real bread from heaven" (ver. 32). God Himself is the perennial fount of new revelation to the new age: "for the bread of God is he who (or 'what') comes from heaven and gives life to the world" (ver. 33),—this manna, revelation for his day, he felt, perhaps (cf. below, pp. 286 ff.), was descending from above through himself, so that he was in a sense identical with it, "I am the bread of life" (ver. 35). That this is, if no more, an accurate representation of his outlook may be inferred from that prayer scene in the Synoptics, where he comes forth, evidently after some wrestling, with his conviction strengthened that he was in his teaching faithful to the spirit of the Law and the Prophets, and must therefore go forward to the end along the road he had been travelling, whatever happened; his mind had been dwelling on "Moses and Elijah," and how possibly they would view "his departure, which he was contemplating, to Jerusalem" (Luke ix. 30 f. || Mark ix. 4, Matt. xvii. 3), attended as it was with the prospect of severe conflict there with the time-honoured interpreters of the Torah (cf. Matt. xxiii. 29-32 || Luke xi. 47 f.), who were held in highest esteem by the people. "The reference to Moses and Elijah shows that He was relieved of one perplexity. Jesus had been driven into antagonism to the Mosaic Law; He must have been distressed to find Himself in such a position, for He was utterly loyal to the Divine revelation given in the Old Testament, and full of reverence for Moses. His work and teaching were based upon the Hebrew Scriptures, and . . . to have discredited

the Old Testament would have cut the ground from under His own feet," hence this particular night vigil resulted in the reassurance "that He was the true successor and representative, not only of the prophets, but also of the legislators of Israel; that while He was repudiating the letter of the Law, He was yet enforcing its spirit" (W. H. Bennett, II, p. 128).

This combination of loyalty and freedom in respect to past revelation he encouraged in his followers. The Rabbinical saying, "Two that sit together and are occupied in the words of the Law have the Shechinah among them" (cf. W. C. Allen, I, p. 199), has not been allowed, as it should, to form the key to the interpretation of Matt. xviii. 20, as it came from the lips of Jesus. "'Shechinah' . . . means just simply the mystic, yet real presence of God" (C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 683; cf. J. Abelson, II, p. 86). Already one has noted the stress on "in my name" (see above, p. 154). It should be contrasted with "the formula to be found on every page of the Talmud. . . . 'Rabbi A. says, in the name of Rabbi B.' . . . Some authority must confirm the dictum of every teacher, the authority, viz., of some previous teacher, or else the authority of the Torah interpreted according to some recognised rule. No teacher could base his teaching merely on his own authority, and the fact that Jesus did this was no doubt one of the grievances against him on the part of the Jews" (R. T. Herford, II, p. 9). This grievance is what he has in mind when he says, "I am here in the name of my Father, and you are not welcoming me," as the remainder of the verse is probably a reference, in contrast to his own, to the Rabbinical manner of teaching and its general acceptability, "if another comes in his own (i.e. not God's) name, him you welcome" (John v. 43); so also the whole argument preceding should be read in the same association: "If I am witnessing about myself, my witness is not true. Another is witness about me; and I know that true is the witness which he witnesses about me . . . but I have witness greater than John . . . the acts themselves which I do witness about me. . . . And he who sent me, the Father, he has witnessed about me" (John v. 31 f., 36 f.). This is a statement of his claim to a direct revelation from the Father.

On the other hand, there is some evidence that he was wont on occasion to use the name of God as revealed to Moses, perhaps with a desire to remind people that he had no intention, as some seemed to suppose, of lightly breaking away from the ancestral religion. אֲנִי הוּא אֲנִי (Ex. iii. 14), "I am that I am," is in the LXX *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*, and later אֲנִי, "I am," is rendered *ὁ ὢν*. In the LXX *ἐγώ εἰμι* is also used (1) as a translation, ungrammatically, of the longer form of the personal pronoun, אֲנִי, e.g. in Judg. vi. 18; (2) as a translation, preceded by *ὄτι* = *כי*,

' that,' of אֲנִי הוּא (Deut. xxxii. 39), "I, even I, am he," or of אֲנִי הוּא (Isa. xliii. 10), "I am he." It seems not unlikely, therefore, that in our records some ἐγώ εἰμι or εἰμί, "I am," and ἐγώ, "I," passages conceal references to God which have been taken as references to himself. Thus, the following: "Cheer up! 'I am' (i.e. God) (is); don't be alarmed" (Mark vi. 30 || Matt. xiv. 27, John vi. 20), which is singularly appropriate as an assurance that God would open them, so to speak, a way through the sea (cf. Ex. xiv. 21 f.), and harmonises with his requirement of faith on a similar occasion (Mark iv. 40 || Matt. viii. 26, Luke viii. 25); "'I am' (is)" (Mark xiv. 62 || Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xxii. 70; cf. John xviii. 23 f.), which is then a pointed reminder to Caiaphas that God was to be reckoned with, and is followed immediately and suitably by a reference to the Judgment; "'I am' (is) the God of Abraham," etc. (Matt. xxii. 32 || Mark xii. 26, Luke xx. 37, 'the Lord'; cf. Ex. iii. 14 f., and P. Goodman, p. 11), which is used in connection with the resurrection by "the power of God" (Matt. xxii. 29 || Mark xii. 24), and which favours the rendering, "'I am' (is) the Resurrection and the Life" (John xi. 25), as the original, as well as "'I (am)' will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 40; cf. vers. 44, 54); "'I am' (is) the light of the world" (John viii. 12; cf. in Rabbinical literature, God is "the light of the world," G. Friedlander, III, p. 214), which accords with the circumstance that in the Johannine epistle "God is Light," and we have to "walk in the Light as he is in the Light" (1 John i. 5, 7; cf. T. B. vi. 4, quoted above, p. 205); also "unless you trust 'I am' (cf. 'believe in God,' John xiv. 1, 'whom you do not know,' John vii. 28; cf. viii. 54 f., xvii. 3) you will die in your sins" (John viii. 24); "When you lift up the 'son of man,' then you will recognise 'I am'" (ver. 28; cf. xiii. 19); "before Abraham came to be, 'I am' (was)" (ver. 58; cf. H. B. Swete, I, p. 139); "'I (am)' and the Father one (i.e. are identical)" (x. 30)—see also above, pp. 76, 216, 285, and below, pp. 338. f.

Hence, "where two or three have come together (i.e. studying the old revelation, the Torah) in my name (i.e. in the light of the revelation which has been mediated through me, with my mind or spirit, and waiting for new revelation which they 'cannot take at the moment' but to which 'the spirit of truth will show you the way,' John xvi. 12 f.), there 'I am' (is) in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20; cf. E. A. Abbott, p. 98). Compare Blass's restoration of the first part of the fifth Oxyrhynchus Logion (B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, pp. 12 ff.): "Wheresoever there are two, they are not without God" (E., June 1913, pp. 484 f.). The same Presence who brought revelation to Moses would also bring it to them, and so in following the new revelation a breach with the spirit of the old would not be possible (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II,

pp. 46 f.). Thus was it that, when the larger commission came home fully to the heart of the Church, these words of assurance were recalled, "And look! 'I am' (is) with you all the days till the consummation of the age" (Matt. xxviii. 20; cf. 'until the consummation of the age,' T.B. xi. 3, and frequently in our literature).

2. How this attitude of loyalty and freedom in relation to the old revelation worked out in the case of the two cardinal commands of Judaism must now be the subject of inquiry.

(1) *The Sabbath* (cf. E. Schürer, II, ii. pp. 96-105).—That he could be credited with saying, "And pray that your flight do not happen . . . on Sabbath" (Matt. xxiv. 20), suggests that he did not reveal any deliberate intention of annulling the Sabbath laws in general: witness, also, the insertion in D at Luke vi. 4, his words to a man labouring on the Sabbath day: "Man, if you know what you are doing, blessed are you, but if you do not know, accursed are you, and a transgressor of the Law," that is, "the Law should be obeyed, unless a higher principle intervenes" (J.E., vol. vii. p. 163; cf. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, p. 10). It may be presumed on the basis of hints in our records that his feeling and practice were mostly in accord with the joyous reverence for God of which this day was expressive, and with the devotion of the day mainly to periods of meditation based on the Torah (cf. Mark i. 21, vi. 2, Luke iv. 16). That he was, however, often up against those people, who stood for the letter of the Law in the matter, is clear from the trouble he sometimes took to show that a literal fulfilment of the Law could not be, and indeed was not, insisted on. The rite of circumcision was not put off, because the proper day for it fell, perchance, on Sabbath: "circumcision a person receives on Sabbath, that Moses' law be not broken" (John vii. 23; cf. E.B., 829; A. Edersheim, II, p. 181). The priests had to go through with their work on the Sabbath: "Have you not read in the Law that on the Sabbath the priests in the Temple Sabbath profane, and are guiltless?" (Matt. xii. 5), and the Sabbath, too, brought them extra duties, for example, "the weekly renewal of the shewbread, and an additional offering of two lambs, with the appropriate meat and drink offerings" (A. Edersheim, II, p. 179). Jesus' reference to the shewbread in illustration (see below) may have been occasioned by his having this extra work in mind.

There was not general agreement in his day on many details of what constituted right observance of the Sabbath. The questions, "What man will there be of you who will have one (or 'a') sheep, and if this falls on the Sabbath into a hole, will not lay hold upon it and lift it out" (Matt. xii. 11). "Whose pig (δς,—R. Harris) or cow—yours—into a well will fall, and he

will not immediately pull it up on Sabbath day?" (Luke xiv. 5), as has been seen, are questions which Zad. did not answer as Jesus expected his hearers to answer; says Zad., "And if it (i.e. an animal) falls into a pit or ditch, he shall not raise it on the Sabbath" (xiii. 23). Zad.'s strict laws of the Sabbath (quoted above, pp. 241 f.) may have been known to his audience, who themselves may have been divided as regards the observance of some of them. Jesus assumes that they will not conform to the one here cited. If he really raised a point at issue between the Pharisees and the better type of Sadducee, his question would tend to accentuate an already existing difference of opinion. He was, then, instancing his agreement with the Pharisees to defeat Pharisaic opposition to his healing activity on the Sabbath. He "appeals to a lenient interpretation of the Law in his day" (J.L., p. 437). They seem, too, to have felt the force of his so doing, since "they could not give a hostile answer" (Luke xiv. 6).

"Rabbinism prescribes what a man shall *do*, and defines his service to God in precise rules. . . . Rabbinism rests on the conception of . . . *orthopraxy*" (R. T. Herford, II, p. 16). The *orthopraxy* here laid down was "that all danger to life should supersede the Sabbath. . . . A physician may attend a patient if he is in danger . . . medical attendance was only allowed on the assumption that life was in danger" (S. Schürer, II, ii. p. 104; cf. M. Joseph, p. 367; E., Jan. 1915, pp. 1-15). This concession for the sake of humanity (cf. concessions in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, pp. 39, 41, and especially p. 144) Jesus pushed still further, till he made it that no case of sickness should be neglected, or left unattended to, on Sabbath. Not casuistry (cf. C. G. Montefiore, III, p. 108), but a very pointed thrust at his opponents for working on the Sabbath at the very opposite kind of work from what he was engaged in (cf. H. B. Swete, I, pp. 51 f.), must be seen in his question to them, "Is it allowed on Sabbath to act generously (i.e. as I am doing by healing), or to act meanly (i.e. as you are doing by your spite against me)?" The next words by their exaggeration but focus attention on the antithesis: "life to save or to kill?" (Mark iii. 4 || Luke vi. 9). People who on the Sabbath were exerting themselves in maleficent action should not criticise one who on the same day was giving himself to obviously beneficent action.

His real defence was that all ceremonial acts of reverence toward God,—very good in their place,—must give way before the demand for assistance which human need presents. Where the ceremonial observance of Sabbath stood in the way of a humanitarian observance of it, the latter must be continued, and the former discontinued to let it go on. Such is the message of his illustration: "Have you not read what David did, when he was

hungry, and they with him (cf. 'The case of the thirst of King David may serve at least to make this clearer,' 4 Macc. iii. 6), how he went into the House of God, and ate the shewbread, which was not allowed him to eat, nor those with him, except priests only? " (Matt. xii. 3 f. || Mark ii. 25 f., Luke vi. 3 f.). No love-token to God involved in the temple services even, to present which priests worked more than usual on Sabbath, was of such importance as $\pi\eta\tau\eta$ (cf. B.D.B., p. 338), that is, "piety" expressed in "goodness" towards men, in doing favours and benefits to them, especially "kindness" as extended to the lowly, needy and miserable. "I tell you, that greater thing than Temple is here. And if you had recognised what it is, (namely), 'Pity (i.e. kindness, $\pi\eta\tau\eta$) I want and not sacrifice,' you would not have condemned the guiltless" (Matt. xii. 6 f). He could not, then, plead guilty of irreverence toward God, heal though he did on Sabbath. Rather he defended his healing work on that day as the only God-like thing to do; he could no more suspend for a day working for human nature in all its great need of help which he could give, than could God the operation of His providence for a similar period: "My Father up to this moment is working, and I am working" (John v. 17). (Cf. A. Büchler, 7 f., 24 f., 41).

It came in his day's work for God among men: hence he went on with it as naturally as the farmer in his attention to his cattle. "Hypocrites! does not each of you on Sabbath loose his ox or ass from the manger, and having led it away make it drink? And this woman, being Abraham's daughter, whom Satan fastened, look! eighteen years, ought not she to be unloosed from this fastening on Sabbath day?" (Luke xiii. 15 f.). "Master even of the Sabbath is the 'son of man.'" (Matt. xii. 8 || Mark ii. 28, Luke vi. 5); he felt that he could do no other than allow the spirit of the 'prophet' (see above, on 'son of man,' p. 175) to determine for him his conduct on the Sabbath. A remark like "Sabbath for ($\delta\iota\alpha$) man came into existence, and not man for ($\delta\iota\alpha$) Sabbath" (Mark ii. 27), was not altogether without precedent; compare, 2 Macc. v. 19. "But the Lord did not choose the nation for the sake of ($\delta\iota\alpha$) the Place, he chose the Place for the sake of ($\delta\iota\alpha$) the nation," on which his utterance may have been modelled, as also in Rabbinical literature, "the Sabbath is delivered unto you, you are not delivered to the Sabbath" (cf. H. B. Swete, I, p. 49; S. Schechter, I, p. 297; M. Joseph, pp. 203 f.; J.E., vol. i. p. 162). As interpreted, however, by his practice (John ix. 14) he meant more, it seems, than his co-religionists could agree to (ver. 16).

The apology of his friends, "He is mad" (Mark iii. 21) should perhaps, then, be read in the light of, "And he whom he (i.e. Belial) leads astray into profaning the Sabbath and the Feasts

shall not be put to death ; but it shall be the duty of the sons of man to watch him ; and should he be healed of it, they shall watch him seven years, and then he shall come into the Congregation " (Zad. xiv. 6), since earlier in the chapter it is said that those whom his Sabbath activity had offended " were taking legal proceedings against him, that they might destroy him " (Mark iii. 6 || Matt. xii. 14, Luke vi. 11), in accordance with " whoever profanes it shall surely die " (Jub. ii. 27), and later that " there come his mother and his brothers ; and, standing outside, they delegated (someone to go) to him, summoning him " (Mark iii. 31 || Matt. xii. 46, Luke viii. 19),—an attempt to take him into custody as an irresponsible Sabbath-breaker, which he very much resented. " He in reply to them says, Who is my mother,—and brothers ? " (Mark iii. 33 || Matt. xii. 49 ; cf. H. Rix, pp. 25 f.).

On this matter of Sabbath observance, then, he was, from the point of view of Jewish orthodoxy, most startlingly original ; to his mind there was no love-token to God enshrined in ceremonial exactitude in keeping Sabbath, which could take precedence of what was contained in the faithful continuance of the ministry of helpfulness to people in need throughout this most sacred day of the week. " The law of love was higher than the ritual law, and must immediately be fulfilled . . . deeds of love and charity must never be put off for the sake of ritual enactments ; . . . the rule and rest of the Sabbath must be interpreted by its spirit, and by the higher law of righteousness and compassion " (C. G. Montefiore, II, pp. 41 ff ; cf. J.L., p. 292). " Consequently it is allowable on Sabbath to do good," (Matt. xii. 12).

(2) *Circumcision—the Clean and the Unclean* (cf. E. Schürer, II, ii. pp. 106–111).—The only occasion on which Jesus refers directly to the rite of circumcision has been already noted in the previous sub-section ; no law of Sabbath observance was allowed to stand in the way of its performance on the proper day. Here he takes it for granted as a normal incident in Jewish life. The reference throws no light on whether its necessity for the Gentile convert, the usual view in Palestine (cf. J. E., vol. iv. p. 95 ; E., July 1916, p. 19), was held by him, or whether the more liberal view, according to which baptism sufficed (see above, p. 96 ; cf. also P. Goodman, pp. 96 f., 361, 386), was also his. Possibly the rebuke, " You go round sea and land to make one (or ' a ') proselyte " (Matt. xxiii. 15), had in view the enthusiasm of some to force the Palestinian feeling on the matter upon the more liberally disposed of the people of the Diaspora (cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, I, pp. 55, 57 ; J.L., p. 342) ; and he " who has (and remains) bathed " (John xiii. 10 ; cf. John iii. 5 ; F. C. Burkitt, II, p. 226 ; Matt. xxviii. 19), that is, has had " a ' washing ' which consists apparently in the rite of Baptism " (E. F. Scott, p. 130), may be an incidental confirmation

of one's suspicion that he took the liberal view, or actually went beyond it (see above, pp. 112 f.).

On the distinction between clean and unclean there were many things he said, which might have been said by any Jew who was in earnest about the service of God; "You clean the outside of cup and bowl, but inside (cup and bowl) are filled by rapacity and self-indulgence . . . clean first the cup's inside, that its outside too be clean (i.e. and its outside can take care of itself). . . . You are comparable to tombs whitewashed, such as outside look fine, but inside are full of dead bones and all uncleanness. So too you outside look to men righteous, but inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness" (Matt. xxiii. 25-28 || Luke xi. 39-41, 44). His word here is not, to 'leave the one and do the other,' but rather "this one ought to do, and that not pass by (*παριέναι*)" (Luke xi. 42 || Matt. xxiii. 3), "all then whatever they tell you, do and keep, but according to their deeds do not; for they are saying and not doing" (Matt. xxiii. 3; cf. A. Büchler, p. 21); compare Psa. Sol. iv. 2 f.: "Extravagant in speech, extravagant in outward seeming beyond all (men). . . . And (yet) he is himself guilty in respect of manifold sin and wantonness." Also M. Joseph, "the idea of physical separateness was to beget the conception of moral separateness, and the (dietary) laws we are considering were peculiarly fitted to foster that conception" (p. 182).

Jesus does, whoever, break away from his contemporaries when, in reference to the complaint that "his learners are not walking (i.e. conducting themselves) according to the tradition of the elders, but with profane (i.e. unwashed) hands are eating bread (i.e. taking their meals)" (Mark vii. 5 || Matt. xv. 2), he says, "Nothing from outside the person is going into him, which can profane him . . . anything which from outside goes into the person cannot profane him" (Mark vii. 15, 18 || Matt. xv. 11, 17). The following passage from the Test. has moral, not ceremonial, defilements in view, namely, fornications: "For as the sun is not defiled by shining on dung and mire, but dries up both and drives away the evil smell; so also the pure mind, though encompassed by the defilements of earth, rather cleanses (them) and is not itself defiled" (T.B. viii. 3). Jesus asserts that if there is no moral defilement, it is out of place to speak of defilement at all, and in so asserting he stepped outside the limits of the Law (cf. A. Loisy, vol. i. p. 959). It was shockingly new doctrine that "THINGS cannot be *religiously* either clean or unclean; only PERSONS. And *persons* cannot be defiled by *things*; they can only be defiled by themselves, by acting irreligiously . . . no *things* can make you unclean. You can only make yourself unclean by sin" (C. G. Montefiore, III, pp. 169 f.; cf. II, p. 49). This removed from the category of sin many acts which had been given great prominence therein

by the devout mind of his time. Thus "with a prophet's blow" he destroyed "the terrible incubus from which all ancient religions suffered, that certain objects or physical states are in themselves taboo or religiously unclean," and in so doing he "represented a higher and purer conception of religion than the opposing principle which is embodied in the Pentateuchal law" (cf. C. G. Montefiore, III, pp. 170, 176). "What is going out from the person, that profanes the person. For from within, from the heart of people bad thoughts are going out, cases of immorality, theft, murder, adultery, greediness, meanness,—(the habit of) deceit, indecency, mean eye (i.e. envy), abusive language, arrogance, senselessness,—all these wickednesses from inside are going out and profaning the person" (Mark vii. 20–23 || Matt. xv. 18–20).

His one and only enthusiasm here was that men put out and keep out "the dirty spirit" (Matt. xii. 43 || Luke xi. 24; cf. above, p. 204, on the evil inclination); his command to his earliest helpers was, "lepers make clean" (Matt. x. 8), and "lepers are made clean" (Matt. xi. 5 || Luke vii. 22) was his message to his despondent fellow-prophet,—the meaning of which may be gathered from the Rabbinical description of Balaam as "that most infected leper among men" (cf. G. Friedlander, III, p. 260). By this test he judged his own success and failure: "Already you are clean on account of the word which I have spoken to (and which continues effective among) you" (John xv. 3), that is, because of the revelation and inspiration which had entered, and continued in, their lives through him: "You are clean, but not all (of you)" (John xiii. 10). In view of the fact that the ceremonial regulations, which his keen moral and religious intuitions made so altogether secondary that their neglect could not be considered sin any longer, were esteemed as special tokens of reverence for and love to God by every member of the synagogue (cf. R. T. Herford, I, pp. 161 f.), it could not have been long before he was made to realise, if he may not have done so at first, the conflict between what he taught here and what was taught in the Law. The cry of 'Irreverent fellow he!' was raised in many quarters,—not, however, among his own immediate friends who knew him better than think thus of him, though, it should be noted, they even did not escape a feeling of concern over the very advanced position he had been led to take up. (Mark vii. 17 f. || Matt. xv. 15 f.; cf. ver. 12).

4. THE FEAR OF GOD.

1. "Fear Him (i.e. reverence God)" (Luke xii. 5 || Matt. x. 28), appears among his exhortations. His aside, "for gentle am I, and humble in heart" (Matt. xi. 29),—compare, "O saints and humble in heart" (Azar., ver. 65),—has reference to his own rever-

ence for God, and may have in view some suggestions which were being made to the contrary. His assertiveness, as he is represented in the Fourth Gospel, should also probably be considered in the light of the charge of irreverence, which was being brought against him sometimes, though not always, quite sincerely. To his contemporaries, as to our writers, wisdom as summed up in the Law was the climax of reverence for God. His agreement in general with these lovers of the Law emerges often incidentally; thus, for example, in the phrase "cancelling the word of God" (Mark vii. 13 || Matt. xv. 6), especially if here "the word" is the equivalent of "the wisdom." That wisdom, however, it was thought, he was not displaying in his attitude to Sabbath observance and the distinction between clean and unclean. Hence, his defence of himself as one who revered or loved God, in the course of which he reveals so precisely what reverence meant for him: "I cannot do from myself anything" (John v. 30); "I am come down (and am here) from heaven (i.e. Heaven, God sent)" (vi. 38); "My teaching is not mine, but His Who sent me" (vii. 16); "I am from above (i.e. religious). . . . I am not of this world (i.e. irreligious)" (viii. 23; cf. D.C.G., vol. i. p. 8); "What I have seen (and now see) (i.e. to be right) in the eyes of (*παρά*) the Father, I am speaking" (ver. 38); "I am recognising the Father" (x. 15); "I am loving the Father, and as the Father commanded me, so I am doing" (xiv. 31),—compare, also above, pp. 214 f.).

Such assertions concerning his relation to God seem to fasten tightly on the charge of irreverence which was being made against him. Sayings of this kind may have been sharpened by time, but, as they stand, many of them are not unnatural, if they are taken as the answer of a sensitive soul, who has been stung into self-defence by the cruel suggestion that he was of irreverent mind. His references to others' irreverence and what he means by irreverence are expressed in similar terms: "His word (i.e. wisdom) you have not in you dwelling" (John v. 38); "the love of God you have not in yourselves" (ver. 42); "He is genuine Who sent me,—Whom you do not know" (vii. 28); "You are from below (i.e. wicked) . . . you are of this world (i.e. irreligious)" (viii. 23); "if God was your father, you would love me" (ver. 42); "he who is from God listens to the utterances of God; so then you are not listening, because from God you are not" (ver. 47). His fine idea of the fear or love of God as filial respect for, and obedience to, the Father's will shines out distinctly. That reverence is essentially filial, is what he is here constantly saying, or implying. This is in perfect accord with the Synoptic presentation of his mind (see above, pp. 57, 60 ff.).

2. He definitely subordinated the ceremonial expression of

reverence for God to the humanitarian expression of it. He did not in so many words do away with the former, neither did he say that it could or should have no place. What was in his mind was not the alternative, "some solemn symbols" or "an active love of one's fellow-creatures" as satisfying "those aspirations of the heart and soul of man which idealise the realities of life and turn its ideals into realities" (cf. P. Goodman, p. 390; H. H. Wendt, vol. i. p. 46), but the relative importance of one when it was viewed in its relation to the other. If one had to go, he declared, it must be the ceremonial,—and he who under such circumstances let it go was not guilty of sin; but the humanitarian must never be neglected,—such neglect would be sin indeed. That is, for him the serious sins of omission were concerned not with the service of God, so called, but with the service of men; not with some etiquette, perhaps good in itself, dictated from Temple or synagogue, but with some duty to others voiced by the spirit of humanity within. "Humanitarian" and "humanity" are not, of course, in this connection to be interpreted as though physical relief were only or even chiefly in view; they refer to all that is truly human. As he depicted the Judgment the only sins of omission which would count against a man were those of omission of service to man, for example, when "hungry" or "thirsty" or "a stranger" or "in his shirt" or "ill" or "in prison" (Matt. xxv. 42 f.). To be as ceremonially clean as a "priest" or a "Levite" mattered nothing at all, if one saw a man "half dead" and "passed on the opposite side of the road" (Luke x. 30-32); whereas to be as ceremonially unclean as a "Samaritan" was likewise nothing to trouble oneself about, if one "was filled with tenderness" to give the unfortunate man the much needed assistance (ver. 33). The usual, and not lightly to be despised, precision of Sabbath-keeping must be relaxed to let him, say, "Stretch the hand out" (Mark iii. 5 || Matt. xii. 13, Luke vi. 10), or "Madam, you have been set free from your weakness" (Luke xiii. 12; cf. xiv. 4), or, "Get up, lift your mat and walk" (John v. 8), or, "Be off, wash in the pool of Siloam" (John ix. 7), and heal the patients.

That the tax-gatherers and sinners were regarded as unclean (cf. J.E., vol. ix. p. 665) made no difference to his clearly conceived duty to get into touch with them, if by any means he might save them: "he saw Levi the son of Alphæus sitting at the revenue office, and says to him, 'Accompany me'" (Mark ii. 14 || Matt. ix. 9, Luke v. 27); again, "he looked up and said" to another such, "Zaccheus, hurry up and get down: for to-day at your house I must stay" (Luke xix. 5); and he was only made, if anything, more enthusiastic in his endeavours by such criticisms as, "With tax-gatherers and sinners he is eating" (Mark ii. 16 || Matt.

ix. 11, Luke v. 30), "This (fellow) if he was a prophet, would recognise who and what sort of woman she is who is touching him, that she is a sinner" (Luke vii. 39). What availed it to be able to say, "I tithe all I get" (Luke xviii. 12), if one's only interest in a penitent outcast was to thank God in prayer that one were not as he? What difference did it make to "tithe peppermint and aniseed and spice," and to leave "the weightier matters of the Law, justice and pity and faithfulness?" (Matt. xxiii. 23 || Luke xi. 42). Thus, in prophetic style he wrote down to lower than usual the value of ceremonialism as an expression of reverence for God, definitely removing it from the prior place which it had in current Judaism, and reducing its value to nil, if it was unaccompanied, as opportunity was given, by the humanitarian expression. He reverences God most who most loves man. As one's reverence is to be filial, it is best expressed by being brotherly and saving in one's activity among men, unhindered therein by any ceremonial distinctions or class barriers.

5. THE TREATMENT OF SIN.

1. The data already considered warrant the statement that while our writers, even the best of them, held together in one category ritual offences and moral delinquencies, Jesus separated them entirely (cf. W. Bousset, pp. 135 f., 138; T. C. Hall, p. 56). "External cleanness is obviously much easier than cleanness of heart, and yet the Law seemed to make an equivalence of value between the one and the other" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 492). This chief moral and religious danger to life under the Law some of our writers had overcome so far as to realise, as did some of the Rabbis (cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 50; also J.Th.S., vol. xiii. p. 336; F. W. Newman, p. 61), that the moral laws were more important than the ceremonial. Jesus went further: to his mind there was no offence against God which was, strictly speaking, of a ritual or ceremonial character. This does not mean that ritual had no significance for him, or that he was committed to break away from or annul every custom of his people. It does, however, signify that any good in these was to be found in their effect on man, and not in their being outward forms of homage to God unconditionally prescribed for man as a being entirely subject to the divine will. To quote H. Rashdall: "The performance of ritual ordinances, sacrifices, acts of worship, etc., will thus only be valuable in so far as they stimulate to the doing of God's will in the service of man" (pp. 286 f.). What, therefore, were heinous sins to his contemporaries (cf. W. H. Bennett, I p. 161),—the wilful and deliberate transgressions of the ceremonial laws,—were not so to him. They were matters indifferent,

in respect of which he displayed a conscious inner freedom which caused no small amazement on occasions even to his closest friends and admirers, and gave the chance of severe criticism and censure to others; witness, for example, his intimate intercourse with that section of the community who were not usually recognised as being within the pale and limits of the common religion. "He knew of no 'lower classes'" (S. Mathews, I, p. 169). By this violent separation of mere ritual offences from moral delinquencies he at once reduced the number of sins and clarified the idea of sin, revealing its deep-seated root within the soul (cf. C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 517).

2. This differentiation was epoch-making as regards sacrifices in relation to God, for the more consistently his thought was adhered to here the more the significance of the sacrificial system would decrease. It has too often been overlooked or ignored that the sacrificial system has to do mostly with unintentional sins. "The ritual, like O.T. generally, is concerned for 'hidden sins' (Psa. xix. 12), sins of carelessness and omission committed inadvertently . . . sacrifices could only be offered for specific sins of inadvertence, when the sinner had become aware of them; and many sins must have remained permanently 'hidden' from the sinner. Moreover, the very commission as well as the author of heinous crimes might remain unknown. Provision for the atonement for such sins is doubtless made in the *hattaths* appointed for the various feasts; or individuals, as in Job i. 5, might offer sacrifices to atone for unknown sins; but the special atonement for sins, which had not been otherwise dealt with, was made on the Day of Atonement" (W. H. Bennett, I, pp. 162 f.). Again, "The peace offerings set forth and celebrate the existence of normal relations of covenant and communion between God and His people; the sin offerings are intended to re-establish those normal relations where disobedience on the part of men has provoked anger on the part of God. But it is made clear (see Lev. iv.) that the sins atoned for are not those done with a 'high hand,' but are sins of ignorance" (J. S. Lidgett, p. 110). "The offences atoned for by sacrifice were sins of ignorance or inadvertence. . . . For wilful disobedience there was no sacrifice" (D.C.G., vol. ii. p. 547; cf. J.E., vol. v. p. 435).

The current teaching in the time of Jesus as regards the efficacy of sacrifice or of particular sacrifices may be put thus: "the things for which these sacrifices respectively atoned . . . are without exception cases of ignorance or unwitting intrusion of the 'unclean' into the sphere of 'holiness.' . . . Transgressions which are between a man and God, the Day of Atonement atones; transgressions that are between a man and his fellows, the Day of Atonement does not atone until he has propitiated the injured party"

(E.B., 4224; cf. S. Schechter, II, pp. 296, 303). But further, "the conception of Atonement underwent a great change. The men of the Great Synagogue,—disciples of the Prophets and imbued with the spirit of the Psalms,—had made prayer an essential element of the Temple Service; and whereas the Hasidean literature, accentuating divine forgiveness and repentance, took little notice of sacrifice, the Levites' song and the prayers introduced as parts of the worship lent to the whole sacrificial service a more symbolic character" (J.E., vol. ii. p. 277; cf. also A. Büchler, pp. 140, 193).

That Jesus cut away the whole class of sins, in relation to which these sacrifices were offered, brought the entire system, which already since the rise of the synagogue had been greatly reduced in importance, to the point of vanishing away. It matters little that, in view of this, some of the things already noted (see above, pp. 264 ff.) laid him open to a charge of inconsistency. It should be allowed that he *advanced* to this position, and that even when he came to occupy it there was no immediate obligation on him to work out even for himself its vast implications and consequences. The particular situation which he had to face hardly allowed him the opportunity of doing so, even if he would. Still, it is not to be assumed that he was entirely unaware that there were such implications and consequences. It is remarkable that afterward his followers, slow as they are sometimes said to have been, so quickly worked these out that they left the Rabbis far behind (cf. J.Q.R., vol. xvi., Jan., 1904, p. 214; S. Schechter, II, pp. 209, note 300). He did, then, what the most advanced of our writers never did, namely, he definitely removed everything unintentional out of the class which he was prepared to call sinful. For him only the intentional could be sinful (cf. H. Townsend, p. 112), and then only if it was such as to affect harmfully the whole character of the man.

3. The requirement of repentance establishes again a definite point of contact between his mind and the mind of our writers. But already it has been shown that the forward look in the repentance which he requires separates his thought from theirs even here (see above, pp. 117 f.). Repentance may have its start in regret of what one has done or been in the past, but it has its end in one doing or being what one has never done or been before. For Jesus repentance does not so much bring one back to what one has left, as drive one on to what one has not been hitherto. The penitent to his mind is not a person simply prepared to go back to the practice of some old good deeds, but one ready to "deny himself" (Mark viii. 34; || Matt. xvi. 24; Luke ix. 23), to go on to an entirely new kind of life. "Goodness is not the fulfilment of so many separate commandments; sin is not the infraction of so

many precepts. Jesus looks to the character as a whole" (C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 102; cf. D.C.G., vol. ii. p. 168). Our writers were not without glimpses of this difference, but to him it was always fully in view,—moreover, he succeeded in making it stand out clearly for others. He took up John the Baptist's, "Change your mind" (Mark i. 15 || Matt. iv. 17; cf. iii. 2), and summoned "sinners to a change of mind" (Luke v. 32 || Matt. ix. 13, Mark ii. 17). He had no immediate hope of moving people "such as have no occasion for change of mind" (Luke xv. 7), who "did not even change later" (Matt. xxi. 32). He was often struck with men's slowness to repent,—"if in Tyre and Sidon there had happened the forceful facts which happened in you, long ago . . . they would have changed their mind" (Luke x. 13 || Matt. xi. 21), "they changed their mind on the occasion of Jonah's preaching" (Luke xi. 32 || Matt. xii. 41), "unless you change your mind, you will all similarly perish" (Luke xiii. 3), "nor if anyone from the dead arose will they be persuaded (cf. 'repent,' ver. 30)" (Luke xvi. 31). He rejoiced "over one sinner changing his mind" (Luke xv. 7, 10), over the man who "later changed" (Matt. xxi. 30). Moreover, the type of penitent which he had in mind he gives us in the tax-gatherer who "recovered himself" (Luke xv. 17), and prayed, "God, have mercy on me a sinner" (Luke xviii. 13), and who "went down to his home acquitted" (ver. 14), a "son . . . dead and come to life again . . . lost and been found" (Luke xv. 24).

With him, then, this repentance to become an entirely new type of personality,—"unless you turn and become as boys" (Matt. xviii. 3),—is an accurate interpretation of his, "unless you change your mind" (Luke xiii. 3),—compare, "unless one be born from above" (John iii. 3). The deliberate turning or conversion of the whole nature here required should be considered in the light of the fact, that for one to be thoroughly religious under the Law "a profound study of its requirements was needed, demanding long and arduous study," and that "consequently learning and religion went hand in hand" (J.L., p. 124; cf. p. 73; R. T. Herford, I, pp. 313 ff., 321 ff., A. Büchler, p. 26). The entirely moral character of repentance, which is required by Jesus, incidentally confirms the profounder apprehension of God as Father which has been already claimed for him (see above, p. 70); what God asks in the demand for repentance, he insists, is that one become God's child, have a nature like God's. Thus, "Sin is tracked home to the innermost and most essential part of the man—his will" (T. R. Glover, I, p. 168). Sin is having the wrong nature,—the unfilial; repentance should be such that it brings with it the right nature,—the filial; for "the real interest of Jesus lies in that moral and spiritual realm which gathers round the filial relation of man to God" (H. W. Robinson, p. 80). "Thou didst hide this from the

wise and educated (cf. above, p. 71), and didst reveal it to babies (i.e. so-called) " (Matt. xi. 25 || Luke x. 21).

It may have been, too, that his anxiety to get his disciples away from the idea of religious life, as life according to a code of conduct, contributed in some measure to that peculiar direction of attention to himself already noticed (see above, pp. 153 ff.); "in devotion to a person, heart, conscience, and reason, so to speak, act from themselves, and the responsibility rests upon them. And the note of the character so formed is not obedience, but consecration of self" (R. T. Herford, I, p. 320). Sometimes, indeed, he did particularise and dwell on certain aspects of conduct, but even then he usually showed his tendency of thought to fall back on the type of mind which was revealed in the conduct, and often left the impression on his hearers that the type, which he set before them in himself, was that toward which any true repentance should take them. It is not, then, so much repentance and reformation which he suggests as repentance and regeneration (cf. S. Mathews, I, pp. 202 ff.). Our writers for the most part think of repentance leading to reformation, not repentance leading to regeneration. He otherwise; hence a temporary lapse does not hide from him the actually existent regenerate mind: "And on having again recovered yourself, strengthen your brothers" (Luke xxii. 32).

4. Consequently there is a greater emphasis on the grace of God (cf. J.E., vol. vi. pp. 60 f.) in his teaching than in our literature. "When it is regarded from the side of man, as an experience the responsibility for which lies with him, it is called *repentance*," but "when that experience is regarded from the side of God, as something due to His grace or Spirit, it is called *regeneration*, a being born again, from above, of God" (D.C.G., vol. ii. p. 486). That he should ever expect from men a repentance so radical arose out of his faith that the divine assistance was being afforded them: "In the sight of men an impossibility! but not in the sight of God; for all things are possible in the sight of God" (Mark x. 27 || Matt. xix. 26, Luke xviii. 27; cf. Mark ix. 23). He would not have such hope of any man, but for what the Father was doing, "No one can come to me, unless the Father Who sent me pull him" (John vi. 44; cf. W. Manson, p. 118). Like our writers he points to prayer (see above, pp. 52-55, also P., p. 623) as the human mode of appropriating this ever-waiting divine assistance; and this "prayer is not a passive thing," but "the highest energy of the pure and eager will" (J. A. Robertson, p. 106). "Ask, and it will be given you; search, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you; for every one who asks, receives; and he who searches, finds; and to him who knocks, it will be opened. Or what person of you is there (from)

whom his son will ask for a loaf,—a stone will he give him? or even a fish will ask for,—a serpent will he give him? If then you, being stingy, know to give generous gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give generously to those who ask Him?" (Matt. vii. 7-11 || Luke xi. 9-13). There need be no hesitation in taking Luke's paraphrase, "will give holy spirit," as accurately interpreting the mind of Jesus, and the Fourth Gospel as historically accurate (cf. E. A. Abbott, p. 796), when it represents his ministry among men as bringing to them a promise of the spirit: "so is every one who has come to birth by the spirit" (John iii. 8), "the spirit is what causes life" (vi. 63), "the spirit of truth from the Father is going out" (xv. 26). (Cf. L. Dougall, pp. 203-206).

Here there is a significant contrast between him and our writers for "it is noteworthy that the Holy Spirit is less frequently referred to in the Apocrypha, and by the Hellenistic writers; and this circumstance leads to the conclusion that the conception of the Holy Spirit was not prominent in the intellectual life of the Jewish people, especially in the Diaspora" (J.E., vol. vi. p. 450). Already one has noted his belief in the constant operation of the wisdom of God among men (see above, pp. 75 ff.), and especially in his own soul (see above, pp. 152-155); and his ministry would hardly have had any distinctive meaning at all, if it had not been essentially the good news of man's opportunity of having his inclination so filled with divine spirit that its entire character be changed (see above, p. 220). Hitherto "the doctrine of God's holy spirit remained inchoate, and . . . the nature of this divine help towards goodness and repentance was not explained to be the presence of the divine spirit within the soul" (C. G. Montefiore, I, p. 520; cf. in Rabbinical literature, J. Abelson, I, p. 200; also A. Büchler, pp. 55, 59). The teaching of Jesus here made a difference; "the purpose and reason, the consistency and unity of life which were intimated in vague outline in the idea of Wisdom, are realised and fulfilled in every factor and function of the Spirit filled life" (T. Rees, II, p. 300),—this was the impression which he gave of life as he conceived it. It was this "life . . . to overflowing" (John x. 10), which it was the opportunity of every man to have. Everything depended on the will to receive. His only anxiety, therefore, was concerning this receptivity; he was accustomed to give warning that men might by neglect lose the power to receive: "Consider what you hear: with what measure you measure, it will be measured to you, and set before you. For he who has (i.e. the quality signified by the big measure), there will be given him; and he who has not, even what he has (i.e. heard,—what is to be measured), will be taken from him" (Mark iv. 24 f. || Matt. xiii. 12; cf. Luke viii. 18). Moreover, he so far succeeded in directing attention to what the soul in becoming good owed to God, that those who were most ruled

by his mind came to feel, that what they owed to their own power in the matter of their salvation was infinitesimal, in comparison with what they owed to the power of God working in them. Their debt to God was measureless, "ten thousand talents (i.e. millions)" (Matt. xviii. 24), and they "loved much" (Luke vii. 47).

5. Much that he said on fasting (but see above, p. 269) and prayer and almsgiving might have been said by the finest of our writers or by the best of the Rabbis (cf. I.J.A., April 1910, p. 30; A. L. Williams, p. 222; J.L., p. 76). He attacks the mere external formalities of some of the Pharisaic disciples of the scribes of the school of Shammai (cf. E., July 1928, p. 63) in the words: "when you fast, do not be as the hypocrites, long-faced; for they make unsightly their outward appearances, that they may show themselves to people as fasting" (Matt. vi. 16); "when . . . you give alms, don't trumpet in front of you, as the hypocrites are doing in synagogues and streets, that they may be made much of by people" (ver. 2); "when you pray, you should not be as the hypocrites; for they like in synagogues and at the corners of streets to stand and pray, that they may show themselves to people. Truly I tell you, they are getting their pay" (ver. 5). "An ancient baraita enumerates seven classes of Pharisees, of which five consist of either eccentric fools or hypocrites. . . . It is such types of Pharisees that Jesus had in view" (J.E., vol. ix. p. 665). He deprecated such play-acting, insincerity in religion (cf. Mark xii. 38 || Matt. xxiii. 5-7, Luke xx. 46), and advocated instead a modest sincerity in all religious exercises or activities: "But you fasting,—oil your head, and your face wash, that you may not show yourselves to people as fasting, but to your Father, who is in the secret place" (Matt. vi. 17); "But you, when you pray,—go into your private room, and, having shut your door, pray to your Father who is in the secret place" (ver. 6); "But when you are giving alms, do not let your left recognise what your right is doing; that your alms may be in the secret place; and your Father who sees in the secret place will pay you" (ver. 4). In the Temple and in every town there existed a chamber of the silent or modest ones "in order that the poor of good families should be enabled to receive their support in seclusion" (J.E., vol. i. p. 436; also in the Talmud, P. I. Hershon, p. 22). There can be little doubt that what Jesus meant in this connection by the thrice repeated, "your Father who sees in the secret place will pay you" (vers. 4, 6, 18), was that the effort to have the right spirit in fasting and prayer and almsgiving would be means whereby the grace of God would become more effective in its good working within the individual's soul. His words on fasting amount to little more than 'if you are repentant, you may be assured that God knows of it,—leave it there.' His exhortation to practise private prayer suggests his

favourite idea of it as communion with God, as a man holds intercourse with his friend, or rather as a son should do with his father. (Cf. A. Büchler, pp. 28, 39, 198, 203 f.).

On almsgiving one may quote further: "To him who asks you give, and from him who wants to borrow from you do not turn away" (Matt. v. 42 || Luke vi. 30; cf. ver. 34, also ver. 35 as quoted above, p. 279), on which D. W. Forrest remarks, "Christ had in view those who were destitute of the necessities or elementary comforts of existence. . . . In that age there was no such organised provision made by the community as exists to-day for the homeless and unemployed" (II, p. 163; also A. M. Ribhany, pp. 88 f.). It can scarcely be doubted that this humanitarian motive was the only true one for the mind of Jesus; almsgiving is to be done in this sense manward, not Godward. This holds good, though indeed he speaks, in the same association, of having "a store in heaven" (Mark x. 21 || Matt. xix. 21, Luke xviii. 22; cf. Matt. vi. 20 || Luke xii. 33), of being "paid back . . . at the resurrection of the righteous" (Luke xiv. 14), or received "into eternal tents" (Luke xvi. 9). These can only refer to an extension into eternity of the kind of recompense, which even now is received from the Father who "in the secret place" sees the almsgiving; the work of grace in the soul which has begun here will have a significance in the Hereafter. There is no suggestion that this secret almsgiving *per se* atones for sin,—a favourite idea with our writers. This is no more than might have been expected, since it has been seen that he is interested not in a list of sins and their piecemeal cancellation, but in sin as a wrong direction of the will and in the righting of that wrong bent of mind in the experience of repentance. This omission suggests his thought on the whole doctrine of merit as popularly understood and generally accepted by our writers. The note of his religion is not 'I do something' (cf. Luke xviii. 11 f.), but 'I love somebody' (cf. Luke vii. 47).

6. There is no consistent doctrine of merit, but the general principle of the prior necessity of some merit in approach to God was a ruling one in the mind of our writers. The paucity of references in our literature to the merits of the fathers, such as, "And if you were not to receive mercy through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, our fathers, not one of our seed should be left upon the earth" (T.L. xv. 4),—compare, "Our father is Abraham" (John viii. 39; cf. Matt. iii. 9; also A. Marmorstein, pp. 38, 165; S. Levy, p. 23),—does, however, reveal that their thought was that in the end it was the merit of the individual which really mattered. This also Jesus sought to drive home, when he said, "If you are children of Abraham, the deeds of Abraham do" (John viii. 39). Evidently, then, on the general question, while our writers, for the most part (cf. H. Townsend, pp. 26-33), and Jesus incline to

the side of those who recognise "only the value of self-acquired merits, and would not admit the help or influence of imputed merits," the people in John viii. reveal the influence of quite a different school "which taught and spread the doctrine of the merits of the fathers and of the righteous," and, not unnaturally, "enjoyed much greater popularity," and a residue of our writers seem to fall in with "a compromise" which "was actually found as early as in the time of Hillel, and carried on by his school" (cf. A. Marmorstein, p. 25).

This much admitted, it is still true that in the teaching of Jesus the old idea of merit has practically been done away with. His attitude on certain outstanding features of orthodox practice depressed the idea, even if it did not crush it out altogether. He made nothing in the ordinary sense of "the merit of the Sabbath." There is no reason to suppose that the much greater merit of "circumcision" was esteemed by him; the controversy in John viii. over Abraham perhaps should be taken as evidence to the contrary. "Sacrifice," a merit greater than that of the fathers, he left little or no place for. "Charity and lovingkindness" he certainly magnified, and it is, significantly enough, only in this connection that the idea of "a store in heaven" makes its appearance in the records of his teaching. "The merit of the Torah" was minimised by his attitude of liberty toward the contents of the Law. "The merit of the Tabernacle or Temple" he seems to have very largely disregarded. There is no indication either that he confined his activities to Palestine because of his being obsessed with "the great merit of dwelling in the Holy Land" (cf. J.E., vol. ix. pp. 502 f.). "The merit of repentance" was transformed by his making the objective of repentance not some reformation in details, but complete regeneration of mind. "The merit of faith" for him was the constant sustentation of that receptive attitude toward the grace of God which had first been assumed in the experience of repentance (cf. A. Marmorstein, pp. 172-184). The merit of those things which he most retained,—namely, charity, repentance, and faith,—he connected primarily with the experience of the soul in the present, not with the making up of accounts at the last day. They had value, that is, as putting the soul now in the most receptive attitude to the grace of God which was operative everywhere, and was seeking to bring the good *par excellence* into human life. But when the value of everything in life is interpreted in relation to God as a present redeeming power for the soul, there is no room for merit in the old sense of the term (cf. T. C. Hall, pp. 65 f.).

Faith then is not trust in the mercy of God, since merit is deficient or wanting altogether, but it is "the regulator" of a man's "attitude towards that which was taught him as the contents of

revelation" (R. T. Herford, I, p. 240). To quote H. L. Jackson: "He is, perhaps, *sui generis* when, eliminating constraint, He gives all prominence to the idea of spontaneous responsiveness to the Heavenly Father's Will on the part of human children who are near and dear to God" (p. 295). "If you have trust (i.e. in God) . . . nothing will be impossible to you" (Matt. xvii. 20 || Luke xvii. 6; cf. Mark xi. 23 || Matt. xxi. 21), when rightly interpreted means, "And all whatever you ask in prayer, trusting (i.e. in God) you will get" (Matt. xxi. 22 || Mark xi. 24; cf. John xiv. 13, 16, 23). It is worthy of notice, too, that in Luke this very *logion* is followed immediately by the parable of the "slave" who, whatever he does, feels that he has not done anything for which his master need "thank" him (Luke xvii. 7-10). Indeed, as "a servant in the sense of antiquity cannot win merit" (cf. D.C.G., vol. ii. p. 168), it may have been that Jesus' fondness for the "servant" in parables had some reference to the prevalent idea of merit. "Have trust in God" (Mark xi. 22), "Put trust in God, and in me put trust" (John xiv. 1), represent the clear call he gives to the needy soul, the trust in himself being only required as an assistance to trust in God; and that trust is just the only fitting response to the seeking love of God, which he conceived it his peculiar mission to make known to men. Hence, human merit is now "the worth to the Heavenly Father of the conduct of His sons when judged by the inward motive of filial obedience" (Ib.). Thus, the more or less imperfectly ethicised idea of merit to be found in our writers he thoroughly ethicised by making it equivalent to filial obedience,—an obedience which is through and through the constant response of faith to the love of the Father, and is alone to his mind worthy the name of salvation.

To summarise what has been claimed for Jesus under this head: He started out with the conviction of his own complete loyalty to the Torah, exhibiting acquaintance with canonical and other Scripture, and sharing that joy in religion which was characteristic of the best life under the Law. He had a fine regard for many of the customs of his people, encouraging the same in others. In his emphasis on righteousness he reveals his kinship with the prophets, as do our writers; he gives it, however, such an interpretation as to make it identical with that fine generosity of interest and activity which is usual only where there is unquenchable love. He agrees with our writers on the virtues to be cultivated, especially inwardness, but his idea of inwardness amounts to a thorough-going sincerity in redeeming love. This is seen, for example, in his view of divorce; he would keep the door always open for the return of the one who has sinned. There is nothing un-Jewish, as has been asserted, in his teaching concerning duty to parents; he unites benevolence towards them and spiritual

independence in relation to them as few have been able to do. Wealth was, he thought, of altogether secondary importance,—at once both an instrument of good and a danger to the soul, and affording a fine opportunity for heroism. The spirit, which would insist on adequate compensation before reconciliation, he set aside altogether as unworthy of the professed children of the Kingdom of God. His high esteem for the revelation which had been given through Moses, did not prevent him from taking seriously any experience of his own which might amount to a revelation of God through himself; and such revelation, he felt, could not in spirit be inconsistent with the revelation of God to devout people in the past. This loyalty and freedom with respect to earlier revelation, which was a marked feature of his mind, came to the front particularly in his attitude to the ordinary idea of Sabbath observance, and to the usual distinction among the orthodox under the Law between the clean and the unclean. Sabbath observance, so he thought, could not be a love-token to God, if it was made to stand in the way of any service to man in need. The religious clearness or uncleanness of things *per se*, he would not for a moment acknowledge; hence he cut out of the category of sin many practices which had hitherto, not only a place, but an exceedingly prominent place therein. Reverence for God he consistently upheld, some of his boldest assertions concerning himself being affirmations made in face of the charge of irreverence which had been levelled against him on not a few occasions. The ceremonial expression of reverence for God he wholly subordinated to the humanitarian expression of it; since reverence was essentially filial, its best expression must be an unflinching brotherliness, especially toward those who are usually despised and forsaken. His entire separation of ritual offences from moral delinquencies helped to clarify the idea of sin by revealing its deep-seated root in the will. Nothing that was unintentional could by any possibility be sin. Repentance, therefore, had relation not so much to deeds as to a state of mind, and was to lead not so much to some improvements in conduct as to a radical change of soul. This change from the unfilial attitude to the filial, which he required in repentance, made him make more of the grace of God coming to the help of man than is done in our literature; his hope for man lay in the opportunity which he had of having his inclination completely changed from evil to good by the indwelling of God's spirit. This was the real objective of the seeking love of God, hence the good result in each individual depended only on his being receptive of the ever-waiting power of God. Every religious exercise or practice was to be the outcome and expression of this new life within, and, properly regarded, was but a means to the further development of that life. The only real merit, then in

the sight of God was filial obedience, and to be filially obedient was to be saved. Hence, while his teaching "is an evolution out of Judaism, is indeed a kind of reformed Judaism," he "being in fact a Jewish Reformer,"—yet in his marvellous personality and teaching there is to be recognised "the beginning of a new movement" (cf. T. W. Davies, pp. 6, 12).

CHAPTER VI

THE HOPE OF THE HEREAFTER

A—THE TEACHING OF THIS LITERATURE

OUR literature is really epoch-making on what the individual had to hope for beyond the experience of death, since vague hints on the matter to be found here and there in the O.T. have been developed into very mature convictions. "The eschatology of the prophets dealt only with the destiny of Israel, as a nation, and the destinies of the Gentile nations, but it had no message of light or comfort for the individual beyond the grave. For all men ultimately, whether of Israel or of the Gentiles, Sheol, the unblessed abode of the shades, was the final and everlasting habitation. Every advance on this heathen conception we owe to apocalyptic. The belief in a blessed future life springs not from prophecy but from apocalyptic" (R. H. Charles, I, p. 178; cf. I.J.A., Oct. 1916, p. 64; cf. for relation to Greek eschatology, I.J.A., April 1915, p. 25). In one book, however, the older non-moral view of the region beyond (cf. A. B. Davidson, chap. xii. 4; also W. O. E. Oesterley, I, pp. 146 f.) appears distinctly. To quote this instance here at the outset will the better, as a background, show up the very real advance which is to occupy attention in this section. Ben Sira exhorts his reader: "Indulge your soul, for in Sheol there is no delight" (Sir. xiv. 16). From another point of view he asks, "What pleasure has God in all that perish in Hades. . . ? Thanksgiving perishes from the dead as from one that is not" (xvii. 27 f.). Of the dead he says, "His light has failed" (xxii. 11; cf., 1 En. cii. 6-8), and "in Sheol there are no reproaches concerning life" (xli. 4, contrast xxi. 10, and see further W. O. E. Oesterley, I, pp. 288-290). It is the whole-hearted abandonment of this position that is now to be reviewed.

I. THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

1. In the ordinary course of events, that is, nearly always in the experience of the righteous and mostly for the wicked as well, there is a period intervening between death and the final Judgment. In 1 En. i.-xxxvi. the writer pictures "hollow places" which "have been created for this very purpose, that the spirits of the souls of the dead should assemble therein, yea that all the

souls of the children of men should assemble here. And these places have been made to receive them till the day of their judgment and till their appointed period, till the great Judgment (comes) upon them" (xxii. 3 f.). In this state moral distinctions are observed, since there are three divisions, one for the good, one for the bad, and one apparently for the indifferent,—the Rabbinical division of men into righteous, wicked, and men of the middle way (cf. A. Marmorstein, p. 24; J.E., vol. iii. p. 313; J. H. Leckie, p. 154). This, then, is a preliminary state of judgment.

The third division "has been made for the spirits of those who make their suit, who make disclosures concerning their destruction, when they were slain in the days of the sinners. Such has been made for the spirits of men who were not righteous but sinners, who were complete in transgression, and of the transgressors they shall be companions" (vers. 12 f.). When one considers that the joy of this intermediate state seems to arise from assurance of reward, and the pain of it for the wicked to be due to the certainty of approaching punishment, the significance of this third division becomes clear. In contrast with those in the first division they have not been in this life what might be termed good; but in contrast with those in the second division their wickedness has not been such as could not be punished in this life. They seem to have received their punishment "in their lifetime" (ver. 10). There is, then, no future punishment for them: "their spirits shall not be slain in the day of Judgment nor shall they be raised from thence" (ver. 13). This is, then, a division reserved for those who have no longer joy or sorrow; that is, the old shadowy Sheol is kept for those who were not so desperately wicked that they could not suffer all they deserved to suffer before the end of the present life. This idea of a third division may be of subordinate interest here, but it should not be overlooked. Souls such as retain consciousness, that is, are capable of experiencing pleasure or pain, either have not been sufficiently rewarded in this life, or have not been sufficiently punished. For these immediately after death there could only be either the rest of hope or the unrest of despair.

2. The first "division has been made (for) the spirits of the righteous, in which there is the bright spring of water" (ver. 9). This is paradise in its earlier eschatological meaning in our literature, as the reference to "the bright spring of water" shows. Enoch and Elijah are prominent among those who have entered it (1 En. lxxxvii. 3 f., lxxxix. 52),—allusions, of course, to the O.T. stories of their translation. It is "the garden where the elect and righteous dwell" (1 En. lx. 8), "the garden of the righteous" (ver. 23), "the garden of righteousness" (lxxvii. 3), the home for the present of those who with the good angels in heaven are classed as spirits "of light,"—"all the elect who dwell in the garden

of life" (lxi. 12). Enoch tells how he saw angels who were given long cords to measure off paradise (lxi. 1), and how that when the day came in which he himself "was no longer numbered amongst them" that "dwell on the earth" he was carried off to "where the angels took the cords to measure . . . the place for the elect and righteous. And there," he says, "I saw the first fathers and the righteous who from the beginning dwell in that place" (lxx. 1-4); that is, when Enoch himself got there, he met there the spirits of his righteous forefathers. It is to Enoch in this paradise that Noah prays, and from whom he gets a message concerning the destruction of the wicked by the deluge and his own preservation therefrom (lxv. 2 ff.). This division is the place of "the chambers of souls" (4 Ez. iv. 41; cf. "hollow places," 1 En. xxii. 3). Here the righteous are guarded by angels: "Over all the righteous and holy" there have been appointed "guardians from amongst the holy ones to guard them as the apple of an eye, until He makes an end of all wickedness and all sin, and though the righteous sleep a long sleep, they have nought to fear" (1 En. c. 5; cf. 2 Bar. xxiii. 4); hence, the future life of the righteous is an absolute certainty, "the ways of the future world are broad and safe, and yield the fruit of immortality" (4 Ez. vii. 13).

The manner of reference to the departed as sleeping does not signify any unconscious continuance in being, till they waken again to consciousness at the resurrection. R. H. Charles has pointed out that "the designation of death as a sleep did not arise from the resurrection hope; for it is found in books (i.e. of the O.T.) that are unacquainted with this hope. . . . Hence, in later times, when the belief in the resurrection was firmly established, and the state of the departed is described as a 'sleep,' the word is not necessarily to be taken in its literal meaning" (I, p. 132, note). He therefore refuses to take it so in our literature: "From this time forward, when the departed are spoken of as 'asleep,' the term is to be regarded as a mere metaphor. The departed are henceforth conceived as possessing life and consciousness as much as the living" (ib., p. 242). So, too, in the parallel to 1 En. c. 5 quoted above, "the dead" is not to be taken literally: "a place was prepared where the living might dwell, and the dead might be guarded" (2 Bar. xxiii. 4), but as in the case of 'sleep' (2 Bar. xxi. 24), as merely descriptive of the departed from the point of view of those who have seen them here alive and active, but see them so no more (cf. the use of "alive" 4 Ez. vii. 94 quoted below). That is, both "sleep" and "dead" have in view the fact of a now still body, and no more; witness, "the earth shall restore those that sleep in her, and the dust those that are at rest therein (and the chambers shall restore those that were committed unto them)" (4 Ez. vii. 32). That our writers

thought of the departed as still alive and active, and that "sleep" conveyed the simple idea of "rest" to their minds, is clear (cf. "beds," 1 En. xlvi. 6 quoted below, p. 316). Individuality was preserved, since there was a chamber for each soul (see above, p. 189).

Great care, too, is taken to bring out the fact that they enter their chambers with even fuller knowledge than they have had in this life. "The matter as it relates to them is as follows: First of all they shall see with great joy the glory of Him who receives them; and they shall rest in seven orders (i.e. joyful dispositions of mind). The first order (is): that they have striven much and painfully to overcome the innate evil thought, that it might not lead them astray from life unto death. The second order (is): that they see the round in which the souls of the ungodly wander, and the punishment that awaits them. The third order³ (is): they see the witness which their Fashioner attests concerning them, that while they were alive they faithfully observed the Law which was given to them. The fourth order (is): they understand the rest which they now, being gathered in their chambers, enjoy in profound quietness guarded by angels, and the glory which awaits them at their latter end. The fifth order (is): they rejoice that they have now escaped what is corruptible, and that they shall inherit that which is to come; and moreover that they see the straitness and painfulness from which they have been delivered, and the spacious liberty which they are destined to receive with enjoyment and immortality. The sixth order: that it is shown unto them how their face is destined to shine as the sun, and how they are destined to be made like the light of the stars, henceforth incorruptible. The seventh order, which exceeds all the aforesaid, (is): that they shall rejoice with boldness, be confident without confusion, be glad without fear, for they are hastening to behold the face of Him Whom in life they served, and from Whom they are destined to receive their reward in glory. . . . Seven days they have freedom, that during these seven days they may see the things aforesaid, afterwards they shall be gathered together in their habitations" (4 Ez. vii. 90-98, 101). That is, they enter the Beyond aware of the fight they have had with sin, sure that sin is being punished, knowing that they themselves are approved of God, realising a fine joy which is but a foretaste of a finer joy yet to be; they see, too, that they are beyond the painful struggle and limitation of mortal life, and that a larger angelic life awaits them, whose chief attraction for them is the vision of God which they will then enjoy.

Moreover, in the chambers themselves they are aware of the flight of time which makes them raise questions; so the divine Speaker to Salathiel (Ezra): "Were not these questions of yours asked by the souls of the righteous in their chambers? How

long are we (to remain) here? When comes the fruit upon the threshing-floor of our reward?" (4 Ez. iv. 35; cf. ? 1 En. xxxix. 5). From these chambers of rest or this paradise the wicked are excluded: "Such (i.e. wicked) souls shall not enter into habitations" (4 Ez. vii. 80),—compare, "And there I saw the mansions of the elect and the mansions of the holy, and my eyes saw there all the sinners being driven from thence who deny the Lord of Spirits" (1 En. xli. 2; cf. 4 Ez. vii. 121). However real also the bliss of this condition of the righteous, it is clearly only a stage on the way to something better: "Then all who have fallen asleep in hope of Him shall rise again. And it shall come to pass at that time that the treasuries will be opened in which is preserved the number of the souls of the righteous, and they shall come forth, and a multitude of souls shall be seen together in one assemblage of one thought, and the first shall rejoice and the last shall not be grieved" (2 Bar. xxx. 2; cf. xxi. 23; 4 Ez. vii. 32). Hence the view of human life, as it may be, which is implied in the words, "I will rejoice . . . over the creation of the righteous, (over) their pilgrimage also (i.e. into another life) and their salvation (i.e. their security and peace in waiting for the final bliss) and their recompence (i.e. when they will enter fully into the reward of heaven for which they have waited)" (4 Ez. viii. 39). The intermediate state for the good is "the place of faith, and the region of hope" (2 Bar. lix. 10; cf. 1 En. cii. 5, and contrast ver. 11).

3. The second division "has been made for sinners when they die and are buried in the earth and judgment has not been executed on them in their lifetime. Here their spirits shall be set apart in this great pain till the great day of Judgment and punishment and torment of those who curse for ever and retribution for their spirits. There He shall bind them for ever" (1 En. xxii. 10 f.). Save that the spirits here find no home and no rest, this division for the wicked who have not received their punishment in this life is in many respects like the division for the righteous who await their full reward. The inhabitants are conscious and have knowledge,—a knowledge, however, which brings them agony. "Such souls shall not enter into habitations (i.e. as the righteous in the other division do), but shall wander about henceforth (i.e. seeking rest and finding none) in torture, ever grieving and sad, in seven ways. The first way (is): that they have scorned the Law of the Most High; the second way, that they are now unable to make a good repentance for life; the third way (is): they shall see the reward laid up for those who have believed the covenants of the Most High; the fourth way, that they shall regard the torture laid up for themselves in the last days; the fifth way, that they shall see how the habitations of the other souls are guarded by angels in profound quietness; the sixth way, that they shall

see how from now henceforth they must pass over into torture. The seventh way, which exceeds all the aforesaid ways, (is) : that they shall pine away from shame, and be consumed with confusion, and withered with fear, in that they see the glory of the Most High, before Whom they have sinned in life, and before Whom they are destined to be judged in the last times " (4 Ez. vii. 80-87). That is, they have here an opportunity for reflection ; it is, so to speak, forced upon them. They see that their wrong manner of life in the past has brought them to that point where the wrong cannot now be put right ; others have the fine prospect of a reward, they the horrid prospect of punishment staring them in the face ; others meanwhile have rest, they can have none ; and worst of all, they are worn with fear of having to appear before God their Judge whose existence they ignored during their pursuit of wickedness, and of whom they had said in their hearts that He was not.

This is, however, but preliminary to their entrance into final punishment ; they " recline in anguish and rest in torment, till " the " last time come " (2 Bar. xxxvi. 11), the nearness of which at the resurrection intensifies the distress of spirit which they experience. " But the souls of the wicked, when they behold all these things (i.e. the resurrection) shall then waste away the more. For they shall know that their torment has come, and their perdition has arrived " (2 Bar. xxx. 4 f.). This preliminary punishment due to anticipation of the real punishment to come was not usually referred to under the figure of " fire." It is unnecessary and arbitrary to emend, " Our souls are full of unrighteous gain, but it does not prevent us from descending from the midst thereof into the burden (*βάρος*, possibly, " stronghold," *βάρην*) of Sheol " (1 En. lxiii. 10) to read, " into the burden of the flame of Sheol " (A.P., vol. ii. p. 230 ; R. H. Charles, II, p. 127), since in that section of 1 En. only the " darkness " prior to the resurrection of the righteous is mentioned, and that emphatically : " darkness shall be their dwelling . . . and they shall have no hope of rising from their beds " (xlvi. 6 ; cf. lxiii. 6). This " darkness " is the chief characteristic of " the place of condemnation " (Jub. vii. 29 ; cf. xxii. 22), whither the wicked are removed at death. In the case of the fallen angels " darkness " is experienced before (cf. 2 En. vii. 1 f.), and " fire " after the Judgment ; e.g., " Bind Azazel hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness . . . cover him with darkness, and let him abide there for ever, and cover his face that he may not see light. And on the day of the great Judgment he shall be cast into the fire " (1 En. x. 4 ; cf. vers. 12 f., liv. 6). In this " darkness " the condemned angels are " incessantly making weeping through all hours " (2 En. vii. 2). The experience of the wicked is thought to be parallel to, or the same as, that of the fallen angels (see below, p. 327). The imme-

diate terror for the wicked at death is, then, just this very "darkness"; "the inheritance of sinners is destruction and darkness, and their iniquities shall pursue them unto Sheol beneath" (Psa. Sol. xv. 11; cf. xiv. 6, xvi. 2). The significance of Apoc. Abr. xxxi, "And I will burn with fire those who have insulted them and who have ruled among them in (this) age . . . and I have prepared them to be food for the fire of Hades and for ceaseless flight to and fro through the air in the underworld beneath the earth," may be, not that "here two conceptions seem to be mixed . . . the idea of 'the fire of Hades'" and the "outer darkness" (G. H. Box, I, p. 85), but that to the "outer darkness" of their experience before the Judgment there will be added at the Judgment the experience of "fire."

2. THE RESURRECTION.

1. First, there is the view of those who place the resurrection at the close of a temporal Messianic Kingdom (see above, pp. 85 ff.). So Jub.: "And at that time the Lord will heal His servants, and they shall rise and see great peace, and drive out their adversaries. And the righteous shall see and be thankful, and rejoice with joy for ever and ever, and shall see their judgments and all their curses on their enemies" (xxiii. 30), the enemies being in Gehenna as in Ass. Mos. x. 10 (quoted below, p. 327; cf. 2 Bar. li. 5). In explanation he adds that there will be a resurrection of spirit, presumably from the paradise or chambers of souls, "And their bones shall rest in the earth, and their spirits shall have much joy, and they shall know that it is the Lord who executes judgment, and shows mercy to hundreds and thousands and to all that love Him" (ver. 31). The resurrection in this writer's idea of it does not concern the body which has been buried. In 1 En. ci-civ this view is given very elaborately. The scene of the resurrection life is heaven: "the first heaven shall depart and pass away, and a new heaven shall appear" (xcī. 16),—"the portals of heaven shall be opened to you" (civ. 2). It is a resurrection of the spirits of the just; from their intermediate abode of rest, where they have been guarded by angels, they will come forth into this heaven. "The righteous one shall arise from sleep, and walk in the paths of righteousness, and all his path and conversation shall be in eternal goodness and grace" (xcii. 3); "the righteous shall arise from their sleep, and wisdom shall arise and be given unto them" (xcī. 10); "all goodness and joy and glory are prepared for them, and written down for the spirits of those who have died in righteousness, and . . . manifold good shall be given to you in recompense for your labours, and . . . your lot is abundantly beyond the lot of the living. And the spirits

of you who have died in righteousness shall live and rejoice, and their spirits shall not perish, nor their memorial from before the face of the Great One unto all the generations of the world" (ciii. 3 f.).

The spirits preserved in being to the resurrection enter then into an angelic life,—the assurances given to the righteous being, "you will shine as the lights of heaven, you will shine and you will be seen . . . you will have great joys as the angels of heaven . . . you will become companions of the hosts of heaven" (civ. 2, 4, 6; cf. 2 En. xxii. 8-10; also in Rabbinical literature, G. Friedlander, III, p. 266). This is the transfigured and glorified Israel who is referred to in Ass. Mos.: "God will exalt you, and He will cause you to approach to the heaven of the stars (i.e. possibly 'angels'), and He will establish your habitation among them" (x. 9). This also is the idea in Psa. Sol.: "they that fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal, and their life (shall be) in the light of the Lord, and shall come to an end no more" (iii. 16); "the pious of the Lord shall inherit life in gladness" (xiv. 7; cf. xv. 15). Here then is the conception of inheriting eternal life in the fine sense of spiritual existence in heaven,—a stage in advance, and the natural development, of spiritual life on a new earth as in 1 En. xxxvii-lxxi, where occurs the very phrase "inherit eternal life" (xl. 9).

This final abode of the righteous is the Paradise in the third heaven which is described in 2 En. The intermediate "paradise is between corruptibility and incorruptibility" (viii. 5), "where rest has been prepared for the just, and it is open to the third heaven, and shut from this world. At the last coming (i.e. of God at the final Judgment) they will lead forth Adam with our forefathers (i.e. out of the intermediate paradise), and conduct them there (i.e. into the final Paradise), that they may rejoice, as a man calls those whom he loves to feast with him; and they having come with joy hold converse . . . and joy and merriment in the light and eternal life" (xlii. 3, 5, given in R. H. Charles, I, p. 318, not apparently in A.P., ii). It is "a place unknown in goodness of appearance" (viii. 1, B.); "prepared for the righteous, who suffer offence in their lives and spite in their souls, and avert their eyes from injustice and make righteous judgment, to give bread to the hungry, to clothe the naked and cover them with a garment, to raise the fallen, and help the wronged, who walk before God's face and serve him alone; now for these is this place prepared for an eternal inheritance" (ix. 1, B.); "a blessed place, and all blessed creatures and all these living in joy and in infinite happiness in eternal life" (xlii. 3); "a Paradise bright and incorruptible, for all corruptible things shall pass away, and there will be eternal life" (lxv. 10); "in the great time (i.e. to come) are

many mansions prepared for men, good for the good. . . . Blessed are those who enter the good houses" (lxi. 2 f.). In this Paradise, therefore, there are many mansions as in the paradise intermediate. In these books, too, it is resurrection to be superlatively happy spirits in heaven which is taught, though in 2 En. a spiritual resurrection of the wicked for the experiences of hell seems to be as clearly taught (see below, pp. 328 f.).

2. Second, there is the view of those who think of the resurrection as preceding the establishment of the eternal Messianic Kingdom on earth (see above, pp. 88 f.). In 1 En. i-xxxvi it is a resurrection of the body to be experienced by the righteous only that they may be able to "live a long life on earth, such as your fathers lived; and in their days shall no sorrow or plague or torment or calamity touch them" (xxv. 6; see also above, p. 88 for this writer's peculiar idea of a limited life within an eternal kingdom). The passage from chapter xxii, quoted above, p. 312, which formed the basis of one's treatment of the intermediate state, is no exception, since verse 13, in which a reference to the resurrection is made, one has interpreted (contrast R. H. Charles, I, p. 292) that there were people not bad enough to be reserved for the future Judgment, and not good enough to be raised to partake in the Messianic Kingdom. At the Judgment the spirits of the wicked in the second division do not seem to be re-embodied in any way at all, but simply transferred to where they experience their final retribution, to the "accursed valley" which "is for those who are accursed for ever; here shall all the accursed be gathered together who utter with their lips against the Lord unseemly words and of His glory speak hard things. Here shall they be gathered together, and here shall be their place of judgment. In the last days there shall be upon them the spectacle of righteous judgment in the presence of the righteous for ever" (xxvii. 2 f.). This removal without resurrection is probably what the martyr in 2 Macc. meant, when he spoke to the tyrant of the experience of "no resurrection": "Tis meet for those who perish at men's hands to cherish hope divine that they shall be raised up by God again; but you—you will have no resurrection" (vii. 14). That is, "no resurrection" signified not so much the negative idea of non-participation in eternal life, which was for the writer just life in the Messianic Kingdom (cf. ver. 9), as the positive idea of sharing in the final punishment of the wicked.

Throughout this book also the materialistic idea of eternal life in a body, much the same as the present body is, is held. So one of the martyrs speaking of his tongue and hands, says, "From Him I hope to get them back again" (vii. 11); the mother, too, assures her sons that "the Creator of the world . . . in mercy

will restore to" them "the breath of life" (ver. 23; cf. ver. 29); and the Jerusalemite elder and patriot, Razis, died "calling on Him who is lord of life and spirit to restore them (i.e. his bowels torn out) to him again" (xiv. 46). Again, in 1 En. i xxxiii-xc, a bodily resurrection of the righteous dead is thought of, but yet it is clearly recognised that the bodies of those who survive to the coming of the Kingdom, and of those who are revived for it, must undergo some transformation (xc. 33, 38, quoted above, p. 86), this expected transformation taking place after the survivors have been joined by those who have been raised from the dead.

In the Test. this idea of a resurrection to a renewed life on this earth appears: "they who have died in grief shall arise in joy, . . . they who are put to death for the Lord's sake shall awake to life" (T.Jud. xxv. 4); "then shall we also rise, each one over our tribe, worshipping the King of heaven. Then also all men shall rise, some unto glory, and some unto shame" (T.B. x. 7 f.). This passage, however, echoes Dan. xii. 1 f. in making the wicked also rise. In the Similitudes it is said of the righteous, "And these measures shall reveal all the secrets of the depths of the earth, and those who have been destroyed by the desert, and those who have been devoured by the beasts, and those who have been devoured by the fish of the sea, that they may return and stay themselves on the day of the Elect One; for none shall be destroyed before the Lord of spirits, and none can be destroyed" (1 En. lxi. 5),—the change expected being spoken of thus: "And the righteous and elect shall have risen from the earth, and ceased to be of a downcast countenance. And they shall have been clothed with garments of glory. And these shall be the garments of life from the Lord of spirits; and your garments shall not grow old, nor your glory pass away before the Lord of spirits" (1 En. lxii. 15 f.; cf. cviii. 12), that is, their bodies shall have become spiritual bodies; and, since in the following Sheol and hell seem to be distinct places in the intermediate state, the wicked here also come in view for a moment: "And in those days shall the earth also give back that which has been entrusted to it, and Sheol also shall give back that which it has received, and hell shall give back that which it owes" (1 En. li. 1). The persistency of this view of a bodily return to life in some sense here is witnessed to by Sib. iv (quoted above, p. 86).

In these books, then, one finds the idea of a resurrection of the body, which is, however, in some degree changed to meet the new circumstances, being either made so healthy as to be equal to a very long or eternal life, or transformed so completely as to be the fit organ of spiritual existence in a new earth. The main interest throughout is in the future life of the righteous, since at

the final Judgment the wicked are either without resurrection removed to the place of final punishment, or else after resurrection sent off the stage of desirable existence.

3. Third, there is the teaching of those writers who, either definitely give up, or make nothing of, a Messianic Kingdom on earth (see above, pp. 89 f.). In B 2 of 2 Bar. the body is to be raised as it was,—“The dust shall be called, and there shall be said to it: ‘Give back that which is not yours, and raise up all that you have kept until its time’” (xl.ii. 8),—and after recognition is to be changed into one possessing suitability for an enduring spiritual existence. “In what shape will those live who live in Thy day? Or how will the splendour of those who (are) after that time continue?” (xl. ix. 2). The reply is: “The earth shall then assuredly restore the dead (which it now receives, in order to preserve them). It shall make no change in their form, but as it has received, so shall it restore them, and as I delivered them unto it, so also shall it raise them. For then it will be necessary to show to the living that the dead have come to life again, and that those who had departed have returned (again). And it shall come to pass, when they have severally recognised those whom they now know, then judgment shall grow strong and those things which before were spoken of shall come” (l. 2-4; cf. 4 Ez. vii. 32-35). In 2 Bar. the interest is in all Israelites; in 4 Ez. it is in all mankind.

It is after the verdict of the final Judgment has been made known, and conceivably as an outcome of that verdict, that the great change occurs: “And it shall come to pass, when that appointed day has gone by, that then shall the aspect of those who are condemned be afterwards changed, and the glory of those who are justified” (2 Bar. li. 1). “For the aspect of those who now act wickedly shall become worse than it is, as they shall suffer torment . . . shall yet more waste away in wonder at the visions and in the beholding of the forms. For they shall first behold and afterwards depart to be tormented”; whereas in the case of the others, “then their splendour shall be glorified in changes, and the form of their face shall be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die, which is then promised to them,”—they are “transformed . . . into the splendour of angels” (vers. 2-6; cf. 4 Ez. vii. 36, 87; cf. ver. 98; also see 2 Bar. xxx. 2-5, xxxvi. 11). These risen righteous enter thus the final Paradise or heaven: “For they shall behold the world which is now invisible to them, and they shall behold the time which is now hidden from them: and time shall no longer age them. For in the heights of that world shall they dwell, and they shall be made like unto the angels . . . be changed into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendour of glory. For there

shall be spread before them the extents of Paradise. . . . Moreover, there shall then be excellency in the righteous surpassing that in the angels" (2 Bar. li. 8-12; cf. 4 Ez. vii. 123, viii. 52). This writer, then, starts with the resurrection of the old body, but finally arrives at a view which is substantially that of those who hold to a spiritual resurrection only; as B 3 of the same book says, "If therefore we direct and dispose our hearts, we shall receive everything that we lost, and much better things than we lost by many times. For what we lost was subject to corruption, and what we shall receive shall not be corruptible" (lxxxv. 4 f.).

On the other hand, two of our writers seem to take a short cut to the same end, a blessed immortality; overleaping the intermediate state, the soul, it is thought,—so the usual interpretation,—attains this immediately on death. Even if this reading of their intention be admitted, this view should not be too readily identified with the Greek doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul; for the immortality here spoken of is an attainment of righteousness, and therefore something more than mere survival of the experience of death. "God created man for incorruption" (Wisd. ii. 23); "in kinship unto wisdom is immortality" (viii. 17); "because of her (i.e. wisdom) I shall have immortality" (ver. 13); "love of her is observance of her laws; and to give heed to her laws is the assurance of incorruption; and incorruption brings near unto God" (vi. 18 f.). But it may be questioned whether this writer really does away with the idea of an intermediate state. Rest and peace and hope are characteristic of that state, and the following may be interpreted as referring thereto: "Their departure (i.e. the death of the righteous) was accounted to be their hurt, and their going from us to be their ruin: but they are in peace. For though in the sight of men they be punished, their hope is full of immortality" (iii. 2-4); compare, "the righteous, though he die before his time, shall be at rest" (iv. 7). That Enoch's translation is taken as an illustration of the early death of the righteous man (ver. 10) favours this interpretation, since the usual view was that he was translated to the intermediate paradise (see above, p. 313),—contrast 2 En. xxii. 1, where, quite exceptionally, he is in "the tenth Heaven"; so, too, "the care of them" in the following may well refer to a time before the final Judgment: "The righteous live for ever, in the Lord is their reward, and the care of them with the Most High" (Wisd. v. 15),—the context being very favourable to such an interpretation.

Besides, the reward of the righteous is still regarded as future: "they shall receive great good . . . and in the time of their visitation they shall shine forth" (iii. 5, 7). This looks like a

reference to the last Judgment and its consequences, especially as there follow at once words which are admitted to be "quite inconsistent with the idea of reward or retribution coming immediately after death" (A.P., vol. i. p. 539): thus, "They shall judge nations and have dominion over peoples" (ver. 8),—words on which W. O. E. Oesterley observes, "the author of Wisdom is speaking of the hereafter" (I, p. 286), and which Jub. xxiii. 30 (quoted above, p. 317) shows might be appropriated to express the idea of the ultimate condemnation of the wicked at the last Judgment. Similarly, the following may be taken to refer to the hopelessness of the wicked as they wait for the Judgment: "they shall have no hope, nor in the day of decision shall they have consolation" (ver. 18); also, "And they shall lie utterly waste, and be in anguish" (iv. 19), that is, after death in "the darkness that should afterward receive them" (xvii. 21). It then becomes unnecessary to say of the following line, "for the end of an unrighteous generation is always grievous" (iii. 19), that it is "an involuntary and instinctive utterance of the old view that wickedness is always punished in this life" (A.P., vol. i. p. 540), since it may be interpreted of punishment in the life beyond. However much, then, be allowed for rhetoric, the Judgment scene, to which the writer gives so much space, seems to have a very real place in his thought: the wicked "shall come, when their sins are reckoned up, with coward fear; and their lawless deeds shall convict them to their face. Then shall the righteous stand in great boldness before the face of them that afflicted him, and them that made his labours of no account. When they see it, they shall be troubled with terrible fear, and shall be amazed at the marvel of his salvation. . . . Therefore shall they (i.e. the righteous who have been kept safe till this time) receive a glorious (i.e. heavenly) Kingdom, and a diadem of beauty from the Lord's hand" (iv. 20-v. 2, 16).

The phenomena in 4 Macc. may be similarly viewed. The reference to the martyr's endurance of torture by fire "as if he were suffering a change by fire to incorruption" (4 Macc. ix. 22), and the other to the patriarchs as "having received pure and immortal souls from God" (xviii. 23) settle nothing to the point. But the allusions to the patriarchs as living and receiving the souls of the martyrs at death are most in accord with what is said elsewhere concerning the intermediate state: "men dying for God live unto God, as live Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the patriarchs" (xvi. 25); "clean shall my fathers receive me, unafraid of your torments even to the death" (v. 37); "after this our passion, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall receive us, and all our forefathers shall praise us" (xiii. 17); "the sons of Abraham, with their victorious mother, are gathered together

unto the place of their ancestors" (xviii. 23). This place of the departed in our literature is the intermediate paradise (see above, p. 313; contrast R. H. Charles, I, p. 322), where, for example, Enoch meets his forefathers. The language of the following, however, is such as belongs properly to passages alluding to the final bliss of the righteous after the Judgment: "your seven starlike sons . . . you are set in heaven with them" (xvii. 5); "they now do both stand beside the throne of God, and live the blessed age" (ver. 18); "eternal life according to God" (xv. 3). The tenses here may be tenses of certainty of possession; compare, e.g., Ass. Mos. x. 9; Psa. Sol. iii. 16, quoted above, p. 318. So, too, the following are such as are associated with the final doom of the wicked: "torments without end" (4 Macc. x. 11), "the eternal doom" (ver. 15), "a more rapid and an eternal fire and torments which shall not leave hold on you to all eternity" (xii. 12), "eternal torment" (xiii. 15); compare, 4 Ez. vii. 38, "fire and torments," also the next section below on the Final Doom. True, the writer does not mention the resurrection, but that may only mean that he has abandoned the materialistic conception of it so prominent in 2 Macc., whence he has derived his martyr illustrations.

Just as one found that the Greek idea of the pre-existence of the soul and the Greek disparagement of the body are not clearly taught anywhere in our literature, but only that language is coloured by the prevalence of these ideas through Greek influences (see above, pp. 188 f.), so there is at any rate reason for hesitating before admitting that there is any clear instance of nonconformity to the scheme of thought concerning the Hereafter which supposes the order of events for the righteous after death to be, rest in an intermediate state, resurrection for the Judgment, departure after the Judgment to the place of final reward,—for the wicked, unrest in an intermediate state, resurrection for the Judgment or judgment without resurrection, departure after the Judgment to the place of final punishment. "The Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul never found a home in the thought of the Jew, who continued to require the body also, in some sense or other, for his idea of a full personality" (H. W. Robinson, p. 102; cf. J.E., vol. iii. p. 284).

4. Of the final Judgment itself only a few things remain to be said. Usually it is held that God Himself will conduct it. The writer of 2 En. in particular is for some reason very emphatic on this point, calling the Judgment God's second coming: "Then I (i.e. God) can again take you (i.e. Adam) at My second coming (i.e. to judge)" (xxxii. 1; cf. xlii. 5 quoted above, p. 318),—compare "then the Judgment shall come wherein God Himself shall give sentence" (Sib. iv. 183). This function is never taken

over by the human Messiah ; " he shall execute a righteous judgment upon the earth," notwithstanding,—“ and he shall open the gates of paradise ” (T.L. xviii. 2, 10), does not refer to the final Judgment. On the latter, compare, “ to open out the earth ” (Sib. iii. 769). The superhuman Messiah, however, is represented as conducting it on behalf of God : “ the sum of all judgment was given unto the Son of Man ” (1 En. lxix. 27). Without losing its cosmic significance the Judgment came to be thought of, during our period, as an intensely individual matter : “ all shall be destined to see what has been determined (for them). And its (i.e. the Judgment's) duration shall be as it were a week of years ” (4 Ez. vii. 42 f.). It was to be characterised by scrupulous accuracy, so that all avenging might very well be left till that time : “ Blessed is the man who does not direct his heart with malice against any man, and helps the injured and condemned, and raises the broken down, and shall do charity to the needy, because on the day of the great Judgment every weight, every measure, and every make-weight will be as in the market, that is to say they are hung on scales and stand in the market, and every one shall learn his own measure, and according to his measure shall take his reward ” (2 En. xlv. 4 f.). “ If ill-requitals befall you, don't return them either to neighbour or enemy, because the Lord will return them for you and be your avenger on the day of great Judgment, that there be no avenging here among men ” (2 En. l. 4). What men have done and thought will be decisive of their fate : “ Deeds of righteousness shall awake, and deeds of iniquity shall not sleep ” (4 Ez. vii. 35) ; “ And He will assuredly examine the secret thoughts, and that which is laid up in the secret chambers of all the members of man. And will make them manifest in the presence of all with reproof ” (2 Bar. lxxxiii. 3).

3. THE FINAL DOOM.

1. In our literature, death seems sometimes to mark the end of all opportunity to change morally ; one's eternal destiny seems perhaps to be fixed by what one does or becomes in this life. The following summarise the prevailing tone of warning : “ they have no place of repentance for ever . . . they are the damned ” (1 En. lxxv. 11 ; cf. lxiii. 1-11) ; “ there shall not there be again . . . place of repentance for the soul ” (2 Bar. lxxxv. 12) ; “ all who have defied my Law, while they yet had liberty, and, while place of repentance was still open to them, gave no heed but scorned (it) ; these must be brought to know after death by torment ” (4 Ez. ix. 11 f.) ; “ in the great time (to come) are many mansions prepared for men, good for the good, and bad for the

bad, without number many. Blessed are those who enter the good houses, for in the bad (houses) there is no peace nor return (from them) " (2 En. lxi. 2 f.) ; " and justly do they perish who have not loved Thy Law " (2 Bar. liv. 14) ; " there is no repentance after death " (2 En. lxii. 2). But while some of these clearly have death in view as the point beyond which repentance cannot take place, the possibility that others have their eye on a point further ahead but prior to the Judgment should be allowed for.

A clear instance is to be found in 2 Macc., where prayer is offered and propitiation is made for the dead. There it is told how that " the troops of Judas . . . discovered under the shirts of every one of the dead men amulets of the idols of Jamnia—a practice forbidden the Jews by Law. All saw at once that this was why they had perished, and, blessing the (dealings) of the Lord . . . all betook themselves to supplication, beseeching that the sin committed might be wholly blotted out. . . . He then collected from them, man by man, the sum of two thousand drachmas of silver, which he forwarded to Jerusalem for a sin-offering. In this he acted quite rightly and properly, bearing in mind the resurrection—for if he had not expected the fallen to rise again, it would have been superfluous and silly to pray for the dead,—and having regard to the splendour of the gracious reward which is reserved for those who have fallen asleep in godliness—a holy and pious consideration! Hence he made propitiation for the dead, that they might be released from their sin " (2 Macc. xii. 39-45 ; cf. ? 1 Bar. iii. 4, where there is a reading " dead " for " men "). Most will probably agree with the comment : " The sacrifice for the dead is recounted in such a way as to suggest that the writer anticipated, not unnaturally, objections to it on the score of novelty. It is, from the religious standpoint, one of the remarkable contributions made by this book to our knowledge of contemporary Judaism " (A.P., vol. i. p. 150). It indicates the beginning of a feeling,—due perhaps to Egyptian influence (cf. E., April 1915, pp. 361-365),—that the consignment of souls to endless torments for their decisions and deeds here was hardly consistent with the idea of the justice of God, not to mention the idea of the tenderer side of God of which our writers were also aware, if indeed they had not made it so fully their own as they had the other.

This feeling gained ground till prayers for the dead established themselves in the Jewish liturgy. " This is true of both the Sephardic and Ashkenazic forms of the Liturgy. In both of these prayers for the departed are used : the *form* of these has undoubtedly been subjected to modification, but the *principle* of offering them has certainly been acted upon ever since belief in the resurrection of the dead became a dogma of Judaism." To

quote Miss Dampier on the prayers in the Sephardic Liturgy: "In substance many of them are believed to date back to the time of Hillel—*circa* 30 B.C.—A.D. 10—and they contain passages of great beauty. They are also of interest as representing at least the type of prayer for the dead which must have been familiar to the earliest circles of Jewish Christians" (Oesterley and Box, II, pp. 203 f.). "It is true that some apocalyptic writers affirm strongly that such prayer does not avail after the Judgment, but the very emphasis with which this assertion is made suggests that it *does* avail until that great day" (J. H. Leckie, p. 72; cf. also above, pp. 48 f.). The same feeling appears in those writers (e.g. 1 En. xxxvii.—lxxi. Test.), who after the final Judgment let the wicked fall out of view altogether. Whether this signifies a hint at the idea of the ultimate annihilation of the wicked,—“and no trace of them shall any more be found” (1 En. xlvi. 9),—or is merely, from the point of view of the righteous, out of sight out of mind,—“and they shall never thenceforward see the face of the sinners and unrighteous” (1 En. lxii. 13; cf. lvi. 8),—it at least testifies to the fact that these people felt that they could not bear Gehenna to be always in sight for them to see the wicked in their suffering, that is, for some the idea of Gehenna was ceasing to give them any pleasure of revenge. Contrast Ass. Mos. x. 10, “And you will look from on high and will see your enemies in Ge(henna) and you will recognise them and rejoice, and you will give thanks and confess your Creator” (cf. 1 En. xxvii. 2 f., quoted above, p. 319; also xc. 26). There were, then, some who retained the idea of Gehenna simply as a sad necessity of the moral government of the world.

2. Gehenna in our literature is the place of final doom for apostate Jews, to begin with, and then for the wicked in general. This is the “accursed valley” (1 En. xxvii. 2), the “abyss . . . opened in the midst of the earth, full of fire, and they brought those blinded sheep (i.e. the apostates), and they were all judged and found guilty and cast into this fiery abyss, and they burned. . . . And I saw those sheep burning, yea, their very selves” (1 En. xc. 26 f.). This abyss is “like” the one “full of fire and flaming, and full of pillars of fire,” which from the Judgment onward is “the place of condemnation” for the fallen angels (vers. 24 f.; cf. xviii. 11, xxi. 7–10). The gloom and bondage of the preliminary place of punishment are continued; what seems to be added thereto is this fierce, all-consuming flame, signifying, perhaps from the first and certainly ere long, a really spiritual experience, namely, the very antithesis of the mystic experience of God as fire which does not consume (see above, p. 38),—it is to meet God as a consuming fire, and not be able to get away from Him as such even for a single moment. The materialising

of this conception should not be allowed to make one miss its essence. "And into darkness and chains and a burning flame where there is grievous judgment shall your spirits enter" (1 En. ciii. 8; cf. Jud. xvi. 17); "their spirits shall be cast into the furnace of fire" (1 En. xcvi. 3); "here are cast the spirits of sinners and blasphemers, and of those who work wickedness, and of those who pervert everything that the Lord has spoken through the mouth of the prophets" (cviii. 6); "in blazing flames burning worse than fire you will burn" (c. 9).

This is the experience of being "slain in Sheol" (xcix. 11); "their spirits shall be slain" (cviii. 3); "the word of his (i.e. the Son of Man's acting for God, see above, p. 144, therefore equivalent to 'God's') mouth slays all the sinners" (lxii. 2); hence, for these "the day of the great Judgment" is "the day of destruction . . . the day of tribulation and great shame for" their "spirits" (xcviii. 10; cf. 2 Bar. xxx. 4 f.). As of those consigned to the shadowy existence which is usual in the older Sheol, involving neither reward nor punishment,—the lot of those in the third division (see above, p. 312),—it is said that "their spirits shall not be slain in the day of Judgment" (xxii. 13); so the experience of the extreme penalty of sin, the slaying of the spirit, can hardly mean immediate annihilation,—it is a painful process, whether or not it brings extinction. If one may judge from the parallel case of the wicked angels, this punishment has great duration, "ten thousand years" or "ages" (1 En. xxi. 6; cf. xviii. 16). Besides, later, e.g. in 1 En. cviii. 3-6, the place of punishment for the disobedient angels and the Gehenna prepared for unrighteous men seem to be thought of as one and the same place. It is not certain that one should take "eternal" in the sense of "unending," though in 1 En. lviii. 3 "eternal life" is explained, "The day of their life shall be unending."

The fullest picture of this Hell is given in 2 En.; it is located in the third heaven as is the final Paradise of the righteous: "a very terrible place, and there were all manner of tortures in that place; cruel darkness and unilluminated gloom, and there is no light there, but murky fire constantly flames aloft, and there is a fiery river coming forth, and that whole place is everywhere fire, and everywhere there is frost and ice (cf. lxvi. 8), thirst and shivering, while the bonds are very cruel, and the angels fearful and merciless, bearing angry weapons, merciless torture" (x. 1-3; cf. xlii. 1-2). It is an uncomfortably cold and loveless place; and turn where one may, one is met by God as consuming fire; so all His angels in this sphere are terrible ministers. Obviously what the writer is taxing his powers of imagery to describe is something very much more terrible than annihilation. "This place . . . is prepared for those who dishonour God, who on earth practise

sin against nature, which is child-corruption after the sodomitic fashion, magic-making, enchantments and devilish witchcrafts, and who boast of their wicked deeds, stealing, lies, calumnies, envy, rancour, fornication, murder, and who, accursed, steal the souls of men : who, seeing the poor take away their goods and themselves wax rich, injuring them for other man's goods ; who being able to satisfy the empty, made the hungering to die ; being able to clothe, stripped the naked ; and who do not know their Creator, and bowed down to soulless (i.e. lifeless) gods, who cannot see nor hear, vain gods, who also built hewn images and bow down to unclean handiwork, for all these is prepared this place amongst these for eternal inheritance" (vers. 4-6). Face to face with "the guardians of the keys of Hell," well might the seer exclaim, "I had better not have seen you, and may none of my tribe come to you" (xlii. 2).

To summarise conclusions : The old idea of a non-moral Sheol, which was in no sense a reward for the righteous or a punishment for the wicked, is abandoned by all, save one, of our writers. In another writer, also, this old Sheol becomes one of the divisions of Sheol, the third division prepared for those who seem to have received justice in this life, and hence have no reward and no punishment awaiting them in the Beyond. The almost universal conception of the soul's experiences after death was, that the soul passed into a state intermediate between the present life on earth and life beyond the Judgment. The experience therein was in each case thought to be that of people anticipating what was to come to them, having fuller knowledge thereof than here ; they had either assurance of reward or certainty of punishment, either a paradise before Paradise, or the darkness without the fire. Where the Judgment follows the temporal Messianic Kingdom on the earth, the resurrection is a spiritual one to an angelic life in Heaven ; and for the wicked there is a corresponding entrance into the final spiritual agony in Hell. Where the final Judgment introduces the eternal Messianic Kingdom on the earth the resurrection thereto is the experience of the righteous only, and mostly some transformation of the body which is raised to suit the new conditions is recognised as necessary ; the wicked meanwhile are thought to experience what was really no resurrection at all, but simply a removal at the Judgment to their final abode of punishment. Where little or nothing is made of the Messianic Kingdom on earth, generally there seems to be no departure from the scheme which provides for an intermediate state,—and the apparent exceptions may not be real ones ; at any rate the Greek idea of the natural immortality of the soul has not been taken over unmodified by any of our writers ; and one writer seems to deal with the problem of recognition in the Beyond, the bodies

of the departed being first raised as they were, and then changed to accord with the new state of being into which they enter after the Judgment. The Judgment is conducted either by God Himself, or by the Superhuman Messiah, the Son of Man, acting for God or being the Judge-manifestation of God ; the basis of judgment is the conduct of the individual,—it is to be a scrupulously accurate requital of one's deeds and thoughts ; for the righteous it is followed by the experience of the final Paradise, for the wicked by that of Gehenna. Some do not, but others do, admit the possibility of a moral change after death ; probably the idea was gaining ground, as it finally established itself in later Jewish thought. The prospect of Gehenna prepared for the wicked after the Judgment seems to afford some writers a measure of satisfaction ; to others it has become a regrettable necessity, being more clearly the inevitable experience of having, through persistent wickedness, to meet God ultimately, and to continue to have Him thereafter, as consuming fire. The same terms seem to apply to the duration of the misery of the wicked as to the happiness of the righteous. Anyhow, annihilation does not take place immediately after the Judgment, nor, if at all, for a very long time after it. There is no trace of the idea of a once wicked soul *on the farther side of the Judgment* being able to pass after a while from Hell to Heaven.

B—JESUS AND THIS TEACHING

It is in accordance with Jesus' intense interest in the redemption of the most insignificant individual, that he should show himself at one with those of our writers, and many of his serious contemporaries, who make very much of the eschatology of the individual. In his idea of the life beyond he reveals general agreement with the main stream of thought among his people. Thus, whatever the Sadducean position on the subject may have been (cf. J.E., vol. vi. p. 566), that is, whether, as has been usually supposed, the Sadducees clung to the old idea of Sheol which, for example, lingers in Sir. or, as has been recently suggested, they "believed in the immortality of the soul, but not in any doctrine of the resurrection" (W. O. E. Oesterley, I, p. 147), a single episode in the Gospels makes clear that Jesus had a scheme of thought, such as most of his fellow-religionists had, which provided not only a doctrine of the continuance of the soul after death, but also a doctrine of resurrection. He not only assumes the continuance of the existence of the patriarchs, but also takes for granted that they will experience resurrection,—in fact, his words are more directed against scepticism in reference to the latter than doubt about the former, though it looks as if he works back from their denial of the latter to their denial of the former. "You are gone astray, not having known (i.e. understood) the Scriptures, nor the power of God . . . about the resurrection of the dead,—have you not read what was told you by God saying, 'I am' (is) the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' He is not the God of dead but living" (Matt. xxii. 29, 31 f. || Mark xii. 24, 26, Luke xx. 37 f.). However Talmud-like may be his treatment of Scripture here, his own belief is clear enough; the old idea of Sheol as the abode of *all* departed, where there is almost feelingless existence, has no place in his thought, and the continuance into a life beyond of the righteous who have departed this life has in view resurrection.

I. THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

I. There is no doubt whatever that Jesus believed in divisions in the Sheol which was entered immediately after death. The evidence to be given immediately below will make that clear.

The question of interest at this stage is, whether there is any trace in his teaching of the third division, which has been seen to be reserved sometimes for those who are "men of the middle way," people not righteous and not wicked, such as get their deserts in this life to the full, and such that if all were like them, it would be difficult to bring forward an argument for the future life, either from the side of those who do not get their reward here, or from the fact that so many in this life escape punishment which they deserve. There are some things in his recorded sayings which seem to have this third division in mind, or an approximation to it. Thus, it should be noticed that of the "hypocrites," who are just people of a very conventional type of religion, doing with some ostentation the common things which were usually expected of the religiously minded,—giving alms, praying, fasting,—he says nothing more than that, "that they are having their pay" (Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16). The note he strikes is not that they will be punished, but either that there will be no need for any further reward in their case at any rate, or else that they are missing a reward which they might have now in this life. So again, perhaps, in the picture of the very remarkable but not uncommon type of failure,—the man who lives entirely that he may arrive at a point, where he can feel quite sure of plenty of this life's blessings for years to come,—whose only objective now is to "rest, eat, drink and be jolly" (Luke xii. 19). Does the word of God to this man, "Ignoramus! on this very night your soul is being asked back from you" (ver. 20), imply not only that by death he has lost his earthly goods which he has stored for himself, but also that he has missed the great opportunity of gaining his soul, of making his soul his own? There is simply nothing for him in the life beyond. It may be, then, that the crucial words in Mark viii. 35 f., and parallels (see above, p. 210) may have to be given their full force; or better, and more in accordance with the teaching of Jesus to be noticed later, this man has to start life again in the Beyond, and be at the beginning when he might have been well on in the things of the soul. This is very different from a threat of Gehenna, and should lead one to take it for granted that he never uttered that threat except after deliberation, and without being convinced of the very stubborn iniquity of the people against whom he uttered it.

2. The first "division," that for "the spirits of the righteous," was much in his thought, especially on his last night on earth, that is, if the Fourth Gospel is to be trusted here. On an earlier occasion he appears to have had the very imagery of 1 En. in mind. This division in 1 En. is characterised without any reference to the burial of the righteous, and similarly in his parable the burial of "Lazarus" is passed by in silence; whereas the other division is said to be "for sinners when they die and are

buried in the earth,"—and of the rich man it is distinctly said that he "died and was buried." Again, the second division was for those whose "judgment has not been executed on them in their lifetime," and to the distressed soul of the rich man it is said, "You received your good things due (to you) in your lifetime." Moreover, in the division for the righteous there is "the bright spring of water," and the request to "send Lazarus that he may dip his finger-tip in water" implies that there was water in the division where Lazarus was, if not in the other (cf. 1 En. xxii. 9 f.; Luke xvi. 22, 24-26). Hence, the side of the chasm on which Lazarus is placed by Jesus,—“And now here he is comforted” (ver. 25),—is the paradise to which he afterward refers in his words to the dying thief: “Truly I tell you, to-day with me you will be in paradise” (Luke xxiii. 43). As in our literature, this is the place where the patriarchs are: so Lazarus is in “Abraham’s bosom,” and from the words which were spoken to those who brought the mocking conundrum in reference to the resurrection, there too “Isaac” and “Jacob” were thought to be (Matt. xxii. 32 || Luke xx. 37),—and probably it is in this place that the “many from east and west” gather and meet “Abraham and Isaac and Jacob” (Matt. viii. 11 || Luke xiii. 28 f.), and where no unworthy person will be allowed to stay (Matt. xxii. 11). The angels take the poor man thence (Luke xvi. 22), as it has been seen in 1 En. that it was theirs to measure off this paradise.

Thither, also, Jesus hopes himself to go at death, and when he is there, to be accessible to his disciples by prayer, as it has been observed Enoch in this paradise was to Noah on earth: “Whatever you ask in my name (i.e. which I can support, cf. above, p. 154), that I will do. . . . Whatever you ask me in my name, I will do. . . . And I will ask the Father and other helper he will give you” (John xiv. 13-16). He tells them, “no longer much will I speak (i.e. here) with you” (ver. 30), “yet much I have to say to you, but you cannot take it at the moment” (John xvi. 12), and on purpose to say these unsaid things he expects to be able to pay them a visit,—“I will not leave you orphans. I am coming to you” (John xiv. 18). These words should be read not only in the light of the representation in 1 En. of Enoch bringing a revelation to Noah, but especially of the following words from another book in reference to Moses’ continuance after death in his office of intercessor for Israel: “My lord, you are departing, and who shall feed this people? . . . who shall be their guide by the way? Or who shall pray for them . . . ? How therefore am I to foster this people as a father (cf. John xiv. 18 above) . . . they have no advocate (cf. John xiv. 16 above) to offer prayers on their behalf to the Lord, like Moses the great messenger”—words of Joshua to which Moses replies, “(The

Lord) has on their behalf appointed me to (pray) for their sins and (make intercession) for them" (Ass. Mos. xi. 9-12, 17, xii. 6). The idea of his coming with a message to them is illustrated further from 2 Macc. : "And Jeremiah held out his right hand to present Judas with a golden sword, and as he gave it he addressed him thus : Take this holy sword as a gift from God, and with it you shall crush the foe" (xv. 15 f., see also above, pp. 48 f.). This way of thinking would make it easy, almost natural, under the circumstances, for him to believe that "Elijah and Moses" actually came to him from paradise one memorable night (Mark ix. 5 || Matt. xvii. 3, Luke ix. 30 ; cf. the request, that Lazarus be sent to the rich man's brothers, Luke xvi. 27 ; also Matt. xxvii. 47, 49, and the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus for the popularity of such ideas).

It is this division of Sheol which he calls his "Father's house," and in which there are "many rooms" (John xiv. 2),—perhaps an incidental denial of the idea that few will be saved (see above, p. 108), or a hint that there will be need for such accommodation, for many will experience death prior to the resurrection and Judgment. Thither he anticipated going before them, and consequently he will be there to welcome any of them on their arrival : "Otherwise I would have told you ; for I am going to make ready a place for you. And should I go and make ready a place for you, again I am coming (i.e. constantly and on a visit to you like Enoch, Jeremiah, etc., cf. ver. 28, 'I am going off and I am coming to you'), and (i.e. at the death of any of you) I will welcome you home to myself, that where I am, you too may be" (John xiv. 2 f. This division would be the meeting-place with him in the life beyond for such as had to suffer death.

Again, he uses the terms "dead" and probably "sleep" of death as our writers do ; that is, without any intention of implying that the departed really sink into a sleep till the day of resurrection. For the former, see Mark ix. 9 || Matt. xvii. 9, Luke ix. 36 ; cf. Mark xii. 27 || Matt. xxii. 32, Luke xx. 38, for the latter possibly "Lazarus, our friend, has fallen asleep," John xi. 11 ; cf. ? Mark v. 39 || Matt ix. 24, Luke viii. 52). He counts them still among the "living" (Matt. xxii. 32 || Mark xii. 27, Luke xx. 38), and they are as awake as he represents both "Abraham" and "Lazarus" to be (Luke xvi. 25). Of himself after death he says, "I am living," and of such as may have to experience the same great change, he says, "you too will be living" (John xiv. 19). It is a similar line of thought which underlies his words of encouragement to those who have the means to help here the pious poor : "that when it fails (i.e. when you die), they may welcome you into the eternal tents" (Luke xvi. 9 ; cf. E. W. Winstanley, p. 247).

It should be emphasised that he makes this section of Sheol much more home-like than it is to be found in our writers, not only by calling it the "Father's house" (John xiv. 2), but also by reiterating that death for him is a going to the Father: "I to the Father am going" (John xiv. 12; cf. ver. 28, xvi. 28), "to the Father I am off" (John xvi. 10, 17). Hence "He did not teach that men would have to wait till the resurrection at the last day before they could resume that communion with God which appeared to be broken by death" (I.J.A., July 1914, p. 97). This was so original that it puzzled his disciples who revealed, to begin with, some hesitancy in asking him about it, "But now I am off to Him Who sent me, and none of you asks me, Where are you off?" (John xvi. 5); and then afterward, when he said, "And where I am off, you know the road" (John xiv. 4), they made open confession of their bewilderment. "I am the road" (ver. 6) was his reply,—they would know what he meant by road from what happened to him; and the Beyond would only be to them what it was to him, if they followed the road his life indicated for them, "No one comes to the Father except through me" (ver. 6),—to live sacrificially even to death was the way to that section of Sheol which would be a going home to the Father in heaven. They at any rate could "rejoice" that their names were down to enter into this "joy" of their "master" (Luke x. 20; Matt. xxv. 21, 23); "Again I will see you, and your heart will rejoice, and your joy no one takes from you" (John xvi. 22). There is to be seen in these last hours the full expression of his filial conviction with regard to the Beyond, which earlier had but partially emerged, that for him, and such as were like him, death could not touch the communion with the Father which had begun here; now he could say, "And I am not alone, for the Father is with me" (John xvi. 32), and he could not think that death could alter that fact, either for him or for his loyal followers.

3. The second division is as in our literature a place where there is no home and no rest. That the wicked are also thought to be conscious, and to have fuller realisation of the truth with respect to themselves than here, is seen again from the picture of the rich man, as he is in this place (cf. E. W. Winstanley, p. 283); he is as fully awake and conscious as either Abraham or Lazarus; he sees and feels and speaks (Luke xvi. 23 f.),—he has also wonderful powers of reflection: "I ask you then, father, that you send him to my father's house,—for I have five brothers,—so that he may authoritatively inform them that they too may not come into this place of torment" (vers. 27 f.). The facts on which he has been compelled to reflect seem, also, to be just such as are suggested by our literature. He is sure that his past life has been

lived on wrong lines, and cannot for him be altered. The prospect of others is reward; his is punishment. There is a rest which he cannot have now. He has yet to face God his Judge. Hence, he is in intense anguish of spirit.

Here, too, should be noticed the absence of fire in the experience of the wicked before the Judgment, as in our writers. The usual translation: "I am in anguish in this flame" (*φλογί*) (Luke xvi. 24), is misleading, and for once J. Moffatt does not improve matters by rendering in the plural, "in these flames." The use of *φλόξ* should be noted, also in this case, the absence after it of *πυρός*, "of fire," with its presence with it in Acts vii. 30, 2 Thess. i. 8, Heb. i. 7, and especially in Rev. i. 14, ii. 18, xix. 12,—compare the phrase *φλόξ οἴνου*, "fiery-heat of wine." Hence, as there is here no explanatory genitive, the request for a drop of water to "cool" the "tongue" suggests that *φλόξ* on the lips of the rich man means "fever," a hitherto unobserved medical use of the term in Luke: "Father Abraham, pity me and send Lazarus that he may dip his finger-tip in water and cool my tongue, for I am suffering acute pain in this fever" (ver. 24). The suggestion is that the disillusionment which death has brought him, the hopeless prospect at the Judgment which stares him in the face has made the rich man ill. So, to quote one of our writers, all he can do now is to "recline in anguish and rest in torment, till" the "last time come" (2 Bar. xxxvi. 11).

With this absence of fire should be noted the presence of darkness, as also in our literature. The rich man "sees Abraham at a great distance and Lazarus in his bosom" (ver. 23), but it is not said that Abraham sees him,—he hears his cry and answers it. This suggests that the side of the chasm, on which the rich man was, was dark—a cavern, and the side where Abraham was, was light—a park; he is among those in "the outmost darkness," who see the people who are in the light with "Abraham and Isaac and Jacob" (Matt. viii. 11 f. || Luke xiii. 28). It is the place of imprisonment, where unsatisfactory "slaves" are put by the King's "attendants," i.e. angels, to await their trial: "Bind his hands and feet and throw him into the outmost darkness" (Matt. xxii. 13; cf. 1 En. x. 4; F. C. Burkitt, I, p. 68), and the useless slave throw into the outmost darkness" (Matt. xxv. 30). This idea is confirmed by the circumstance that immediately after the latter instance the Judgment scene proper is brought on. These are, then, detained in prison, and the Judgment has still to come. It is, as in our literature, a place of preliminary punishment; here the wicked lie after scourging,—compare the instance of the angel waiting for the death of the culprits in Sus. (see above, p. 74),—some severely scourged, "cut in two," the "lot" of "the irreligious" (Matt. xxiv. 51 || Luke xii. 46), "beaten with.

many stripes" (Luke xii. 47);—some "beaten with few stripes" (ver. 48). Death, that is, will make a greater difference to some than to others; but for everybody in this dungeon the experience will be distressing enough: "in that place (ἐκεῖ) there will be weeping and crunching of teeth" (Matt. viii. 12 || Luke xiii. 28; cf. Matt. xxii. 13, xxiv. 51, xxv. 30). This dark region is reserved for those who "in the life" that now is (Luke xvi. 25) are receiving in full their "comfort" (Luke vi. 24), their "good things," but have escaped "the bad things" (Luke xvi. 25), which they have deserved to suffer. Hence, the point of the warning, "Woe, laughers now! for you will wail and weep" (Luke vi. 25), also the original reference in his statement of the purpose of his efforts to save men: "that every one who trusts me may not dwell (i.e. when death comes) in the darkness (awaiting in fear and distress the Judgment)" (John xii. 46), since immediately, just as in Matt. xxv., he passes on to speak of the Judgment "at the last day" (ver. 48).

His imagery at any rate was, then, such as would be popularly understood,—darkness till the Judgment, then fire after it. This, of course, does not mean that the deeds or kind of life, which would destine people to this darkness at death, was such as the popular mind, or even the official religious mind, would agree deserved to be so requited. It mattered little that he continued to use popular imagery quite consistently, when his ideas of goodness and badness in men were so far, as we have seen them to have been, above the popular or official conceptions. The imagery probably was more consciously figurative in his usage of it; but, for all that, none the less,—rather all the more,—indicative of the sad consequences to the soul of a career of sin in this life,—a career only too possible amid many things which were not only often outwardly pleasant, but also generally satisfactory to the usual standard of respectability among men. "There could be no more expressive description of those who are separated from God than to speak of them as being in darkness, since God is the only source of light, as of life and love" (E. W. Worsley, p. 161).

2. THE RESURRECTION.

1. His language on the resurrection is naturally most akin to that of our writers, who think of it as taking place at the close of a temporal Messianic Kingdom on the earth (see above, p. 317; cf. also E. W. Winstanley, p. 207). He contemplated a spiritual resurrection to heaven, such as these writers did, after the Kingdom of God on earth had passed away. "When from the dead they shall rise, they neither marry, nor are married, but they are like

angels in heaven" (Mark xii. 25 || Matt. xxii. 30, Luke xx. 35); "they can die no more; for they are like angels" (Luke xx. 36). "Like angels" is to be explained as "holy, spiritual, living the eternal life," "spiritual ones" who have no "wives," and whom "death . . . could not take hold of" (1 En. xv. 4, 6 f., lxix. 11, fully quoted above, p. 73). "Then the righteous will shine forth like the sun in the Kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii. 43), is also language familiar enough in those of our writers who believe in a heaven to come, when the Messianic Kingdom on earth is no more (see above, pp. 85 ff.). His use of "eternal life" is, too, the very use of it in these particular writers: it is the reward which "the righteous" will have "in the coming age" (Mark x. 30 || Luke xviii. 30, Matt. xix. 29; cf. John xii. 25),—"they will go forth" into Heaven as a result of the verdict of the Judge at the last day (Matt. xxv. 46). Where also in the Fourth Gospel "eternal life" seems to belong to the present, the present tenses may sometimes be disguised future tenses (cf. C. F. Burney, p. 94), and where they are not, there is still the forward look to the time, when the particular species of life will be lived under other conditions than those which this world affords. This is a last "great deed comparable to the first act of creation" (cf. B. Duhm, p. 78) accomplished by "the power of God" (Mark xii. 24 || Matt. xxii. 29), for "those who have been considered deserving" (Luke xx. 35), "the resurrection of the righteous" which will be an adequate payment for any sacrifices which have been made in this life (Luke xiv. 14).

To share in this resurrection, which he thought was to happen within a generation (see above, p. 175), would seem to have been his hope, when he spoke of himself as "the 'son of man'" who "must suffer much . . . and after three days (i.e. very shortly) rise again" (Mark viii. 31 || Matt. xvi. 21; cf. xvii. 23, xx. 19). "To no one tell the sight till the 'son of man' from the dead be raised" (Matt. xvii. 9 || Mark ix. 9), would then mean, "Never tell it to any one on earth!" (cf. Luke ix. 36). He looked forward to partaking in this "resurrection to (eternal) life" which awaited "those who had done generously" (John v. 29; cf. C. G. Montefiore, II, p. 135; S. Mathews, III, pp. 101, 114). The reference of Mark xiv. 28 || Matt. xxvi. 32 may then have been practically the same as John xii. 32: "And after I have been raised (i.e. up from the ground, crucified) 'I am' (i.e. God) will lead you forth (i.e. from Jerusalem) into Galilee (i.e. of the Gentiles; cf. Matt. iv. 15, whence came probably the Greeks, John xii. 20,—hence on the road to a larger mission than hitherto)."

All his statements about this risen life are, very remarkably, in terms of moral and spiritual life only. "'I am' will raise 'them' up at the last day" (John vi. 40; cf. vers. 44, 54), the

"I am" who is "the Resurrection and the Life" (John xi. 25; see above, pp. 286 f.), and they will be "sons of the Resurrection," that is, fully recognised "sons of God" (Luke xx. 36; cf. Acts xvii. 18, Matt. v. 9). At the Judgment they will experience the "pity" of God (Matt. v. 7), "they will be comforted" (ver. 4), of righteousness "have their fill" (ver. 6), "see God" (vers. 8), to a degree hitherto unknown, "recognise . . . the only genuine God" (John¹ xvii. 3) who is "spirit" (John iv. 24),—such is their "pay . . . in heaven" (Matt. v. 12; cf. E. W. Winstanley, pp. 234 f.). This does not differ essentially from the good life here, nor from life in the paradise which is entered immediately after death. But it is probably presumed that as life in the intermediate paradise is an advance on life here on earth, so life in this heaven after the Judgment will be on that in the intermediate paradise,—for one thing those who are alive on earth will have joined those who have in the meantime suffered death. The necessary transformation of these latter is probably referred to in Matt. xiii. 43 quoted above,—they will experience translation or ascension.

"Certain it is that the Pharisaic belief in resurrection had not even a name for the immortality of the soul. For them, man was made for two worlds, the world that now is, and the world to come, where life does not end in death. . . . The point of view from which the Hasidean regarded earthly existence was that man was born for another and a better world than this" (J.E., vol. vi. p. 566). This holds good of the belief and point of view both of our writers and of Jesus. The Kingdom of God which is yet to come is this very perfected heavenly state,—"that community over whom God was to rule, whose members were like God in character, and in that they were not possessed of physical bodies" (S. Mathews, III, p. 82). That he thought that life here was followed hereafter by a happy intermediate state, which issued in the resurrection life in heaven, may have been his way of stating that life in the Hereafter would be progressive, a passing from glory to glory. Here it need only be added that as, for example, in 2 En., so also in his teaching there is contemplated,—but apparently in reference to fewer,—a resurrection for the bad to experiences of the very opposite from those which are laid up for the good (see below, pp. 347 ff.).

2. There is practically nothing in our Gospels which favours the idea that Jesus' thought of resurrection as the resuscitation of the present body, and a transformation of it that it might be made fit for those who are to participate in an eternal Messianic Kingdom on earth. It is remarkable that in every reference to the subject of resurrection which appears on the lips of Jesus the "body" is never mentioned; the person is spoken of as rising

or being raised, not the body. Again, there is no particular interest displayed in empty tombs ; only once in this association do tombs come into view, and that instance strangely enough confirms the idea that "the whole cycle of Christ's apocalyptic teaching is presupposed" by the very writer of whom it is so often said that he "intentionally sets aside the apocalyptic element, or interprets it in a wholly spiritual sense" (cf. I. J. A., April 1914, p. 35) : in the Fourth Gospel only do we read, "Do not wonder at this that there is coming a time in which all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and will come forth" (John v. 28 f.). This is, perhaps, indirect evidence that the most spiritual of the disciples did not surpass the master in the spirituality of his conceptions ; in ver. 25 the same statement is made without reference to tombs. Besides, that the future reward of the righteous, the perfected Kingdom in which they are to have a share, is to be on earth, is only once stated in his recorded words, namely, in the beatitude which, from the fact that it is inserted in one place in some MSS., and in another in others,—now second, and now third among the beatitudes,—probably is a devout reader's gloss which has come in from the margin of the original. It is practically a quotation of a psalm : "Blessed the gentle, for they will inherit the earth (or 'land')" (Matt. v. 5 ; cf. Psa. xxxvii. 11, 22 ; 1 En. v. 7). Furthermore, the idea was popular enough that those who had departed this life might return and live again among men ; for example, Herod suspected that John the Baptist was raised again from the dead (Mark vi. 14 || Matt. xiv. 2, Luke ix. 7), and it was generally expected that Elijah would reappear to prepare for the coming of the Messiah (Mark ix. 12 || Matt. xvii. 11 ; cf. Luke ix. 8). Jesus repudiated such conceptions. The idea that Lazarus should return to this earth on even so redemptive an errand as the salvation of five brothers is set aside ; there could be no messenger from the grave granted : Lazarus could not go and "authoritatively inform them,"—"they have Moses and the prophets. Let them listen to them" (Luke xvi. 28 f.). He also asked his disciples to accept his word for it that John the Baptist was the only Elijah there would be : "Elijah has come" (Mark ix. 13 || Matt. xvii. 12).

3. This evidence also separates him from some of our writers who think of no Messianic Kingdom on earth. These take great interest in the resuscitation of the body and its subsequent change into fitness for life in the heavenly Paradise ; he, as has been proved, does not. The other writers here have been supposed to overleap the intermediate state ; but grounds for hesitating before accepting such a supposition have been adduced. If these really retain the idea of an intermediate state, then Jesus and they come very close together in thought, since if they do not teach

a blessed immortality without resurrection, they are committed to the idea of a spiritual resurrection.

4. The Judgment in the teaching of Jesus is to be conducted by the apocalyptic Son of Man. It has been seen already that he never directly identified himself with this figure (see above, pp. 179 f.). It would seem rather as if he habitually thought of this supernatural Son of Man as the delegate of God who, now in the heavens, would make his official appearance at the last day (see above, pp. 171 f.). "All judgment He (i.e. God) has given to (i.e. into the hands of) the Son (of Man,—cf. ver. 27) . . . and authority He gave him to do judgment (i.e. to secure justice)" (John v. 22, 27). To Jesus this Son of Man was the great Divine agent of that unerring justice of God, which he on occasions did so much to expound to people, who were either prone to be sceptical concerning it or desirous of ignoring it. Already in our literature the cosmic significance of the Judgment was giving way to the individual significance. In the teaching of Jesus this movement has gone forward to completion, though the outward form of a great public assize is still retained (cf. F. C. Burkitt, I, pp. 44 ; W. Bousset, pp. 124 ff.). "Instead of the blessedness of *the Righteous* in the Kingdom, it is the blessedness of *the righteous one* that is emphasised in the Gospel teaching, each individual receiving recognition ; and instead of the judgment on *the Wicked* it is the judgment on *each wicked man* that is emphasised, each individual receiving judgment" (W. O. E. Oesterley, IV, pp. 202 f.). The standard of judgment, too, will be in accordance with the opportunities of each ; some will be acquitted who did not expect it, and others will meet a condemnation which will surprise them (Matt. xxv. 37, 44).

This marks an advance on current conceptions, since the Torah, it would seem, was usually regarded as a fixed standard for all, so that by it men were almost automatically divided into good and bad, and also were accorded punishment according to their individual conformity to or divergence from its requirements. There was thus a tendency to think of a judgment on deeds (cf. S. Levy, p. 40) rather than on character. This, however, should not be pressed so much as it has been, for, after all, what is this weighing of deed against deed but a very human way of saying, that you should not pronounce on a man's character from an isolated deed, good or bad,—the whole must be considered, if the judgment is to be just. When also a stage has been reached, as by our writers, where the thoughts of a man are seriously taken into consideration in the determination of what is due to him, it matters little whether one says, "And then he will pay to each (his due) according to his conduct ($\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\upsilon$)" (Matt. xvi. 27), or "according to his deeds ($\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$)" (Sir. xxxv. 19). Compare, "those who the generous

things have done . . . those who the paltry things have practised " (John v. 29). It is probably true that the teaching of Jesus tended to accentuate more than hitherto the character of a man as a whole, rather than the details of his conduct, but it is not safe to generalise, as one would be doing, if one were to say that this was in complete contrast even with the best religious thinking among his people. An unsympathetic reader of some of Jesus' own sayings, even, might not be impressed with the unity of character which he was invariably considering; for example, in reading, " And I tell you that every thoughtless utterance which people will speak, they will render concerning it an account in the day of Judgment. For by your accounts you will be acquitted, and by your accounts you will be condemned " (Matt. xii. 36 f.), it would be easy to forget that he constantly took the lips as indicative of the condition of heart (cf. E., Jan. 1910, p. 45), " From the overflow of the heart the mouth speaks " (Matt. xii. 34 || Luke vi. 45; cf. Matt. xv. 11, 16, Luke xix. 22).

The really original thing in the teaching of Jesus here is the amazing flexibility of the standard, so that it might not only be that present positions relative to each other will be reversed, but also that professed, and seemingly respectable, members of the Kingdom of God on earth might be deemed unfit for the heavenly community, and very ordinary people who without prejudice allowed the spirit of humanity to determine what they should do, not having been members of the Kingdom of God on earth, might be judged worthy of a place in the spiritual Kingdom in the Beyond. A certain rigidity of standard characterised the best thinking of his day; hence the easily made divisions of people into good and bad. Jesus did not, of course, deny that there were such divisions, but he was certain that they were not as obvious as they were usually made out to be, nor was the line to be drawn exactly where popularly among ordinary religious people it was drawn. He saw clearly that a rigid standard could not be just; that whether deeds or words or thoughts be in view, everything must be judged relatively to the privileges which had been enjoyed,—that this must be the case, if the justice was to be worthy the name, thoroughly God-like. Hence, the series of amazing contrasts which characterise his teaching on the subject. " I tell you, for (people of) Tyre and Sidon it will be more bearable in the day of Judgment than for you " (Matt. xi. 22, cf. ver. 23 || Luke x. 14, cf. ver. 15). " I tell you that for land (i.e. people) of Sodom it will be more bearable in the day of Judgment than for you (people of Capernaum) " (Matt. xi. 24 || Luke x. 12; cf. Matt. x. 15). " Ninevite people will rise at the Judgment with this sort and will condemn it, for they repented on the occasion of the proclamation of Jonah, and look! more than Jonah here! A

queen of South will be raised up at the Judgment with this sort and will condemn it, for she came from the boundaries of the land to hear Solomon's wisdom, and look! more than Solomon here!" (Matt. xii. 41 f. || Luke xi. 31 f.).

Besides, there is said to those who "prophesied . . . evil spirits used to throw out . . . many powerful deeds did" in God's name (see above, p. 154), "Go from me workers of lawlessness" (Matt. vii. 22 f. || Luke xiii. 26 f.), but to pagans much their inferiors in religious culture, but true to such very elementary humanities as they knew, "Come, blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom made ready for you from the world's foundation" (Matt. xxv. 34),—an astounding surprise to both. "Many first shall be last and last first" (Mark x. 31 || Matt. xix. 30; cf. xx. 16, Luke xiii. 30), when, relative to the enlightenment of each, justice settles everything by the degrees of the rescue-spirit, which each has shown in the course of his activity among his fellows. His finely original rescue-idea of duty in this way revolutionises for him the whole conception of the Judgment; and on the principle that what is in heaven must first be on earth, the Kingdom of Heaven on earth is now revealed to have had only its centre at the professed missionary community,—within its circumference come all those who, in their own way in accordance with their light, give a helping hand to another.

3. THE FINAL DOOM.

1. If the idea of the Fatherhood of God, in the sense in which Jesus expounded it, were thoroughly worked out in relation to what happens after death and what ultimately is to be the fate of the wicked, it is difficult to believe that there would be left any place for the notion of final doom. This does not result from the thought that the Fatherhood of God makes the forgiveness of sin easy (cf. D.C.G., vol. i. p. 540); the Fatherhood really increases the difficulty of forgiveness,—it makes the conditions of forgiveness at once clear and profound, simple but not so easy (see above, p. 270). The exclusion of the idea of final doom for the wicked seems to be necessitated by that aspect of the Divine Fatherhood which Jesus so singularly enunciated; it would be a contradiction, indeed an annihilation of the Divine nature as he revealed it, if there ever came a moment when the salvation of the sinner ceased to be an objective of the Divine life. God would be no longer the Divine Father, if there failed in Him the love that would not let me go. Jesus, therefore, never once says that there is no place of repentance after death, as some of our writers do.

His saying about unpardonable sin has been often lamentably

misunderstood. "But whoever uses abusive language (cf. above, p. 342, on the relation of words and heart) against the holy spirit, he has no forgiveness for ever, but is liable for an eternal sin" (Mark iii. 29): "Whoever speaks against the spirit of the Holy (see above, p. 59), it will not be forgiven him neither in this age nor in the coming" (Matt. xii. 31); "for him who uses abusive language against the holy spirit there will not be forgiveness" (Luke xii. 10). A comparison of these versions reveals that the original saying of Jesus contained a reference to "no forgiveness" and to "eternal sin," and that the Matthean words, "neither in this age nor in the coming," are an elaboration of "eternal." In reference to "no forgiveness" the following from R. T. Herford should be noted, on the words from the lips of a Rabbi: "But if he has put forth a bad name against his fellow-man, he hath not forgiveness for ever," he comments, "There is here no question of a sin which God will not pardon, but of an affront which man will not, or does not pardon. It is only a way of saying that slander is one of the hardest of all offences to forgive. The Rabbi who said this never dreamed of an unpardonable sin, as Christians have imagined it. The unvarying doctrine in Pharisaic theology on the subject of forgiveness is that God always forgives those who repent, when they repent" (I, pp. 150 f. note). Against this should be put perhaps the stronger use in *Jub.*, where concerning the sin of uncircumcision it is said: "And there will no more be pardon or forgiveness unto them . . . for all the sin of this eternal error" (*Jub.* xv. 34). Jesus on the occasion seems to be hinting at a common idea at any rate among Palestinians, that for uncircumcision there was no pardon at all, in going into quite another region of human action for something of the sort. This something he does not find exactly where the Rabbi who has been quoted found it, but rather where some of our writers suggest: "Before the Lord of spirits none shall utter an idle word" (1 En. lxvii. 9; cf. Matt. xii. 36 f., quoted above, p. 342): "and all the words of your unrighteousness shall be read out before the Great Holy One, and your faces shall be covered with shame" (1 En. xcvi. 6); "nor charge with lying the words of the Holy Great One . . . for all your lying . . . issue . . . in great sin" (1 En. civ. 9); and, especially, "Wisdom is a spirit that loves man, and she will not hold a blasphemer guiltless for his lips; because God is witness of his reins, and is a true overseer of his heart, and a hearer of his tongue" (*Wisd.* i. 6). Jesus' use of the idea of no forgiveness seems to be in accordance with the Rabbi quoted, but he applies it specifically to what is suggested by the quotations from our writers,—the spirit of the slanderer with respect to unmistakably the purest matters: hence he tells his opponents that they reveal a spirit which is really very hard

to forgive, since it is a deliberate sin against the light which they have,—if there is any sin which cannot be forgiven, this is it, not uncircumcision.

Again, to continue with R. T. Herford on his Rabbinical quotation: "The term rendered 'for ever' is used in the Talmud in connections which preclude all idea of theological meaning. . . . The declaration of Jesus accordingly is not the intimation that there is a sin which God will never forgive, but the denunciation of malicious slander by a justly indignant man. The phrase 'is guilty of an eternal sin' is only an expansion of 'hath never forgiveness.'" The Fourth Gospel is at least evidence that "eternal" could be used with little or no temporal connotation, and the papyri reveal how the temporal reference could sometimes be very limited (cf. G. Milligan, p. 110; M.M., p. 16; G. A. Deissmann, I, p. 363). It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that "these will go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life" (Matt. xxv. 46), has reference to intensity of loss and intensity of gain, and that "eternal sin" is sin of greatest intensity. "When we are discussing our Lord's use of such terms as 'eternal' or 'never to be quenched,' may we not recognise the possibility that the *real* significance of these words is to express *intensity*, and that their association with the idea of time is due to the inadequacy of human language to express the whole of truth? It is generally agreed that 'αἰώνιος' when applied to a sin denotes intensity rather than duration of time; why not also when the same word is applied to 'punishment' or to 'life'? So long as we use the terms 'eternal fire,' 'eternal punishment,' to express the immeasurable gravity of the consequences of sin, and the urgency of the call to immediate repentance, we are true to our Lord's teaching; but if we allow our minds to dwell on the thought of an unending succession of ages of torture, we are introducing thoughts which the Gospels nowhere thrust into prominence" (E. C. Dewick, p. 189).

Whether or not Jesus had fully worked out his idea of the Fatherhood of God in reference to the Beyond (cf. R. H. Charles, VII, p. 101), there is little doubt as to what that full working out should be. There are some things in his teaching which favour the idea that he was not as slow in this matter as the history of religious beliefs would incline us to suppose that he might be. In the light of that Fatherhood, the "many" stripes and the "few" of experience after death (see above, pp. 336 f.) must mean that the stripes were not merely retributive,—they must be the respective degrees of severity which one might reasonably expect were needed to correct these souls. He also gives a picture of punishment leading to reflection, but at a stage where punishment has not yet done its full work (see above, p. 336). What, too, he regards as punishable in men was something which could be

altered: the unmerciful slave is not "handed over . . . to the tormenters" under a life sentence, but "till he pay everything owing" (Matt. xviii. 34), which means, dropping parable, till he learns that apart from Divine forgiveness his life would not be bearable, and hence the least he should have done was to have shown forgiveness on the comparatively few occasions which had presented him opportunities for so doing. F. W. Worsley (p. 123; cf. J. H. Leckie, p. 156) takes Matt. v. 25 f. || Luke xii. 58 f. in the same way (but see above, p. 159), and in Pirke Aboth iii. 20 it is taught, so R. T. Herford interprets, "that the debtor, having paid his debt and submitted to just judgment, is welcomed into Paradise" (A.P., vol. ii. p. 702),—compare also the case of Adam of whom God says in handing him over to Michael: "Let him be in your charge till the day of Judgment in punishment, till the last years when I will convert his sorrow into joy" (A. and E. xlviii. 1 f.). Moreover, Jesus asked for a faith, hence himself had a hope, that in the providence of God there would be adequate room both for the vindication of the righteous and for compassion on the wicked (see above, p. 68).

Yet again, neither in the Synoptics nor in the Fourth Gospel is the Father put directly in the place of the Judge at the last day; this formal separation of the Judgment scene from the Father does not, of course, imply any inconsistency between Judgment and Fatherhood,—“the Son of Man” comes in the glory of the “Father” (Mark viii. 38 || Matt. xvi. 27, Luke ix. 26),—but it does suggest that Judgment may not be the last word of the Father on any. Hence, his outlook is in harmony with those of our writers in whom the gentler aspects of the divine nature had so wrought that they could not bear the sight of Gehenna and rejoice,—and some of whom were making room in their devotions for prayers for the departed. He who, while acknowledging his own failure in Jerusalem, still had hope that some day they would welcome God’s messenger, and say, “Blessed is he who comes in the Lord’s name” (Matt. xxiii. 39), and who with his last breath did his best in prayer to present a case for the forgiveness of his enemies, “My Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing” (Luke xxiii. 34),—had to the last a prayerful interest in their souls,—is just such as, had he been spared, would have worked out in consistency with the Fatherhood of God his teaching with reference to the future. Even as that teaching stands, the total impression favours rather the idea that “the future state . . . is one of spiritual growth, a state in which the soul has room to expand, to attain to a continually increasing stature . . . a state in which sinners are purged from their transgressions, and the good made better still” (cf. M. Joseph, p. 143), than that the door of further opportunity is fast barred (cf. Matt.

xxv. 10; Luke xiii. 25) against the wicked soul at death. This may be what the time element involved in his acceptance of the idea of an intermediate state means; the "few" or "many" stripes may do their work,—the senseless man learn his folly, the rich man recognise his sin, and the resurrection to condemnation be reserved for those in whom perversity is so extreme that nothing less will suffice, the Judgment even then representing the last and severest measure of redemptive love.

2. What is said of Gehenna in the teaching of Jesus accords with this idea of the tendency of his thought. The amazing paucity of his references thereto is what most impresses one on turning from our literature to the Gospels. The only instance in the earliest Gospel looks in the very direction which has been anticipated in the previous paragraph, and may be taken as a statement of the very view there advocated as necessary to bringing his teaching here into consistency with his doctrine of the Father in heaven in whom "there is no wish . . . that there should perish one of these little ones" (Matt. xviii. 14), "And if your hand entraps you, chop it off. Fine is it that you go maimed into (eternal) life, than that having two hands you go forth into Gehenna, into fire unquenchable (i.e. until it has done its appointed work). And if your foot entraps you, chop it off. Fine is it that you go into (eternal) life lame, than that having two feet you be thrown into Gehenna. And if your eye entraps you, throw it out. Fine is it that you one-eyed go into the Kingdom of God (i.e. hereafter), than that having two eyes you be thrown into Gehenna, where (to quote scripture) 'their worm does not die and the fire is not put out (i.e. till all the rubbish is gone).' For every one by fire will be salted (i.e. preserved, saved)" (Mark ix. 43-49 || Matt. xviii. 7-10; cf. Matt. v. 29-30; cf. E. P. Gould, p. 181; also P. I. Hershon, p. 12, for the verb "salt" meaning "preserve"). The intention of this passage seems to be to say, that far better exercise self-denial than have to have the rubbish of your personality taken away by fire,—the personality in that case, however, being saved by this severe process.

It should be observed that this surgical self-denial in each instance is required that sin against others be not committed; in Mark to show that the man who "in his name was throwing out evil spirits," yet was not a professed disciple should not have been stopped (ix. 38 f.), in Matthew either that they should not do anything to entrap "little believers" (xviii. 6), or that one should not infringe the sacredness of a woman's personality (v. 28-32). Similarly, to the opponents of the prophets of their day, "How are you going to escape the judgment of Gehenna?" (Matt. xxiii. 33), and of the bigoted proselyte, "a son of Gehenna twice as much so as you" (Matt. xxiii. 15); also concerning people who neglected

amazing opportunities (see above, p. 342), or who have been only formally, never genuinely, part of the missionary Kingdom on earth (Matt. xiii. 40, 42, 50; cf. xxv. 41). This is quite in the style of the Rabbis who "frequently said that certain sins will lead into Gehenna . . . unchastity, . . . adultery, idolatry, pride, mockery, hypocrisy, anger, etc." (J.E., vol. v. p. 584); compare, "And whoever says, Fool! (cf. above, p. 159) will be liable to the Gehenna of fire" (Matt. v. 22).

It should also be noted that only twice in our Gospels are there direct references to Gehenna as "Destruction" (*ἀπόλεια*): "Broad is the road which goes right on to Destruction" (Matt. vii. 13), "No one of them has been destroyed except the son of Destruction" (John xvii. 12). The former does not say that many are actually there; and the latter should be a warning against taking literally, as signifying annihilation (cf. "lost," *ἀπολωλότα*, Matt. x. 6, xv. 24, *ἀπολωλός*, Matt. xviii. 11, Luke xv. 4, 6) rather than the experience of the extremity of loss by the soul who still continues to be, such parabolic expressions as the following: "Every tree not making fine fruit is chopped down and into the fire is thrown" (Matt. vii. 19); "they gather and into the fire throw them (i.e. the severed branches) and they are burned" (John xv. 6); "Just, then, as weeds are collected and with fire are burned up, so will it be in the consummation of the age" (Matt. xiii. 40; cf. vers. 49 f.). This last, with its parallel, has in view people who, since they have not died before the Judgment, have not entered into the dark intermediate state which would otherwise have been their lot; hence the fire seems to do for them what the darkness does for others: "And they will collect out of his (professed) Kingdom (i.e. as it is on earth at the Judgment) all the traps, that is (*καί*), the doers of lawlessness, and they will throw them into the furnace of fire. There there will be weeping and crunching of teeth" (Matt. xiii. 41 f.). Probably this element in the teaching of Jesus has been exaggerated in Matthew and assimilated to such popular conceptions as are met with in our literature (cf. F. W. Worsley, pp. 128 f.): witness, how that Luke has, "Fear him who after having killed has power (i.e. if things turn out that you deserve it) to throw into Gehenna" (Luke xii. 5), where Matthew has, "Fear rather him who can both soul and body destroy in Gehenna" (Matt. x. 28).

The balance of the evidence, then, is on the side of an interpretation of his words, which, while allowing for the probability that his teaching here was not systematically worked out in thorough consistency with his idea of the Fatherhood of God (cf. E. W. Winstanley, p. 293), yet sees such a softening of the harshness of current thinking on the subject as to make it likely that

he had a feeling, that those souls who must meet God as a consuming fire (cf. D.C.G., vol. i. p. 537) were only such as many stripes, dark reflection, had not been equal to changing, and that such a fiery entrance of God into the experience of such perverse souls was just the desperate and regrettable expedient of a love in the heart of God, which could not let even the worst go beyond the range of its redemptive operations. "Go from me under a curse, (that is), into fire the eternal (i.e. the intensest sort) which is got ready for the devil and his angels (i.e. which is reserved only for the very worst)" (Matt. xxv. 41). To quote Dr. Hort: "The idea of purgation, of cleansing as by fire, seems to me inseparable from what the Bible teaches us of the divine chastisements; and though little is directly said respecting the future state, it seems to me incredible that the divine chastisements in this respect change their character when this visible life is ended. . . . I do not believe that God's purposes of love can ever cease towards us in any stage of our existence, or that they can accomplish themselves by our purification and perfection without painful processes" (*Life and Letters*, vol. ii. p. 336, quoted D. W. Forrest, I, pp. 377 f., note 1; cf. J. H. Leckie, p. 51; E.G.T., vol. i. p. 306). These words seem to carry out consistently the line of thought which Jesus started, if perchance he did not complete it.

To summarise what has been claimed for Jesus under this head: he in agreement with the majority of his time refused to think of the Beyond as other than the continuance of the soul in conscious life after the experience of death, and with a view to the ultimate arrival at that fulness of life which is signified by resurrection. He accepted the idea of distinctions of experience in Sheol, and seems to have provided at least an equivalent for the third division, though the tenor of his teaching would make it rather a place to which a soul was recalled to make a fresh start, when he might have been well on the way in goodness, than one in which a soul arrives at a standstill because of the balance of its good and bad being so struck at death that there was nothing in the way of reward or punishment in the Hereafter. He accepted the general scheme of the future which allowed for an intermediate state. In his teaching that state has become for the righteous much more homelike than it is in our literature; thither he himself expects to go and to be joined there later by such of his loyal followers as may, like him, have to suffer death before the arrival of the day of Judgment. For the wicked this state is, as in our writers, the very dark place, where in varying degrees people have occasion for tears, that is, they discover themselves shut out from much goodness once open to them; he makes clear, then, that "in any calculable period of time you will, by your selfish choice,

have involved yourself in loss, perhaps in ruin" (W. Temple, p. 104). The resurrection is the entrance into fulness of life in heaven, and is apparently of the nature of a happy advance in life for those who at death entered a home-life Hereafter; it signifies progress in the life beyond. In this connection he has no interest in the resuscitation of the body nor in empty tombs; his conception seems to be entirely spiritual, the scene of the resurrection life being heaven, not earth. The Judgment which precedes this change is conducted on God's behalf by the apocalyptic Son of Man; it is intensely a judgment of the individual, not however by a rigid standard such as the Law supplied for our writers, but, in accordance with the privileges enjoyed, by the degrees of the rescue-spirit which have been shown by each; hence there are surprising changes of position from those such as the appearance of things here would seem to have determined. "The reward he preaches is, virtually speaking, existence in the sight of God, nearness to God, and the punishment, rejection by God, removal from His presence" (W. Bousset, p. 127). The idea of the Fatherhood of God, if it is worked out consistently, shuts out the idea of final doom altogether, for "when we think of his doctrine that 'God is love,' we see that it involves the universality and everlasting persistence of divine grace" (J. H. Leckie, p. 166); consequently, there are some things in his teaching which suggest that he allowed for the operation of the grace and compassion of God in the darkness of the intermediate state, so that only for souls who were most stubborn in wickedness and still at the Judgment unchanged, would there be added to the experience of darkness the experience of fire. The references to Gehenna in his teaching seem to have had this contingency in mind; and that such people are in his view destined to meet God as a consuming fire,—an unspeakably unenviable lot (Matt. xviii. 6 f. || Luke xvii. 1 f.; cf. Mark xiv. 21 || Matt. xxvi. 24, Luke xxii. 22),—is just his way of thinking that "God may always, even in the end, have resources still in His Almighty love by which He will recall back all souls at last to Himself and save them from the results of their self-will and from that self-will itself" (cf. W. Temple, p. 104).

"O depth of wealth both of God's wisdom and knowledge! How unsearchable His judgments and inexorable His roads! . . . For from Him and through Him and arriving at Him all things! To Him glory for ever! Amen" (Rom. xi. 33, 36).

INDEX I

IMPORTANT SUBJECTS AND NAMES

- Abba, 61 f.
- Abraham, 37, 38, 41, 42, 48, 52, 53, 150, 192, 203, 244, 255, 323; cf. 58, 110, 116, 170, 212, 278, 287, 290, 303, 304, 333, 334, 335, 336
- Acts of Apostles, 61, 76, 117, 162, 336, 339
- Adam, 37, 44, 48, 94, 146, 190, 193, 203, 205, 318, 324, 346. Cf. Fall
- Adultery, 233 ff., cf. 273-276; *also* 190, 206, 237, 256, 293, 348
- Advocate, 48, cf. 333 f.
- Almsgiving, 256 f., cf. 302 f.; *also* 73, 234, 236, 249, 281, 332
- 'Am Ha-Arez, 118. Cf. Common people.
- Angels, 47 ff., cf. 73-75; *also* 38, 56, 77, 134, 139, 143, 144, 146, 151, 174, 175, 179, 180, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 205, 239, 243, 244, 254, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 318, 322, 327, 328, 333, 336, 338, 349
- Anger, God's, 45, 48, 251, 297. Cf. Wrath
- Annihilation, 327, 328, 330; cf. 332, 348; *also* 94, 136, 151, 166, 216, 244
- Anointed, the, 129 f., cf. 148 f.; *also* 37
- Anthropomorphism, 38 f.
- Apocalypse, N.T., 42, 72, 336
- Apocalyptic, 27, 31, 46, 100, 102, 103, 122, 129, 144 f., 185, 311, 327; cf. 30, 68, 79, 102, 105 f., 118, 122, 123, 124, 172, 174 f., 179, 180, 181, 207, 220, 340
- Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, 27 ff., 31, 46, 51; cf. 30, 31 f., 79, 264
- Asceticism, 188, cf. 208 f.
- Asidæan, cf. Hasidæan
- Atonement, 255 ff., cf. 302 f.; *also* 41, 178, 238, 250, 252, 297, 298 f., 326
- Azazel, 72, 144, 196, 200, 316
- Baptism, 96, cf. 112 f., 149 f., 291; *also* 117, 121, 162
- Beelzebul, 121, 158
- Behemoth 95
- Belial, 235, 290
- Beliar, 136, 193, 197, 205, 244
- Birds, 111 f., 216; *also* 155, 189, 210, 241, 245, 251, 279
- Body, 186 ff., cf. 208 f. Cf. Resuscitation
- Boy, 105, 110, 115, 120, 299. Cf. Child, Servant, Slave
- Camel, 196, 280 f.
- Canon, 27, 31, 32, 226; cf. 263 f., 267, 285, 305
- Capernaum, 32, 342
- Ceremonial, 248 ff., 250 ff., cf. 297 f. Cf. Circumcision, Temple
- Child, 211 f.; *also* 57, 60, 80, 89, 155, 299. Cf. Boy
- Church, 31, 59, 60, 101, 102, 106, (116), 288
- Circumcision, clean and unclean, 243-246, cf. 291 ff., 295 f.; *also* 94, 95 f., 96, 112, 228, 284 f., 288, 304, 344, 345
- Clean and unclean, cf. Circumcision
- Common people, 110, 161, 215. Cf. 'Am Ha-Arez
- Community, 85, cf. 101-107, 118 f.; *also* 55 f., 96, 123, 132, 163 f.;
- Conscience, 190 ff., cf. 212 f., 300
- Consummation, 87, 97, 136, 175, 187; cf. 288, 348
- Conversion, 92, 94, 95, 97, 99, 273, 299
- Corruption, corruptible, 186 ff., contrast 216, 235; *also* 87, 89, 90, 190, 192, 201, 226, 260, 314, 318, 322, 323
- Covenant (New), 225 f., cf. 162 f., 121, 123; *also* 40, 52, 92, 112, 113, 133, 142, 190, 238, 244, 253, 297, 315
- Creator, 44, 96 f., cf. 71; *also* 43, 45, 93, 151, 174, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 197, 199, 203, 216, 237, 244, 245, 256, 315, 319, 327, 329, 338. Cf. Deism, Immanence, Pantheism
- Cup = martyrdom, 80, 121, 161
- David, 239, 258, 289 f. Cf. Son of David

- Darkness, place of, 315 ff., cf. 335 ff. ;
also 143, cf. 320
- Death, 200 ff., 325 ff. ; cf. 210 f., 243 ;
also 40, 52, 54, 198, 234, 236, 257,
264, 312, 316, 317, 325, 335, 336,
337, 343, 345, 347. Cf. Prayers
for the dead, Resurrection, Sleep
= death
- Deism, 44 f., 47, 49, 53 ; cf. 58, 72.
Cf. Heaven = God, Transcendence
- Delegate of God, Messiah as, 130, cf.
149 ff.
- Demons, 45, 138, 196, 197, 216. Cf.
Spirits (evil)
- Denunciation, 65
- Depravity, 202 f., 205, 221, 227, 314 ;
cf. 217 f.
- Determinism, cf. Will
- Development, cf. Progress
- Devil, 198, 199, 201, 218 ; cf. 216 f.,
349. Cf. Satan, Temptations of
Jesus
- Dichotomy, 185 f., cf. 207 f.
- Divorce, 305. Cf. Adultery
- Dog, 113-116
- Doom, final, 325 ff., cf. 343-347
- Dualism, 186 f., 188
- Eagle = Rome, 87, 136, 137 ; cf. 161
- Eden, cf. Fall
- Education, 32, 42, 97
- Enemy, 86, 96, 134, 136, 137, 142,
145, 160, 216, 229, 231, 237, 238,
242, 264, 317, 325 ; cf. 65, 267,
269, 283 f.
- Enoch, 313, cf. 333 ; also 38, 39, 42,
46, 47, 49, 51, 53, 89, 141, 312, 322
- Essenes, 118, 188, 251
- Eternal, 88 f., 328, cf. 344 f. ; also 40,
41, 42, 44, 56, 73, 86, 87, 89 (cf.
229), 105, 137, 142, 178, 201, 225,
226, 235, 244, 268, 281, 303, 317,
318, 324, 334, 338, 347
- Eve, 243. Cf. Fall
- Ezekiel, 141 f., 168, 175, 181, 245, 265
- Ezra, 29, 90, 108, 141, 239
- Faith, 41, 44, 96, 98, 112, 142, 229,
259 f., 261, 315 ; cf. 67, 68, 71, 78,
79, 103, 115, 119, 167, 170, 172,
175, 181, 286, 289, 300, 304 f., 346.
Cf. Merit
- Fall, the, 197-203, cf. 216 ff.
- Fasting, 43, 45, 230, 237, 241, 255 f.,
259 ; cf. 78, 164, 209, 302, 332
- Father, God as, 36 ff., 56, 139 ; cf.
59-62, 70, 343, 345 f., 348 f.
- Favouritism, 117, 226. Cf. Particu-
larism
- Fear of God, 246-249, cf. 293-296 ;
also 41, 45, 54, 74, 91, 93, 104,
232, 234, 256, 260
- Fire, place of, 90, 201 f. Cf. Gehenna
- Foreign influences, 47, 49, 51, 186,
188 f., 311, 322, 324, 326, 329.
Cf. Hellenism
- Forgiveness, God's, 37, 54, 55, 91,
238, 250, 251, 252, 254, 256, 257,
258, 260 ; cf. 67, 70, 78, 79, 106,
176, 212, 270, 343, 346. Cf. Un-
pardonable sin
- Forgiveness, man's, 230, 231, 236 ;
cf. 30, 78, 151, 208, 270 f., 284,
346
- Foundation, world's (45), 46, 93 (141),
142 (188) ; cf. 70, 171, 343
- Four hundred years, 87, 145 ; cf. 107,
124
- Fourth Gospel, 30, 62, 76, 77, 111,
112, 121, 150, 158, 161, 170, 178,
214, 217, 265, 294, 301, 332, 338,
340, 345, 346
- Freedom, human, 192 ff., 203 ff., 255 ;
cf. 213 ff., 299. Cf. Will
- "Fulfil," 262 f.
- Future life, cf. Hereafter
- Galilee, 32, 67, 107, 156, 159, 168,
280, 338
- Gehenna, 327 ff., cf. 347 ff. ; also 30,
71, 113, 142, 159, 237, 317, 327,
332, 346
- Generous, 66, 68, 69, 79, 207, 212,
213, 218, 240, 268, 289, 301, 338,
341 f.
- Gentiles, 90-96, cf. 107-117 ; also 42,
56, 61, 67, 76, 88, 96, 98, 131,
135, 158, 177, 192, 197, 239, 241,
245, 255, 291, 311, 338. Cf.
Heathen, Nations
- Gethsemane, 79 f., 264
- God, cf. Contents, Chap. I ; also 191
Gospels, 29 f. Cf. Fourth Gospel
- Grace, 254 f., cf. 300 ff. ; also 54, 70,
86, 91, 112, 196, 247, 258, 302,
303, 304, 306, 317, 350
- Hades, 185, 311, 317 ; cf. 163
- Hasidæan, 157, 298, 339
- Hate, 194, 228, 230, 231, 232, 233,
238, 253, 282, 283
- Hatred, God's, 42, 43, 205, 232, 244.
Cf. Wrath
- Heart, 52, 54, 75, 91, 96, 97, 99, 151,
152, 160, 186, 190, 191, 202, 203,
205, 206, 207 f., 219, 220, 229,
230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 236, 247,
248, 251, 255, 256, 257, 258, 262,
263, 265, 270, 272, 280, 294, 296,
322, 325, 335, 342, 344. Cf.
Thoughts
- Heathen, 90, 92, 93, 94, 111, 140, 191,
240, 311. Cf. Gentiles, Nations
- Heaven = God, 45, 53, 80 ; cf. 58,
59, 75, 101, 104, 105, 116, 120, 121,
122, 154, 176, 209, 212, 265, 294

- Heaven, 73, 75, 77, 87, 88, 89, 91, 105, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 151, 170, 175, 198, 206, 240, 303, 312, 315, 321, 322, 324, 328, 330, 339, 342. Cf. Paradise, final
- Hell, 143, 319, 330. Cf. Gehenna
- Hellenism, -istic, 35, 58, 95 f., 121, 136, 185, 243, 250, 262 f., 301
- Hereafter, cf. Contents, Chap. VI; also, 85, 86, 88, 89, 99, 100, 105, 181, 186, 189, 303
- Herodians, 160 f.
- Hillel, -ites, 236, 237, 262, 273, 274, 304, 327
- History, God in, 45, 46, 50, 100, 136, 185; cf. 72, 77, 174, 175, 181. Cf. Providence
- Holiness, 227, 239; cf. 284-288. Cf. Ceremonial
- Holy city, 49; cf. 63, 64, 72
- Holy One, God as, 36, cf. 59
- Holy Spirit, 50, 87, 96, 139, 205, 232, 254, 255; cf. 59, 76, 156, 167, 219, 220, 266, 301, 344
- "I am," God as, 76, 216 (285), 286 ff., 331, 338 f.
- Idols, 91, 93, 95, 326, 329
- Image of God, 189 f., cf. 211 f.; also 37, 44, 95, 159, 199, 201, 203, 214 f.
- Immanence, 47, 51
- Immortality, 322 ff., cf. 340 f.; also 41, 44, 50, 145, 146, 189, 190, 191, 201, 202, 206, 313, 314, 323, 331, 339
- Inclination, 187, 190, 191, 195, 198, 230, 301. Cf. *Yezzer*
- Incorruption, incorruptible, cf. Corruption
- Intermediate state, 311-317, cf. 331-337, 348
- Inwardness, 205, 208, 231 ff., 234, 257, 292; cf. 102, 106, 208, 211, 219, 272 f., 282
- Isaiah, 255, cf. 121, 178
- Jamnia, 31, 326
- Jeremiah, 48 f., 203, 256; cf. 334
- Jerusalem, 91, 97, 135, 136, 137, 171, 249, 320, 326; cf. 32, 63, 64, 67, 72, 152, 155, 156, 161, 168, 177, 181, 214, 265, 285, 338, 346. Cf. Holy city, Temple
- John the Baptist, 102, 104, 109 f., 113, 124, 149 f., 167, 169, 177, 213, 266, 267, 269, 286, 293, 299, 340
- Jonah, 37, 111, 176, 299, 342
- Joseph, the father of Jesus, 119, 277
- Joseph, the patriarch, 41, 43, 47, 50, 53, 234, 253; cf. 78, 219
- Judaea, 32, 274. Cf. Jerusalem
- Judge, divine, 143 f., cf. 171 f.
- Judgment, final, 85-90, 324 f.; cf. 102-107, 341 ff.; also 39, 49, 51, 66, 74, 93, 98 f., 129, 144, 145, 189, 196, 216, 287, 295, 311, 312, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 321, 322, 326, 327, 328, 334, 336, 337, 339, 341, 346, 348
- Justice, God's, 39-42, cf. 64-68; also 52, 55, 326, 341, 342, 343
- King, God as, 36, cf. 59 f.
- King, Messiah as, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 168. Cf. Son of David
- Kingdom of God, cf. Contents, Chap. II; also 50, 58, 59, 197, 347
- Law, 225 ff., cf. 262-266, 284-288; also 50, 71, 97, 132, 153, 154, 192, 193, 194, 202, 228, 245, 247, 249, 250, 257, 259, 260, 271, 276, 278, 280, 286, 288, 289, 292, 293, 294, 299, 314, 315, 325, 326. Cf. Torah
- Leper, figuratively, 293
- Leviathan, 95
- Lex talionis*, 236 ff., cf. 282 ff.
- Logos, 215. Cf. Word
- Love, God's, to man, 42 ff., cf. 68-71; also 36, 38, 40, 50, 62, 72, 152, 171, 208, 214, 215, 246, 256, 269, 305, 317, 343, 344, 347, 348 f. Cf. Forgiveness, God's
- Love, man's, to God, 74, 85, 188, 191, 208, 230, 240, 246, 262, 282, 322, 326. Cf. Fear of God
- Love, man's, to man, 49, 139, 194, 229, 230 f., 234, 237, 238, 247, 248; cf. 69, 111, 151, 152, 153, 214, 215, 269, 270 f., 272 f., 275, 277, 291, 295. Cf. Forgiveness, man's
- Maccabees, 53, 80, 132 f., 134, 139, 159, 165, 237, 242, 262, 263, 326
- Mammon, 236, cf. 58, 281, 282
- Man, cf. Contents, Chap. IV
- Manna, 54, cf. 280, 285
- Marriage, 73, 108, 119, 164, 194, 200, 234, 240, 243, 251, 274 f., 337 f. Cf. Adultery
- Martyrdom, 40, 89, 98, 114, 144, 173, 230, 237, 244, 250, 255, 263, 319 f., 323 f.; cf. 114, 121 f., 161-166, 177 ff., 211, 335. Cf. Cup
- Mastema, 41, 45, 216
- Mean, 66, 68, 69, 207, 212, 213, 217, 218, 289, 293, 301
- Mediation, 44, 48 f., 51, 54 f., 74, 142, 225, 251, 256, 258; cf. 214 f., 333 f.
- Memra, 47
- Merit, 44, 163, 257-261; cf. 303 ff. Cf. Works
- Messiah, cf. Contents, Chap. III; also 72, 87, 90, 97, 98, 99, 103, 107, 192, 197, 260

- Michael, 48, 49, 51, 141, 198, 199, 243, 346
 Mishnah, 276
 Missionary, 90, 94, 99, 100; cf. 107, 109, 111, 112, 117 f., 119, 122 f., 124, 269, 271, 343, 348
 Monotheism, 49, 56, 95, 96
 Moses, 45, 48, 50, 97, 142, 171, 190, 202, 225, 226, 230, 246; cf. 175, 262, 263, 265, 274, 277, 284 f., 285 f., 287, 288, 306, 333 f., 340
 Name = God, 58, 63, 148, 154, 156, 208, 262; cf. other uses, 74, 96, 117, 144, 179, 214, 247, 255, 260, 273, 286, 287, 333, 346, 347
 National supremacy, 134 f., cf. 157 f.
 Nationalism, 56, 96, 112, 160 f., 231; cf. 61, 64, 157 f. Cf. Neighbour
 Nations, 43, 45, 50, 90, 91, 92, 94, 131, 135, 136, 137, 191, 226, 259, 323. Cf. Gentiles
 Native rulers, judgment on, 144 f., cf. 172-175
 Nazareth, 32, 109, 115, 118 f., 152, 168
 Neighbour, 139, 160, 190, 228, 229, 230 f., 238, 241, 247, 248, 249, 253, 261, 325; cf. 262, 271
 New Covenant, cf. Covenant
 Noah, 28, 313; cf. 172, 333; also 196, 200, cf. 216
 Non-retaliation, non-resistance, 229; cf. 159 f., 165, 270. Cf. Quietism
 Obligation, cf. Conscience, Freedom, Image of God
 Old Testament, 27, 31, 35, 39, 40, 46, 58, 79, 94, 99, 114, 129, 169, 173, 174, 175, 186, 189, 197, 239, 249, 266, 270, 275, 276, 285, 286, 297, 311, 312, 313, 340
 Omniscience, 45 f., 64, 246; cf. 72 f., 75
 Optimism, 85-88, 90-98, 187; cf. 102 ff., 107, 220
 Oral law, 132, 242, 283; cf. 285. Cf. Scribes
 Orientalism, 43, 66; cf. 65, 113, 160, 210, 282, 283
 Originality, Jesus', 56, 60, 70 f., 73, 79 f., 167 f., 169 f.; 62 ff., 290, 295, 304; 66 f.; 112 f.; 117 f., 152; 121 f.; 122 f.; 123; 152-155; 161-165; 267 ff.; 270 f.; 285-288; 291; 292 ff., 295 f.; 296 f., 298; 300 ff.; 305; 341 ff.; 347
 Outsiders, 113, 116 f., 124. Cf. Common people, Publicans, Sinners
 Palestine, 27, 38, 95, 106, 145, 173, 226, 250, 251, 291, 304, 344
 Pantheism, 35 f., 47; cf. 57
 Paradise = Eden, cf. Fall
 Paradise, intermediate, 312-315, cf. 332-335; also 143, 170, 205, 212, 216, 320
 Paradise, final, 317 ff., cf. 337 ff.; also 146, 340, 346
 Parents, 234 f., cf. 276 ff.; also 118 ff., 154, 164, 194, 200
 Particularism, 96, 110, 116, 124
 Patriotism, 151, 157, 160 f., 320 Cf..
 Political supremacy
 Paul, 62, 114, 118, 152, 216, 217, 218, 336, 350
 Peace, 138 f., cf. 165 ff.; also 45, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93, 97, 118, 132, 135, 137, 144, 145, 149, 152, 159 (164), 229, 230, 236, 284, 317, 322, 326
 Pearl = righteous man, 69 (cf. 123)
 Personal influence, Messiah's, 139 ff.; cf. 167-170
 Pessimism, 85, 88 ff., 93 f., 98 f., 192, 255; cf. 108
 Pharisees, 27, 31, 113, 118, 133, 238, 283, 339, 344; cf. 65, 105, 110, 123, 124, 160, 217, 264, 265, 267-269, 272, 284, 289, 302
 Philanthropy, 228, 240, 261, 318; cf. 267, 281, 295 f., 304, 343. Cf. Almsgiving, Poor, Sabbath
 Philo, 60, 169, 190
 Pirke Aboth, 38, 346
 Plato, 187, 194. Cf. Dualism
 Poetry, 39, 48, 75, 138
 Political supremacy, 98, 139, 155; cf. 103, 157. Cf. National supremacy, Patriotism, Rome, War
 Polytheism, 48. Cf. Idols
 Poor, 54, 134, 228, 235, 236, 248, 249, 256, 257, 329; cf. 209, 266, 268, 278, 279, 281, 282, 333, 334
 Poverty, 228, 235, 248; cf. 68, 209, 278 f. Cf. Poor
 Power = God, 58 f.
 Prayer, 51-55, cf. 77-81; also 37, 42, 43, 46, 48, 98, 135, 143, 196, 197, 229, 231, 232, 235, 237, 247, 252, 254, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260 f., 263, 313; cf. 61, 63, 73, 74, 75, 105, 150, 152, 167, 172, 219, 267, 270, 280, 285, 288, 296, 298, 300, 302, 305, 332, 333 f., 346. Cf. Prayers for the dead
 Prayer Book (Jewish), 80, 113, 117, 130, 176, 212, 219
 Prayers for the dead, 326 f., cf. 346
 Pre-existence, Messiah's, 141 f., cf. 170 f., 215
 Pre-existence, soul's, 188 f., 324
 Progress, 85, 95, 97 ff., 100, 140, 146; cf. 112, 120-123, 125
 Prophet, Jesus as, 64, 109, 123 (139), 152, 167-70, 174, 175-179, 286, 290, 293, 296

- Prophets, influence of, 55, 92, 94, 139, 144 f., 226, 228, 247, 249, 258, 298, 328, 340; cf. 76, 99, 102, 111, 115, 121, 123, 155, 157, 164, 174, 266 f., 286, 305, 340, 347
- Prophets, teaching of, 64, 65, 70, 92, 95, 99, 102, 111, 123, 129, 139, 144 f., 153, 157, 164, 169, 174, 226, 249, 284, 311
- Proselytism, 92, 93, 94 ff., 249; cf. 111-117, 291, 347
- Prosperity, 50, 52, 86, 92, 95, 155, 193, 199, 232, 280. Cf. Justice, God's
- Providence, 37, 44-47, 52, 55, 56, 142, 227, 237; cf. 72 ff., 101, 112, 155, 280, 290, 346, 350. Cf. History
- Prudence, 43, 228 f.; cf. 105, 115, 214, 267
- Pseudepigrapha, cf. Apocrypha
- Publicans, 118, 217. Cf. Tax-gatherers
- Punishment, 192, 314 ff., 321, 323, 332, 336, 345, 346, 350. Cf. Justice, God's
- Quietism, 137, 238; cf. 159, 161. Cf. Non-retaliation.
- Rabbinical teaching, 37, 41, 44, 53, 55, 58, 61, 69, 78, 96, 114, 148, 154, 156, 163, 171, 175, 191, 195, 200, 201, 203, 219, 220, 235, 243, 252, 255, 258, 260, 266, 268, 269, 270, 271, 275, 276, 277, 279, 286, 287, 289, 290, 293, 301, 302, 303 f., 312, 318, 345, 347. Cf. Mishnah, Prayer Book (Jewish), Rabbis, Talmud, Targums
- Rabbis, 32 (67), 101, 109, 200, 209, 249, 271 f., 276, 278, 279, 280, 283, 284, 296, 298, 302, 344, 348. Cf. Rabbinical teaching
- Ransom, 162, 210 f.
- Raphael, 48
- Reparation, cf. *Lex talionis*.
- Repentance, 96 ff., cf. 117-120, 122, 125; 252 ff., cf. 298 ff.; 325, cf. 343; also 91, 92, 94, 96, 97, 151, 167, 193, 203, 212, 214, 218, 219, 230, 238, 253, 255, 269, 282, 284, 302, 303, 304, 315, 325, 342, 343, 344. Cf. Prayers for the dead
- Resurrection, 317-324, cf. 337-341; also 86, 143, 189, 303, 313, 316, 326, 330, 333, 334, 335, 347
- Resuscitation, body's, 319-322, cf. 339 f.
- Revenge, 66, 85, 238, 283, 327. Cf. Vengeance
- Reverence, 58, 114, 173, 193, 218, 246, 266, 288, 289, 293. Cf. Fear of God
- Reward, 312, 314 ff., 322 f., 332, 336, 350. Cf. Justice, God's
- Righteousness, God's, 40, 45, 23, 260 f. Cf. Justice, God's; Love, God's
- Righteousness, man's, 227-233, cf. 266-273; also 97, 139 f., 150, 154, 203, 204, 210, 234, 257, 258, 264. Cf. Inwardness, Generous, Love, Vices, Virtues
- Righteousness, Messiah's, 130 f., cf. 151 f.
- Rome, 87, 88, 136, 137, 142, 146, 165; cf. 161 f., 173, 274, 283
- Sabbath, 239-243, cf. 288-291; also 88, 95, 245, 247; cf. 71, 116 f., 176, 211, 263, 285, 295, 304
- Sacrifices, 169, 232, 304. Cf. Ceremonial
- Sadducees, 144 f., 181, 237, 289, 331
- Salt, figuratively, 165 f., 347
- Salvation, cf. Contents, Chap. V; also 49, 64, 91, 130, 133, 231, 253, 258, 260, 281, 323, 343
- Samaritans, 64, 109, 111, 124, 295
- Sanhedrin, 159, 276
- Satan, 45, 139, 195, 198, 199; cf. 68, 72, 106, 157 f., 213, 215 ff., 290. Cf. Azazel, Belial, Beliar, Devil, Mastema
- Scribes, 63, 132, 140; cf. 76, 110, 156, 169. Cf. Pharisees
- Septuagint, 31, 120, 173, 174, 194, 239, 247, 263, 264, 277, 286
- Servant, 305; also 130, 141, 317. Cf. Boy, Slave, Suffering, Servant
- Seventy-seven times, 270 f.
- Shammai, -ites, 237, 244; cf. 273, 274, 283, 302.
- Shechinah, 286
- Shema, 51
- Sheol, old idea of, 311, cf. 331; also 185, 328, 329
- Sheol, first division of, cf. Paradise, intermediate
- Sheol, second division of, cf. Darkness
- Sheol, third division of, 311 f., 328; cf. 331 f.
- Sin, 249 f. cf. 296 f.; also 41, 42, 187, 191, 192, 193, 199, 200, 202, 209, 292 f., 323. Cf. Unpardonable sin
- Sinlessness, 85, 97, 98, 99, 131, 202 f., 205; cf. 214, 220
- Sinners, 42, 48, 89, 98, 136, 137, 143, 173, 260, 312, 315, 317, 327, 328, 332; cf. 67, 109, 110, 111, 118, 151, 152, 176, 212, 217, 272, 295, 296, 297, 299
- Slave, 66, 69, 108, 110, 120 f., 155, 194, 267, 270, 282, 305, 336. Cf. Servant
- Sleep = death, 74, 132, 258, 313 f., 315, 317, 326; cf. 334
- Sodom, sin of, 197; cf. 216, 342
- Solomon, 154, 239, 258, 279, 343
- Son of David, 132 ff., cf. 155 ff.; also 145, 146

- Son of God, 36 f., 140, 253; cf. 57, 63, 69, 70, 75, 119, 149, 150, 151, 155, 161, 163 f., 167, 169 f., 180, 212 f., 267, 272 f., 303, 305
- Son of Man, apocalyptic, 141-146, 352; cf. 171-175, 179 f., 341; *also* 89, 98; cf. 30, 59, 106, 330
- Son of man, prophetic, 145 f.; cf. 175-180, 290, 338. Cf. Ezekiel
- Soul, 185 f., 188 f., 314 f., 317 ff.; cf. 207 f., 209 ff., 337 ff.; *also* 54, 55, 65, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 77, 90, 96, 97, 106, 163, 164, 167, 190, 193, 202, 204, 205, 230, 232, 233, 243, 251, 253, 255, 257, 263, 264, 270, 280, 311, 312, 313, 322, 325, 329, 347
- Spirit, divine, 37, 53, 71, 131, 139, 150, 191, 219, 220, 234; cf. 104, 178, 287, 300, 301, 316. Cf. Holy Spirit, Wisdom
- Spirit, God as, 38 f.; cf. 62 ff., 75, 339
- Spirit, human, 80, 97, 187, 228, 255, 311, 312, 315, 317, 320, 328. Cf. Soul
- Spirits, evil, 52, 91, 187, 192, 196, 197, 204, 235; cf. 104, 115, 158, 179, 216, 218, 219, 293, 343, 347. Cf. Demons
- Suffering, problem of, cf. Justice, God's
- Suffering servant, 80, 117, 118, 121, 125, 162-165
- Sword, figuratively, 164
- Synagogue, 32, 38, 52, 60, 81, 121, 173, 185; cf. 107 ff., 110, 116, 293, 295, 302. Cf. Nazareth, Temple
- Talmud, 135, 146, 166, 210, 229, 236 f., 243, 257, 267, 273, 276, 280 f., 289, 302, 345; cf. 157, 286, 331
- Targums, 46, 190
- Tax-gatherers, 104, 109, 110, 111, 113, 151, 176, 212, 272, 295, 299. Cf. Publicans
- Teaching, summaries of, 55 f., cf. 81; 99 f., cf. 123 f.; 147 f., cf. 180 f.; 205 f., cf. 200; 261, cf. 305 f.; 329 f., cf. 349 f.
- Temple, 51, 63, 90 f., 95 (112), (135), 140, 153, 235, 249, 251, 256, 260, 302; cf. 62 ff., 149 (150), 265, 284, 288, 290, 295, 304
- Temptation, 55, 141, 193, 198, 229, 245; cf. 65, 75, 78, 156, 219, 278
- Temptations, Jesus', 63 f., 118 f., 157 f.; *also* 68, 158
- Thoughts, 45, 52, 93, 136, 160, 190, 191, 194, 205, 228, 231 f., 234, 314, 325, 330, 341, 342. Cf. Heart, Inwardness
- Thousand years, 86, 88; cf. 107, 124
- Tithes, 249, cf. 296
- Titles for God, 36 ff., cf. 57-62
- Torah, 38, 55, 132, 153, 169, 185, 225, 226, 235, 238, 239; cf. 77, 125, 262, 263, 265, 285, 286, 287, 288, 304, 305, 341. Cf. Law
- Transcendence, 36, 46 f., 51, 55, 56. Cf. Deism
- Trichotomy, cf. Dichotomy
- Universalism, 92, 96, 116
- Unpardonable sin, 139, 244; cf. 76, 343 ff.
- Vengeance, 94, 98, 135, 143, 144, 229, 230, 231, 236, 237, 238. Cf. Enemy
- Vices, 85, 140, 191, 194, 232 f., 235, 248; cf. 159, 160, 266, 272, 278, 348
- Virtues, 191, 193, 228, 229-232, 247, 248; cf. 160, 209, 268, 269-273
- War, 134-138, 155; cf. 158-165, 166; *also* 40, 132, 139, 140, 144, 173, 191, 195, 196, 237, 241, 242
- Watchers, 194 ff., cf. 215 f.; *also* 49, 187
- Wealth, 144, 228, 235 f., 241; cf. 278-282
- Will, divine, 45, 130, 153, 192, 240, 241, 242, 243, 245 f., 247, 250; cf. 75, 79 f., 101, 105, 106, 110, 150, 161, 163, 165, 178, 214, 273, 277, 296, 305
- Will, human, 80, 178, 181, 187, 191, 202, 217, 241, 255, 300, 301, 303, 306. Cf. Freedom
- Wisdom, Messiah's, 131 f., cf. 152-155
- Wisdom of God, 46 f., 49 ff.; cf. 75 ff.; *also* 41, 43, 55, 75, 76, 132, 142, 190, 191, 192, 193, 198, 246, 254, 257, 317, 344. Cf. Word
- Woman, 64, 73, 109, 114 ff., 200, 212, 215, 217, 251, 255, 269, 296, 347. Cf. Adultery, Watchers
- Word = wisdom, 44, 50, 225; cf. 77, 213, 294. Cf. Memra
- Works, 89, 91, 144, 193, 218, 252, 256, 341. Cf. Merit
- Worship, 62, 64, 94, 140, 143, 157, 185, 195, 199, 206, 240, 245, 255, 261, 296, 298. Cf. Synagogue, Temple
- Wrath, God's, 40, 86, 91, 163, 187, 199, 201, 235, 260. Cf. Anger, Hatred
- Yezzer, 202, 203 ff.; cf. 218 ff.
- Yoke, 92, 140, 202; cf. 58, 101, 152, 275
- Zadokites, 234; cf. 273, 275
- Zealots, 137; cf. 159 ff., 165, 283

INDEX II

PASSAGES FROM THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

ABRAHAM, THE APOCALYPSE OF.	PAGE
viii.	36
x.	43
xvi. f.	38
xvii.	43, 50, 54
xxii.	94
xxiii.	43, 200
xxv.	54
xxvi.	192
xxix.	90, 94, 238
xxx.	90, 317

ADAM AND EVE, THE BOOKS OF.	PAGE
xii. 1	199
xiii. 2	189, 199
xiv. 3	199
xv. 1	199
2	189
3	199
xvi. 1-3	199
xxi. 2	48
xxxiii. 1 f.	199
xxxv. 2 f.	199
xxxvii. 1 f.	199
3	189
xxxix. 1	189
xlviii. 1 f.	346
li. 1 f.	243

AZARIAH, THE PRAYER OF.	PAGE
12	43
15 ff.	233
65	293

I BARUCH.	PAGE
ii. 12	247
13	239
17	185
19	259
iii. 1	186
1 f.	254
2	259
4	326
7	247
8	259
26	195
27 f.	192

I BARUCH.	PAGE
iii. 30 f.	50
iv. 1-4	226
2	36
6	40
21	54
25	237
27	54

2 BARUCH.	PAGE
i. 1, 4	92
ii. 2	49, 258
iv. 3	198
v. 7	256
ix. 1	203
2	256
x. 1	256
xiii. 11	228
xiv. 7	258
12	260
xv. 3-5	226
xvii. 3	20
xviii. 1 f.	202
xix. 3	226
8	201
xxi. 19	89
21	42
22	89
23	315
24	313
xxiii. 4	201, 313
xxvii. 2-5 ff.	137
2-13	138
xxix. 3	137, 145
4	95
5 f.	95
8	87
xxx. 1	87, 145
2	315
2-5	321
3	87
4 f.	316, 328
xxxvi. 11	316, 321, 336
xxxviii. 1-3	54
2	50, 226
xxxix. 7	130, 134, 136
xl. 1 f.	136

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA 859

I ENOCH.		PAGE
xxxii.	3-6	76
xxxvii.	2	36
	4	89
xxxviii.	1	98
	2	131, 255, 264
	3	143
	5	145
xxxix.	4	227
	5	48, 315
	6	131, 260
	7	74, 141
xl.	5	255
	6	48
	7	195
	8	47
	9	89, 253, 318
xli.	1	259
	2	227, 315
	8	255
	9	143
xlvi.	2	50
	2 f.	192
xlvi.	4	227
xlvi.	1	144
	4	89
	5	89
xlvi.	2	36
	2 f.	141
	3	130, 131, 142, 143
	5	144
	6	314, 316
	7	144, 236
	8	144, 255
xlvi.	1 f.	144
	2	48, 54, 98, 143
	3	39, 130, 143
	4	227
xlvi.	2 f.	141
	4	131, 192
	4 f.	94
	6	141
	7	141, 255
	9	227
	10	129, 144
xlvi.	1 f.	132
	2	85, 131, 141, 143, 146
	14	130
l.	2	94
li.	1	143, 320
	2	143
	3	130
	4	73
	5	143
lii.	4	129
	5	47
liii.	1	49
	3	195
	4	47
	6	131
	7	98
lii.	6	195, 316
lv.	4	144

I ENOCH.		PAGE
lviii.	3	87, 328
	5	260
lx.	8	312
	10	142
	23	312
lxi.	1	313
	2 f.	326
	4	260
	5	320
	8	144
	9	144
	10	74
	12	313
lxii.	2	130, 131, 136, 328
	3	130
	5	130, 143
	7	141, 142
	9-II	143
	11	144
	13	144, 327
	14	89, 146
	15	320
	15 f.	144
lxiii.	1	94, 144
	1-II	325
	6	316
	7	144
	10	235
	10-12	94
lxiv.	2	196
lxv.	2	49
	2 ff.	313
	6	196
	11	325
lxvii.	3	312
	9	344
lxviii.	4	48, 49
lxix.	4-8	195
	6	196, 197
	11	73, 198, 338
	27	130, 180, 325
	29	85, 130
lxx.	1	141
	1-4	313
	3	49
lxxi.	7-9	74
	14	131, 141
lxxx.	2	174
	2 f., 6	138
lxxxiii.	2	188
	10	53
lxxxiv.		53
	1	36
	6	187
lxxxvi.	1	72, 196, 215
	3-6	196
lxxxvii.	3 f.	312
lxxxviii.	1, 3	196
lxxxix.	6	196
	52	312
	59 f.	43
	76	49

I ENOCH.		PAGE	I ENOCH.		PAGE
kc.	2.	112	civ.	10.	233
	9.	135	cv.	2.	131, 346
	14.	49	cvi.	13 f.	195
	18 f.	112	cviii.	3.	328
	19.	135		3-6.	328
	20.	36		6.	328
	22.	48, 49		7-9.	188
	24 f.	327		12.	130, 320
	26 f.	327			
	30.	91, 112	2 ENOCH.		
	33.	86, 91, 141, 320	Title A		42
	34.	135	i.	5.	74
	35 f.	91	ii.	3.	255
	36.	112	vii.	1 f.	316
	37.	112		2.	316
	37 f.	134		4.	49
	38.	86, 135, 320	viii.	1.	318
	4.	232		5.	318
	8.	233	ix.	1.	318
	10.	317	x.	1-3.	328
	12.	87, 137		4-6.	233, 329
	13.	36		5.	179
	13 f.	140	xviii.	3-5.	195
	14.	87, 93		7.	49
	15.	196	xix.	1.	74
	16.	317		5 f.	45
xcii.	3.	317	xx.	1.	161
xciii.	4.	233		1, 3.	74
xciv.	4.	139		3.	161
	4-6.	138	xxii.	1.	39, 322
	6.	233		6.	141
	8.	236		8-10.	318
	10.	43		10.	74
xcvi.	4.	236		11.	49
xcvii.	2.	151	xxiii.	5.	188
	6.	344	xxiv.	2.	44
	8 ff.	236		3.	74, 174
	10.	235		4.	38
xcviii.	3.	236, 328	xxix.	3.	74, 161
	4.	179, 193, 203		4 f.	199
	7.	186	xxx.	6.	161
	10.	328		8.	50
xcix.	2.	225		10-12.	198
	3.	48		12.	190
	7.	196		15.	190, 198, 218
	11.	328		16.	198, 200, 203
	16.	48		17.	200
c.	1 f.	138	xxxi.	1-3.	198
	5.	74, 313		6.	199
	7.	235	xxxii.	1.	198, 324
	9.	328		2.	239
ci.	1 f.	45		2-xxxiii. 2.	88
	3.	45	xxxiii.	1 f.	88
cii.	5.	315		4.	50
	6-8.	311		6.	74
	11.	315	xxxiv.	1 f.	233
ciii.	3 f.	318	xxxv.	2.	73
	8.	328	xxxix.	3.	39
civ.	2.	74, 317, 318		4.	39
	4.	73, 196, 318		5, 6.	39
	6.	73, 318		8.	74, 161
	9.	344	xl.	3.	74, 174

2 ENOCH.		PAGE	4 EZRA.		PAGE
xl.	13	49	iii.	26	205
xli.	1 f.	202		36	92
xlii.	1-2	328	iv.	11	187
	2	329		23	42
	3	318		30	203, 205
	5	318, 324		35	315
	6, 7-9	248		41	313
	13	159, 229	v.	1	259
xlili.	2 f.	93, 248		20	54
	3	74		40	43
xliv.	1	44		55	90
	1-3	159, 233	vi.	5	259
	4 f.	325		6	44
xlv.	1-3	160, 232		7-10	90
xlvi.	5	39		26	97
xlvi.	2	189		28	259
	1	229		31	256
	3	231		35	54
	3 f.	160, 229		56	43, 92, 94
	4	325	vii.	13	313
li.	3	160		27 f.	137
	4	256		28 f.	87, 145
lii.	2-4	159, 233		30	87
	11	159		32	313, 315
	14	164		32-35	321
liii.	3	232		33	39, 42, 87
liiii.	5 f.	189		34	259
	6	88		35	325
lix.	2	251		36	321
lx.	5	159		38	324
lxi.	2	189		42 f.	325
	2 f.	319		48	205
	4 f.	232		60	108
lxii.	2	326		72	191
lxiii.	4	232		77	260
lxiv.	5	49		80	315
lxv.	6	88		80-87	316
	10	318		87	321
lxvi.	2	43		88	188
	3	46		90-98	314
	5	39		92	205
	6	229		94	313
	7	88		97	74
	8	328		98	39, 321
lxvii.	2	141		101	314
				102-115	49
				114	187
				121	315
				123	322
				127 f.	192
				132-140	44
			viii.	1, 3	108
				20 f.	48
				22	44
				31-36	261
				39	315
				47	43
				52	198, 322
				53	205
			ix.	7	260
				11 f.	325
				26 f.	54
I ESDRAS.					
iv.	58-60	52			
ESTHER, THE ADDITIONS TO.					
xi.	10	54			
xiii.	12-17	54			
xiv.	3-19	54			
	15	244			
xvi.	4	43			
4 EZRA.					
iii.	4 f.	44			
	6 f.	201			
	14	43			
	21	203			
	21 f.	205			

4 EZRA.		PAGE	JUBILEES, THE BOOK OF.		PAGE
xi.	4	259	x.	5	197
	46	87		8	216
xii.	32	145, 228		9, 11	45
	32 f.	136	xi.	11	216
	34	87		17	52
xiii.	5, 9, 12	144	xii.	20	52
	12	93	xiii.	8-16	52
	13	92		25-7	249
	23	260	xv.	11, 14	243
	26	145		17	170
	28	43, 136		25	244
	38	93		27	244
xiv.	9	141		31	91, 192
	10, 13-17	90		32	197
				33	244
ISAIAH, THE MARTYRDOM OF.				34	225, 244, 344
i.	7	255	xvi.	1	47
ii.	4	158		14	244
v.	10	164		26	244
	13	121	xvii.	16	41
	14	219, 255	xviii.	12	41
JEREMY, THE EPISTLE OF.				16	91
6 f.	54	xix.	4	229
7		47		28	197
			xx.	2	230
JUBILEES, THE BOOK OF.				3	243
i.	10	225		4	234
	12	76		9	40, 228
	15	96, 232		10	91
	21	232, 254	xxi.	4	40
	23	96, 254		16	232
	24 f.	36, 42		19 f.	236
	28	36	xxii.	7-9	52
	29	97		10	254
ii.	1	239, 254		14	251
	2	48		22	316
	17 f.	240		28-30	52
	26	240	xxiii.	11	86
	27	291		13	138
	29 f.	240		18	138
iii.	6 f.	234		21	235
	15	198		22	138
iv.	15	195		27	86
	22	195		29	139
	26	97		30	86, 317, 323
	31	236	xxiv.	11	317
v.	1-3	195		28	225
	12	97		33	237
	17 f.	250	xxv.	14	86
vi.	8	236		20	52
	14	250		21	139
vii.	20	230, 235	xxx.	6	237
	21	196		16	251
	22	196		21	225
	27	196	xxx.	13	36
	29	316		18	91
	36	36	xxx.	18 f.	133, 134
viii.	3	196	xxxii.	4-15	249
x.	2	197, 216		15	249
	3	188, 197, 216		21	254
	3-7	52	xxxvi.	25	77, 254
				4	230

JUBILEES, THE BOOK OF.		PAGE
xl.	5	255
	9	139
xli.	8	233
	26	234
xlvi.	14	236
l.	5	97
	8, 12 f.	241

JUDITH.		PAGE
iv.	9	53
	9 f.	256
	13	53, 256
vi.	18 f.	53
	19	36
vii.	19	53
viii.	5 f.	243
	27	40
	29	232
ix.	53
x.	13	185
xi.	11 ff.	252
	17	53
xii.	2	252
	6	53
	7	252
	8	53
xiii.	4	53
	7	53, 237
xiv.	10	94
xv.	10	237
xvi.	16	232
	17	328

1 MACCABEES.		PAGE
i.	15	244
	43	242
	45	243
	48	244
ii.	21	53
	32-38	242
	40 f.	242
	46	244
iii.	7	237
	46 f.	53, 256
	50	53
	60	79
iv.	10	53
	28	165
	29	165
	30	53
	46	139
v.	33	54
vi.	49, 53	242
vii.	40	53
ix.	37-42	164
	43-49	242
x.	31	244
	34	242, 243
xi.	71	54
xiv.	4-15	134
	41	139
xvi.	3	53

2 MACCABEES.		PAGE
i.	2-5	54
	3 f.	255
	17	237
	24-29	54
	28	237
ii.	18	173
	21	225
	22	263
	37	230
	50	225
iii.	15, 18, 20 f.	54
iv.	6	244
	11	263
v.	19	290
	25 f.	242
vi.	5	242, 243
	11	242
	19	230
vii.	2	230
	9	319
	11	319
	14	319
	17	40, 98
	22 f.	186
	23	320
	29	320
	35 f.	98
	37 f.	40
	38	163
viii.	2	53
	26-28	242
	29	53
x.	16	54
	26	54
xi.	6	51, 53
xii.	39-45	326
	42-45	256
xiii.	4	36
	10	53
	12	256
	14, 17	54
xiv.	15	89
	46	186, 320
xv.	1-3	242
	9	263
	14	49
	15 f.	334
	18	153
	23	51
	27	54

3 MACCABEES.		PAGE
ii.	1-20	54
	4	195
	10	43
	13	36
iii.	5	228
	21	37
	22	202
v.	7	37, 268
	51	163
vi.	1-15	54

3 MACCABEES.		PAGE
vi. 3	.	44
4	.	37
8	.	37
9	.	43
10	.	250
28	.	36
vii. 6	.	37
4 MACCABEES.		PAGE
i. 6	.	193
15	.	193
16-18	.	50
17	.	193
18	.	233
32	.	188, 193
33 f.	.	245
35	.	193
ii. 2	.	78
4	.	194
9	.	193
10-12	.	153
10-14	.	194
18	.	194
21	.	193
21 f.	.	188
22	.	193
23	.	102
iii. 2	.	193, 194
5	.	194
6	.	290
iv. 12	.	40
25	.	244
v. 3	.	245
14	.	245
19 f.	.	245
25	.	245
33	.	263
37	.	323
vi. 23	.	154
29	.	163
ix. 1 f., 4	.	230
6 f.	.	154
22	.	323
22 f.	.	164
24	.	237
29 f.	.	154
x. 4	.	164
11	.	324
15	.	324
xi. 20	.	154
22 f.	.	237
xiii. 2	.	245
12	.	154
13 f.	.	164
15	.	324
17	.	323
xv. 3	.	324
10	.	233
24	.	260
xvi. 25	.	323
xvii. 2	.	260
5	.	324

4 MACCABEES.		PAGE
xvii. 7	.	154
9	.	263
18	.	324
22	.	103
xviii. 3	.	154
7	.	199
22	.	179, 189, 255
23	.	188, 323, 324

MANASSES, PRAYER OF.

7-9	.	254
8	.	54, 212, 217
8 f.	.	203
12 f.	.	254
13	.	54

MOSES, THE APOCALYPSE OF.

iii. 2	.	49
vii. 1	.	200
x. 3	.	189
xii. 1	.	189
xiii. 2	.	49
xiv 1 f.	.	201
xvii. 1	.	199
xix. 1, 3	.	199
xxv. 3	.	199
xxxii. 1 f.	.	200
xxxv. 2 f.	.	37
4	.	37
xliii. 1, 3	.	43

MOSES, THE ASSUMPTION OF.

i. 12 f.	.	93
14	.	48, 142, 225
17	.	171
18	.	97
iii. 14	.	270
iv. 1	.	54
2	.	36
8	.	140, 259
vii. 6 f.	.	228
viii. 1	.	174
2	.	244
ix. 4 f.	.	259
6	.	230
x. 1.	.	93, 139
5 f.	.	138, 174
6	.	31
7.	.	93, 142
7-10.	.	88
8.	.	137, 161
9.	.	318
9 f.	.	142
10	.	237, 327
xi. 9-12.	.	334
17.	.	48, 54, 334
xii. 4 f.	.	45
6.	.	48, 142, 334
7 f.	.	259
10	.	192, 263
10 f.	.	259
13	.	46

SIBYLLINE ORACLES. THE.		PAGE
iii	101	44
	189	235
	194 f.	141
	234-236	191
	234-245	228
	235 f.	235
	246	191
	260	40
	276	44
	278	37
	286	132
	296	36
	373-376	139
	478	36
	548 f.	39
	550	37
	593 f.	235
	594	234
	597-600	191
	601-603	41
	616 f.	41
	630	228
	652	132
	653	138
	655 f.	130
	662	85, 233
	663-673	138
	670 f.	85
	702	37
	703	95
	705 f.	38
	711	42
	726	37
	744	95
	750	95
	756 f.	86
	764	234
	766 f.	86
	769	325
	772-776	91
iv	10-12	38
	51	36
	162 f.	91
	165	96
	166	55
	166-170	91
	183	324
	187-190	86
SIRACH.		
i	9 f.	191
	10	50
	11	246
	14	246
	16	246
	18	246
	22	233
	23	229
	27	229, 246
	28 f.	232
ii	2	299
	11	44

SIRACH.		PAGE
ii	15 f.	247
	18	44
iii	3	257
	3-15	259
	7 f.	234
	10-12	234
	14	234, 257
	16	234
	17 f.	233
	30	256
iv	1-10	228
	10	37, 119
	11	50, 76
	14	43
	17, 19	75
	26	253
v	1-3	236
	4	44
	5 f.	252, 259
	8	235
vi	9 f., 12	264
	22	50
	25 f.	152
	25-28	50
	28	152
	32	229
	37	239, 247
vii	1	228
	5	40
	8 f.	252
	14	78
	15, 22, 26	108
	27 f.	234
viii	2	236
ix	5	273
	9	233
	11	41
	15	50
x	4 f.	45
	6 f.	232
	13	40
	19	246
	20, 22, 24	248
	28	233
xi	12	46
	19	236, 279
	26	51
xii	6	43
xiii	18, 20, 22	236
	24	235
xiv	3	233
	3-19	236
	8	233
	16	311
	17	201
xv	1	246
	3	153
	11	204
	14	203
xvi	7	195
	14	259
	17	188

SIRACH.		PAGE	SIRACH.		PAGE
xvii.	2-4	189	xxxiv.	8	246
	7	50, 190		14	248
	11, 14	190		18 f.	78, 251
	22	257		25	251
	24	253		26	259
	25 f.	253	xxxv.	1	251
	27 f.	311		2	78
	29	253		2 f.	252
	31	187, 204		4 f.	251
xviii.	1	44		8-10	233
	2	41		12	40, 251
	11-14	44		16	256
	16-18	257		17	52
	21	253		18	68
xix.	16	232		19	341
	20	246, 263	xxxvii.	1 f.	201
	23 f.	229		1-4	264
	26 f.	232		15	52, 256
xx.	27	229		16	50
xxi.	1	252, 256	xxxviii.	9 f.	40
	6	248		9-14	52
	10	311		23	185
	11	204, 246		24	50
xxii.	11	311	xl.	11	201
	13	114		26 f.	246
xxiii.	2	231	xli.	3	201
	3-6	52		4	311
	5 f.	254	xliii.	2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13,	
	18	233		15, 23, 26, 27	35
	19 f.	44	xliv.	25	133
	21-24	233	xlvi.	11	133
	23	36, 228		12	258
xxiv.	8	50		14	153
	9	171		22	132
	16	76	xliv.	16	198
	21	153	l.	19	268
	23	246		29	246
	23-27	153	li.	1	37
	30 f., 33	153		10	37
xxv.	7	231		12	133
	11	246		23	152
	24	200		26	75
xxvi.	14	75		26 f.	152
	25	114	SOLOMON, THE PSALMS OF.		
	29	281	ii.	36	36
xxvii.	1	181		37	248
	6	232		40	54
	24	43	iii.	7-9	188
	30	238		9	255
xxviii.	2	78, 231		10.	257
	4	78		16.	318, 324
	7	238	iv.	2 f.	292
xxix.	8 ff.	257		4 f.	234
	22	235		16-22.	238
xxx.	6	231		26.	248
	20	273	v.	2	235
xxxi.	1	37, 235		6, 11, 15, 16	279
	8	236		18.	210
	13	233		18-20.	235
xxxii.	16	248		20	210
xxxiii.	1	248		21	279
	2 f.	247			

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA 367

SOLOMON, THE PSALMS OF.		PAGE
vi.	7 f.	232
	8	54
	9	248
viii.	13	245
ix.	7	193
	12 f., 15	254
x.	1 f.	41
	4	248
	5	226
	7	235
xii.	6	229
xiii.	9	41
xiv.	5	232
	6	317
	7	318
xv.	2	235
	11	317
	15	318
xvi.	2	163, 317
	7	255, 273
	10-12	232
	12	210
xvii.	4	85, 91
	5	133
	17	226
	23	72, 130, 133
	24 f.	135
	27	136
	28	130
	28 f.	140
	29	85
	29 f.	42
	30	37, 140, 149
	31	131
	31 f.	92
	32	130, 140
	34	92, 93
	34 f.	130
	35	131
	36	85, 129
	37	139
	38	130, 140
	38 f.	136
	41	131, 136, 203
	42	131, 132, 139
	44	140
	44-46	140
	45	260
	46	228
	47	134
	48 f.	140
	50	86
xviii.	3	54, 235
	4	42
	6	129
	8	129, 131
	11	36
SOLOMON, THE WISDOM OF.		
i.	1	233, 248
	3	44
	4	187

SOLOMON, THE WISDOM OF.		PAGE
i.	4 f.	59
	5	219
	6	43, 344
	6 f.	50
	9	51
	12 f.	201
	14	187
	15	201
ii.	13	37
	16, 18	37
	22 f.	190
	23	322
	23 f.	201
	24	217
iii.	2-4	322
	4 f.	41
	5	322
	7	74, 322
	8	323
	9	42
	12 f.	188
	14	273
	18	323
	19	323
iv.	1	188
	7	322
	10	43
	18	43
	19	323
	20	239
	20-v. 2	323
v.	1 ff.	51
	5	37
	7	239
	15	322
	16	39, 323
vi.	4	228
	7	43
	9, 11	93
	17 f.	247
	18 f.	322
	23	233
vii.	1	201
	7	54
	17	247
	23	50
	27	50, 247
	28	43
viii.	1	50
	7	233, 247
	8	191
	13	322
	17	50, 322
	19	202
	19 f.	255
	20	187
	21	54
	22 f.	50
ix.		54
	2 f.	190
	4	50
	10	85

SOLOMON, THE WISDOM OF.		PAGE
ix. 11	.	50
15	.	186
17	.	50
19 f.	.	188
x. 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 15	.	50
xi. 6	.	236
17	.	44
20	.	279
23	.	253
24-xii. 2	.	43
xii. 1	.	50, 187
4	.	43
10	.	202, 253
19	.	230
19 f.	.	253
xiv. 3	.	37
6	.	195
xv. 1	.	44
3	.	50
8	.	186, 210
11	.	186
16	.	210
xvi. 13	.	163
17	.	187
24	.	187
26	.	37, 232
27, 28	.	54
xvii. 4	.	191
11-13	.	191
21	.	323
xviii. 4	.	192, 226
13	.	37
15	.	50

SUSANNA.

7, 12	.	233
14, 28	.	275
31 f.	.	233
32, 34	.	233
42 f.	.	54
55, 59	.	74

TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS, THE.

ASHER.

i. 2-5	.	204
6	.	204, 218
8	.	204
8 f.	.	218
9	.	204
ii. 3	.	237
6 f.	.	257
8	.	256
iii. 2	.	232
iv. 1	.	233
2 f.	.	237
3	.	256
v. 1	.	234
3	.	233
4	.	233

ASHER.

	PAGE
vi. 1	233
2	232
6	254
vii. 3	91
7	48

BENJAMIN.

iii. 3 f.	230, 247
6	256
8	41
v. 4	229
vi. 1	48, 205, 254
3	234
4	205, 220, 287
7	233
viii. 2	219, 234, 255
3	292
ix. 2	91
x. 1	53, 256
5	91
7 f.	320
xi. 1	85

DAN.

i.	228
ii. 2	233
iii. 1 f.	233
6	217
v. 1	226
3	230, 247
4	254
5	197
10	130, 133, 136
vi. 1	247
2	48
4	96
5	48, 254

GAD.

iii. 1 f.	233
iv. 6	237
7	231
v. 1	233
3	191
3-7	270
5	191, 232
6-8	253
9	53, 256
vi. 1	230
2	233
3 f., 6 f.	230
vii. 1	53
5	230
6	233
7	230

ISSACHAR.

i. 1	43
4	233
7 f.	233
iv. 1, 6	233
v. 1	233
2	230

	ISSACHAR.	PAGE
v. 7	.	133
8	.	233
vi. 1	.	233
vii. 2	.	234
6	.	230
JOSEPH.		
i. 4	.	43
5 f.	.	173
ii. 2	.	255, 256
6	.	205
7	.	229
iii. 3	.	53, 78
5	.	256
iv. 8	.	53
vi. 6	.	253
vii. 4	.	53
viii. 1	.	53
ix. 1 f.	.	234
2	.	43, 139
x. 1	.	229
2	.	43, 233, 256
xi. 1	.	247, 248
2	.	43
xvii. 2	.	230
3	.	232
xviii. 2	.	229
xix. 8	.	134, 135
12	.	86
JUDAH.		
iii. 10	.	254
xiii. 8	.	205
xv. 4	.	255
5	.	254
xvi. 1	.	235
2 f.	.	246
xviii. 3	.	205, 225
xix. 2	.	256
xx. 1	.	220
1 f.	.	191
5	.	191, 220
xxiii. 5	.	96
xxiv. 1	.	131, 132, 134
2	.	37, 134, 139
3	.	140
6	.	131
xxv. 4	.	320
LEVI.		
ii. 11	.	91, 133
iii. 5	.	48, 251
iv. 2	.	37
4	.	91
v. 1	.	130
6 f.	.	48
viii. 14	.	133
15	.	134
ix. 7-14	.	252
11	.	252
xiii. 1	.	248
3 f.	.	154

	LEVI.	PAGE
xiii. 7	.	41, 191, 246
xiv. 4	.	192, 226
xv. 4	.	303
xvii. 2	.	37
xviii. 2	.	325
3	.	139, 192
4	.	138
6	.	37, 134
6 f.	.	150
7	.	131
8	.	140
9	.	85, 91, 97, 255
10	.	325
10-12	.	197
12	.	197, 216
13	.	150
15	.	139
xix. 1	.	193

	NAPHTALI.	PAGE
ii. 2-4	.	187
5	.	190, 203
6	.	186
9	.	232
iii. 1, 3-5	.	197
4 f.	.	216
iv. 5	.	131
vi. 8	.	53
viii. 2	.	133
3	.	91
4	.	43
5	.	257
6	.	43, 218
10	.	43
x. (= App. I in A.P.), 8	.	186
9	.	205

	REUBEN.	PAGE
i. 7	.	53, 256
10	.	255
ii. 1 f.	.	218
iii. 8	.	191
15	.	254
iv. 1	.	233, 248
2 f.	.	191
4	.	256
9, 11	.	205
v. 3	.	254
6 f.	.	195
vi. 1	.	234
7 f.	.	133
8	.	134
8 ff.	.	139
9	.	230
11	.	130, 133

	SIMEON.	PAGE
ii. 8	.	47
13	.	253, 255
iii. 1 f.	.	233
4	.	230, 248, 256
5 f.	.	53

SIMEON.		PAGE	ZADOKITE WORK, THE FRAGMENTS OF A.		PAGE	
iii.	6	230	i.	17	245	
iv.	4	219	ii.	3	253	
	7	230		10	87, 130, 131	
v.	2	232	iii.	2	195, 234	
vi.	4	138		4	195	
	6	197, 216	iv.	1	195	
vii.	2	133		2	255	
				2-3	203	
				9	195	
				v.	6	87
				vi.	10 f.	235
				vii.	1 f.	234
					8	245
					12	226
				viii.	2	130
					5 f.	226
					12	92, 235, 244
					14	245
					15	162, 242
					16	92
					17	230
					21	226
				ix.	7	92
					10	133, 136
					15	162, 253
					17	235
					28	92, 162
					29	133
					37	92, 162, 260
					47	260
					54	260
				x.	2 f.	238
					16	253
				xii.	1 f.	245, 252
				xiii.	2-II	242
					12	245
					13-27	242
					23	289
				xiv.	6	242, 291
				xv.	1	245
					4	133
				xvi.	1 f.	245
					7	244
					12-16	245
				xviii.	1-10	257
				xx.	8	226
					9, II, 14	97
				xx.	2	97

INDEX III

PASSAGES FROM THE GOSPELS

	MATTHEW.	PAGE		MATTHEW.	PAGE
iii.	2	102, 299	v.	35	59
	9	303		37	218, 266
	14	149		38	169, 282
	15	150, 266		39-41	160, 283
	16 f.	150		42	279, 303
	17	150, 164		43	169, 283
iv.	3	119		44	79
	4	119		44 f.	267
	5-7	63		45	61, 68, 72, 117, 167, 212
	8	157		46	65
	9	157		46 f.	111, 267
	10	216		48	61, 69
	11	75	vi.	1	61, 65
	15	338		2	302, 332
	17	102, 299		4	61, 65, 73, 302
	19	118		5	272, 302, 332
v.	3-12	105		6	61, 65, 73, 78, 302
	3	207		7	61, 78, 111
	4	339		8	61, 75, 79
	5	340		9	62, 154
	6	75, 264, 266, 339		9 f.	60
	7	151, 159, 270, 339		10	105
	8	39, 207, 217, 339		11	61, 78, 280
	9	159, 339		12	78, 270
	10	154, 266		13	75, 219
	11	154		14	61, 78
	12	58, 266, 339		14 f.	270
	13	166		15	61
	16	61, 267		16	302, 332
	17	262		17	302
	18	263		17 f.	78
	19	265		18	61, 65, 73, 302
	20	105, 268		19	280
	21	169		20	58, 210, 303
	22	159, 271, 272, 348		21	207, 281
	23 f.	160		22	272
	25 f.	159, 346		22 f.	208
	27	169, 180		24	58, 282
	28	207, 273		25	210
	28-32	347		26	61, 72, 210, 279
	29	273		27	279
	29-30	347		28	72
	30	214		29	279
	32	217, 274		30	72, 273, 279
	33	169		31	279
	34	59		32	61, 72, 79, 111, 279
	34 f.	72		33	266, 279

MATTHEW.		PAGE	MATTHEW.		PAGE
vi.	33 f.	119	x.	33	172
	34	210, 279		34	164, 219
vii.	4	271		35 f.	118
	6	113		37	120, 153
	7-11	301		38	122, 164
	8	79		39	75, 154, 173
	11	61, 79, 217		41	65, 299
	12	262, 263		42	65, 149, 209
	13	214, 348	xi.	5	293
	13 f.	218		6	176
	14	108		11	105, 269
	17 f.	219		11 f.	65
	19	348		12	104, 214
	21	61, 105		13	263, 267, 268
	22	154		16-19	110
	22 f.	179, 343		19	76, 176
	23	72, 266		21	299
	24	267		22	66, 342
	28 f.	155		24	66, 216, 342
viii.	4	265		25	60, 78, 300
	11	116, 333		25 f.	61, 71
	11 f.	336		27	57
	12	109, 337		28 f.	107
	16	116		28-30	152
	20	67, 119, 176		29	207, 208, 293
	22	119, 278	xii.	3 f.	290
	26	287		5	288
ix.	2	166		5 f.	263
	4	207, 218		6 f.	290
	6	166, 176		7	169, 268
	9	295		8	176, 290
	11	296		11	288
	12	110, 213		11 f.	211
	12 f.	151		12	291
	13	169, 299		13	295
	15	164, 209		14	291
	16 f.	267		23	156
	24	334		24	158
	27	156		24-26	216
	37	109, 278		28	59, 104, 219
	38	79		29	158
x.	5	109		30	214
	6	348		31	59, 344
	7	102		32	59, 65, 76, 176, 220
	8	104, 293		33	76, 213
	8 ff.	280		34	207, 213, 342
	10	280		35	213
	11-13	166		36	65
	15	66, 216, 342		36 f.	342, 344
	16	267, 272		39 f.	176
	17 f.	173		41	111
	18	117, 154		41 f.	343
	20	76, 219		42	154
	21	164		43	293
	22	154, 270		44	218
	23	106, 172		45	218
	24 f.	121		46	291
	26 f.	118		48 ff.	277
	28	71, 164, 207, 293, 348		49	291
	29-31	73		50	153
	31	211	xiii.	3-9	66
	32 f.	59, 179		4	110, 216

PASSAGES FROM THE GOSPELS

878

MATTHEW.		PAGE
xiii.	8	110, 219
	11	114, 122
	12	301
	16 f.	103
	19	77, 208, 213, 216
	21	269
	21 f.	213
	22	282
	23	219
	24	69, 219
	24-30	65, 213
	27	219
	30	105
	32	112
	35	122
	37	176, 179
	37 f.	219
	38	117
	40	348
	41	179, 266
	41 f.	348
	42	348
	43	60, 74, 338, 339
	44	122
	45	69
	47-50	65, 213
	49	74
	49 f.	348
	50	348
	52	169
	57	168
xiv.	2	340
	4	168
	16	209
	27	287
xv.	2	292
	3	276
	4-6	119
	4-7	277
	6	294
	11	292, 342
	16	342
	17	292
	18	207
	18 f.	273
	18-20	293
	19	218
	21-28	114
	22	156
	23-28	115
	24	348
xvi.	4	111
	6	160
	13, 15	176
	16	148
	17	208
	18	163
	18 f.	101
	19	58, 176
	21	177, 338
	23	68, 216
	24	122, 298

MATTHEW.		PAGE
xvi.	25	75, 154, 173, 210
	25 f.	210
	26	68, 75, 280
	27	60, 68, 74, 172, 341, 346
	28	106, 179
xvii.	2	74
	3	285, 334
	5	152
	9	177, 334, 338
	11	177, 340
	12	340
	20	305
	21	78
	22 f.	177
	23	338
	24	120
	25	59
	27	265
xviii.	1 f.	120
	3	105, 299
	4 f.	120
	5	121, 154
	6	347
	6 f.	350
	7-10	347
	8	214
	10	75, 211
	11	348
	12	211
	14	152, 211, 347
	15	270, 271
	17	113
	18	58, 176
	20	154, 286, 287
	21	271
	21 f.	270
	23	59, 69
	24	302
	27	69, 270
	29	270
	30	284
	34	346
	35	69, 151, 208, 270
xix.	3	274
	4 ff.	209
	5	216
	6	58
	7	274
	8	275
	12	154, 209
	14	105, 212
	16 f.	268
	17	264
	18 f.	262
	19	276
	20 f.	268
	21	58, 209, 303
	23 f.	280
	25 f.	71
	26	213, 300
	28	59, 179
	29	105, 120, 154, 338

	MATTHEW.	PAGE
xix.	30	343
xx.	1-15	69
	16	343
	18 f.	177
	19	338
	22 f.	121
	23	151
	25 f.	158
	26 f.	121
	28	161, 163, 177, 210
	30 f.	156
xxi.	9	156
	11	168
	13	63
	15	156
	21	305
	22	79, 305
	24-27	167
	25	58
	30	299
	31	104
	32	266, 299
	34-37	155
	38	116
	43	174
xxii.	2	59
	5	108, 148
	9	112
	13	74, 336, 337
	14	108
	21	161
	24	284
	29	59, 71, 287, 331, 338
	30	58, 73, 338
	31	284
	31 f.	331
	32	58, 287, 333, 334
	37	58, 208, 262
	40	263
	42	148
	42-45	156
	43	59
	44	58
xxiii.	2 f.	265
	3	292
	4	265
	5-7	302
	8	148
	10	148
	11	121
	13	104, 272
	13 ff.	65
	14	209
	15	113, 272, 291, 347
	16-22	266
	22	59
	23	226, 268, 296
	25	266
	25-28	292
	27	217
	28	267
	29-32	285

	MATTHEW.	PAGE
xxiii.	33	347
	34	76
	36	174
	37	155, 214
	37 f.	63
	39	346
xxiv.	5	154
	6	173
	9	154
	12	267
	13	270
	14	117
	15	173
	16	174
	20	78, 288
	21	174
	22	58, 174
	23 f.	148
	24	76
	27	172
	29	174
	30	58, 59, 171
	31	73, 74
	32-35	174
	33	106
	36	58, 61, 72, 74, 174
	37	172
	39	172
	44	172
	45	267
	48	208
	51	74, 336, 337
xxv.	1-13	214
	2, 4, 8	267
	10	347
	13	105
	20-23	66
	21, 23	335
	26	66
	29	213
	30	59, 336, 337
	31	59, 74, 179
	32 f.	65
	34	59, 60, 171, 343
	34-36	173
	37	341
	40	59
	41	72, 179, 348, 349
	41-43	173
	42 f.	295
	44	341
	46	338
	48	337
xxvi.	2	177
	10 f.	282
	11	209
	18	205
	23	264
	24	177, 264, 350
	26	209
	27	121
	28	62, 166

PASSAGES FROM THE GOSPELS

375

MATTHEW.		PAGE
xxvi.	29	60, 180
	32	111, 338
	38	208, 264
	39	61, 80, 121
	41	78, 207, 208
	42	61, 80, 121
	45	177
	50	264
	52	161
	53	74, 161
	54	162
	55	63
	56	162
	61	62
	63	148, 173
	64	58, 171, 287
xxvii.	40	62
	46	80
xxviii.	47, 49	334
	19	61, 117, 291
	20	288

MARK.		PAGE
i.	10 f.	150
	11	150, 164
	13	75
	15	102, 299
	17	118
	21	288
	27	155
	32	116
	38	167
	39	107
	44	265
ii.	5	67, 166
	10	166, 176
	14	295
	16	295
	17	110, 151, 217, 299
	19	209
	20	164
	21 f.	267
	25 f.	290
	27	211, 290
	28	176, 290
iii.	4	289
	5	295
	6	291
	21	290
	22	158
	22 f.	215
	27	158
	28	176
	29	59, 76, 220, 344
	31	291
	33	291
	33 ff.	277
	35	153
iv.	2-9	66
	3	110
	4	216

MARK.		PAGE
iv.	8	110, 219
	11	114, 122
	14	77
	15	213, 216
	17	213, 269
	19	213, 282
	20	219
	21 f.	118
	24 f.	301
	25	213
	26-28	122
	28	213
	32	112
	40	287
v.	19	58
	31	114
	39	334
vi.	2	288
	4	168
	8	280
	14	340
	15	168
	30	287
	37	209
vii.	5	292
	7	176
	9	276
	10-13	119, 277
	13	294
	15, 18	292
	20-23	293
	21	207, 218
	21 f.	273
	22	272, 278
	24-30	114
	27-29	115
viii.	2 f.	209
	15	160
	17	207
	27	176, 334
	29	148, 176
	31	177, 338
	33	68
	34	122, 298
	35	75, 154, 173, 210
	35 f.	210, 332
	36	67, 280
	36 f.	75
	38	60, 74, 172, 346
ix.	1	59, 179
	4	285
	5	334
	7	152
	9	177, 334, 338
	12	340
	12 f.	177
	13	340
	23	300
	29	78
	31	177
	33	120
	33 f.	177

PASSAGES FROM THE GOSPELS

877

LUKE.		PAGE	LUKE.		PAGE
iv.	44	107	viii.	15	207, 219, 270
v.	10	118		16 f.	118
	14	265		18	301
	20	166		19	291
	22	208		21	77, 153, 277
	24	166, 176		25	287
	27	295		39	58
	30	296		45	114
	31	110, 213		52	334
	31 f.	151	ix.	3	280
	32	217, 299		7	340
	34	209		8	168, 340
	35	164		13	61, 209
	36 ff.	267		18	176
	39	264		20	148, 176
vi.	3 f.	290		21	177
	4	288		23	122, 298
	5	176, 290		24	154, 173, 210
	9	211, 289		24 f.	210
	10	295		25	68, 280
	11	291		26	60, 61, 74, 172, 346
	20	58, 278		27	179
	20-23	105		30	334
	22 f.	65		30 f.	285
	23	58		32	299
	24	337		35	152
	24 f.	280		36	177, 334, 338
	25	337		44	177
	27 f.	267		48	120, 121, 151, 154
	28	79		51	168
	29	160, 283		54	166, 169
	30	279, 303		54 f.	111
	31	262		58	67, 119
	32 f.	111, 267		59	176
	34	303		60	119, 278
	35	57, 65, 267, 268, 279, 303		62	119
	36	268	x.	2	79
	40	269		4	280
	43 f.	219		5 f.	166
	45	207, 213, 218, 342		12	66, 216, 342
	46	179		13	299
	47 f.	267		14	66, 342
vii.	16	168		18	72, 215
	22	293		19 f.	216
	23	176		20	335
	28	105, 269		21	60, 62, 300
	31-34	110		22	57
	34	176		23 f.	103
	35	76		26	262
	37 f.	282		27	58, 208, 262
	39	296		28	264
	42	284		30-32	295
	47	212, 302, 303		33	295
viii.	4-8	66		33 ff.	111
	5	110, 216		36 f.	271
	8	110, 219		41 f.	279
	10	114, 122		42	212
	11	77	xi.	2	60, 62, 105, 154
	12	213, 216		3	78, 280
	13	269		4	78
	13 f.	213		5 f.	79
	14	282		9-13	301

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

	LUKE.	PAGE
x. 10		79
13	59, 61, 79,	217
15		158
20	104,	219
21 f.		158
23		214
24		293
26		218
27		106
28		77
29		219
29 f.		176
31		154
31 f.		343
32	111,	176
34	208,	172
36		72
39-41		292
42	292,	296
44	217,	292
46		265
47 f.		285
49		76
52		104
xii. 2 f.		279
4		207
4 f.		164
5	71, 293,	348
6 f.		73
7		211
8 f.		179
8, 9		59
10	59, 76, 176, 220,	344
12	59,	219
15		278
19		332
19 f.	210,	279
20		332
21	210,	280
22 f.		210
24	72, 210,	279
25		279
27 f.	72,	279
30	60, 72, 79,	279
31	266,	279
33	58, 280,	303
34	207,	281
35-39		267
40		172
42		267
45		208
46	74,	336
47		337
47 f.		66
48		337
49		164
50		162
51		164
52 f.		118
58 f.	160,	346
xiii. 2-5		67
3		299

	LUKE.	PAGE
xiii. 8		152
12		295
15 f.		290
16		116
19		112
21		122
23		108
24	105, 108,	214
25		347
26 f.		343
27		72, 105
28	336,	337
28 f.		333
29		116
30		343
33		168
34	155,	214
xiv. 4		295
5		289
6		289
13		209
14	65, 303,	338
15		108
16-21		108
21		110
23		112
26	153, 278,	283
27	122, 164,	269
28-30		165
31 f.		165
34 f.		165
34 ff.		166
xv. 3-7		214
4	211, 275,	348
6		348
7	58, 73, 75, 151,	299
10	71, 73, 75, 151,	299
13		284
13 f.		278
17-20		212
17		299
18		58
20		152
21	58,	212
23		212
24		299
27, 32		269, 271
xvi. 8		267
9	281, 303,	334
10		281
11		281
12		281
13	58,	282
15	208,	282
16	104, 214,	263
17		263
18		275
19		67
19 f.		280
20	67,	278
20 f.		209
22	74, 278,	333

PASSAGES FROM THE GOSPELS

379

	LUKE.	PAGE		LUKE.	PAGE
xvi.	23	336	xix.	26	213
	23 f.	335		38	58, 156
	24	336		42	165
	24-26	333		43 f.	165
	25	333, 334, 337		44	165
	26	65		46	63
	27	334	xx.	3-8	167
	27 f.	335		4	58
	28 f.	340		10-13	155
	29	266		14	116
	30	299		25	161
	31	266, 299		28	284
xvii.	1 f.	350		35	73, 338
	3	270		36	73, 338, 339
	4	271		37	58, 284, 287, 333
	6	305		37 f.	331
	7-10	305		38	334
	10	121		41	148
	14	265		41-44	156
	16 ff.	111		42	58
	18	111		46	302
	20 f.	103		47	209, 266
	21	103	xxi.	3	278
	22	172		8	148, 154
	23	154		9	173
	24	172		12	154
	25, 26	179		12 f.	117, 173
	26 f.	172		14	208
	30	172		15	76, 219
	33	75, 173		16	164
	37	161		18	73
xviii.	2	173		19	270
	3	79		20	173
	7	270		21	174
	7 f.	68		23	174
	8	172		25	31
	9-14	217		25 f.	174
	10	63		27	59, 171
	11	272		29-33	174
	11 f.	303		31	106
	12	296		34	207, 217
	13	212, 299		36	78, 172
	14	272, 299	xxii.	8, 10 f.	265
	16	105, 212		13	162
	17	105		16	180
	18 f.	268		17	121
	20	262, 276		18	180
	22	58, 209, 303		19	209
	24 f.	280		20	162
	26 f.	71		21	264
	27	213, 300		22	177, 350
	29	120, 154		25 f.	158
	29 f.	154		26 f.	121
	30	105, 338		27	163
	31 ff.	177		29	179
	38 f.	156		31	216
xix.	5	295		32	78, 300
	8	281		35	280
	9	110, 212, 281		36	164
	10	176, 265, 269		37	178
	12-19	66		40	78
	22	342		42	61, 80, 121

	LUKE.	PAGE
xxii.	46	78
	48	176
	53	63
	66	173
	67	148
	69	58, 171
	70	287
xxiii.	28-31	174
	34	61, 79, 346
	43	170, 212, 216, 333
	46	61, 80
xxiv.	7	177
	19	168
	21	162
	25	207
	38	208
	47	166

	JOHN.	PAGE
i.	18	38, 57
	32-34	150
	33 f.	150
	47	77
	50	77
	51	77, 170, 175
ii.	4, 5	277
	16	62
	19	62
	24	156
iii.	3	71, 299
	6	208
	8	71, 301
	13	170, 175
	14	178
iv.	1-42	111
	14	153
	18	275
	19	168, 177
	19-23	64
	23	207
	24	39, 339
	25 f.	177
	44	168
v.	8	295
	14	67, 276
	17	71, 290
	19	214
	22	341
	24	281
	26	214, 281
	27	341
	28 f.	340
	29	338, 342
	30	214, 294
	31 f.	286
	34	65
	36 f.	286
	38	294
	41	220
	42	294
	43	154, 214, 286

	JOHN.	PAGE
v.	44	220
	45 ff.	285
vi.	5	209
	20	287
	26 f.	279
	27	178
	31	285
	32	285
	33	285
	35	153, 285
	38	153, 214, 294
	40	287, 338
	44	287, 300, 338
	53	178
	54	287, 338
	62	170
	63	178, 208
	68	178
	69	148
vii.	16	294
	17	214
	19	262, 284
	22	285
	23	284, 288
	24	266
	28	214, 287, 294
	30	277
	37 f.	153
	40	168
	42	156
	49	179
	52	168
	53-viii. 11	275
viii.		304
	4	276
	5	284
	7, 9, 10 f.	276
	11	212, 276
	12	287
	20	277
	23	294
	24	287
	28	178, 214, 287
	29	214
	38	294
	39	303
	40	178, 214
	42	214, 294
	44	217
	44 f.	217
	46	214
	47	294
	48	111
	54 f.	287
	55	214
	56	170
	58	170
ix.	2 f.	67
	7	295
	14, 16	117, 290
	17	168, 177
	24, 25	117

	JOHN.	PAGE
ix.	28 f.	285
	34	117
	35, 37	177
x.	10	301
	15	294
	17	152
	17 f.	211
	25	154, 214
	30	287
	34	263
xi.	11	334
	25	287, 339
	41	78
	49 f.	173
xii.	8	282
	13	156
	20	338
	20 ff.	112
	23 f.	178
	25	338
	28	154
	31	72, 158
	32	178, 338
	34	178
	35	218
	46	337
	48	77
xiii.	5 f.	120
	10	291, 293
	12-15	120
	19	287
	25 ff.	179
	31	178
	34	271
	34 f.	270
	58	287
xiv.	1	208, 287, 305
	2	170, 334, 335
	2 f.	334
	4	335
	6	335
	12	335
	13	305
	13 f.	154
	13-16	333
	16	78, 305, 333
	17	220
	18	333
	19	334
	23	305

	JOHN.	PAGE
xiv.	24	77
	26	59, 77, 154
	27	167, 208
	28	334, 335
	30	158
	31	294
xv.	3	77, 293
	6	348
	10	214, 215
	12	270, 271
	16	154
	17	270
	20	121
	21	154
	25	263
	26	220, 301
xvi.	5	335
	6	208
	8	220, 266
	10	266, 335
	11	158
	12	333
	12 f.	287
	16	267
	17	335
	22	208, 335
	23 f.	154
	26	78, 154
	28	335
	32	335
	33	167
xvii.		167
	3	215, 287, 339
	5	171
	6	154
	9	78
	11	59
	12	154, 216, 348
	15	78, 219
	20	78
	23	70, 171
	24	70, 71, 171
	26	154
xviii.	11	121, 161
	23 f.	287
	36	74, 158
xix.	26 f.	277
xx.	22	59
	22 f.	176



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.
LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET
SYDNEY, N.S.W.: 218-222 CLARENCE STREET
WELLINGTON, N.Z.: 110-112 LAMBTON QUAY

Ideas of God in Israel Their Content and Development
By REV. EDWARD PACE, D.D. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.
"A notable book."—*Spectator*.

The Pharisees
By REV. R. TRAVERS HERFORD, B.A. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.
"The spirit in which the book is written is as admirable as the learning manifest on every page."—*Manchester Guardian*.

The Legends of Israel Essays in interpretation of some famous stories from the Old Testament
By REV. LEWIS JOHNSON. Cr. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
"The preacher will find real help in this book."—*Church Times*.

The Old Testament in the Twentieth Century
By REV. JOHN LEWIS, B.Sc. Cr. 8vo. Cloth, 6s. ; Paper, 3s. 6d.
"Teachers, especially those in primary schools, may be recommended to study this book."—*The Times*.

The Religion of Wise Men
By G. F. WATES. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.
"Mr. Wates is a clever and informed writer; . . . A noteworthy and eminently readable book."—*Inquirer*.

Christianity and the Religions of the World
By DR. ALBERT SCHWEITZER.
(*Selly Oak Colleges Publications*, No. 3.) Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.
"Everything from Dr. Schweitzer's pen carries with it the flavour of his heroic mind."—*British Weekly*.

Jesus and Civil Government
By A. T. CADOUX, D.D., Author of "Essays in Christian Thinking."
Cr. 8vo, 6s.
"It is a discussion to carry conviction to any impartial mind."—*Aberdeen Press and Journal*.

Jesus Christ and the World To-day
By GRACE HUTCHINS and ANNA ROCHESTER. Cr. 8vo, 5s.
"Packed full of good matter."—*Expository Times*.

Jesus, Lover of Men
By REV. WILTON RIX. Fcap. 4to, 2s. 6d.
"Many will find the volume a real help."—*Church Family Newspaper*.

Aspects of Reunion
By REV. HAROLD H. ROWLEY, B.A., B.D. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
"Well written and instructive."—*Yorkshire Observer*.

THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION SERIES

EDITED BY NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M.A.

- The Christian Revolution
By Dr. HENRY T. HODGKIN Cr. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
- The Constructive Revolution of Jesus
By PROFESSOR SAMUEL DICKEY Cr. 8vo, 6s. ; Paper, 3s. 6d.
- Religion and Biology
By ERNEST E. UNWIN, M.Sc. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
- Essays in Christian Thinking
By A. T. CADOUX, B.A., D.D. Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.
- Christian Justice
By NORMAN L. ROBINSON, M.A. Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.
- Christ and Cæsar
By N. MICKLEM AND HERBERT MORGAN Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.
- The Meaning of Paul for To-day
By PROFESSOR C. H. DODD, M.A. *Second Impression.* Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.
- The Remnant By RUFUS M. JONES Cr. 8vo, 5s. 6d.
- The Christ of Revolution
By JOHN R. COATES, B.A. Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 5s. ; Paper, 3s.
- The Way to Personality By GEORGE B. ROBSON
Third Edition. Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 5s. 6d. ; Paper, 3s. 6d.
- The Christian Ideal By W. E. WILSON Cr. 8vo, 5s. 6d.
- The Open Light By NATHANIEL MICKLEM Cr. 8vo, 5s.
- Reconciliation and Reality
By W. FEARON HALLIDAY *Second Impression.* Cr. 8vo, 5s.
- The Early Christian Attitude to War
By C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D. Cr. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Lay Religion By HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A. Cr. 8vo, 4s.
- Man and His Buildings
By T. S. ATLEE, A.R.I.B.A. *Illustrated.* Cr. 8vo, 6s.
- The Kingship of God
By GEORGE B. ROBSON Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 5s. ; Paper, 3s.
- Economic Justice
By GERARD COLLIER, M.A. Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 7s. 6d. ; Paper, 5s.
-

All Prices are net

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C. 1.