

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
SERVANT OF YAHWEH
AND
OTHER LECTURES

Published for the Governors of the John Rylands Library at
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS (H. M. McKECHNIE, M.A., SECRETARY),
23 LIME GROVE, OXFORD ROAD, MANCHESTER



By kind permission of Lafayette Ltd.

ARTHUR SAMUEL PEAKE
November 24, 1865—August 19, 1929

THE
SERVANT OF YAHWEH

THREE LECTURES DELIVERED AT KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON, DURING 1926

TOGETHER WITH
THE RYLANDS LECTURES ON OLD TESTAMENT
AND NEW TESTAMENT SUBJECTS

BY

ARTHUR SAMUEL PEAKE

M.A., D.D. (ABERDEEN), D.D. (OXFORD)

SOMETIME RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL EXEGESIS IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

MANCHESTER: THE MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY
PRESS, 23 LIME GROVE, OXFORD ROAD; AND THE
LIBRARIAN, THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY,
DEANSGATE

MCMXXXI

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE sense of frustration which is felt when a life appears to be prematurely ended is a common experience: but when a great scholar dies at an age which entitles us to look for more work from his pen the sense of frustration is very keen. There is always the tragedy of the unfinished work. It had for long been the intention of Dr. Peake to write a large-scale book on Hebrew Religion. His smaller book covering this ground has been long out of print, and copies fetch fancy prices. The monographs—originally published in the *Bulletin* of the John Rylands Library—on *The Roots of Hebrew Prophecy*, *Elijah and Jezebel*, *The Messiah*, had been intended as bricks for the projected building. Another scheme which Dr. Peake had in his mind was a big book on Paul, for which the last two monographs in this collection were to be of service. No British scholar could have accomplished these aims with greater success, for it was in the exposition of religion that Dr. Peake excelled. Paulinism and the religion of the Old Testament prophets were his favourite studies. What we have lost because these dreams have not been realised is hardly to be measured. We are grateful, however, for the parts that were completed, and as Dr. Peake's literary executor I should like here to express my sincere

appreciation of the way in which the Governors of the John Rylands Library, and in particular the Librarian, Dr. Guppy, have facilitated this publication. One or two other monographs from the *Bulletin* of the Library have been added to make the collection complete.

The lectures on the *Servant of Yahweh* have not been published before. They were delivered for the University of London shortly before Dr. Peake's death, and present the most admirable summary of the many interpretations of that elusive character, *The Servant*, that is to be found, and the strongest defence of the view which sees in the *Servant* the actual Israel. About this discussion, too, there is a certain atmosphere of melancholy, for the material in it would have been used in the long-awaited commentary on Isaiah of which its author's death has deprived us.

As an old student of Dr. Peake's I esteem it a great honour to have been able in the slightest degree to help in the preservation of these—alas! the final—studies in Biblical Theology from his pen.

W. LANSDALL WARDLE.

CONTENTS.

	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	Page
PORTRAIT	v
PREFATORY NOTE	ix
IN MEMORIAM : A. S. PEAKE	1
THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH	75
THE ROOTS OF HEBREW PROPHECY AND JEWISH APOCALYPTIC	111
ELIJAH AND JEZEBEL : THE CONFLICT WITH THE TYRIAN BAAL	151
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM	194
THE MESSIAH AND THE SON OF MAN	238
THE QUINTESSENCE OF PAULINISM	280
PAUL THE APOSTLE : HIS PERSONALITY AND ACHIEVEMENT	319
PAUL AND THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS	

THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH.¹

IF the question were to be raised in any company of Christian people what portion of the Old Testament should be regarded as the most important, no one would be surprised if a majority of those present selected the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. For in this chapter the Church has found from its earliest days a description of the sufferings endured by Jesus, and an anticipation of their glorious sequel. It has found not simply a description, but an interpretation so clear and so definite that the passage has been treated by the theologian and by the simple Christian as a document of the first importance for the doctrine of the Atonement. When D. L. Moody first visited England some who were anxious to be reassured as to his orthodoxy asked if he would furnish them with a statement of his belief. He replied, "My creed is in print." When they asked where they could find it his answer, which I believe was regarded as quite satisfactory, was "You will find it in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah."

If the same question should be raised in a company of

¹ A course of three lectures delivered at King's College, London, on the 24th February, the 3rd and the 10th March, 1926.

expert students of the Old Testament, while there would still be no occasion for surprise if a majority gave the same answer, the reasons which determined the choice would be different. The extent of the section would be more correctly defined ; it would also be treated as but one element, though the longest and most important, in a larger complex. But, above all, it would be commonly, though not universally, denied that the author wrote with any reference to Jesus in his mind. Opinions might differ as to whether the passage could be described as Messianic in the technical sense ; but that many centuries before the Passion the author sketched beforehand the humiliation of Jesus, His suffering and death, His burial with the infamous, His resurrection and exaltation, would be conceded by extremely few. It might be widely held that the Christian application could be justified, but not that it was the sense intended by the author.

It might be urged, indeed, not only that the traditional interpretation in the Christian Church has been erroneous in itself, but also that it has in another way made the approach to a right understanding more difficult. For it has had the unfortunate effect of isolating the passage from kindred passages which must be taken into account if its true meaning is to be discovered. And the division into chapters and verses, nowhere in the whole Bible so calamitous as at this point, has aggravated the misunderstanding to which the passage has been exposed. For it has cut off the first three verses of the poem and created the almost universal impression that it begins with the first verse of the fifty-third chapter rather than

with the thirteenth verse of the fifty-second. Since the three verses thus detached are momentous for the correct apprehension of the passage as a whole the barriers placed in the reader's way were made still more formidable.

But it was only slowly that modern scholars succeeded in rightly formulating the problem. For a long time after the non-Isaianic origin of chapters xl.-lxvi. had been recognised it was taken for granted that these chapters formed a unity. And since it was undeniable that the servant was explicitly identified with Israel in various parts of this work it was natural to assume that this meaning must be imposed on the term throughout. Ewald broke away from this so far as the fifty-third of Isaiah was concerned. He took it to have been originally a poem written on some unknown martyr who had been put to death in Mannasseh's persecution. In its original form it gave expression not only to the thoughts and feelings aroused by the fate of the innocent victim but to the emotions evoked by the subsequent change for the better. The faith developed through the sufferings of those times is magnificently combined with the highest art in the Book of Job. "No literary composition, however," Ewald proceeds, "can have expressed more deeply and truly the feelings which agitated the heart of the pious in these times than the crown of all extant prophetic utterances; which was originally occasioned, there is every reason to believe, by this long period of suffering." A later prophet worked up the description for another purpose and applied it to the sufferings of the

nation ; and its inclusion in the Book of Isaiah was due to accident. Ewald's theory is interesting not only for the view that the poem was an earlier composition which was occasioned by the martyrdom of an individual, but also for the suggestion, which has been revived in our own time, that a poem which in the first instance was composed with reference to an individual has, in its present form, received a national application. Still more important was the advance made by Duhm in his *Theologie der Propheten*, published in 1875, when the author was seven or eight and twenty. He singled out four passages which differed so much from the Second Isaiah's work that the suspicion could not be dismissed that, originally, they did not belong to the plan of the work, but were derived from another source. He thought that a prophetic sketch of the life and activity of Jeremiah, perhaps from the pen of a younger contemporary, formed their basis, and that the Second Isaiah became acquainted with them after he had written the first part of his work (chapters xl.-xlviii.), so that xlii. 1-7, was an insertion in this composition. He did not, however, leave them untouched ; rather they were considerably worked over. He intended Israel when he spoke of the Servant, but in the loftier passages he thought of the pious kernel of the people rather than of Israel as a whole. The passages which Duhm regarded as taken from an earlier source were, xlii. 1-7, xlix. 1-6, l. 4-9, lii. 13-liii. 1. It is remarkable that half a century later we are still speaking of the four Servant poems and that Duhm's delimitation of them still holds good, with the exception that the

first poem is now generally defined as xlii. 1-4 rather than xlii. 1-7, in harmony with Duhm's own view expressed in his epoch-making Commentary on Isaiah published in 1892. In this commentary Duhm modified his position at two important points. He regarded the Servant poems as not earlier but considerably later than the work of the Second Isaiah, and he identified the Servant no longer with Israel in any sense but with an individual, a contemporary of the post-exilic author. One other point must be included in this preliminary statement. In his *Beiträge zur Jesaia-Kritik*, published in 1890, that is, two years before the publication of Duhm's commentary, Giesebrecht argued in a very important paper on Isaiah liii. that the Servant is to be identified with the empirical Israel. Further developments in the discussion will come before us in the detailed examination of the subject, but two positions which will be assumed as working hypotheses ought to be indicated at this point. It has long been recognised that not the whole of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is to be assigned to the Second Isaiah. The great majority of scholars would probably acquiesce in Duhm's view that the work of this prophet does not extend beyond Isaiah lv. It is also generally agreed that within these chapters four sections can be distinguished as a group specially concerned with the vocation and the fortunes of the Servant, and that Duhm has correctly defined their limits in his commentary. Our special problem is, if not exclusively, yet primarily, raised by these four passages. I do not wish to be regarded as definitely committed to these two positions.

I desire to leave the possibility open that some portion of Isaiah lvi.-lxvi. may be the work of the Second Isaiah and the further possibility that in one or two cases the Servant poems may be somewhat longer than Duhm allows. But in view of the large acceptance which these positions command I think it is desirable to accept the limits provisionally as he has laid them down.

Our problem is primarily one of interpretation, but critical and historical questions inevitably arise. In enumerating some of the critical issues I am less concerned to give a list of the abstract possibilities than to indicate the points which have actually played their part in the debate ; and I shall say much less about them than their bearing on the interpretation might seem to deserve, because they are not suited to discussion in a course of general lectures. I select the following as relevant to our discussion. Are the poems the work of the Second Isaiah ? If so, were they composed by him at an earlier period and inserted by him in their present position in his book ? Or, still assuming that they were earlier compositions of his, do they owe their inclusion in the prophecy to a later editor. Or were they written by the second Isaiah during the same period in which the prophecy as a whole was composed, and did they form an integral part of it ? If they are not the work of the Second Isaiah were they earlier ? And in that case did he or another insert them in their present context. Are they later than his time ? and if so why were they introduced into the prophecy at all and introduced at the points where they are now to be found ?

Are the poems indeed all the work of one author ? and if the work of more than one, which are to be attributed to each of the poets concerned ? Further, how are the poems related to each other ? Is the order in which they are at present arranged original ? and are they progressive in the delineation of the servant's career and his significance ? If the poems are older than the main body of the prophecy may they, whether written by the Second Isaiah or another, have been altered to fit them for their new position ? And may they have received a new interpretation ?

A few words must be added on method. Our object is to determine the identity of the Servant. The problem breaks up into a number of subsidiary problems, and something might be said for taking these up independently in turn and following them as far as we can go before bringing them into relation and then determining their bearing on the problem as a whole. But this more abstract method is less suited to our circumstances, and it is better to adjust our discussion to a consideration of the solutions actually proposed. As is well known, the interpretations fall into two classes, the collective and the individual. *A priori* it might seem possible to rule out one type of interpretation by demonstrating the correctness of the alternative. If we could definitely prove the collective character of the Servant we might dismiss without further discussion all the identifications with individuals. But we should still have to determine in what sense the identification with Israel was to be understood. If, on the other hand, we could definitely

prove the individual character of the Servant we should still have to test the various identifications which have been proposed, either selecting one for our acceptance or suggesting a new one ; or we might recognise that we were dealing with a Great Unknown. But in either case, and especially in the former, the task of exploration would be greatly simplified ; when the paths diverged we could place at the entrance to one of them the warning " No Road."

But matters are far less simple than this. A case can be presented for both views and a case against both views so plausible that it is not, and I doubt if it ever will be, safe to dismiss one of the two as no longer needing a refutation.

It may be salutary for us at this point to recall the words of one who, eminent alike as poet and as literary critic, was also deeply concerned for a truer appreciation of Scripture. In the Preface to his volume *The Great Prophecies of Israel's Restoration*, Matthew Arnold wrote as follows :—

" There can hardly be a more interesting enquiry than who the *servant of God*, so often mentioned in our series of chapters, really was. We all know the secondary application to Christ, often so striking ; but certainly this was not the primary application ; who was originally meant ? the purged, idealised Israel ? or a single prophet, the writer of the book ? or the whole body of prophets ? or the pious and persistent part of the Jewish nation ? or the whole mass of the Jewish nation ? It may safely be said that *all* these are meant, sometimes

the one of them, sometimes the other, and the best critic is he who does not insist on being more precise than his text, who follows his text with docility, allows it to have its way in meaning sometimes one and sometimes the other, and is intelligent to discern when it means one and when the other. But a German critic elects one out of these several meanings, and will have the text decidedly mean that one and no other. He does not reflect that in his author's own being all these characters were certainly blended: the ideal Israel, his own personal individuality, the character of representative of his order, the character of representative of the pious and faithful part of the nation, the character—who that knows human nature can doubt it?—of representative of the sinful mass of the nation. How then, when the prophet came to speak, could *God's servant* fail to be all these by turns? No doubt, the most important and beautiful of these characters is the character of the ideal Israel, and Professor Ewald has shown poetical feeling in seizing on it, and in eloquently developing its significance. Gesenius, Professor Ewald's inferior in genius, but how superior in good temper and freedom from jealousy and acrimony! seizes in like manner on the character of representative of the order of prophets. But both of them make the object of their selection a hobby, and ride it too hard; and when they come to the perilous opening of the 49th chapter, both of them permit themselves, in order to save their hobby, to tamper with the text. These are the proceedings which give rise to disputes, cause offence, make historical and

literary criticism of the Bible to be regarded with suspicion ; a faithful, simple, yet discriminating following of one's author and his text might avoid them all."

This passage was written before the problem had passed into its present shape, and did not reflect with strict accuracy the position as it was in the writer's time. But now it is on all hands conceded that in several passages the Second Isaiah means by the Servant the empirical Israel, though so far from pressing this view throughout a number of interpreters insist that the Servant is an individual, while there is much divergence of opinion, not only as to the precise identification, but also as to the class in which he is to be placed.

I proceed then to a discussion of the individual identifications. In doing so it will be most convenient to indicate the strength and weakness of the theories taken separately, and then to point out those which are common to all forms of individual interpretation alike.

It is fitting that I should begin with Duhm, to whom we owe that delimitation of the Second Isaiah's work and of the Servant passages which has commanded the widest assent among adherents both of the collective and the individual interpretation. He regarded the four poems as considerably later than the Second Isaiah's work, written probably in the first half of the fifth century. They are undoubtedly the work of a single poet and form only a portion of his compositions, the rest of which have been lost. Their author probably did not intend them to be inserted in the prophecy of the Second Isaiah ; they were inserted by an editor where there

happened to be room enough in the manuscript, without regard to their appropriateness for their new setting. Still, at various points the editor inserted additions to create a connection between the prophecy and the poems. Duhm rejects the view that the Servant is a collective as the most superficial of all solutions. The Servant was an individual, the contemporary of the author, who was one of his disciples. He was not so much a prophet as a shepherd of souls and a teacher of the Law. He was afflicted with leprosy or some similar incurable disease, and was regarded with loathing by his contemporaries, who saw in his afflictions a signal mark of the Divine displeasure at his sins. In the pursuit of his vocation he was cruelly mishandled by his opponents. He did not quail before his persecutors or shrink from the sufferings which befell him in the loyal discharge of his duty. Patiently and in silence he endured his miseries till they culminated in death and burial in a dishonoured tomb. But as his disciple stands by his master's grave and meditates on his lot he becomes a prophet. He reads the torments which the Servant has endured in a new light. His sufferings and death are not penalties for his sin but sufferings he has endured to expiate the sins of his people. And a glorious destiny is reserved for him. To the amazement of the nations he will be brought back to life and proclaim the true religion to the heathen.

In addition to the difficulties to which all individual interpretations are exposed this theory labours under difficulties of its own. A critic who can seriously

propose so frivolous an explanation of the inclusion of the poems in the prophecy has scarcely the right to stigmatise an uncongenial interpretation of the passages as superficial beyond all others. Divergent views may be, and have been, legitimately held as to the relation of the poems to the prophecy and their relevance to their present position ; but the idea that they were written on the margin where there happened to be room, or between paragraphs or quires, is quite fantastic. It is no doubt a temptation to those who are opponents of the collective interpretation to disconnect the Servant poems from the prophecy in which they are embedded ; but notable advocates of the individual interpretation have not succumbed to it. Indeed, the case for recognising a close connection between the two is, if not conclusive, at any rate sufficiently cogent to make so light-hearted an account as Duhm's quite indefensible. Nor is it probable, even if the poems are by another author than the Second Isaiah, that they are to be relegated to the post-exilic period. Duhm, it is true, does not stand alone in the view that they are later than the prophecy of the Second Isaiah. Roy, who adopts the collective interpretation, takes a similar view of the chronological sequence, while Bertholet takes the greater part of chapter liii. into the Maccabean period, and Professor Kennett dates the whole of the Servant poems in that period, to which he also assigns by far the larger part of the Second Isaiah's work. But the general tendency of critics is to adopt the opposite view. The question is one which does not admit of adequate examination now,

and it is obviously one which cannot be settled by striking a balance of authorities ; so I must content myself with expressing my concurrence with those who hold that the poems, whatever their relation to the prophecy, do not belong to a later age.

Further, the whole representation of the Servant as smitten with leprosy or some similar loathsome disease, and yet as carrying on the mission which Duhm attributes to him, is very difficult to accept. He works, he tells us, through instruction and conversation, not in the street, but in the meeting-house, the circle of those seekers after knowledge, at the table or by the bedside of the private individual. It is difficult to think that anyone so afflicted would have been able to carry on the mission described, especially when the disease was held to be a conspicuous mark of the Divine displeasure. And it is not as if he had carried on his teaching ministry, had gained his circle of adherents, and established his reputation, and then fallen a victim to his disease. In that case he might have retained, amid the incredulity of the disillusioned multitude, the loyal adhesion of the few kindred spirits whose sense of his spiritual greatness triumphed over the temptation to doubt his integrity. The story of Job, indeed, warns us how difficult such a triumph would be, how hard to let the impression of a long and blameless career, eminent for its benevolence to man and its anxious piety towards God, prevail over the immediate impression that God had smitten him with an awful penalty which certified only too truly the gravity of his sin. Further, the disciples of Jesus needed for the re-estab-

lishment of their faith in face of the scandal of the cross and the curse of God which rested on the crucified the conviction that their master had risen from the dead. And they, it must be remembered, had believed Him to be the Messiah and the Son of man. But in the case of the Servant the poet emphasises that from the first his contemporaries had found him singularly unattractive, and cold disfavour deepened into physical repulsion and grave moral condemnation as they watched the ravages of that fell disease inflicted by the finger of God. Yet such is the poet's faith that after his teacher has died he needs no resurrection to steady his reeling confidence; even while his master lies in a dishonoured tomb he is assured that death is not the end of him, that he will rise again, be exalted before the world, and proclaim to the heathen the knowledge of the true God. The difficulty of believing in such a resurrection and destiny would in any case be serious, but that out of such antecedents such an expectation should arise is wellnigh incredible.

Nor is this all. It is difficult to avoid the impression that before his death the Servant had attracted the attention of the heathen nations. When the Servant's exaltation takes place many nations are startled and kings are struck dumb with amazement. Now it is, in itself, conceivable that the news of some Jewish leper who had exercised a ministry of teaching in a restricted circle of his own countrymen, but who had been raised from the dead and exalted to a position of eminence, should have affected the Gentile world in this way, though the supposition is not without difficulties of its own. But the

context strongly suggests that the Servant has been known to the nations before. The text is corrupt and defective at this point, but the general sense is sufficiently clear for our purpose. The missing line cannot be supplied with any certainty, but it does not vitally affect the question we are considering. I quote the rendering of the reconstructed text given in my *Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament* :

Even as many were appalled at him,
(And princes shuddered at him),
(For marred so as not to be human was his visage,
And his form so as not to be that of the sons of men),
So shall he startle many nations,
At him kings shall shut their mouths,
For what was not told them they see.
And what they did not hear they consider.

The natural impression made by this passage is that the author contrasts the attitude taken up by the nations after the Servant's exaltation with that which they had adopted towards him in his humiliation. And if so the nations must have been familiar with the personality and career of the Servant ; but it is obvious that Duhm's obscure and leprous Rabbi could have had no such international reputation as this. The objection is not indeed conclusive, for another interpretation of the passage is possible ; yet the cumulative force of the different objections is enough to render Duhm's theory improbable in the highest degree. In saying this I do not forget that its author has reaffirmed it both in his volume on the prophets published in 1916 and in the fourth edition of his Commentary published in 1922.

The difficulty of supposing that a private individual working in a restricted circle should attract the attention of foreign nations does not arise in at all the same degree if the position of the Servant is one which gives him an international significance. A king or prince or high official in the State might much more readily arouse the interest of other peoples. It is in this class of persons that some of the most eminent defenders of the individual solution have found the Servant. Of these scholars Sellin stands easily first alike for the copiousness of his writings, for the ingenuity and originality, the resourcefulness and skill, which his writings on the subject display. In addition to the more elaborate treatises to which special reference must be made the student should not overlook his briefer contributions in his *Heilandserwartung*, his reply to Cornill's attack on his Old Testament Introduction, and his volume on Old Testament Prophecy. I shall have these in mind in what I say of Sellin's record on this subject, which has exhibited a development for which the history of interpretation can offer but few parallels. But his main contributions to the subject are his volume on Zerubbabel (1898), the first of his Studies dealing with the origin of the Jewish Community after the Exile, a treatise of more than 300 pages (1901), his briefer but still fairly comprehensive work *The Enigma of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah* (1908), and, finally, the chapter devoted to the subject in his startling work on Moses (1922). Three entirely different forms of the individual hypothesis are associated with his name. But he has been true to certain fixed principles. He has

always identified the Servant with an individual who is a king or ruler. And he has regarded the tragic career of the Servant as something which lies largely, if not entirely, in the past, and his exaltation as something which has yet to come. He has been equally consistent in the conviction that each of the three identifications he has successively proposed offers the final solution of the enigma.

In view of the fact that Sellin has himself abandoned two of these solutions it might seem unnecessary to delay over them. This would, however, be a mistake. They have a certain intrinsic interest in themselves, even though they are disowned by their progenitor. Moreover, if a solution of this type is to be adopted, it by no means follows from the mere fact that Sellin has abandoned two of his solutions that his second or his third thoughts are to be preferred to his first or his second. Indeed it is scarcely probable that the scholars who accepted his second identification as the best proposed up to that time will be likely to follow him into so speculative a region as that which he now occupies.

The first theory which he proposed was that the Servant should be identified with Zerubbabel. This identification was not in any sense capricious. It rested in the first place on the conviction that the Servant was a Jewish ruler. This conviction was not based simply on the general consideration that only a person in such a position could have the international significance assigned to the Servant, but also on the belief that the language of the poems pointed unmistakably to a king or a ruler. But

the fifty-third of Isaiah seemed to imply that the Servant had suffered a violent death. Now it is true that we know nothing as to the end of Zerubbabel, but such a fate might very well have overtaken him. We know from Haggai and Zechariah that the nation's hope was centred on Zerubbabel: in the crash of empire God's people would come to its own and Zerubbabel would be the Messianic king. Zerubbabel, it was supposed, had welcomed and acted upon these ill-grounded hopes, and his rash enterprise was duly punished by the Persian king, who crucified him. The disappearance of Zerubbabel does in fact present an enigma. Independently of Sellin Cheyne had, also in 1898, called attention to the sudden disappearance of Zerubbabel, and suggested that he may have been suspected of treason and have been recalled by Darius. It should also be added that in 1890 Friedmann had substantially anticipated Sellin in his hypothesis, though Sellin knew nothing of this till after his own work had been published.

It is obvious, however, that a composition which was written under these circumstances must be several years later than the date to which the work of the Second Isaiah is commonly assigned. It is clear that although the career of Cyrus has begun, it has not reached its close; usually it is held that much, if not the whole, of the work was written before he had captured Babylon. To account for the conflicting phenomena, Sellin put forward a complicated literary hypothesis. He regarded Isaiah xl.-lv. as written after the death of Zerubbabel. But the passages by which the exilic date

seemed to be established were not capable of supporting that conclusion. They had, indeed, been written in Babylonia and by the Second Isaiah. But they were earlier utterances which the author has inserted as quotations in his later work.

The special difficulties of this solution must be briefly indicated. The execution of Zerubbabel is not an irrational hypothesis, and even after Sellin had abandoned the theory that he was the suffering Servant he still adhered substantially to his conviction as to his fate. But we have no positive information at all, and Sellin himself speaks much less positively in his *Heilandserwartung* than he does in his monograph on the fate of Zerubbabel with which he concluded his *Studien*. He still believed that Zerubbabel did not refuse the suggestions which the prophets of his time made to him. But he continues: "If a rebellion against the king really took place it is certain that the terrible disillusion, the downfall, occurred very soon afterwards—whether it consisted in Zerubbabel's return to exile, his death, or simply his deposition. Several indications point in this direction. Still everything is uncertain. Only one thing we know with complete certainty, that the high-pitched hopes were followed by bitter disillusion, that the expectation of a deliverer was for centuries silenced in Judah."

A further objection was to be found in the drastic character of the critical operations which the identification with Zerubbabel necessitated. That the passages which seemed so clearly to demand a date during the career of Cyrus should be mere quotations while the great body

of the book was as late as the time of Darius was very difficult to accept, for it meant that the clearest indications of date were false clues, to the misleading character of which the author himself might, we should expect, have been sensitive. Further, as Nowack pointed out, the catastrophes from which in Sellin's own judgment the people had suffered in Judea at this period constituted a forcible objection to Sellin's view. The Temple, he believed, had been plundered and profaned, the walls of Jerusalem had been destroyed and the city gates had been burnt, and no small proportion of the returned exiles had been exterminated. How could a people acutely conscious of their own desperate calamities have confessed that Zerubbabel had borne what they had deserved and seen in him the smitten of God and thought of themselves as spared severe sufferings?

When he wrote his work on Zerubbabel, Sellin believed that in it at one stroke the whole riddle was solved; he and no other must be the Servant of Yahweh who had hitherto been sought in vain. Nevertheless before very long he found it necessary to abandon this solution. The decisive reason, he tells us, for his change of view was the conclusion he subsequently reached as to the date of the Second Isaiah and especially the Servant poems. His more recent investigations convinced him that the book as a whole belonged to Babylon. Moreover, the Servant passages he found to be so organically connected with the rest of the book that they could not be detached from it and dated in a later period. Accordingly they could not refer to Zerubbabel, who was born about 540.

His continued study of the book had also yielded an exegetical result which was unfavourable to his theory about Zerubbabel. That theory had specially commended itself to him because he thought he could discover sure indications that he had died a martyr's death for his people. Without, at any rate for the time, abandoning this belief, he came to the conclusion that the interpretation of Isaiah liii. as referring to a martyr's death rested on an exegetical misapprehension which dated back for centuries, and that nothing was expressed in the description beyond the exile and imprisonment of the Servant. And this, on his premisses, made a reference to Zerubbabel impossible. We explained, however, that the arguments which he had put forward in support of Zerubbabel for the most part merely demonstrated that the Servant was a descendant of David who lived in exile and suffered for the people, from whom, however, deliverance from exile had been expected. And since Zerubbabel no longer satisfied the conditions, and the references to the Servant's death and burial could be explained as metaphorical, it was not unnatural that Sellin's thoughts turned in the direction of Jehoiachin. Just as his theory that Zerubbabel was the Servant had been anticipated, so the identification with Jehoiachin had been proposed by L. A. Bühler in 1896. And Kittel, whose general view of the problem as stated in his lecture on Old Testament Theology, published in 1899, while not proposing a definite identification, made the figure of Jehoiachin rather prominent in his discussion.

Sellin's statement and defence of his theory was most

elaborately presented in his *Studien* (published in 1901), but further study, and in particular the criticisms to which this work was subjected, led him to modify it at important points, and it is best accordingly to deal with it in the form which it took in his volume on *The Enigma of the Book of the Second Isaiah*, issued in 1908, and the discussions which followed in the next three or four years.

As a king Jehoiachin was a figure of international reputation whose unhappy lot might well have drawn attention to him in a more than usual degree. To the Jews he was the Lord's Anointed, the rightful king of his people, even when Zedekiah was reigning in Jerusalem by the grace of Nebuchadnezzar and he was languishing in a Babylonian prison. He still remained their king when Jerusalem had fallen and the people were in exile. Hopes of restoration would include the re-establishment of the monarchy, and who but the rightful king would reign over the restored community? When, then, Evil-Merodach succeeded his father, Nebuchadnezzar, in 561, released Jehoiachin from his imprisonment, which had lasted about 36 years, and placed him in a position of dignity in his court, setting his throne above the thrones of the other kings, it is not at all unlikely that this signal favour may have awakened in the minds of the exiles extravagant anticipations of a decisive change in their fortunes. Sellin believed that it did give birth to such hopes, and that the Second Isaiah, then a young man, wrote the Servant poems, in which he identified the Servant with Jehoiachin. He is expected to lead the

exiles back to reign in glory over the Messianic kingdom while his exaltation will effect the conversion of the heathen to belief in Yahweh, the one true God.

In spite, however, of the sympathy which a few eminent Old Testament scholars have expressed, and in spite of the pertinacity and skill with which Sellin has defended his case, it can scarcely be denied that it is exposed to objections of the most formidable character. If anyone will try the experiment of reading the poems through with this identification in his mind, the theory can hardly fail to strike him as a cluster of paradoxes. It must be remembered in the first place that we know very little about Jehoiachin, but what little we do know does not suggest that his personality and character were such as to qualify him for the part which Sellin assigns to him. I do not wish to lay undue stress on the unfavourable judgment passed upon him in the Book of Kings, in view of the rather conventional character of these judgments. And it must be remembered that his reign lasted only three months. But we have other evidence which cannot be easily dismissed. Ewald and others have idealised him, but for this there is no warrant either in the utterances of Jeremiah or Ezekiel. Sellin himself has withdrawn his earlier view that Jeremiah expressed a favourable opinion of him, but, with his singular gift for making the best of things and coaxing an argument out of the most unpromising material, he drew the sting from his admission by pointing to the coincidence between Jeremiah's judgment on Jehoiachin and the attitude taken by the speakers in Isaiah liii. Whether it does

justice to Jeremiah to make him also a victim of the deplorable error there penitently confessed might deserve some consideration. And as to Ezekiel, Cornill forcibly urges in his commentary (pp. 285 f.) the inconsistency with Ezekiel's own principles of such an idealisation. "Had Jehoiachin really been the ideal youth in whom the prophet honoured his king, how could Ezekiel in that case set forth with such emphasis in the preceding chapter that every one was requited according to his own doings and that the son must not suffer for the guilt of the father? Would not every hearer have then adduced the case of the unhappy king as a palpable proof to the contrary if Jehoiachin had really been innocent of serious personal fault and through his harsh imprisonment was merely atoning for the sins of his worthless father Jehoiakim?" We may cordially admit that time and pity for his prolonged sufferings might have mellowed the severity of the original condemnation, especially as a new generation had grown up in Babylon which had not the bitter memories connected with the Exile in 597. But this somewhat kindlier verdict which may possibly have been passed on the unhappy king does nothing at all to bridge the gulf which separates him from the hero and martyr, the innocent victim whose undeserved sufferings atone for the sins of others. No negative qualities are relevant here. Only outstanding virtue and achievement of the first order could justify the exalted tributes paid to the Servant. Sellin does indeed find in the voluntary surrender of Jehoiachin to Nebuchadnezzar a noble act of self-sacrifice. But in the

sacrifice were included his mother, his ministers, his princes and officers, and it is intrinsically far more probable that policy rather than generous self-sacrifice for others dictated this surrender, and that the responsibility for the decision rested more with the king's counsellors than with himself. When the mighty monarch of the Babylonian Empire arrived in person the king's advisers, men far more capable and experienced than those who precipitated the final disaster of 586, may well have recognised that resistance was hopeless and have counselled immediate surrender in order that the most favourable terms might be secured. We have accordingly nothing in the personality or action of Jehoiachin to justify even remotely such language as is used about the Servant.

Nor is there anything in his unhappy fate which answers to the description given in the Servant poems. That he was physically ill-treated during his imprisonment is, of course, possible; but beyond actual confinement, prison dress, and prison fare, the narrative suggests no maltreatment. The language of the third poem represents the Servant as the patient victim of violence and humiliation, but the scourging and spitting and the plucking out of the beard are indignities and wrongs which he might have escaped but which he bravely accepted since loyalty to his vocation involved him in bitter persecution. This in no way suits the case of Jehoiachin. Nor does the narrative of Jehoiachin's release suggest that in the intention of the Babylonian king it was designed to lead on to a reversal of Nebuchadnezzar's policy towards the

Jews. Of course the assassination of Evil-Merodach by Neriglissar, after a reign of less than two years, leaves it doubtful whether the release of Jehoiachin was a prelude to his restoration. But the narrative of Kings is unfavourable to such a supposition. The impression which it makes is that the new condition was intended to be final. That Jehoiachin was granted the first position among the other kings of conquered peoples who were detained at the Babylonian court may quite well have been due to the feeling that he had been more than amply punished and that recompense was overdue. But the really significant point is not that he receives a greater honour than the other kings but that he is placed in their class with apparently as little prospect as they had of any release from honourable captivity and restoration to his own kingdom. Nor does the narrative suggest at all any change in the attitude of the later Babylonian kings. Quite the contrary, in fact. The humane treatment initiated by Evil-Merodach was continued to the time of Jehoiachin's death. It is difficult, accordingly, to follow Sellin in his view that the high hopes entertained by the Second Isaiah in consequence of Jehoiachin's release were severely disappointed after the murder of the Babylonian king.

And when we turn to the fourth poem the difficulties of Sellin's identification perhaps reach their climax. It is unfortunate, indeed, that the poem has suffered from so much textual corruption, but Sellin's elaborate attempt to prove that nothing more than exile and imprisonment are described contradicts the plain sense of the passage so

completely that it is never likely to command any substantial acceptance. And that the identification controlled the exegesis is clear, from the fact, not so much that he adopted the usual view that the Servant was represented as slain in his Zerubbabel, but that he has returned to it in his volume on Moses. Speaking of the poem he says (p. 96), "In this mighty poem, the loftiest point reached by the Book of the Second Isaiah, the problem of the individual Servant of God reaches a definite decision. Only the art of Rabbinical exegesis can veil the fact that here a man is spoken of who had once suffered from severe illness for the benefit of his people, who had been shamefully killed and unworthily buried as an expiatory sacrifice for the guilt of his people, but whom now God will redeem from death, to whom He will now grant long life, children, and good fortune, and whom He will make the head of the nations." If Sellin's general theory is that the Servant suffered a violent death, then the fifty-third of Isaiah is interpreted in this sense. If, however, his sufferings stopped short of death then the exegesis of the passage is compelled to stop short of it. It is scarcely wise under these circumstances to taunt one's opponents with practising the arts of a Rabbinical exegesis.

So far I have barely touched on the general principle which underlies both the forms which Sellin's interpretation of the passage has assumed. This is that the Servant is a ruler of some kind standing at the head of the nation. This runs counter to the general opinion that the Servant is a prophet, well expressed on the collective theory in

Wellhausen's adaptation of the Mohammedan confession "There is no God but Yahweh and Israel is His prophet." Duhm's view is of the same type, though he would substitute a teacher of the law, and it has been rightly said that he makes the Servant a Rabbi rather than a prophet. That in the first poem the Servant is said to send forth judgment to the nations and to set judgment in the earth cannot be regarded as conclusive proof that the Servant was conceived as a ruler. Certainly, taken in itself, it would quite well suit the royal prerogative; but the term may equally well mean "the whole complex of religious ordinances." If so, the Servant's function was to spread among the heathen the knowledge of the true religion. And still more important is the fact that *Torah* also is entrusted to him, and this is not an element in royal administration; it is entrusted to the teacher or the prophet. Sellin himself recognises that the interpretation he rejects is so deeply rooted in the minds of interpreters that no speedy extirpation of it is to be anticipated. But his elaborate defence of his own view is not likely to convince them; it is a corollary from his general theory, and the weakness of the corollary makes more evident the improbability of the theory.

But perhaps the most startling feature in the identification of the Servant with Jehoiachin remains to be mentioned. Firmly holding that the poems were written by the Second Isaiah, he is compelled to place a considerable interval between them and the main body of the work, for the poems were written about 560 and the main body of the prophecy when Cyrus was in the full stream of

that victorious career which was to culminate in the downfall of the Babylonian Empire. Presumably Jehoiachin had died in the meantime. But neither this nor the fact that the policy towards the Jews initiated by Jehoiachin's elevation had been continued by Neriglissar and Nabunaid had crippled the prophet's faith. Was it not his firm conviction that "They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength?" Accordingly when the hopes which had centred on Cyrus seemed at last to be on the eve of fulfilment he came forward with the prophecies of Isaiah xl.-lv. incorporating in them the Servant poems. But these poems no longer retained their original application to Jehoiachin. Some of the series may not have been included at all; some which have been included may have been modified. But their original significance can still be clearly perceived, and the prophet was content if in the main they suited the new application without too anxious a concern for the appropriateness of certain details. The new identification was not individual but collective; in fact what the Servant now meant by the figure of the suffering Servant was not Jehoiachin but Israel. By this hypothesis Sellin believed that, while reaffirming the view that the poems were originally written with reference to Jehoiachin, he had also done justice to what elements of truth were to be found in the collective interpretation.

It is not surprising that Cornill saw in this development of the theory a confession from the most unexpected quarter that the champions of the despised collective interpretation were right after all. And in spite of

Sellin's rather warm repudiation of this inference it was certainly not wholly unwarranted. For, after all, the interpreter has to do, in the first instance, with the work as it stands and the admission made by the keenest, most thorough, and most persistent, champion of the individual interpretation must stand out as a notable landmark in the history of the controversy. He was perfectly entitled, in common with other opponents of the national interpretation, to press those phenomena in the present text which are often thought to exclude that interpretation altogether. But to suppose that the poet himself left these passages in a context which now imposed upon them a sense which he insists they cannot possibly bear is to render very scanty justice to the prophet, and is more creditable to the candour of the interpreter than to his realisation of the logical consequences of his concession. Further, even if it were granted that the language of the poems pointed to an earlier origin, it would not follow that Jehoiachin was intended. Sellin, it must be remembered, started from the identification with Jehoiachin and ultimately was driven to the conclusion that in the book as it stands the poems refer to Israel. But the only right method is to start with the book as we have it, and, if the identification with the empirical Israel cannot be carried through, then to seek from some further solution. But we must also urge that the poet's procedure is not easy to understand. If the hopes fixed on Jehoiachin had proved an illusion, why should he have transferred them to the nation? If it was axiomatic for him that the Servant

was a descendant of David, why should he not still have maintained this hope, and either expected that Jehoiachin himself should be raised from the dead to achieve his task, or have looked to some scion of the Davidic house to achieve it in the not too distant future ?

True to the precedent which he had set in the case of Zerubbabel, Sellin was quite confident that the identification with Jehoiachin was simply unavoidable. He went so far as to affirm his belief that his discussion satisfactorily solved for all time the literary riddle of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah. But this time not two, but twenty, years intervened before the solution which was good for all time was definitely abandoned by its author. His volume on Moses appeared in 1922, and in it he puts forward a new thesis as to which he is so confident that he says, "I really regard the whole problem of the Servant of God as by this hypothesis finally solved, leaving no residuum unaccounted for, and hope that I may assume that now at last even those who, up to the present, in spite of all convincing arguments to the contrary, though I grant with a certain justification, have maintained the reference to the people even within the Servant passages will abandon their opposition." A similarly delusive hope was entertained by Staerk as to the effect of Sellin's earlier demonstration that the collective interpretation could not be right, and he was moved to an indignation which found somewhat odious expression in his extremely discourteous reply to Budde who had dared still to maintain the collective interpretation. In fact the bewilderment they display at the blindness of

those who still adhere to the collective interpretation makes one desire for them the blessing of a humorous self-criticism. What then is this new solution so convincingly demonstrated that no reasonable alternative is left to the opponents of the individual interpretation save graceful surrender? The candidate for the place successively vacated by Zerubbabel and Jehoiachin turns out to be no other than Moses himself.

Let us for the time forget the startling character of the suggestion, and dispassionately consider what one might say in its favour. Undeniably, it has this great advantage over Sellin's previous suggestions, that in place of fourth-rate princes like Zerubbabel and Jehoiachin we have one of the truly stupendous figures of history, the creative personality who stood at the fountain head of Israel's religion. And since, according to the usual interpretation of a difficult passage, it was the mission of the Servant to lead Israel from captivity to Palestine, there was a real appropriateness in the choice of Moses risen from the dead to lead his people out of exile in Babylon across the wilderness, as once he had led them through the wilderness, after he had delivered them from bondage in Egypt. The parallel between the two was before the mind of the prophet, and Füllkrug in 1899 had put forward the view that the Servant is depicted as a second Moses. The same view was reaffirmed by Hontheim and more recently by Johann Fischer in 1916 and 1922.

The term "Servant of Yahweh" is frequently applied to Moses in the Old Testament. He is eminent as an

intercessor for Israel, and even prays that Yahweh would blot him out of his book after the people have sinned in worshipping the Golden Calf. Sellin also infers that behind the present text of Exodus xv. 25b, 26 was an older text which represented Moses as having inflicted on him as a trial of his faith the disease which had been inflicted on the Egyptians, but that he had maintained his faith and been healed by the water of Massa. This would, he thinks, correspond to the representation of the Servant as smitten with leprosy. On this point I might add that in my *Problem of Suffering*, interpreting the fifty-third of Isaiah as referring to Israel, and explaining the statement that the Servant had been stricken to refer to leprosy, I added, "It is an interesting coincidence that Manetho asserted that the Hebrews partly sprang from the lepers of Egypt." If, however, one wished to support the view that Moses had been smitten by God with leprosy and subsequently healed, I should find it safer to trace a faded version of the fact in the sign recorded in Exodus iv. 6, where Moses at the divine command puts his hand into his bosom and when he takes it out finds it leprous, white as snow; then puts it back into his bosom again, and when he withdraws it finds the leprosy removed. Another point which might be relevant, to which also Sellin does not allude, is the story that Moses' sister, Miriam, was on one occasion smitten with leprosy, Numbers xii. 10. But interesting points of contact such as these do not carry us far if we are seeking to identify the Servant with Moses.

The obvious objection to the identification of the Servant with Moses lies in the fact that Isaiah liii. suggests that the servant was martyred and buried in a dishonoured tomb, whereas Deuteronomy relates that Moses died on Pisgah, and suggests that Yahweh buried him. If, in reaching this identification, Sellin had started from the Servant passages and reached the conclusion that they pointed to Moses, he need have felt the difficulty no more than he had done in the case of Jehoiachin, who had also been spared a violent death. But he was led to this interpretation from a study of the career of Moses. He believed that he had discovered traces of a tradition that Moses had been martyred, and when he had reached this conclusion it was not unnatural that he should identify him with the martyr of Isaiah liii. If the objections to an individual identification could be overcome, and if the martyrdom of Moses could be regarded as an established fact, this view would not be unattractive. If Elijah, and perhaps David, were expected to return such an anticipation would be equally natural in the case of Moses, and we have some evidence that it was actually entertained. Whether it could be carried right through the Servant poems is questionable. But can we place any confidence in the theory of martyrdom? If the story of his leadership had culminated in an account of his murder by infuriated opponents it would have caused the reader no astonishment. The discontent of the people is constantly emphasised, and it even breaks out in open mutiny. Moses himself says that the people are ready to stone him. Moreover, the story of his

lonely death and burial in an unknown grave might not unreasonably excite the distrust of critics who are on the alert to detect that this curious narrative conceals under its innocent surface a more sinister ending to his career.

But, when all this is conceded, we are confronted with the gravest objections to the whole theory. The whole hypothesis of Moses' martyrdom rests on an interpretation of a number of passages in which the microscopic scrutiny of previous scholars, including for many years Sellin himself, has detected nothing of the kind. So far as we have a positive statement as to the end of Moses, it asserts without any ambiguity that he died in peace. That the discreditable story which Sellin divines could have been so successfully suppressed as to leave no ripple of doubt on the surface is very hard to credit. It would indeed have been easier if it had been stifled in the early period of the nation's history, but it is of the very essence of the supposition that the knowledge of the tragic fate which had overtaken the great leader was preserved for many centuries after his time and was well known to the Second Isaiah. How then is it conceivable that it should have been so completely suppressed, and the story of Deuteronomy xxxiv. substituted for it? Still more difficult does the position become when we find that Sellin regards it as well known to Deutero-Zechariah in the third century, and possibly even to the author of the Book of Daniel in the second century.

I have not yet touched on the general difficulties to which all individual interpretations are exposed, but

Sellin's unfaltering certainty that he has at last attained the true solution seems to me as ill-founded as in the case of his earlier solutions.

I turn to another solution specially associated with the name of Gressmann. It was Gunkel, however, who suggested the lines on which this theory has been developed. In his striking and influential work, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1903, he speaks of mysterious passages which up to the present have defied all attempts at interpretation. They speak of a figure greater than Moses and Joshua, entrusted with the vocation of leading the people back and organising it anew, one who will take the religion of Yahweh to all the heathen, who will stretch out the heavens anew and anew lay the foundations of the earth. This figure has already appeared but has remained unknown; he has died ignominiously but will rise again to the glory which is appointed for him. In these passages it is with no historical figure that we have to do; for how could anyone in ancient Israel regard a person whom one had known as the creator of a new world? The prophet rather means that this Servant of Yahweh had moved among men unknown and so passed away. In the final resort he adds there is no other explanation possible than that the figure of a dying and rising God stands in the background, reinterpreted in its own way by Judaism, represented as a great prophet of Yahweh, and provided with features derived from the fate of Israel (p. 78). In 1905 Gressmann's very important volume, *The Origin of Israelite and*

Jewish Eschatology appeared, and in it he devotes a special discussion to our problem. Starting from a discussion of the style of the Second Isaiah, which he regards as deeply influenced by Babylonian models, he approaches the interpretation of the Servant. He emphatically rejects the view that the Servant everywhere means Israel; sometimes it stands for the people, sometimes for the Great Unknown. But the two figures tend to merge into each other, and no sharp distinction between them is possible. That is just the peculiar quality of the prophet's style, a vagueness and lack of lucidity is diffused over all his personality and speeches. Moreover, in dealing with the Servant passages we must not obliterate their fragmentary character. The necessary links are often omitted, the transitions are abrupt, the essential facts are left in obscurity. If the Servant is not the people, neither is he a historical personality. In that case his name must have been given, the details of his career must have been supplied. Besides the interpretation placed upon his death, resurrection, and exaltation, and the vicarious atonement effected by his sufferings, would be inexplicable in the case of a historic individual. Inasmuch then as he can neither have been Israel nor a historical personality, and yet had to be represented as an individual, nothing is left but to treat him as a mythical figure. This comes out clearly in his resurrection, which is not related in the present text, but must have been originally related. The stylistic enigmas can be explained only on the assumption that the Second Isaiah cannot have created the figure of

the Servant of Yahweh, but must have borrowed it from a tradition, oral or written, already in existence, and then portrayed it in his own language. He derived it, in fact, from a cultic poem, which was itself derived from the mysteries and was sung by the initiated on the day when the deity's death was celebrated. How the Second Isaiah conceived the Servant cannot be determined with certainty, but he seems to have regarded him as an eschatological figure. He is not to be identified with the Messiah, for he is not a descendant of David; and, while he is a king, he is not exclusively such, but also a prophet. We may regard him as a parallel figure to the Messiah. Himself an innocent victim, he goes to death for the transgression of others, bearing their sins as the goat for Azazel bore away the sins of Israel on the day of Atonement. Yet, while a human scapegoat, he differs from ordinary sacrificial victims in that he is not offered up by others, but freely presents himself. The cultic hymn sung by the initiated answered the question, "How is it that we are celebrating to-day the death of the God?" Since we know as good as nothing about the life of the Servant, the mythical figure that lies in the background must have been of such a kind that atoning death and resurrection were characteristic of him. He belongs to the type of Adonis or Tammuz such as we also find in Zechariah xii. 9 ff.

Gunkel has taken up the subject again in the article he contributed to the third volume of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1912). The Servant is not to be understood in a collective sense; but neither is

he a historical personality : he is rather an ideal figure, represented as a mighty prophet, a founder of the new people and the maker of a new covenant like Moses, a leader and organiser like Joshua, but far surpassing these since he has to speak to the heathen and found the universal religion. He embodies Israel's national and religious hope, its longing for return home, and its highest religious idea. The impregnable faith of the religion in itself is incorporated in him. The antithesis between the ideals of the prophet and the actual situation is reflected in his story. He appeared in homely guise, worked in secrecy and silence, and accomplished nothing. He was defamed, dishonoured and harassed to death. Unable to achieve his task for Israel, let alone for the heathen, he was executed as a criminal. Now faith pulls itself together, Israel becomes Yahweh's people and the heathen fall at God's feet. The Servant has died for our sins and for our salvation ; and now the dishonoured one receives ample honour, the slain lives again, and accomplishes his task gloriously.

Many elements have mingled in this figure ; the experiences of Israel in exile, the image of great prophets like Jeremiah, the poet's own experience, not least, and perhaps as the occasion of the whole creation, the thought that at the end of things, when the primitive era is repeated, and when a new deliverance comparable to the deliverance from Egypt sets Israel free, a new Moses will make a new Covenant. Perhaps foreign influence may be suspected for the idea of the resurrection, and Zechariah xii. 10 ff. suggests a connection with Tammuz.

The vagueness and omissions of the description on which Gressmann lays such stress need not on an individual interpretation be explained as due to derivation from an earlier tradition. For if the Servant is a contemporary individual known to the readers, or if he is a well-known historical figure like Moses, his career would be already familiar, and the fragmentary and elusive character of the poems would be due to the poet's selection of those features which served his special purpose. On collective interpretation the problem hardly arises. But I share the feeling of those scholars who think that Gressmann has exaggerated this feature of the poems. In the next place I find it very difficult to form any clear idea of the Servant as Gressmann and Gunkel describe him. This shadowy figure, what can we really make of it? And what did the poet himself understand by it? And when we read the poems themselves is any justice done by this theory to the impression they make upon us? That real historical experiences, whether of the nation or of an individual lie behind their descriptions, is the only natural explanation; they do not suggest that we are reading the story of a dying and a rising God. Further, Gressmann finds the mythical character of the figure specially clear in the idea of his resurrection. But his resurrection is not actually mentioned; and granting that resurrection is implied (though this has been denied), we should have anticipated that so crucial an element in the myth would have been explicitly mentioned. In any case it is somewhat unsafe to build a theory on the assumption that a feature now absent was once

prominent. As to the relation with Tammuz or Adonis, we know from Ezekiel that this cult had found adherents among the Jews, and the reference in Zechariah xii. 11 to the mourning for Hadadrimmon in the Valley of Megiddo is significant in this connection. But Baudissin in his *Adonis und Esmun* has allowed only a very limited range to the parallel of the Servant with Adonis, rejecting the idea of expiation and of the eschatological character of the Servant on both of which Gressmann lays such stress. He says (p. 424) : "I cannot accept any relation between the Servant in the Second Isaiah and the myth of Adonis which goes beyond the thought of resuscitation after death. Gressmann sees in the dying Adonis or Tammuz the original of the dying Servant of Yahweh, since he suspects an atoning significance in the death of the God (331 f.). This interpretation of the Adonis, or even of the Tammuz, myth seems to me to be suggested by nothing." A little later he adds, "I do not understand with what right Gressmann speaks of an 'eschatological Tammuz' and combines with it a Messianic interpretation of Isaiah liii. So far as we know the Babylonian Tammuz seems to have nothing to do with eschatology, but only with nature as it is."

Sellin, who of course rejects the theory as a whole, concedes that the language of the poems may be coloured by the literature to which Gressmann attaches such importance. But beyond this he is unwilling to go, and it is questionable whether we should go even so far. Dr. Skinner affirms that the *ideas* are all foreign to the assumed original. He says : "The sense of guilt on the

part of the worshippers, their conviction of the Servant's innocence, his own fidelity to his task and faith in the righteousness of Jehovah, above all his consciousness to Israel and the world: all these—and they are the essentials of the conception—have to be set down to the Hebrew development: and nothing remains in which influence of an underlying myth can be traced.”

It is remarkable that Gunkel, who had emphatically declared that the Servant towered far above all historical reality, was far too great even for a Jeremiah, and that of no figure of the time could one have said or even have expected what is asserted of the Servant, should have accepted a view which identifies the Servant with a contemporary figure. This has been put forward by Mowinckel; and in addition to Gunkel two writers in the volume presented to him on his sixtieth birthday (1923) have also declared their adhesion. These are Balla in his *Problem of Suffering in the Religion of Israel and Judah*, and Haller in *The Cyrus-Poems of the Second Isaiah*. All three are agreed that his little book definitely settled the problem. The theory is that the Servant is no other than the Second Isaiah himself. The Ethiopian put the question to Philip, “Of whom doth the prophet say this, of himself or another?” It is scarcely correct to say that the theory is absolutely new. Earlier Expositors like Grotius had thought of the prophet as at some points himself the speaker; and it will be remembered that Matthew Arnold includes this identification in his list of the various theories which had been proposed. But it is true that in the more recent

form in which the question has been put no one before Mowinckel definitely set out to prove the hypothesis, though that it was a possible hypothesis had been recognised. Mowinckel starts from the assumption that the collective identification had been finally disproved, thanks above all to Sellin. The mythical theory is also rejected, and thus we reach the conclusion that the Servant is a figure in contemporary history. That this is possible is shown by the use of the first person singular in the Second and Third poems and next by the fact that the Servant is described as a prophet. Then he argues, contrary to the usual opinion, that in the rest of the book the Second Isaiah does come forward and speak in his own person, just as the Servant does. Further in the famous prophecy read by Jesus at Nazareth we have the prophet himself speaking. The chapters (Isa. lx.-lxii.) from which it is taken are, Mowinckel believes, probably the work of the Second Isaiah, but, even if not, they come from his disciples. The prophet, then, whether the Second Isaiah or not, speaks of himself in terms similar to those used of the Servant, which would not have been done if the disciples had not identified him with their master. The poet also takes into his conception of the Servant features derived from the traditional portrait of the Messiah, though he was primarily conscious of his prophetic vocation. The further details of this theory must be passed over, and I must briefly indicate why this identification is unacceptable, even apart from the general objections to which all forms of an individual theory are exposed.

The exegetical basis does not lend itself for discussion here, so I will simply say that I regard it as quite insecure. But, passing to more general considerations, it is not without weight that it has been left for Mowinckel to make a discovery which has escaped the keen and resolute scrutiny which a multitude of the ablest Biblical scholars have brought to bear upon the problem. This would not be so significant if the identification lay so far below the surface that only the most diligent research and piercing insight could discover it. But it lies on the very surface. The natural reference of the first person in a prophecy where Yahweh is not the speaker is to the prophet himself. And earlier interpreters have regarded some of the Servant passages as spoken by the prophet with reference to himself. One can hardly, therefore, compare Mowinckel's discovery with the egg of Columbus, and suppose that the very simplicity of the problem has caused the right solution to be overlooked. The real reason why Mowinckel has not been anticipated is that on the face of it the identification cannot be right. The language in which the Servant speaks would imply far too extravagant an egotism for us lightly to charge the prophet with it. We should have expected such egotism to have come to expression in other parts of the book. But, above all, the Fourth poem speaks decisively against the theory. For when the penitent confession of Isaiah liii. is uttered the sufferings of the Servant have already ended in his death, and while he lies in his grave awaiting his return to life. But if the Servant is himself the speaker, his death obviously cannot have taken place.

Mowinckel is accordingly driven to the very artificial and entirely unsatisfactory expedient of supposing that the prophet wrote the poem just before his execution.

A similar objection lies against the identification with the Messiah. The standpoint of the prophet is after the death but before the resurrection of the Servant. The career of the Servant has already ended in death. Obviously this excludes the traditional Christian interpretation of the passage as a direct prediction of Jesus ; but neither does it suit the Messiah of Jewish belief, for he, too, was one who had still to come. And we have already seen that the Servant is not a royal personage such as the Messiah of prophecy must be.

On other identifications with known individuals it is not necessary to linger at this point. In view of the grave objections to which all specific identifications are exposed, it is not surprising that scholars have postulated some unknown contemporary of the author, whose career had closed in death and dishonour, but who was expected to rise from the dead and accomplish his glorious destiny. A very attractive presentation of this form of the individualist theory has recently been given by Dr. Stanley Cook in the third volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History*. Obviously the identification of the Servant with an individual postulated *ad hoc* cannot be criticised by the methods adopted in refutation of the theories already discussed. I must, therefore, come to the objections not to this or that form of it but to the individualist theory in any and every form. It is obvious that every argument for a collective is an argument against an in-

dividual identification, so that the two sides of the case cannot be very sharply distinguished.

It must be granted at the outset that the language does make on the modern reader the impression that an individual must be intended. And it is not unlikely that in many minds this immediate impression will always outweigh every argument to the contrary. A striking feature in recent defences of it is not simply the absolute conviction that the theory is right but the bewilderment and even the indignation which they betray at the blindness, not to say the perversity, of those who venture to champion the collective view. Sellin may be quoted as an illustration ; still more perhaps Staerk, whose sustained attack on Budde I can characterise as nothing short of deplorable. The feeling, moreover, is reinforced by what Mowinckel describes as the rapid fall in the stocks of the collectivist interpretation of many Psalms, which he takes to be a good omen for a similar depreciation in the assets of the parallel interpretation in the Servant poems. I have no desire to underestimate the value of direct impressions, but even if they should prove the decisive factor at the last they are not entitled to such a position until every relevant consideration has been taken into account.

There is in the first place a real, though perhaps not insuperable, objection raised by the prediction of the Servant's return to life, which is implied, if not definitely stated. The assurance of a resurrection is to be found in Isaiah xxvi., that is, probably in the latter part of the fourth century, and in a more developed form at the end

of the Book of Daniel. Roughly speaking, two centuries lie between the Second Isaiah and Isaiah xxvi. Ezekiel's vision of the Valley of the Dry Bones refers to the restoration of the nation ; that it implies familiarity with the idea of individual resurrection as some think seems to me quite improbable. But the idea of individual resurrection is present to the mind of Job, though he always refuses to accept it. But I cannot help suspecting that the poet himself inclined to a more positive view. Still, even here the interval is rather long, probably not less than a century. The earlier stories connected with Elijah and Elisha are scarcely parallel. Yet while I think the objection is real I should not regard it as at all conclusive.

A graver difficulty lies in the improbability, which I cannot regard as other than extreme, that any individual contemporary of the prophet, especially labouring under the terrible afflictions and enduring the fate which brought his career to an end, could have made an impression on his adherents so amazing as to excite the anticipation that a destiny so glorious and so unparalleled in all the history of his race should be reserved for him after God by a signal manifestation of his power had recalled him from the realm of the dead. Here the considerations which drove Gunkel and Gressmann from the sphere of historical reality to find the Servant among the figures of mythology remain in full force, even if the positive interpretation in which they took refuge has to be set aside. And since the identification with contemporary kings or rulers is exposed to insuperable

difficulties, where are we to look for an individual whose career attracted the attention of nations and their kings ?

Another serious objection lies in those phenomena which are thought to point most clearly to some historic personality. For if we take all the poems together it is difficult to combine the different features into a consistent portrait of one personality and a coherent record of his career. This is especially the case with Isaiah liii., a fact which has led some who support the individual interpretation to detach it from the other poems. But if the Servant is collective the difficulty disappears. If he is an individual we are entitled to claim that the description shall be literally taken. And then the difficulty of combining the several features in any one personality is acute ; but if the Servant is a nation then the vivid language which is used can legitimately be interpreted as expressing the same thing by different metaphors.

I pass on then to state the positive arguments for the collective identification, once more emphasising that these are equally objections to the individualist theory. We are entitled to place in the forefront the fact that the passages in question are to be found in a composition which at several points identifies the Servant with Israel. In fact we have become habituated so much to isolate the Servant poems from the rest of Isaiah xl.-lv. as almost to lose sight of the fact that these are marked off in no way from the main body of the book, and are not collected together as a group. Moreover, they are differently defined by different critics, and while Duhm's delimitation has found wide acceptance scholars of high rank do as

a matter of fact assign more to some of the poems than Duhm allows. There is accordingly a strong presumption that the term will mean the same thing throughout. It is a grotesque and indeed unpardonable exaggeration when it is suggested that it is only their inclusion in their present context which favours the national interpretation, and that if they had been preserved separately no one would have questioned that the Servant of whom they spoke was an individual. We have seen that the phenomena of the poems themselves are difficult to reconcile with an individual interpretation. We are all the more entitled to expect unity of meaning throughout if we can accept unity of authorship. But in view of the curious cross division of critics and interpreters in this respect too much stress must not be laid on this.

It is an important fact that in the Servant poems themselves the identification is explicitly made: "I said, Thou art my Servant, Israel, in whom I will get myself glory." Naturally so inconvenient a reading must be suppressed at all costs. Obviously the poet cannot have written this we are told. But "obviously" is one of those words against which the critic will do well to be on his guard. Too often it is employed as a bit of camouflage to impress the unwary reader with the feeling that this is the only view which a competent judge can take of the question at issue. And if the Servant is an individual then obviously he cannot be described as Israel. But this is to assume the very point at issue, and however simple the advocates of the collective interpretation may be they are not simple enough to be taken in by this. And as we

are tactless enough to insist on some justification for this act of critical violence some defence of it has to be forthcoming. One Hebrew manuscript we are reminded does not read the word. One Hebrew manuscript ! Would not silence have been more prudent, than to parade one Hebrew manuscript as if such evidence counted for anything ? Would it not be more seemly to cover up the nakedness of the land ? And some Greek manuscripts, it is added ; but do they represent the genuine Septuagint text ? But we are told the Septuagint adds the word in the first poem and it is likely enough accordingly to have been added here in the Hebrew. In the abstract that is possible but in the absence of any evidence worthy of consideration we have no right to assume that what may conceivably have happened has happened as a matter of fact. But it is said in this very poem Israel and the Servant are distinguished and the poet cannot therefore in the same breath have identified them. If this distinction is really present in the poem that would be a weighty argument ; but this is sufficiently important to call for separate discussion. It is urged that the symmetrical form of the verse structure is disturbed by the word. But in this Sellin may be left to answer himself and his fellows. In his *Mose* he reaffirms the view that it is an insertion. He says " that the *Israel* in verse 3 cannot be original, but, on the analogy of the Septuagint in xlii. 1, is a false interpretation, is, when we have regard to verses 5 and 6, obvious." But instead of simply striking the word out he substitutes for it " my chosen." He adds, " The mistake of many earlier individualist interpreters was that in spite

of the metre they simply struck out that word which was so hard to explain instead of substituting another for it." In 1904 I expressed the view that the balance of clauses was disturbed by the deletion of the word, and I am glad that Sellin has at last come round to that view. I only regret that he does not explain how it comes about that if "my chosen" was the original meaning a text in every way so unexceptionable should have been altered. The case really stands as follows. There is no reason of any substance for altering the text unless we start from the conviction that Israel and the Servant simply cannot be identified. But we have no right to start from this. The phenomena which suggest it must of course receive due consideration, but the phenomena on the other side are equally entitled to be taken into account. The fact is that the poems according to their present text present apparently irreconcilable phenomena. The right method is to start from more general features to gain an impression of the poems as a whole, to let the broad facts of the situation determine our provisional conclusions and then to enquire whether individual data can be harmonised with them, or, if not, how the refractory elements can most fairly be dealt with.

The broad facts are that grave objections lie against every form of the individualist theory, that the poems are imbedded in a large composition in which the Servant unquestionably means Israel, that as the Servant is, and has probably previously been, an object of interest to peoples, and is probably not represented as a royal personage, he is therefore himself a nation, otherwise the

wide international interest is very difficult to account for. This conclusion is confirmed by the identification with Israel which the poems actually contain and which there is the less reason for suspecting since it harmonises with these main phenomena. I turn accordingly to the two details which are said absolutely to forbid this identification.

The first is to be found in the 49th chapter, that is in the second poem in which the identification with Israel also occurs. The passage is undeniably suspicious in its present form. It is very clumsy in form, and suggestions for rearrangement and removal of a gloss such as Duhm has made are recommended by the fact that they do relieve some of the worst difficulties. The exegesis of the passage, however, does not specially concern us apart from the question whether the Servant is represented as bringing Israel back from Babylon. If the Servant executes a mission to Israel then he would seem to be distinguished from Israel. Duhm himself, individualist though he is, argues that it is Yahweh and not the Servant who restores Israel from exile. This harmonises with the representation elsewhere in the Second Isaiah whereas nowhere else do we find this function attributed to the Servant. Moreover, if I may use the language I have previously employed on this question, "it would be very remarkable that the author should assume, as if it were a well-known function of the Servant, that he should raise up the tribes of Jacob, although this is nowhere else mentioned, and announce as a still further achievement the mission to the Gentiles which has already been emphasised in the first Servant passage."

But even if we granted that it is the Servant who is charged with the task the passage may very well bear a sense which does not involve surrender of the collective interpretation. If that interpretation is right, and the Servant is identified with Israel, it is the Israel which is in the Babylonian exile. But to this Israel the task might conceivably be assigned of raising up the tribes of Jacob and restoring the preserved of Israel. For the tribes of Jacob and the preserved of Israel may quite possibly refer not to the Jews but to the Northern tribes which had gone into exile after the destruction of Samaria. And this is all the more likely since the anticipation of the restoration of the Northern tribes and their reunion with Judah is a very prominent feature in the prophecy of the period. Jeremiah, who had heard Rachel the mother of Joseph and Benjamin weeping in her grave for her children, and refusing to be comforted because they were not, is entrusted with the Divine message to her : "Refrain thy voice from weeping and thine eyes from tears : for thy work shall be rewarded, saith Yahweh ; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy." Ezekiel looks forward to the reunion of Israel and Judah under David their king. And these prophets are not alone by any means in this anticipation. But whichever expedient be adopted it is clear that we are not shut up to the view that the Servant cannot be the nation.

The other passage which is said to preclude the national interpretation is in the 53rd chapter—"for the transgression of my people was smitten." Here the

Servant is smitten to atone for the sin of God's people, or the poet's people, that is of Israel, and therefore he cannot be identified with Israel. If this is treated as in itself conclusive a very heavy weight is being suspended by a very brittle thread. For it is notorious that the passage occurs in a context which, in the judgment of most scholars, has been badly preserved. The most serious difficulties are to be found in the later verses, but Duhm begins his notes on verse 8 with the statement, with which I fully agree, "from this point the text exhibits many corruptions." It is accordingly precarious to build too much on a single word in a passage which in other respects excites so much suspicion. No doubt, what weighs with the scholars who maintain the correctness of the text at this point is as a rule their conviction that the identification with the empirical Israel is incorrect. Accordingly, the text makes no difficulty to their theory and they have no inducement to alter it. But when Duhm says, "'My people' is got out of the way by the allegorical interpreters by quite arbitrary emendation and indeed it fits in with their nebulous ideas altogether too badly," we have some right to be astonished at this virtuous attitude. When it comes to arbitrariness in either Lower or Higher criticism there are few scholars who can compete with him. One can only be amused at the sanctimonious condemnation of a quite trivial emendation by critics who rewrite whole passages without turning a hair. For an extremely slight correction which might in fact be made in two or three forms would remove all reference to "my people." We could read

with Budde, "for our transgressions" or, what is transcriptionally easier though perhaps on the whole less satisfactory, with Giesebrecht, "for their transgressions he was smitten." Another suggestion that we should read "peoples" for "my people" is possible, but I think improbable. When we remember that scholars of quite different schools of interpretation are agreed that far more drastic emendations are required, and in several cases, if the text of vv. 8-11, and especially of vv. 10 and 11, is to be restored, those who cavil at so trifling a correction as one of these scrupulously strain out a gnat but with no apparent inconvenience bolt a camel whole. The correction could be defended simply on the ground that if the poems as a whole point to the collective interpretation of the Servant we are not compelled to let a trifle like this stand in our way. But it ought to be added that there are other grounds on which we may reasonably suspect corruption. On this I may quote what I wrote in my *Problem of Suffering*. " 'My people' is strange in this context. If the first person refers to Yahweh this creates difficulties, for both before and after in this context (verses 1, 6, 10), Yahweh is spoken of in the third person, He does not Himself resume His speech till verse 11. It is also unlikely that the prophet should here refer to himself. Elsewhere he keeps his own personality in the background ; why should he intrude it here ? The first person is used in liii. 1-6, but it is the first person plural. If the prophet includes himself among those who speak in liii. 1-6, why should he all at once pass from the

plural to the singular, and now speak as though he were not included among those for whom the Servant suffered. Moreover, when we remember that the text of the latter part of the chapter is very corrupt, and it is generally agreed that the two following words have to be emended, we are perfectly justified in suspecting its soundness here."

The result of this discussion is that neither of the passages commonly alleged to exclude the collective interpretation can be safely used for this purpose. The issue must be settled by much larger considerations. And it cannot be denied that there are real objections to the identification of the Servant with the nation, some of which apply to any form of collective interpretation.

I have already called attention to the fact that the strikingly personal character of the descriptions of the Servant and his career, his activities and his sufferings, makes it difficult for the modern reader to believe that anyone but a person can be before the author's mind. But it was customary for the Hebrews to use personal language about classes of peoples in a degree quite foreign to ourselves and in a form frequently disguised from the English reader by the fact that it would be intolerable in our idiom. I may refer for proof as illustration of this to Dr. Gray's *Numbers*, pp. 265 f. and to Mr. Edghill's *Evidential Value of Prophecy*, pp. 298 f., where the extent to which this principle is illustrated by the Second Isaiah himself is briefly indicated. I may also be permitted to call special attention to the discussion of corporate personality in Principal Wheeler Robinson's

Essay on "Hebrew Psychology" in *The People and the Book*, pp. 375-378. On our subject he says: "We must not attempt to decide whether the figure drawn in Isaiah liii. is individual or national, before we have taken into account the remarkable lengths to which the principle of corporate personality can go." And in the same volume in the essay by Dr. Abrahams on "Jewish Interpretation of the Old Testament," pp. 412-414, we have a noteworthy reference to the general problem. I call attention to this partly for the evidence it gives that such tendency to personify the community or the nation was natural to Jewish writers, and partly for its bearing on the interpretation of the first person singular in the Psalter. As to the former, referring to Jewish exegesis in the Midrash, Dr. Abrahams says: "The interesting point is that a communal turn is given to strongly individualised utterances." On the latter point I have already referred to Mowinckel's remark that the slump in the stocks of the nationalist interpretation in the Psalter has facilitated a similar depreciation of value in the collective interpretation of the Servant. Dr. Abrahams believes, however, that the reaction against the collective interpretation in the Psalter has gone to indefensible lengths, and similarly he adopts the identification of the Servant with Israel. I may illustrate the position in this way. I have often wondered that no evangelist, not even Matthew or John, added to his mention of the scourging of Jesus, "Now this came to pass that it might be fulfilled which was written:

The plowers plowed upon my back;
They made long their furrows."

Let anyone who is not otherwise familiar with the passage have the following lines placed before him :

Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth up,
Yet they have not prevailed against me
The plowers plowed upon my back ;
They made long their furrows.

What impression will they make upon him ? He will take them to be the utterance of some poor tortured individual who had suffered from severe scourging. But this impression though it would seem to be much the most natural would nevertheless be incorrect. Had the passage been read in full the individual interpretation would have been excluded. The opening really read as follows :

Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth up,
Let Israel now say.

Let us place side by side with it the following extract from the third Servant poem : "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair : I hid not my face from shame and spitting." Here also the poet might have introduced the utterance from which this passage is taken with the words, "Let Israel now say." We must accordingly recognise that the very marked personal features in the delineation of the Servant and his experiences need not in a Hebrew poem imply that their subject is an individual. The weight to be attached to the immediate impression a passage makes is assuredly not to be overlooked or undervalued, but this principle may easily be misapplied. For the real question is not what impression does this make on the modern Western reader whose sense of individual personality is

so much more vivid and intense and whose sense of corporate personality is correspondingly fainter, but what impression did it make on the men of the poet's own race, age, and culture, who shared his mental outlook and modes of expression. It is abundantly clear from the evidence of the Old Testament itself that language might be applied to a community or a nation which would seem to us strange and unnatural if used of any but an individual. We may accordingly with a clear conscience dismiss the objection that the language is of such a character that the Servant cannot be the nation, or indeed any collective entity, but must be an individual.

I pass on to another objection which many regard as fatal. If the Servant is the empirical Israel then the speakers who make the penitent confession in the former part of chapter liii. must be the heathen nations. It is held that such utterances are incredible on their lips. It must be remembered, however, that the 53rd of Isaiah stands quite by itself in the Old Testament. Whatever view we take of the Servant the passage is astonishing, and we must not in a description so unique too readily appeal to the intrinsic incredibility involved in an interpretation, in order to discredit it in favour of one more congenial. Here again first impressions are not to be too implicitly trusted, we must rather see if cool reflection can reduce the difficulty and make this awkward bit fit into its proper place in the puzzle. It is barely credible, of course, that the poet should have represented the heathen while still in heathen darkness as having expressed thoughts so deep that they find no parallel in the

Old Testament. If, accordingly, the standpoint of the speakers is after the death, but before the resurrection, of the Servant then it would be difficult to defend the ascription of thoughts so profound to the heathen nations. But it does not seem to me that this is the situation in which the words are spoken. The vital thing to observe is that this poem opens with the prediction of the Servant's exaltation and the amazement which it will cause to the nations. It is perfectly natural, then, that in what follows the emotions aroused in the nations should find expression. At first speechless with astonishment at the marvellous revolution in the fortunes of one whom they had so despised, they next express that amazement, then explain their earlier misjudgment, and then in contrite words confess that the Servant had endured, though innocent, the penalty which they, the guilty, had deserved. That the poet should have attributed to them such insight into the laws of the spiritual universe as is here disclosed must not be dismissed as incredible. It measures as nothing else could do his sense of the amazing illumination which God's mighty act in the exaltation of Israel will bring to the Gentiles who had sat in darkness and in the shadow of death. And the objection that had the prophet meant to describe the heathen as the speakers he must have explicitly indicated it has but little weight. Elsewhere the Second Isaiah leaves the speakers whose utterance he reports unnamed, and in the second and the third poems that the Servant is speaking is left to be inferred. Here the many nations and kings are mentioned immediately before the confession begins, and thus that

they are the speakers in chapter liii. is not obscurely indicated in the verse which immediately precedes.

The most serious difficulty, however, remains. It is urged that there is a definite incompatibility between the prophet's representations of Israel and of the Servant. For Israel is represented as guilty and suffering for her own sin, as fearful and discouraged; whereas the Servant is innocent and suffers vicariously, he is courageous and undismayed. The discrepancy may be somewhat reduced if we remember that it is just in the confession of the heathen that this estimate of the Servant and this interpretation of his sufferings are to be found. We must not accordingly judge them as if they had been uttered by the poet himself. They are not the cool and detached verdict of the disinterested spectator, they burst from hearts awed by the manifest miracle they have witnessed, contrite and subdued as they remembered their sin, ashamed that they have misjudged the Servant so harshly, filled with overwhelming gratitude that he has suffered the penalty which was due to themselves. With Dr. Skinner's reply to my earlier statement of this position I am in substantial agreement. He says: "Whoever the speakers may be, we refuse to believe that the thought expressed are anything less than the writer's own deepest convictions as to the character of the Servant." But we must allow for the working of the poet's sympathetic imagination, and we must not forget that it is with a very great poet that we are concerned. That he puts his own interpretation of the total situation into the mouth of the Gentiles is of

course correct, but that in doing so he puts himself into their imagined conditions is surely not to be excluded. If he expresses his deepest convictions in his own person in one way he will surely express them somewhat differently when he represents them as spoken by others. We must be prepared accordingly for a measure of exaggeration ; the contrast between Israel and the heathen is made somewhat more absolute than the prophet himself might have made it. And, after all, what is positively said with reference to the Servant's character scarcely goes so far as is often supposed. He had done no violence and deceit was not in his mouth. He was Yahweh's loyal and righteous Servant. This is practically all that is said directly upon this point. No doubt the interpretation of his sufferings as borne to atone for the sins of others does suggest that he was an entirely innocent victim smitten and slain for sins not his own. Now it is true that the Second Isaiah represents Israel as punished for its own sin. But at the very outset of the prophecy he recognises that the punishment has been excessive : "She hath received at Yahweh's hand double for all her sins." From this to the thought that Israel's sufferings have been, partially, at least, borne vicariously for the sins of the nations is a very short step. And when Israel is placed in contrast with the heathen a relative righteousness might justly be claimed for it, in that Israel had worshipped the one true God and been loyal to the true religion, while the heathen had forsaken Him and abandoned themselves to idolatry. The contradiction cannot perhaps be completely overcome ; but it is due

largely to change in the prophet's point of view. When he is thinking of Israel as it has manifested its character in history he is conscious like the earlier prophets of Israel's sin and the justice of punishment. But even here his attitude is milder, and his estimate of Israel more favourable, than is the case with his predecessors. But when he changes his point of view, still thinking of the actual Israel, he regards the nation not in its sordid and sinful reality but in the light of its mission for the world. And when his thought thus dwells upon its vocation, and especially its knowledge of the one true God, and proclamation of Him to the Gentiles, these sordid and sinful characteristics drop out of view, and he thinks and speaks of Israel as it lives to the mind and the purpose of God. In the light of its vocation the rather unlovely reality is transfigured. And such variation in language about the same object is quite familiar to ourselves. We, too, can speak of Israel or Greece, of Rome or England, now in glowing language of appreciation, when we think of the part they have played in universal history, and now in severe criticism when our thought is concentrated on the unlovely qualities by which they are marred. It is the same object of which we speak, but we disengage in the one case the essential significance from the real figure in which the good and the noble are mingled with the evil and the base.

This still seems to me a better form of the collective interpretation than those solutions of the problem which, while maintaining the identification with Israel, deny that the empirical Israel is intended. This may take the form,

advocated by Gesenius and others, that the Servant is the prophetic order, or the righteous kernel of the nation, or the ideal Israel. The two former are to be set aside, partly because such a limitation is nowhere suggested, partly because since the whole nation had been overwhelmed by calamity no section of it could properly be regarded as enduring sufferings on behalf of the nation as a whole which had been spared. The other view, that the ideal Israel is intended, seems to me to be still open to most of the objections I urged in my *Problem of Suffering* to which Dr. Skinner replies in the second edition of his commentary. These are that if the Servant passages are by the Second Isaiah it follows that he uses the term "the Servant" in incompatible senses. In the next place, the thought that the ideal Israel suffers for the sins of the actual Israel is extremely artificial, and one not likely to have been expressed by the Israelites themselves. In the third place, the exile itself forms no part of the sufferings of the Servant, and thus we detach the poems from the outstanding fact of the contemporary situation. "If we identify," I said, "the Servant with the ideal Israel we reach the strange result that while the actual Israel has received in the exile twice as much punishment as it deserved, its sins are nevertheless atoned for by the sufferings of the ideal Israel, in which the exile is not included." To the first objection Dr. Skinner replies that incompatible is too strong a term for what may be only a difference of degree. But the difference is confessedly so great that on the basis of it the identification with the empirical Israel is decisively set aside by

Dr. Skinner and the ideal Israel is put in its place. On the second objection, Dr. Skinner says, "Dr. Peake himself suggests a line of thought by which the conception might be made intelligible, but finally he rejects it as 'extremely artificial,' and most recent writers do the same, with less attempt at appreciation." He candidly recognises the force of the argument and continues, in words to which I very cordially assent, expounding the principle which in the course of these lectures I have myself more than once exemplified. He says: "We submit, however, that where we are faced with a balance of disadvantages, difficulties exist to be surmounted." But I'm afraid that even after what Dr. Skinner offers in its defence I can still only regard the interpretation as too artificial to be accepted unless we were shut up to this form of the collective theory. The third objection Dr. Skinner does not feel. He thinks that in the sufferings of the exile as experienced by spiritually-minded Israelites we find "those which could be most naturally attributed to the ideal represented by the Servant as forming the atoning element in the calamities which overwhelmed the nation as a whole." But this explanation seems to me to be more in place in a collective theory which identifies the Servant with the pious kernel of the nation rather than with an ideal Israel which is distinct from the actual Israel. And neither for the pious kernel nor for the ideal Israel does it seem to me to be remotely probable that the nation which had itself endured all the calamities of the downfall of the State and the captivity could have regarded the share of them which fell to the spiritually-

minded Israelites as sufferings which had been transferred from themselves to the ideal Israel. The whole point of the description is that the speakers recognise that the penalties they ought to have endured have been transferred from themselves to the Servant. How then can we include in these penalties a calamity which had not been so transferred but which they had felt in full measure. To a further objection that it is difficult to think of the ideal Israel as restoring the actual Israel from exile, Dr. Skinner replies that it is just as open to his school as to mine to meet the difficulty by explaining the deliverance as the act not of the Servant but of Yahweh. This I can scarcely concede. To say, it is too slight a distinction for the actual Israel that Yahweh should restore it from exile and so He entrusts it with a mission to the heathen is perfectly clear and simple. But to say, it is too slight a distinction for the ideal Israel that Yahweh should restore the actual Israel from captivity and so He entrusts the ideal Israel with a mission to the heathen, gives by no means so simple a sequence of thought.

I fear, accordingly, that I must rather emphatically dissent from Dr. Skinner's final conclusion, thankfully recognising the value of the admission that the objections are serious. He says: "We hold, then, that while the conception of the Servant as the ideal Israel is attended by grave difficulties, it is, nevertheless, the only form in which the national interpretation can be successfully maintained."

The truth for which this school of interpreters stands

is that the description of the Servant in the poems has an ideal element in it. But full recognition can be given to this without resort to the difficult hypothesis of an ideal Israel which is distinct from the actual Israel, has its own character and its own career of teaching the nation, confronting opposition without flinching, suffering, dying, raised from the dead, exalted and entrusted with a world-wide mission to the heathen. What enables us to avoid such artificialities, which might quite well have been unintelligible to the author, is to hold fast to the identity of the subject throughout but to recognise that it is treated from different points of view. The Servant is not an ideal Israel, distinct from the empirical Israel, he is the empirical Israel regarded from an ideal point of view.

The poems had their origin in the conditions of the author's time. He interprets to the crushed and despondent people the meaning of Israel's calamities, viewing them in the light of the vocation entrusted to the chosen people. Israel is in other parts of the prophecy also represented as Yahweh's instrument in the conversion of the world. But it is in the poems that the meaning of Israel's sufferings is disclosed. The splendour of Babylon's idolatry, the might which had shattered the tiny kingdom of Judah, seemed to proclaim the supremacy of the victor's deities and the irretrievable defeat of Israel's God. But Yahweh who knows the end from the beginning, and demonstrates his power to control by his ability to predict the future, is but working out a plan which his matchless wisdom has designed and the inexhaustible resources of his energy will carry into effect.

He has chosen his instruments and equipped them for their work. They are Israel and Cyrus. To the latter is assigned the task of overthrowing Babylon and liberating the Jews from captivity. He will cause Jerusalem to be rebuilt and there, in its own land, Israel will resume the full worship of Yahweh. But naturally his thoughts dwell far more on Israel than on Cyrus, who is but the means through which Israel is to achieve its destiny. In the main body of the prophecy the imperfections of Israel are clearly recognised and a partial explanation of its suffering is found in merited chastisement for its sin. But even here the gracious tenderness of Yahweh for his people finds ample expression, touched, indeed, at points with an unpleasing favouritism. Not only the future glory of Israel but also its mission to the heathen are announced. But it is in the Servant poems that the fullest and deepest teaching on the mission of Israel and the meaning of its tragic career is to be found. Israel is the chosen of Yahweh, who has put his spirit upon him. From his birth Yahweh has called him and named him; his vocation is to be Yahweh's Servant; his name is Israel. Prepared like a keen blade, but concealed in the shadow of Yahweh's hand, or like a polished arrow hidden in the quiver, he has awaited the hour when Yahweh would speed him on his mission. He confesses disappointment at the fruitlessness of his labour, but commits his cause and his reward to God. It is He who has entrusted him with his message and himself trained him to deliver it. He had been loyal and faithful in the task appointed him, in spite of cruel persecution, which

he has endured without flinching. He is cheered by the conviction that God is his helper and his vindicator. He faces his foes undismayed, and, assured of their destruction, challenges them to the conflict. He is to be restored from exile ; but great and wonderful though this deliverance is, it is not enough for the honour which is due to God's Servant. Hence Israel is to be entrusted with a world-wide mission. He is Yahweh's prophet, but he will not strive nor cry, he will not, like the Hebrew prophets, proclaim his message in the public ways, not, that is, by mingling in international politics, but by quiet teaching will he do his work for the world. He will take to the nations the true religion, tenderly fostering whatever truth they already know and coaxing into brighter flame the feebly glimmering wick. He, himself, burns with intense and steady flame and labours with unexhausted energy. Nor will he cease from his toil till he has firmly established the true religion in the earth. He will find the heathen responsive ; they are already waiting for his instruction.

So far the suffering of Israel has been but slightly touched upon. It is the main theme of the fourth poem. Yahweh announces the coming elevation of His Servant to the loftiest dignity, and the impression which this will make on the nations. They had looked at Israel with loathing, his face and form so scarred and disfigured that he seemed no longer human. But the contrast between the depth of his earlier abasement and the height to which Yahweh will exalt him strikes the nations and their monarchs dumb with astonishment. Then they will

burst into speech. "Who could have credited," they ask, "the amazing tidings which we have heard?" Yet how great the excuse for their failure to divine the truth. For they had received no revelation of the wonder-working power of God. And on the other hand all that they had seen of the Servant had but deepened their contempt for him and confirmed their unfavourable judgment of him. Of contemptible origin and mean appearance, he had seemed destitute of all charm and attractiveness. Despised and forsaken of men he was also smitten by God. He was shunned by his fellows, for leprosy had claimed him as its victim, and they turned away from such loathsome disfigurement with a shudder of repulsion and saw in sufferings so painful and disfigurements so extreme a visible token of the divine displeasure. But how cruelly they had misjudged him! For now God Himself has intervened and vindicated his Servant. Israel's suffering, they feel, has been undeserved. For they had wandered like heedless, wayward, sheep away from the true God and the true religion. Israel alone had remained faithful to him. They were the guilty ones, and Israel was innocent. Yet the innocent had suffered, and the guilty had escaped. What could be the meaning of so strange an inversion of the moral order? What but this, that Israel had endured the penalties of their sin? To their amazement at the sudden change in Israel's fortunes there is added deep penitence and over-whelming gratitude.

Who could have believed that which we have heard ?
But to whom was the arm of Yahweh revealed ?
For he grew up as a sapling before us,
And as a root out of a dry ground,
He had no form that we should look upon him,
No visage that we should desire him,
Despised and forsaken of men,
A man of pains and familiar with sickness,
And as one from whom men hide the face,
Despised, and we regarded him not.
But it was our sickness that he bore,
And our pains, he carried them.
While we regarded him as stricken,
Smitten of God and afflicted.
But he was pierced through our rebellions,
Crushed through our sins,
The chastisement to win our peace was upon him,
And by his stripes was healing wrought for us.
We had all gone astray like sheep,
We had turned each his own way,
And Yahweh made to light on him
The sin of us all.

But not only was he tortured by the ravages of hideous and painful disease. He was the victim of oppression and injustice. He submitted with lamb-like meekness and made no protest ; without legal trial he was led unresisting to his death, and no one troubled about his fate, or realised that he had died for the sins of the nations. But if men so misjudged him God judged otherwise. He proclaims the righteousness of his Servant and brings him back to life from the dishonoured grave into which he had been flung. And this divine revision of their judgment the nations penitently accepted. A new era opens for Israel. He will receive a lofty place among

the nations as a reward for his vicarious suffering on their behalf.

It would be unjust to see in this interpretation of Israel's mission and sufferings an expression of national megalomania. That the Second Isaiah was not wholly free from this limitation I have already hinted. But in these poems he has risen sheer above it. We may, indeed, feel some difficulty about his interpretation of the vicarious character of Israel's sufferings in the strict sense of the term. But we should recognise in the amplest manner the truth of the representation that Israel has been the revealer of the true God to the world; and, not in the author's time alone, but since, has Israel suffered cruel, prolonged and repeated martyrdom for its faith. Who can think without admiration of the noble fidelity shown by the martyrs in the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes, or what Christian, who really understands his religion, can think without admiration, mingled with shame and horror, of the pitiless persecution which inflexible loyalty to their religion has brought them from those who bore the Christian name? And turning from this primary application we may ask how it stands with the secondary application which has been current in the Christian Church. That the poet had the application to Jesus in mind seems to me excluded by the language of the poems, however striking the coincidences may be. But I fully believe that these passages meant much to Jesus Himself. Many years ago when I was working at the Pauline theology I was greatly impressed by the almost complete absence of the reference to these passages which might

naturally have been expected. But I believe that it would be a mistake to infer that they had not left their mark very deep in his doctrine of the death of Christ. And, similarly, I believe that Jesus found Himself in the Servant passages, and that the peculiar development of the conception of the Son of man was partly, at least, determined by the fact that Jesus identified Himself not only with the Messiah and the Son of man but also with the suffering Servant. It would be improper for me to deal with this problem in any but a detached way. I am not raising or wishing to raise the question whether, as a matter of fact, the Christian view of Jesus is correct or not. But without deserting the strictly scientific attitude I may put the question : how far on the hypothesis that the Christian view of Jesus is true could we justify the secondary application of the Servant passages to Him as I have interpreted them. It is of Israel that the prophet spoke, but of Israel in his essential significance for the history of mankind. I have steadily rejected all identifications with the ideal Israel or with a section of Israel. Yet these theories do bring home to us how defective from its inevitably mixed character a nation must be as the organ of revelation and the sufferer for the world's sin. If, however, we can discover some individual or group in which these qualities of Israel are to be found, we may have an application not intended by the prophet but more adequate to the functions he assigned to the Servant than Israel itself could be. If we could identify Israel with Jesus then the Christian application would be justified, not exegetically, but in principle. The Christian belief

is that Jesus was the supreme revealer of God and the sufferer for the world's sin. From that point of view the application would be justified. We could think of Him as the true Servant of Yahweh because in Him the essential significance of Israel, as the poet defines it, was concentrated.

THE ROOTS OF HEBREW PROPHECY AND JEWISH APOCALYPTIC.¹

IT is not always easy for us to trace to their sources movements and tendencies which are momentous in our own day. The quest of origins is proverbially difficult. The tracks as we follow them backward grow fainter till they become imperceptible. And naturally when we are dealing with a movement in antiquity which, even in its brightest period, is all too dimly seen, we must not be surprised if the problem of origins baffles us. Our records are scanty at the best, and much information that would be priceless to us is not preserved because it was too commonplace or familiar to be put on record.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the significance and the influence of Israel. That tiny people ranks for us with Greece and Rome when we are estimating our incalculable debt to antiquity. Primarily it is of its religion that we think, alike for its own intrinsic value and because Christianity grew out of it. But this religion found expression in a literature of lofty quality; and even if the religion should be set aside, the literature would remain

¹ An amplification of the Lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library, the 14th December, 1921, and first printed in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 7, 1923.

a possession for ever. Of this religion Hebrew prophecy is the most splendid flower ; and if other Hebrew writings may rank as literature with the finest prophecies, or perhaps even surpass them, yet prophecy, rather than the Psalms or the Wisdom Books, is the mightiest creation of the Hebrew spirit. He who would understand the richness and depth of the religion of Israel and rightly measure the range and quality of its influence must beyond everything else steep himself in the study of the great prophets. For even if at certain points the Psalmists may rise to loftier heights of thought or expression, or touch profounder levels of experience, it is the prophets who have made this possible ; for in these instances they are original and creative, the Psalmists secondary and dependent. No pains then can be too great which are spent in learning to appreciate them ; and though my present concern is not with prophecy in the noble splendour of its maturity, yet the task of uncovering the roots that we may the better understand the forces which created the flower will not be without its reward.

Although Abraham and Moses are described as "prophets," that is the application to them of a later term which was not appropriate except in a very loose sense. The narrative of the seventy elders who received a portion of Yahweh's Spirit and prophesied at the Tent of Meeting in the wilderness, is closely related to the stories of the prophets in the time of Saul. The prophetic frenzy is evanescent and it does not return ; and when Eldad and Medad shared the experience and prophesied in the camp, and Moses rebuked the scandalised Joshua,

desiring that Yahweh would put His Spirit upon all so that all the Lord's people might be prophets, it was not of anything beyond this passing ecstasy that he was thinking. But whether we regard this narrative as historical or as reflecting a condition of things which was really much later, it is of no special importance for our particular purpose. The story is isolated, no results seem to flow from it. It does not initiate any new and eventful movement.

To find the historical roots of Hebrew prophecy we must move forward to the age of Samuel. Samuel himself is described as a seer, and though a note in the narrative (1 Sam. ix. 9) seems to identify the prophet with the seer, the names being later and earlier terms for the same class, we should probably regard them as distinct. If we assumed that the seers and the prophets, after maintaining their separate identity for a period, finally coalesced, then the name "prophet," surviving as the designation of the whole, might not unnaturally be employed for one of the elements in the combination to which it was not strictly applicable.

A seer, as the name indicates, is one who sees, that is who sees what the ordinary man cannot see. Of Balaam it is said that his eye was closed, that he heard the words of God, saw the vision of God, falling down and having his eyes open. This seems to mean that he falls in a trance with his eyes closed, but with the inner eye open for the vision of God. The seers as a class were wise men, who were consulted by those who were in difficulties and received a fee for their professional services.

A typical case is that of Samuel, to whom Saul goes to enquire about his father's asses. Samuel was, it is true, no common seer, but we learn from this narrative what the profession involved. The seers would contribute to the combination their cooler judgment, their insight, their shrewdness in dealing with practical problems, while the prophets would bring to it their fiery enthusiasm.

It is in the time of Samuel that the prophets begin to be prominent. We do not know whether they had an earlier history, but they appeared at the time when the Hebrews were groaning under the oppression of the Philistines. Saul, who is selected by Samuel as the liberator of his people, comes in contact with a band of prophets, he is seized with their infectious ecstasy and, to the surprise of every one, himself becomes a prophet. It is of course clear that prophecy is at this stage very rudimentary, with scarcely, it would seem, anything in common with the later activities of the great prophets. We are struck at once by its connexion with certain physical conditions. Music seems to have played a large part in the exercises. Saul is told by Samuel that he will meet a band of prophets, with a psaltery and a timbrel and a pipe and a harp before them, and when he meets them they will be prophesying. So too at a later period Elisha, when he was consulted by the King of Israel and his allies, called for a minstrel ; and when the minstrel played before him the hand of Yahweh came upon him. The effect of the music was not, as we might have supposed, to soothe the prophet that he might the better hear the voice of God. It was rather

designed to excite him and induce a condition of ecstasy. We have several indications of this in the history. Thus one form of the verb "to prophesy" in Hebrew means also "to rave"; and in the narrative of Saul's attempt on David's life, the text of the Revised Version says that Saul prophesied in the midst of the house, but the margin gives the alternative rendering "raved." Similarly the prophet who anointed Jehu gave the impression to Jehu's comrades that he was mad. The same abnormal element appeared in Elijah, when the hand of the Lord was upon him and he ran before the chariot of Ahab from Carmel to Jezreel.

I have already touched on the contagious character of prophecy in my reference to the experience of Saul when he met the band of prophets. The Spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon him, he prophesied with them and was turned into another man. The strength of the influence and the measure of its transforming energy may be inferred from the amazement which Saul's experience occasioned. It found expression in an exclamation which passed into a proverb: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" But in a late narrative, which gives another account of the origin of this proverb, we are told of a similar phenomenon. When he sent messengers to capture David, who had taken refuge with Samuel at Naioth, they saw the company of prophets prophesying and Samuel standing as head over them. They were seized with the infectious ecstasy, and the same experience happened to two other companies of messengers and finally to Saul himself. The case of the seventy

elders illustrates how the prophetic impulse might run like wildfire through a group, and even communicate the contagion to members of the group who had remained behind in the camp when the others had gone out to the Tent of Meeting. Another form of psychical phenomena, illustrated in the history of prophecy, is clairvoyance, as in Elisha's words to Gehazi, as he returned from the interview with Naaman: "Went not mine heart with thee, when the man turned again from his chariot to meet thee?" Ezekiel in particular is notable in this respect. Future events are vividly seen in the prophetic trance. Voices are heard, of God or of heavenly beings. If abnormal physical strength sometimes comes with the prophetic ecstasy, it may leave the prophet in a state of physical collapse. The Book of Daniel belongs to apocalyptic rather than to prophetic literature but it illustrates this point. After one of his visions and its interpretation we read that he fainted and was sick certain days. And on other occasions he says that his strength completely left him. The experience itself might sometimes be one of rapture, at other times it might fill the soul with horror or rack it with excruciating agony.

When we remember the wild contagious excitement, the infectious frenzy, of the early prophets there is no reason for surprise if, as is often supposed, they had no very high reputation at this time. It was just their eccentricities which would catch the popular eye and determine the popular estimate that they were more or less mad. It is usually thought that the question "Is Saul also among the prophets?" expresses the amaze-

ment of his friends that so respectable and steady a man as Saul should have joined a band of strolling enthusiasts. This may not be the correct interpretation of the passage, though there is much to make it plausible.

The fact that the prophets come into prominence at the time of the Philistine oppression, has suggested to many scholars that the movement was patriotic and directed to the attainment of national freedom. It must be remembered that religion and patriotism were vitally associated from the very foundation of Israel's existence as a nation. Thus the impulse to achieve national independence would carry with it an intenser devotion to the national Deity. The prophets would combine a zeal for freedom with zeal for Yahweh of Hosts. Samuel himself seems to have been a seer rather than a prophet; but he sympathised with the aims of the prophets, and predicted that the champion whom he had chosen to vindicate the liberties of his nation would experience the Divine enthusiasm and catch the contagion of the prophetic ecstasy. It is possible of course that prophecy appeared among the Hebrews before the Philistine invasion, and that it did not have its root in reaction against a foreign tyranny. It has often been supposed that it was not native to the religion of Israel, but derived from an external source. Generally it has been to Canaanite influence that its importation into Israel has been attributed. The Hebrews incorporated a large number of Canaanites and, with the adoption of the settled agricultural life, they took over the cult of the Baalim, that is the local divinities on whose favour and

co-operation the fertility of the soil was thought to depend. It is asserted that the Canaanites had prophets of a character similar to that already depicted. It is true that the narrative of Elijah's contest on Carmel with the prophets of the Tyrian Baal shows that they went to wilder excesses in religious dancing and self-laceration than the prophets of Israel. But at any rate the antagonists of Elijah and the early Hebrew prophets had the ecstatic element in common. On the other hand, the prophets confronted by Elijah were not Canaanite prophets but Phœnician. They were prophets of a foreign deity. We know nothing of Canaanite prophets. And it is questioned whether a movement so zealous for the worship of Yahweh would have taken over for its propaganda a form of religious exercise characteristic of Canaanite religion.

We cannot, however, build with any confidence on such arguments. That the prophets would have refrained from conscious adaptation of elements derived from the paganism of Canaan may be true. But we need not think of deliberate borrowing. The Hebrews were very susceptible to their environment and it was not so much in modes of worship, or forms in which religious emotion found expression, as in the object to which worship was directed and the higher ideas by which they were re-interpreted that the genius of Israel stamped its religion with a unique quality. And the salient characteristics of early prophecy are such as we find in other lands and among other races. They seem to spring spontaneously out of the very nature of religion. It should be added,

however, that recent investigation has tended to bring home the very complex character of the religion which the Hebrews found in Palestine at the time of their settlement. And it has been suggested that ultimately this corybantic prophecy really had its origin in the Dionysiac orgies of Thrace and Asia Minor, the movement spreading on the one side to Syria and Canaan and on the other to Greece. At present it is advisable to hold our judgment in suspense on the question whether prophecy was a foreign importation in Israel and if so from what people it was derived.

The question of foreign origin has recently come into special prominence in connexion with the eschatology of the prophets. It is rather unfortunate that the reaction from the old-fashioned view that prophecy was in the main prediction has led to the prevalent belief that the prophets were scarcely concerned with the future at all, but only with declaring the will of God for His people, denouncing the sin of their contemporaries and threatening them with speedy judgment if they failed to reform. Reaction was needed, but it has swung to an extreme. For really the predictive element in prophecy was very prominent. In the main, no doubt, prophecy before the destruction of Jerusalem was concerned with judgment. This is clear from a famous passage in Jeremiah. When Hananiah predicted that Jehoiachin and the captives, together with the Temple vessels, would be brought back to Jerusalem within two years, Jeremiah replied that he hoped the prophecy might come true. But he went on to say: "The prophets that have been before me and

before thee of old prophesied against many countries, and against great kingdoms, of war, and of evil, and of pestilence. The prophet which prophesieth of peace, when the word of the prophet shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known that the Lord hath truly sent him." In other words, Jeremiah regarded the characteristic note of true prophecy to be a prediction of calamity. And we find that Amos, the earliest of our literary prophets, utters a warning against the optimism of the people who expected the Day of Yahweh to be a day of triumph: "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! wherefore would ye have the day of the Lord? it is darkness and not light. As if a man did flee from a lion and a bear met him; or went into the house and leaned his hand on the wall and a serpent bit him. Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness and not light? even very dark, and no brightness in it?" But in the portions of the prophetic writings which we can with some confidence date before the destruction of Jerusalem, we have a number of passages which depict a glorious future for Israel. And after the downfall of Judah prophecy became largely a message of consolation. This continued even after the return from captivity. For the fortunes of the people were still miserable, and multitudes remained in the land of captivity or were scattered in the Dispersion.

The tendency among scholars has been to reduce the extent of optimistic prophecy before the Exile, and this has led to the denial on an increasing scale of the authenticity of such passages at present found in pre-

exilic prophecies. But even those critics who have not gone to such drastic extremes as Duhm or Marti have held for the most part that the eschatology was a comparatively late development. Predictions of future felicity might be pre-exilic ; but in the main the older prophets were prophets of disaster, and eschatology was a comparatively late development. Opinions differed as to the route by which the conviction of impending catastrophe was reached. Generally it was thought to have a moral root. The prophets felt deeply the sin of Israel and realised intensely its intolerable incompatibility with the righteousness of Yahweh. They preached repentance and reform but did not believe that their message would be received. Hence the speedy coming of judgment was in their belief inevitable. Against this it was urged by others that we cannot understand why such an inference should have arisen only in Israel and why it should have extended only over a period of four hundred years. Why should there have been such long periods without prophecy ? Hence Wellhausen laid stress on the foreboding of the future. He compared the prophets with storm-birds, sensitive to approaching change, who were moved to utterance by the conviction that Yahweh was about to do something. Or again prediction was derived from an acute observation of the political conditions, and might in some cases be regarded as prophecy after the event. There was, however, another possibility. It might have been due, not to instinctive anticipation or political or moral inference, but to tradition. In that case the prophets did not draw

their certainty of judgment from the contradiction between a Holy God and an unclean people, or from keener insight into the political forces at work, or from their instinctive anticipation of calamity ; but they applied to the situation a traditional scheme familiar to themselves and their hearers. This scheme embraced not only the prophecy of disaster but that of restoration and blessedness.

Several advocates of this view argue that the scheme was borrowed from abroad. This conclusion was independently reached along two lines. Eduard Meyer brought forward proofs that such a scheme existed in Egypt. Gressmann argued for it on the Old Testament evidence. Gunkel had previously expressed the view that there was in Israel a pre-prophetic eschatology. In his commentary on Genesis he said in reply to the view that the Messianic element in Jacob's blessing on Judah was a late interpolation : "Modern scholars are of the opinion that the eschatology of Israel was a creation of the literary prophets, hence they strike out the verse since it contradicts this fundamental conviction. The author of this commentary does not share this conviction ; he believes on the contrary that the prophets can be understood only on the assumption that they found an eschatology already in existence, took it over, contested it, transformed it. This pre-prophetic eschatology is here attested." Gressmann worked out the evidence most thoroughly. Both he and Gunkel lay stress on the mythical survivals in the descriptions of the future, especially in the imagery, which could not have origin-

ated in Israel. Sellin tries to trace back the evidence in the pre-prophetic period ; but he believes that the eschatology, while it may employ mythical imagery, yet grew directly out of the fundamental ideas of Israel's religion.

It will be seen at once that this implies a totally different attitude to the origin of eschatology. Wellhausen argued that eschatology was an artificial creation, and had a literary origin. The older prophets started with the actual situation and their predictions grew out of the historical facts. Ezekiel created eschatology by starting, not from the actual conditions, but from literary sources, that is from earlier prophecies. Thus the prophecies occasioned by the Scythian peril in the reign of Josiah were the origin of Ezekiel's prophecy on Gog. From the Exile onwards fantastic forecasts were made of a general combination of God knows what nations against the New Jerusalem, for which in reality there was no occasion at all. Sellin, who is opposed to this theory, has thus formulated it. "For pre-exilic eschatology a psychological explanation is to be given, for eschatology after Ezekiel, a literary."

This theory as to the origin of the eschatology naturally affected the literary criticism of the books. The prophets interpreted history and foretold the future in the light of great fundamental ideas. Then the eschatological writers constructed their scheme of the future from the data of the prophets. There was accordingly a strong and increasing tendency to reject the authenticity of eschatological passages in pre-exilic prophecy. Critics of this school argued that earlier prophecies,

relating to contemporary conditions, had been adjusted to later eschatological theories. The eschatologists on the other hand contend that an old eschatological scheme was adapted by the prophets to contemporary conditions. They are therefore ready to recognise the authenticity of many passages in pre-exilic prophecy which scholars like Duhm and Marti relegated to the post-exilic period. It ought of course to be recognised that in the criticism of the prophets passages are frequently assigned to a late date on grounds which are not connected with any theory on the origin of eschatology. The presence of ideas which we have independent reasons for regarding as late in their origin, allusions to events or conditions of a later time, expressions characteristic of the post-exilic period, literary dependence on late originals, may all serve as criteria pointing to post-exilic date. At the same time it is undeniable that if the origin of the prophetic eschatology is traced to Ezekiel there will be a strong temptation to approach the study of particular passages with a certain bias in favour of a late date. Wellhausen himself applied the principle with much more moderation than Duhm, while Duhm has not been so thoroughgoing as Marti. My personal judgment on the matter is that it is not safe to settle the date of a particular passage by this criterion alone. Yet there are not a few passages that fall into this category which are probably late rather than early. And as the number of these passages grows, the tendency is not unjustified to recognise a certain presumption that passages which betray a close kinship with them are likely to belong to the same period.

I may illustrate what I have been saying by reference to the closing verses of Amos. This is a typically eschatological passage. It was regarded by Wellhausen as a late appendix and his verdict has been very widely accepted. But the important point to emphasise is that his case did not rest on the assumption that a passage of this kind must, since it was eschatological, in the nature of the case be late. He based it on the glaring contradiction it presents to what has gone before. After Amos had expressed his conviction of judgment in its most drastic form, he could not have broken the point of all that he had been saying, assured his hearers that matters would not be so bad after all, substituted roses and lavender for blood and iron or allowed milk and honey to pour from the goblet of Yahweh's wrath. It is accordingly not surprising that Gunkel in his recent work on the prophets says: "The close of the Book of Amos (ix. 8 ff.) is according to the generally accepted opinion non-authentic." It is interesting, however, that both Eduard Meyer and Sellin argue for its authenticity. Meyer does not contend that the contradiction does not exist. He says: "The closing chapter of Amos, which is generally regarded as a late addition, I consider to be in all essentials genuine, and its ideas as indispensable for the book of the prophet. It is usually forgotten that contradictions in ideas often exist harmoniously side by side in an author and entirely so in a prophet, who ought never to be judged by rules of logic." For my own part I think the price Eduard Meyer pays for the authenticity of the passage is too high. Sellin, in his volume

of studies entitled *Der Alttestamentliche Prophetismus* (1912), met the difficulty in another way. Amos did not utter the closing passage in Bethel. The total destruction announced by him concerned North Israel alone. The closing passage refers only to Judah, and was added by the prophet when on his way home he halted at Jerusalem and put his book together there. It was obvious to him as to any other Israelite that the downfall of the Northern Kingdom was not the end of God's ways. The final thing on earth was the salvation for which all the fathers had hoped. How could this be expressed otherwise than in ix. 11-15? The God of Amos, he says, was more than a logical category (pp. 32 f.). I see no reason for this very hypothetical reconstruction of history, and one would have expected the contrast which Sellin found to have been clearly indicated. It is interesting that in the third edition of his *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1920) he offers quite a different explanation. He says it is obvious that Amos cannot have uttered the prophecy in question immediately after ix. 1-4. But all objections disappear as soon as it is recognised that it once stood after vii. 10-17, and was a continuation of the doom announced to Amaziah, for whom, as for Israel, the brilliant future of Judah signified a verdict of destruction. This reconstruction is also quite hypothetical and the actual language of the passage does not seem to suit the situation to which Sellin assigns it.

So far I have not explained in any detail the grounds on which the eschatological theory is based. In certain

Egyptian documents Eduard Meyer discovered Egyptian prophecies with a fixed eschatological scheme. The general outline is as follows : A wise man unveils to the king Egypt's future, falls dead and is solemnly buried by the king, his prophecies are recorded and handed down to later generations. Their content is that, first a period of terrible misery is coming, in which everything in Egypt is turned upside down, foreign nations burst in, the temples are plundered and desecrated, their mysteries are unveiled, while the king himself is carried off as a prisoner or has to flee to a foreign land. Then, however, an epoch follows, in which the Gods again bestow their favour on the land, and a righteous ruler, beloved of the gods, of the seed of Rê, drives out the enemy, restores the cultus and the ancient order, subdues the neighbouring countries, and enjoys a long and fortunate reign. Meyer thinks that the numerous points of contact between this scheme and Old Testament prophecy need no further exposition. The scheme is in its fundamental features entirely the same ; first a time of severe affliction, the destruction of the civil power, the devastation of the country and its sanctuaries, then the glory of the Messianic kingdom under the righteous king, beloved of the gods, of the old legitimate stock to whom all nations will be made subject. This scheme is to be found in all the Hebrew prophets from whom we possess extensive remains composed in written form by the prophets themselves. This scheme, he continues, the material content of all prophecy, undoubtedly comes from Egypt. The prophets did not spring from Egypt, they were Canaanite ;

and just as little were the solitary men, brooding in melancholy, like Amos and Hosea, who were not nor wished to be prophets, under their influence. But this traditional history of the future came to Palestine like other fine histories ; and the great Israelite prophets fastened on to it and made it the foundation of their preaching and thereby filled it with quite a new spiritual content. It was here as with the old Babylonian dragon myth, which, when turned into a history of the future, formed the basis of eschatology. But the spirit which filled the Old Testament prophets was absent from this eschatology ; so the prophets' pictures of the future had an eternal significance and quite another worth than the Jewish and Christian and ancient Egyptian Apocalypses ever gained.

I have said that Gressmann reached his belief in a pre-prophetic eschatology derived by Israel from abroad along lines quite different from those which led Meyer to a similar result ; and the convergence of two independent lines of enquiry may seem a striking testimony in favour of the conclusion reached. On the question of foreign origin Gressmann has since expressed the opinion that the probability is more in favour of Egypt than Babylonia, although there may have been similar expectations throughout the nearer East. Moreover, in Palestine the influence of Egypt and Babylonia may have crossed. He adds : " The characteristic difference in the oracles of the two peoples is that the Egyptians only repeat the usual phrases while the Israelites transform the type individually here and everywhere. Therefore the Messianic prophecies in Israel had a long and important history, while in Egypt

they remained unaltered through the centuries." Gunkel considers the Egyptian parallels as of the highest significance, but will not allow that they gave rise to the Hebrew prophecies. He draws attention especially to the absence in the Egyptian sources of the cosmic, mythological imagery which is so frequent in the writings of the prophets; quoting as instances of this, the burning of the world, the universal deluge, a new chaos and a new creation, the wars of the deity against the powers of the deep and of heaven, a kingdom of peace even among the beasts. Yet while he argues that we could infer from the Old Testament itself that another and more popular prophecy had preceded that of the great prophets, and that Israelite eschatology had grown up on the basis of a borrowed foreign eschatology, he says nevertheless that the eschatology of the prophets and psalmists is in its present form a thoroughly Israelite phenomenon and filled with ideas which are peculiarly Israelite. As a whole it is undoubtedly the creation of the great literary prophets.

It may be questioned, however, whether the existence of this ancient Egyptian eschatology has not been too hastily affirmed. For example, H. O. Lange of Copenhagen, speaking of the hieratic papyrus known as *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*, affirmed that the speeches of the sage were prophetic in character predicting an era of disaster for Egypt for which the king is responsible. The advent of a Saviour is prophesied, a wise and mild ruler who will restore order among his people and inaugurate an age of happiness and prosperity. This

prophecy of restoration Lange regarded as quite Messianic in its colouring, both the form in which it is put, and the choice of words, recalling those higher flights of Hebrew prophecy that speak of a coming Messiah. Dr. Alan Gardner, however, is convinced that there is no prophecy at all in these passages. He says: "At all events it seems now to be clear that whichever hypothesis scholars may choose, there is too much uncertainty about the matter for it to be made the basis of any far-reaching conclusions as to the influence of Egyptian on Hebrew literature." And at the close of the discussion he says: "Before leaving the subject of its contents, I must once more affirm that there is no certain or even likely trace of prophecies in any part of the book."

Sellin reduces the Egyptian parallels to two; but he does not accept Meyer's view as to the indebtedness of Hebrew prophecy to Egyptian influence. He endorses König's criticism that we ought to have found the Egyptian scheme in the professional prophets, the opponents of Micah or Jeremiah, who were much more susceptible than the great prophets to foreign influence. But they say, "Peace, where there is no peace, no disaster can overtake us". Sellin also emphasises the difference in the sense attached to calamity and deliverance in the Egyptian and Hebrew prophecies. The former simply described national catastrophes, adding the hope of a new future. In Israel calamity is the judgment of the inexorably righteous God upon sin, and the coming of the Kingdom of God is proclaimed, of which in the Egyptian texts there is not the slightest trace.

Hölscher in his volume on the Prophets takes a still less favourable view. Acknowledging a certain connexion between the Egyptian form of literature and the literary scheme of the Jewish prophetic literature, he urges that the influence as to the age of this scheme on Hebrew soil remains unproved. Against it lie the objections to the authenticity of most of the predictions of blessedness in the old prophetic books, objections which have not been refuted. Nor is the mere antithesis of misfortune and blessedness necessarily to be derived from a mythical or a literary scheme. Moreover, Egyptian influence on ancient Israel is minute even to vanishing point, and the religious ideas and usages of the Hebrews in the early period nowhere betray any traces of it. If such influence is to be assumed, it can belong only to a much later period and it must have been mediated through the later Jewish communities in Egypt.

It will be clear then that we cannot with any confidence assert the derivation of the prophetic eschatology from an Egyptian source. It is also uncertain whether we are entitled to attribute it to a foreign origin at all. Gunkel and Gressmann think the imagery we find in the eschatological descriptions points to derivations from foreign mythology. It is quite possible that imagery foreign in origin might be used to depict religious ideas which were a later development ; and if there was a pre-prophetic eschatology in Israel it may have grown from a genuine Hebrew root, developed from the fundamental principles of the religion. This is Sellin's position. But, when all is said, it must still be regarded as very

questionable whether there was in early Israel any developed eschatology at all.

I pass on to the origin of Jewish Apocalyptic. The general distinction between prophecy and apocalyptic may be best realised if we place a typical prophetic book alongside of an apocalypse, for example, *Amos* by the side of *Daniel*. Biblical apocalypses are to be found in *Daniel*, *Revelation* and *II Esdras*. Other apocalypses are the *Book of Enoch*, the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the *Assumption of Moses*, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. But it is not possible to draw a clear-cut distinction between the two, because the transition from one to the other was gradual, and the later prophecy is in many cases a good deal marked with apocalyptic features. Here I return to matters already mentioned. I have already pointed out that the great pre-exilic prophets were mainly concerned with the religious and moral condition of their own people. With but slight exceptions they are emphatic in their condemnation of sinful Israel and Judah; they anticipate that the people of God will be punished by a heathen power which is the rod of Yahweh's anger. When the Northern Kingdom had fallen, prophecy was concentrated on Judah and was very largely prophecy of approaching judgment. Yet some qualification must be made. There are in the earlier prophetic books prophecies of a radiant future, whose pre-exilic origin we have no good reason for doubting. Yet glowing forecasts of the blessed future have been

added somewhat freely in the later period to prophecies of judgment, especially in the form of happy endings. Another qualification must be made. While the great prophets proclaim that the primary object of Yahweh's anger is His own people, the prophecy of Nahum is directed entirely against Nineveh. He brings no complaint against the morality or righteousness of Judah. His hot and fierce indignation is poured out exclusively upon the heathen oppressor. A similar view has been taken in various forms with reference to Habakkuk, but, I believe, incorrectly.

No sooner is Jerusalem destroyed than the whole character of prophecy is transformed. This was due to the terrible fate which had overtaken the Jews. Now that they had been carried into captivity with their city destroyed, their temple in ruins, their national existence brought to an end, it was felt that the stroke of judgment had fallen and henceforward the prophet must provide for the future. We see the actual transition in the message of Ezekiel. His ministry began in 592, while Jerusalem and the first temple were still standing; he outlived the destruction of the city for a considerable period; and his prophecy comes to us from both these periods in his life. He is uncompromising in the severity of the judgment he passes on Israel's history from beginning to end. He speaks with loathing and with anger, not only of his contemporaries in Palestine, but of all the past generations, whether in Egyptian bondage, in the wilderness, or in Canaan. There is no redeeming feature in the indictment he draws up against his people

through the whole of its history. And this unrelieved condemnation is matched by his prediction of unsparing retribution. But when the city was in ruins and the people were in exile, he turned his face towards the future. Not that he retracted his judgments on the people. His estimate of its moral character and ungrateful apostasy is just as stern as ever. But as he contemplates the destiny of the people, his tone entirely changes. He predicts the return from exile to Palestine. He contemplates a regenerate and happy community, a re-united Israel living under a Davidic prince in security in its own land, the old ceremonial established in a new temple in which Yahweh Himself will dwell in the midst of His people. He also foretells how, when the hosts of heathendom assail the apparently defenceless Israelites, Yahweh without human aid will utterly overthrow them. The other great prophet of the Exile, the author of Isaiah xl.-lv., who is commonly called the Second Isaiah, foretold in glowing language the return of the Jews from exile, the rebuilding of the Temple, the bliss of the redeemed in their ancestral home.

The return from captivity took place; but the Jews entered on a long period of disillusion. On the political side the old tradition was simply continued. The downfall of Assyria had not meant the liberation of Judah, for she fell first into the power of Egypt and in a few years passed under the sway of Babylon. The Second Isaiah predicted that Cyrus would destroy the Babylonian power. That came to pass. But while a certain number went back to their own land, they did not secure political

independence ; they remained subject to Persia and in later times suffered much from the Persian Government. Alexander the Great broke the power of Persia, but the Jews did not go free, they were still under foreign rule. And when Alexander's empire broke up, first Egypt and then Syria kept them in subjection. Their material conditions were often distressing. Thus, while the prophecies of the downfall of tyrants had been fulfilled, the fulfilment only meant the change of one tyrant for another. They came to realise that in the overthrow of empires there was no relief from their miseries.

We are thus able to understand how the outlook of apocalyptic is differentiated from that of prophecy. The anticipations of the prophets are conditioned by contemporary political conditions. Isaiah expects judgment to be inflicted by Assyria, Jeremiah anticipates it from Babylonia. The Second Isaiah predicts deliverance from Babylonia, but it is to be effected by the triumph of Cyrus. In apocalyptic this is not the case. Apocalypses have been described in a happy phrase as "tracts for bad times." The writers have come to despair of any relief through normal political action in international affairs. They rely no longer on human agency, whether in the form of insurrection or the overthrow of the oppressor by a foreign power. Experience showed that insurrection was worse than futile, and that if one empire was overthrown by a successful conqueror a new tyrant simply took the place of the old. Hence they were driven to turn from earth to heaven, from man to God. God Himself will intervene to crush the oppressor and establish His kingdom on earth.

Since deliverance does not come from any development in the political situation but by Divine intervention, no visible movement of events will lead up to it. Whatever preparation there may or may not be in the unseen world, the action of God will come on men like lightning out of a clear sky. "When they are saying Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them." We find in the earlier prophets something parallel, but with a more limited application. For example Isaiah says: "At eventide behold terror; and before the morning they are not. This is the portion of them that spoil us and the lot of them that rob us." This refers simply to the overthrow of a great invading army, which strikes horror into God's people but is annihilated in the night. But Ezekiel is here, as in so much besides, the ultimate literary source. He anticipates that when Israel is living in peace and security after its restoration to Palestine, Yahweh will lure Gog to his destruction, by the prospect of easy victory and rich spoil. For Israel will be dwelling in unwalled villages with no fortifications and apparently defenceless. When Gog and his multitudinous hordes come from the ends of the earth, greedy for their certain spoil, Israel will need to lift no hand in self-defence, for God will destroy them with pestilence and tempest, with fire and brimstone, and by inciting them to mutual slaughter.

How then did Ezekiel's anticipation originate? It was in the first instance the outcome of his theodicy. His fundamental doctrine was the sovereignty and glory of God. In all his action God has His own glory for

His supreme end. The whole course of history is directed to that goal. By its misconduct Israel had compromised the reputation of its God in the sight of the heathen. The merited judgment had been again and again averted. But now the Divine patience has been exhausted and judgment has fallen on the guilty nation. But this has compromised Yahweh's reputation afresh, for the overthrow of His people can be interpreted by the heathen as due only to the weakness of its God. Hence Yahweh must demonstrate His supreme power by restoring His people from exile to their own land. Again and again it is affirmed that regard for His own glory, tender pity for His own outraged reputation, is the motive for His action. But the restoration of Israel is not enough; Yahweh has an account to settle with the heathen for their misjudgment of Him and for the insults they have heaped upon Him. And so, still with the all-controlling purpose of vindicating His holy name, He entices Gog and all his vast multitudes to fall on defenceless Israel, that He may thus, by this appalling slaughter, for ever secure His glory in the sight of the nations. "It shall come to pass in the latter days, that I will bring thee against my land, that the nations may know me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes." "And I will magnify myself, and sanctify myself, and I will make myself known in the eyes of many nations; and they shall know that I am Yahweh." It is again and again affirmed that the restoration of Israel is not accomplished for Israel's own sake. Such passages as these are characteristic. "I do not this for your sake, O

house of Israel, but for mine holy name, which ye have profaned among the nations, whither ye went." "Not for your sake do I this, saith the Lord Yahweh, be it known unto you : be ashamed and confounded for your ways O house of Israel." It is this conception of a ruler of the universe, self-centred, jealous for His reputation, feeling it intolerable to be misjudged by the heathen, brooding over the insults they had heaped upon Him, and finally demonstrating His supremacy by the vast holocaust of the heathen whom He had inspired to undertake their ill-fated expedition, which is the main root of this prophecy.

But it was not simply the doctrine of Yahweh's outraged dignity, to which reparation must be made, that accounts for it. The form which Yahweh's exemplary vengeance takes was suggested by earlier prophecy which Ezekiel considers to have been unfulfilled. He represents Yahweh as saying to Gog : "Art thou he of whom I spake in old time by my servants the prophets of Israel, which prophesied in those days for many years that I would bring you against them." Ezekiel seems to have in mind those prophecies in Jeremiah and Zephaniah which referred originally to the Scythians. It is axiomatic for him that prophecy must be fulfilled, hence from his study of unfulfilled prophecies he creates new prophecies. This literary method is characteristic for apocalyptic. Thus Daniel is represented as brooding over the seventy years predicted by Jeremiah "for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem." Gabriel explains to him that the seventy years are seventy weeks,

that is seventy weeks of years, each year in Jeremiah's prophecy being multiplied by seven. This calculation starts from the fact that the prophecy has not been fulfilled in its literal sense. It is therefore obvious to the writer that the literal is not the real sense. Hence we have a re-interpretation, a feature very familiar to students of our modern apocalyptists who, when one re-interpretation after another breaks down, never draw the conclusion that the whole method is at fault, but devise some new re-interpretation.

With this study and re-interpretation of older prophecy there naturally goes a systematisation. Forecasts of the future which were originally independent and might even, because they sprang out of different circumstances, be superficially contradictory, would be brought together and combined into a coherent scheme of future history, which would become more extensive as the range of material from which the scheme was derived became fuller. It was believed that a scheme or programme of history had been laid down by God, and that the fixed order of events inscribed on the heavenly tablets must be exactly carried out. Given sufficient data and correct methods of calculation, and the whole development of history would become plain. In particular by identifying events in past history with those indicated in the scheme, it would become possible to determine what point in the programme history had actually reached and fix the interval which had to be traversed before the consummation was attained. Hence the calculation of times and seasons becomes an important part of the apocalyptist's task, with any

adjustment or reinterpretation that the failure of earlier calculations may involve. This may account for a feature which is at first sight very perplexing, namely the very long record of historical events given in predictive form in some apocalypses. The most familiar example is found in the Book of Daniel. According to the generally received judgment of scholars that book, at least in its present form, dates from 165 or 164 B.C. But it contains a good deal of earlier history, often of a rather minute kind, related in the form of prophecy. The prediction is ostensibly uttered from a much earlier period than that in which it was actually composed. But when the author's own time is actually reached and the assumed standpoint gives place to the real, history in the guise of prediction changes into prediction proper, and what had been minutely foretold, because it had already happened, is now replaced by real prediction which becomes vague and general. The reason for this may have been that the prediction of so long a series of events, with an accuracy that the reader can test, inspires confidence in the forecasts of the actual future. The reader will naturally say, "I have found the prophet right so far up to my own time, I can therefore trust him to disclose what still lies in the future." But if this method is to be adopted, it can only be by antedating the composition of the prophecy. Hence it is attributed to some seer of the older time such as Daniel or Enoch or Baruch or the patriarchs. This pseudonymous character of apocalyptic may be further explained by the extinction which had overtaken prophecy through the dominance of the Law,

so that if a man wished to gain acceptance for prophecies of his own, he would put them forward not in his own name but under some ancient name. The question would naturally occur, Why if these famous men of old uttered these prophecies do we hear of them only now? The explanation given is that while the oracle had been uttered centuries before, it had been sealed by Divine command, in other words it had been withheld from publication. Thus Daniel is told to "shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end."

In connexion with what has been said about reinterpretation, I may call attention to the elaborate symbolism in apocalyptic. Partly this is traditional in character, some of it is derived from oriental mythology, some from earlier prophecy. We have for example in Daniel the four beasts, the fourth of which had ten horns, among which there came up a little horn. These represent empires, the little horn is Antiochus Epiphanes. The kings of Media and Persia are later represented by a ram, while a he-goat stands for Greece. This kind of imagery is familiar to us also in the Book of Revelation. Sometimes the symbolism is interpreted, sometimes it is not interpreted. But even when it has been interpreted in one apocalypse it may be reinterpreted in another. For example in II Esdras we have a vision of an eagle, and the seer receives an interpretation which is thus introduced: "The eagle, whom thou sawest come up from the sea, is the fourth kingdom which appeared in vision to thy brother Daniel. But it was not expounded unto him as I now expound it unto thee or have

expounded it." This symbolism might also serve to safeguard the meaning from discovery in cases where it might be unsafe to speak plainly. Two points may be added here. It is not necessary to suppose that a writer always used his symbols with a clear understanding of what was intended. He may have used them as part of the sacred material which had come down to him in the apocalyptic tradition, but to which, though he faithfully transmitted it, he may have assigned no definite signification.

The conviction that the course of history was pre-determined and had to be worked out according to a programme with fixed dates, meant that nothing could be done by men or angels to hasten or retard the process. Punctually at the time appointed each event would happen. God himself would not depart from the scheme which in His wisdom He had, even in its details, foreordained. Yet the seer, though he cannot put forward or back the clock of destiny, may still give an answer to the question "Watchman, what of the night?" He can devote himself to the study of history and match it with the revealed plan of its movement, calculate the position of his own time in the programme, and determine how much remains to be endured, and how long it will be before with catastrophic suddenness the old order is replaced by the new. Moreover, he is possessed in his measure by a conviction similar to that which we find in the ancient prophets. Amos had said, "Surely the Lord Yahweh will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." The very fact that a true prophet had ap-

peared was an omen, which men ought to heed, that God was going to intervene in history in some signal way. And so the apocalypticist publishes his message because he is certain that the end is very near. Now this certainty, it may be said, grew out of his study. Through elaborate calculations he reached the conclusion that he was living in the very last times. But all who are familiar with the history of modern interpretation of prophecy on apocalyptic lines are well aware that nothing is more common than to find the interpreter quite in good faith fixing the critical events in his own immediate future. It is a human frailty to believe that the times in which we live are specially important in the world's history. And if we are preoccupied with millenarian speculations we easily find reasons for believing that the end is very near. It is this conviction which, whether consciously or unconsciously, largely guides the quest for identification of events in history with predictions in prophecy and apocalypse. But what specially convinces the apocalypticist that history is rushing to its crisis is the acuteness of the present distress. Times of persecution in particular, when the people of God are outlawed and hunted down, tortured and massacred, are fruitful in apocalyptic. What makes the seer so sure that history has only a very little course to run is the fact that the pressure has become so acute. For the powers of evil who instigate the fiery trial, from which the people of God are suffering, know well that the hour of doom is approaching and work with all the more ferocious energy that the period of their activity draws so near to its close. This is brought out in the comment on

the result of the war between Michael and the dragon in the Book of Revelation. To heaven's joy, the defeated dragon is cast out ; but the passage continues : " Woe for the earth and for the sea : because the devil is gone down unto you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time." Therefore the immediate prospect for the saints is appalling, since the dragon, smarting under defeat and maddened by the knowledge that his night is coming when he will be able to work no longer, pours all his concentrated fury on the people of God. Hence a season of unprecedented persecution is to burst upon the church ; but the very intensity of the devil's malevolent energy is in itself a ground of consolation. For it means that the appointed time of redemption is very near, therefore let the saints lift up their heads. It is to be observed that no matter how awful the persecution may be, God does not intervene before the predestined time has come. The author does not suggest that for the elect's sake God may shorten the days.

The same conviction of a fixed scheme, from which no departure will be made, may be illustrated by what seems the strange forecast that when the thousand years of the devil's imprisonment are ended, " he must be loosed for a little time." The reason why this should be inscribed on the tablets of destiny is not certain. There are parallels to it in ethnic religions and from these it may be derived. But ultimately it may rest on the principle that the last things are to be like the first, and if at creation God triumphed over the dragon of darkness and chaos, so with the creation of new heavens and a new

earth there is to be a final victory over the powers of evil.

I have already spoken of the supernatural forces which the apocalypticist believed to be at work behind the veil. In earlier Jewish theology responsibility for the evils from which Israel suffered was laid at the door of the angels. According to Deut. xxxii. 8 (LXX) Yahweh assigned the nations to angelic rulers reserving Israel for Himself. We read in the Psalms (lviii., lxxxii.) and in the apocalyptic section of Isaiah, belonging probably to the time of Alexander the Great (xxiv. 21 f.), of the unrighteous rule of the angels and the punishment to be inflicted on them. This belief finds a fuller development in Daniel. We read of the angel princes of Persia or Greece; but now Israel has its own angel. Behind the heathen empires and their kings there are their angelic rulers who have incited their earthly instruments to hostility against Israel. In the later period this angelology is much more developed; and it is not improbable that in this Persian influence is to be recognised. In the development of the angelology, especially the doctrine of evil angels, the story of the marriages of the angels with women in Gen. vi. 1-4 plays a prominent part. Another interesting development is the angel who frequently in apocalyptic communicates or interprets the revelation. But this goes back to Ezekiel and in particular to Zechariah.

To us apocalyptic is likely to seem a decadent form of prophecy. Its preoccupation with the future, its dualism, its pessimistic interpretation of the present, its bizarre symbolism, its rigid predestinarianism and theory of a

fixed programme to which history must conform, its bitterness towards the heathen, its lapses into mythology, its forced and fluctuating exegesis, its publication under pseudonyms, are all hindrances to our appreciation. But, if strange to our own time, the apocalypses appealed to the men of their own age. They represent a very important development in the history of Judaism. An understanding of them is necessary if we are to reconstruct the religious conditions in which Christianity was born. Important Christian doctrines owe much in their form and even content to this literature. Nor can we withhold our tribute to the amazing courage of their authors' faith. With a hostile world all about them, a world polytheistic and idolatrous, with the civil forces, military, political, social, and intellectual, massed against them, with sinister supernatural powers, as they believed, marshalling these forces against them, their faith rose to unprecedented heights. Appearances were all against them, the hard realities seemed fatal to a belief in the righteousness of the world's government or the final triumph of their cause. But even when strength and endurance seemed to be strained to the uttermost, they nerved themselves still to bear their tortures, confident that the end was very near and that soon in one radiant moment the kingdoms of this world would become the kingdom of their God and His Messiah.

ELIJAH AND JEZEBEL.¹

THE CONFLICT WITH THE TYRIAN BAAL.

ON the death of Omri Ahab became king of Israel. His father had founded a new dynasty and seems to have been one of the ablest rulers of the Northern Kingdom. The power of Syria was growing and its menace to Israel was becoming more formidable. Omri himself had been forced to make humiliating concessions to it. It was natural that measures should be taken to strengthen the country's military and diplomatic position. How far this process had gone during the reign of Omri we cannot tell. But we find Ahab in alliance with Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, so that the state of war which had existed from the time of Rehoboam was ended and with it a grave source of weakness to both countries. There was also an alliance with Tyre which was sealed by the marriage of Ahab with Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal the king of Tyre.

This alliance of the House of Omri with the royal family of Tyre created grave problems for Israel's religion. Religion entered into the national life to a degree difficult

¹ An amplification of a Lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library, 19th December, 1925, and first printed in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 11, 1927.

for us to understand who make so sharp a separation between the religious and the secular. The alliance of nations carried with it the alliance of their deities. This would involve in the first instance the provision of a sanctuary in which the foreign princess and her Phœnician suite could worship Melkart, their national deity. There, too, the traders from Tyre might find in Samaria a spiritual home. Had matters gone no further than the provision of this religious hospitality, no crisis would perhaps have arisen ; though the more rigorous worshippers of Israel's God might have resented any provision for the worship of a foreign deity. But Jezebel, who was strong-willed and unscrupulous and who had Phœnician rather than Hebrew notions as to the prerogatives of royalty, seems also to have been a fanatical devotee of her national deity and to have shown great zeal in spreading his worship among the Israelites. There is no reason to doubt that Ahab participated in the cult or that the influence of the Court favoured the spread of the foreign religion among the people. This would not necessarily involve any abandonment of the national Deity. The two sons of Ahab, who both reigned over Israel, Ahaziah and Jehoram, and their sister Athaliah who became queen of Judah, all bore names in which the name of Yahweh, the God of Israel, formed an element. In view of the significance attaching to names, which were not among the Hebrews the mere labels of identification they commonly are with ourselves, the giving of such names is significant of Ahab's attachment to Yahweh. When the King was meditating the ill-fated expedition to

Ramoth-gilead which was to cost him his life he consulted four hundred prophets of Yahweh. Prophets of Yahweh were in communication with him in the earlier stages of the Syrian war (1 Kings xx.).

It is clear from this that Ahab felt no incompatibility between the worship of Yahweh the God of Israel and Melkart the Baal of Tyre. Nor would it seem that those of his subjects who adopted the worship of Melkart abandoned the worship of Yahweh or practised it with less ardour. It was not intended that the two deities should be pitted in rivalry against each other, but that they should stand in friendship side by side. To the politicians of Israel it would have seemed a matter of international comity, not to be neglected without risk of rupture.

How far then may we describe the situation as novel? And was the conduct of the king a violation of the fundamental character of Israel's religion? It might seem as if Ahab was only following the precedent of Solomon; but Solomon appears to have done little more than provide sanctuaries where his wives and those who had come with them to Jerusalem might practise the worship of their own deities. That Solomon himself occasionally participated in these cults is not unlikely; but apparently there was no attempt to promote their worship among the people. But in view of the frequent reference in the earlier history to the cult of the Baalim it might seem as if we had simply the reappearance here of a long familiar tendency.

This, however, would be a serious error. When the

Hebrews entered Canaan they gradually abandoned their nomadic habits and, in the more fertile districts, learnt from the older inhabitants the art of tilling the soil. This involved more than we should understand the art of agriculture to include. The land belonged to the local divinities and for the use of it and for the water which fertilised it tribute must be paid. Moreover, on their favour or displeasure the success or failure of the husbandman's labour might depend. These local divinities were collectively known as the Baalim or Baals. The divinity of a particular district was known as its Baal. Presumably at the outset the Hebrews paid their offerings for the use of the land and to express their gratitude or avert the displeasure of the divine owner at the local shrine. The cult of these gods of fertility was undoubtedly inimical to sound morality. Yet they stood in quite a different category from Israel's national God, much as the saints might receive a homage which the worshipper would insist did not rank with the worship that was due to God alone. At least it is probable that the mass of the people practised the cult of the local Baalim, or of the household deities, without any consciousness that it trenched on Yahweh's exclusive domain. For Yahweh was the God of the nation; and His worship, practised by all the tribes, was the bond which held them together in spite of geographical separation or political division. Above all He was the God of battles. He went before the Hebrew hosts and led them to victory. The wars of Israel were also the wars of Yahweh; her warriors were Yahweh's "consecrated ones," for war was a sacred service. He

marshalled the hosts of heaven, the stars in their courses, to fight against His enemies ; He routed them with terrible slaughter and often put upon the survivors the ban or the decree of extermination. As the wilderness Deity He might naturally have been regarded as unsympathetic with the agricultural mode of life. At a later period Canaan was for the Hebrews the land of corn and wine and oil ; but earlier it was pre-eminently " a land flowing with milk and honey." The pasturage for their cattle meant more to these hardy emigrants from the desert than the cornfield, the vineyard and the oliveyard. So when they settled down and cultivated the ground, it might well seem as if with this new mode of life the national God had little or nothing to do. Hence the cult of the Baalim may have been quite naturally adopted without any consciousness of disloyalty to Yahweh, who was lifted far above them and whose primary concern was centred on the fortunes of the nation.

But, as time went on, the feeling that Canaan was Yahweh's land grew stronger ; and the tribute paid for the use of the fertile soil was felt to be due to Him. But the ritual which had been practised from time immemorial might still be regarded not only as correct but as essential, though the offerings were now made to Yahweh and not to the Baalim. Change in the destination of the service need not imply any change in its character. Thus into the purer worship of Yahweh heathenish rites might readily intrude. And the contamination was all the easier that the term " Baal " itself was neutral, meaning " lord " or " owner." It was applied to the relation of

a husband to his wife, or of the owner to his land. Hence Yahweh Himself might quite innocently be spoken of as a Baal,¹ and so the distinction between Him and the local Baalim might easily be blunted. Thus the peril of moral degradation affected the religion not only in its practice but in its conception of the Deity.

It was not unnatural that protests should be made. And it is the more necessary for our purpose to dwell upon this, since the movement initiated by Elijah and carried out by Elisha brings a figure on the scene who is specially associated with a protest against the agricultural life. When Jehu was playing, with oriental thoroughness, the part of a bloodthirsty usurper and was going from one scene of massacre to another, Jehonadab the son of Rechab went to meet him (2 Kings x. 15-28). Jehu accosted him with the question, "Is thine heart genuinely with my heart as my heart is with thy heart?" Jehonadab replied, "It is." Then Jehu said to him, "If it is, give me thy hand." So he gave Jehu his hand and Jehu took him up into his chariot inviting him to accompany

¹ The use of such names as Ishbaal and Meribaal in the family of Saul, still more such a name as we meet with in 1 Chron. xii. 5, Beliah (Yahweh is Baal) attest this. Hos. ii. 16 f. is specially instructive, "thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali. For I will take away the names of the Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall be no more mentioned by their name." It was customary for Israel to call Yahweh 'my Baal,' that is 'my husband.' But this usage will be discontinued and 'Ishi,' also meaning 'my husband' will be substituted. The evil associations of the term 'Baal' have ruined it for religious use, even though in a sense quite innocent in itself. I see no reason for disputing the authenticity of this passage.

him and see his zeal for Yahweh. Then Jehu went on to Samaria and completed the extermination of "all that remained unto Ahab." Then he ordered all the worshippers of Baal to attend a great sacrifice to their deity. When they were assembled, Jehonadab accompanied Jehu into the temple, the sacrifice was offered and then the idolators whom he had entrapped were massacred. This narrative makes it clear that Jehonadab was in hearty sympathy with the atrocities perpetrated by the usurper. But religion was the root of his attitude, while the motives of Jehu were more complex. We need not doubt that Jehu had a genuine antagonism to the cult of the Tyrian Baal; but his policy was guided by ambition from which the fanatical son of Rechab was entirely free.

But the point which concerns us is that Jehonadab is specially associated with the total rejection of settled life and the practice of agriculture.¹ In the striking story which we read in Jeremiah xxxv. his descendants strictly observe the prohibitions which he imposed upon them. When Jeremiah, that he might rebuke the disobedience of Judah to Yahweh by the fidelity of the Rechabites to their ancestral law, invited them to drink wine, they refused. "We will drink no wine: for Jonadab the son

¹ For the Rechabites I may refer to my commentary on Jeremiah, Vol. II. 144-146. See further the histories of the Religion of Israel, the dictionaries of the Bible, and the works on Hebrew Archæology by Nowack, Benzinger, and Volz. B. Luther has an important discussion in E. Meyer's *Die Israeliten und Ihre Nachbarstämme* (pp. 132 ff., 166 f.), cf. Meyer's own remarks on p. 84.

of Rechab our father commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye, nor your sons for ever : neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any : but all your days ye shall dwell in tents ; that ye may live many days in the land wherein ye sojourn." The fact that wine happened to be the point at which their obedience was challenged has led to the popular association of the Rechabites with total abstinence from intoxicants ; but this completely misses the significance of the rule under which they lived. It is clear from the terms in which it is stated that this rule was directed against settled life in any form. They were to remain true to their nomadic ideal. A moveable tent, not a fixed house, was to be the dwelling ; no seed was to be sown or harvest reaped and especially they were to plant no vineyard.¹ For while it is possible for nomads to sow and reap corn, the vineyard demands attention for years before it yields any return, and therefore implies a long settled life. The prohibition of wine was accordingly only incidental ; it was not aimed against intoxication or drinking to excess, but against the use of a product of settled life. This loyalty to the nomadic

¹Diodorus Siculus (xix. 94), as Graf and others have pointed out, tells us that the Nabatæans had a similar rule. They lived in the open air and to preserve their liberty had "a law neither to sow corn, nor plant any fruit-bearing plant, nor to drink wine, nor to build a house. Whoever transgresses this law is punished with death." W. H. Bennett very aptly quotes a parallel from Scott's *Legend of Montrose* : "Son of the Mist ! be free as thy forefathers. Own no lord—receive no law—take no hire—give no stipend—build no hut—enclose no pasture—sow no grain."

ideal was not merely a conservative prejudice in favour of an older mode of life to which they had been long habituated ; it was also rooted in religion. From Jehonadab's complete approval of Jehu's actions and his participation in the scheme to massacre the worshippers of the Tyrian Baal we may infer that his zeal for Yahweh was very great. And from the form which his prohibitions to his descendants took we may infer that zeal for Yahweh meant for him an utter repudiation of the Canaanite civilisation and a steadfast adherence to the wandering manner of life characteristic of the wilderness period. And this would be all the more the case since the tilling of the soil carried with it either direct worship of the Baalim, or the service of Yahweh with the rites customary in the Canaanite cultus. For him to build a house and to cultivate the soil was to be disloyal to the God who had made a covenant with Israel in the desert.

It might seem then as if the apostasy against which his movement was a protest was simply that which had been more or less prevalent in Israel from the settlement in Canaan onwards, and that the Baal-worship which Jehu uprooted was no novel form of idolatry. But the narrative in Kings clearly indicates that the idolatry against which Elijah protested and which Jehu extirpated was the worship of the Tyrian Baal. And we ought not to urge against this that the cult of the Canaanite Baalim must be intended because it was against this that Jehonadab's prohibitions were specially directed. That is, of course, correct ; but if loyalty to Yahweh demanded unswerving hostility to the Canaanite Baalim and the

whole form of life associated with their worship, *a fortiori* it demanded unrelenting opposition to the cult of the Tyrian Baal. For with the coming of Jezebel a new problem had been raised—not that of recognising a swarm of inferior divinities but that of placing a foreign divinity on the same level as Yahweh. And it is not unlikely that the Rechabite movement itself took shape at this time, and embodied a protest against the policy of the royal house. For while it had a much wider range and embodied a deep antipathy to the whole practice of agriculture as inconsistent with loyalty to Israel's desert God, the new worship came into even sharper collision with the ideal of monolatry. It is noteworthy that although the movement derived its rule from Jehonadab, its adherents are called the Rechabites; that is they derive their name not from Jehonadab but from his father. It is accordingly not unlikely that Rechab himself was its originator, though his son may have formulated the rule; and if so it is a natural hypothesis that the movement itself dates back to the early period of Ahab's reign when the Tyrian cult would be introduced.

It cannot, then, be too clearly recognised that the action of Ahab created a new situation. The crisis was indeed of the first magnitude. For the issue raised was whether Yahweh would tolerate a companion in the allegiance of His people. Or was He a deity who sat in unchallenged supremacy and undisturbed solitude on His throne? Was the religion of Israel a rigid monotheism or a tolerant polytheism or something between the two? We could answer these questions with more

confidence if we could reach any assured conclusion as to the religion of Moses. This is too large and too intricate a question to be discussed here ; but if we can scarcely venture to affirm that Moses was a monotheist, we may believe with some assurance that he did not permit the worship of more gods than one. He may have recognised the existence of other deities. But this was no concern of Israel ; these other deities were for her as if they did not exist. Such a belief and practice is called "monolatry." It was characteristic of the religion that Yahweh was a jealous God, one who tolerated neither rival nor companion.

The action of Ahab and Jezebel was, if this view is correct, a direct challenge to a fundamental principle of the Hebrew religion. For it placed by the side of Yahweh a companion to share the allegiance of His people.

What then was the attitude of the people to the religious policy and practice of the Court ? Elijah complains at Horeb that the apostasy has been universal. "I have been very jealous for Yahweh, the God of hosts ; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword ; and I, even I only, am left ; and they seek my life, to take it away" (1 Kings xix. 14). This is plainly far too sweeping ; yet it points to a widespread apostasy due presumably less to the enthusiasm of the people for the national deity of their allies than to tolerant acquiescence in a fashionable cult or a desire to stand well with the rulers of the State. The later history seems to suggest that though the foreign cult was widely spread

in Israel it was not deeply rooted. And there were not a few who were neither sycophants nor Laodiceans. Some may simply have stood aloof; but others seem to have made a definite protest. For we have a reference to an attempt of Jezebel to exterminate the prophets of Yahweh when Obadiah took a hundred of them and hid them by fifties in a cave and fed them with bread and water. And while some actively opposed, others quietly abstained. In the deep despondency occasioned by his sense of isolation Elijah is assured (1 Kings xix. 15-18) that when the drastic triple judgment he is to set in motion falls on Israel, Yahweh will preserve alive a remnant of seven thousand, "all the knees which have not bowed unto the Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him." Thus he learns that in his refusal to share in the national apostasy he is far less lonely than he had thought. But that he needed this assurance suggests that they had quietly stood aloof rather than actively opposed. It may be added that it is a quite illegitimate inference from the fact that a single temple accommodated all the worshippers of the Tyrian Baal in the time of Jehu (2 Kings x. 21), that the numbers were very small in the time of Ahab. For we are explicitly told that Jehoram, the son of Ahab, did not follow Ahab and Jezebel in their apostasy and in fact took measures against the foreign worship (2 Kings iii. 2). And it would be a very precarious inference from the narrative of Jehu's massacre of the devotees of Baal that the whole of them put their necks in the noose, trusting in Jehu's good faith.

We are now ready to turn to the work of Elijah in which the authentic Hebrew feeling, whether dumb or articulate, found its supreme expression. And it will serve our purpose best to sketch the story of his conflict first and then to touch on points of interest in it or the problems which it raises. It is indeed probable that the original opening of the story has been omitted. Presumably it told how the worship of Melkart was set up and how Elijah protested against it. But as the story now stands Elijah, of Tishbe in Gilead, is introduced to us with highly effective abruptness. He announces to Ahab "As Yahweh the God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years but according to my word" (1 Kings xvii. 1). It is not indicated at this point why the judgment is announced; but it is clear from the preceding context and from the sequel that the drought is a penalty for the worship of Melkart. Fed by ravens at the brook Cherith and by the widow of Zarephath in Phœnicia after the brook had dried up, his career is marked by further wonders—the unwasting barrel of meal, the unfailing cruse of oil, and the raising to life of the widow's son. Then in the third year of the drought the prophet is bidden to present himself before Ahab, who meanwhile had been seeking for him in all the neighbouring kingdoms. The drought had driven matters to extremities, and the king and Obadiah his minister were searching the country to find pasture for the horses and mules. The prophet meets Obadiah and bids him announce his return to the king. Obadiah fears the risk

involved to himself in the errand since he has a foreboding that Yahweh will spirit His messenger away and that Ahab will slay his minister when he cannot find the prophet. Reassured by Elijah's promise that he will confront the king that day, he carries the message to Ahab who goes to meet the "troubler of Israel." Elijah retorting this ill-omened designation upon the king, challenges him to arrange a contest before all Israel on Mount Carmel between the four hundred and fifty prophets of Melkart and the lonely prophet of Yahweh. The test is to be made by sacrifice. Each party is to dress its bullock and lay it on the wood upon the altar ; but the wood is not to be kindled by human hands. The God who answers by fire is to be recognised as the true God. Ahab accepts the challenge and the meeting takes place. Through the whole morning the priests of Melkart vainly plead with their god to answer them. Stung by the pitiless mockery of Elijah, they utter more piercing cries and gash their bodies till they stream with blood. At the time of the evening oblation Elijah repairs the ruined altar of Yahweh, constructing it of twelve stones, corresponding to the number of the tribes of the undivided Israel. Then he makes a trench about the altar, places the wood upon the altar, and the pieces of the bullock upon the wood. Three times the wood and the offering are drenched with water and then in answer to the prophet's prayer the fire of Yahweh falls on the sacrifice, consumes the burnt offering, the wood and the stones, and licks up the water with which the

trench had been filled.¹ All the people prostrate themselves with the cry that Yahweh is God; and the prophet takes advantage of the revulsion of feeling

¹ Hitzig in his *Geschichte Israels* suggested naphtha as the means employed for the kindling of the sacrifice, and I believe that he was anticipated in this by Lord Herbert of Cherbury. The suggestion has been revived in recent times. See especially Saintyves, *Essais de Folklore Biblique* (1922). In the first chapter "Le Feu qui descend du Ciel et le Renouveau du Feu Sacré" the author deals with the scene on Carmel, p. 21. "Or il ne semble pas douteux qu'il s'agit là d'un feu allumé par l'action d'un liquide sur une préparation pyrophorique préalablement disposée sur l'autel. . . . Ces eaux qui semblent rendre le miracle tout à fait impossible en sont précisément l'agent efficace." But even if Elijah could have descended to such a trick, which I do not for a moment believe, how could he have successfully carried it through under the vigilant eyes of the king and so many spectators, and above all under the eyes of the bitterly hostile priests of Melkart, already successful and in imminent peril of being discredited? How could he have made the previous preparation of the inflammable material on the altar, seeing that the altar was in ruins and was built up by Elijah in the sight of all the spectators? And who were his accomplices who drenched the sacrifice with the inflammable liquid, mistaken by every one else for water? And are we to suppose that Elijah knew a trick which the priests of Melkart did not know? Saintyves himself says (p. 23) that the secret was known to priests of foreign deities and quotes many examples. However a credulous populace may have been imposed on by the impostures of an unscrupulous priesthood, we may rest assured that one so unsophisticated as Elijah would have been no match for the priests of Melkart, heirs of a long tradition and well versed in the wiles of their craft. We must remember that Tyre was not only itself highly civilised, but its vast naval and commercial enterprise brought Phœnicia into contact with a far wider range of cultures than any other people. We need not go outside the Old Testament for ancient evidence. Ezekiel gives us a most impressive picture (chs. xxvi., xxviii.).

occasioned by his victory to have the prophets of Melkart executed to a man.

The God who answered by fire was the God who controlled the elements. So it was Yahweh and not Melkart in whose hands the power rested to slay man and beast by famine or to bring the drought to an end. The lightning had fallen on the sacrifice from a clear sky and gave no promise of the longed-for rain. So while Ahab goes up to eat and drink, the prophet goes to the top of Carmel to agonise in prayer with God.¹ Already he had heard in spirit the sound of the approaching tempest ; but his psychical sensitiveness finds no confirmation in the atmospheric condition. Six times he sends his servant to look out over the sea and each time he sees a cloudless sky. And only from the seventh journey does he return with the tidings of the tiny cloud, no larger than a man's hand, which is rising out of the sea. Then Elijah knows that the rain is coming and he sends an urgent message to the king bidding him ride swiftly homeward lest the roads should become impassable through the floods. And he himself in a prophetic ecstasy, gifted with unnatural strength and speed, runs before the royal chariot from Carmel to Jezreel, while the long drought is ended by the torrential rain.

Cowed by a message from the infuriated Jezebel that he should pay with his life for the execution of her prophets, he escaped into Judah, left his servant at

¹ There is no need to see in Elijah's strange posture any rain-making magic. It indicates his intense concentration on the prayer he is offering.

Beersheba and went a day's journey into the wilderness. There under a juniper tree he prayed that he might die, conscious that he has only human strength to achieve his superhuman task. He sleeps and an angel rouses him that he may eat ; but apparently he has no heart for food in his weariness and despair¹ and sleeps again. He is wakened a second time and now he obeys the command to eat, assured by the angel that the journey to his destination will otherwise be too much for him. In the strength of that meat he goes forty days and forty nights to Horeb, the Mount of God, where he lodges in the cave.² Then a strong wind rent the mountains and shattered the rocks and after the wind came the earthquake and then a fire. But Yahweh was in none of these, they were but the heralds of His approach. After the deafening crash of these mighty elemental forces there followed a dead silence which was broken by the gentlest whisper. Now the prophet knows that Yahweh Himself has come ; and a deeper awe fills him than has been inspired by the dread harbingers of His coming. Muffling his face in his mantle that he may not see the terrible God of Horeb, he goes out to stand in His presence at the entrance of the cave. Then the divine

¹ Gunkel (*Elias, Jahve und Baal*, p. 22) has made the very attractive suggestion that the original text represented Elijah as refusing the first invitation to eat. In that case we should omit "he did eat and drink and" in xix. 6. So also Gressmann, though in his first edition he secured the same sense by inserting the negative "And he did not eat and drink."

² Translate "the cave" rather than "a cave," i.e., the cleft in the rock where Moses had stood (Ex. xxxiii. 22).

voice challenges him to explain his presence at Horeb: "What doest thou here, Elijah?" In reply he asserts his zeal for Yahweh in face of a complete national apostasy in which he alone of the prophets has escaped the sword—and his life also is threatened. Then he receives his orders to return to his post and is entrusted with the threefold commission—to anoint Hazael king over Syria and Jehu king over Israel and Elisha to be his own successor.¹ "Him that escapeth from the sword of Hazael shall Jehu slay: and him that escapeth from the sword of Jehu shall Elisha slay." Yet this judgment of extermination will not be visited on the whole people. Seven thousand will be left as a remnant, consisting of those who have not done homage to the Baal. The narrative closes with an account of the call of Elisha to be the attendant of the prophet.

The next narrative is that of Naboth's vineyard. Ahab wished to have it for a garden of herbs because it was near his house, and offered Naboth a better vineyard in exchange, or payment in money. Naboth felt that there would be a certain impiety in parting with the inheritance of his father, so he refused. Ahab was

¹ It is questionable if Gunkel is right in thinking (l.c. p. 25) that xix. 15-17 looks back to ver. 4. Elijah, he says, has prayed for death; he is told to anoint Elisha in his stead; therefore his prayer is answered, he may die; but he will die comforted, for judgment will come and it is his task to anoint its instruments. But Elijah's prayer was only the expression of a deep despondency, which the theophany removes. He would not now wish the prayer to be answered. That the story, if a unity, belongs to his final period is by no means clear; and it is not at all certain that originally vv. 15-18 formed the sequel to vv. 1-14.

deeply mortified but regarded Naboth's refusal as settling the question. The sequel brings to further expression the difference between Israel and Phœnicia. For Jezebel, brought up in the atmosphere of the Tyrian Court, feels only amazement and contempt for the poltroonery and the scruples of her husband who permits himself to be thwarted by Naboth's obstinate refusal to part with his ancestral holding. The only monarchy she understands is one which recognises no law save the despotic will of the sovereign and holds at its own disposal the property and life of the subject. Yet Jezebel herself does not venture in Israel to put her Phœnician principles in practice. She recognises that the confiscation of Naboth's estate cannot be effected by high-handed violence, but only by a legal process in which the life of her victim is sworn away by perjurers. She lays her plans accordingly and Naboth, accused by false witnesses of blasphemy against God and the king, is stoned to death.¹ His property falls to the crown, Jezebel informs her husband that Naboth is dead and bids him take possession of the vineyard. It is true that Ahab played no active part in this legal robbery and murder ; but he took no steps to prevent it, though he must have known that his wife's promise to secure the vineyard for him could be carried out only by some such scheme as this. Elijah accordingly denounced the king as guilty of the crime which he had allowed to take

¹ Klostermann and Gunkel think that xxi. 10 is an insertion. There was no need that so many should be cognisant of the plot ; everything could be achieved by the false witnesses.

its course and the fruits of which he was content to enjoy.

After the death of Ahab, his son Ahaziah, having met with an accident, sent messengers to Ekron to enquire from Baalzebub its deity whether he would recover from his illness. Elijah met them and sent them back to the king with a message rebuking him for consulting a pagan oracle, as if there were no God in Israel, and assuring him that his sickness would be fatal. When the king hears the explanation of their return and learns the reason, he enquires as to his appearance and recognises from the description that the message has been sent by Elijah. The narrative proceeds to relate that the king sent a captain with fifty men to apprehend the prophet, who called down fire from heaven which consumed the captain and his company. This happened to a second company of soldiers ; but when a third was sent the captain entreated the prophet to be merciful. He granted his petition and went down with him and confronted the king, repeating the prediction of death which he had previously announced to the king's messengers. This, we are told, was duly fulfilled.

This narrative is so offensive to our moral sense and so unworthy of Elijah that it would be a relief to regard it as a legendary embellishment. It reminds us of the unpleasant tale of Elisha and the children who, in response to his curse upon them, are torn by the she-bears. This story also gives a very different impression of Elisha from the stories of the deeds of mercy which are recorded in subsequent chapters, especially the magnanimity with

which he bids the king of Israel feast the Syrian soldiers who had been sent to capture the prophet when the king himself was minded to slay them in cold blood, even though they were not prisoners of war. It is possible, as Benzinger suggests in his commentary, that the original narrative told simply that Elijah announced to the messengers that Ahaziah would die and that the king's death followed. This suggestion is approved by Gunkel. There is no serious reason for doubting that Elijah sent the message to Ahaziah. The fact that Ahab on the eve of his expedition to Ramoth-gilead had reluctantly to consult Micaiah gives no warrant for the inference that Elijah had already been removed from the scene. Elijah went and came as he willed, he did not dance attendance on the king or deign to make one of a long retinue of prophets.

The closing scene is that of Elijah's translation, told with great literary power. Elijah is accompanied by his faithful attendant. Again and again the prophet, aware of his approaching departure, begs his servant to leave him. But he, too, is aware that the bond between them is that day to be broken and is resolute to see the end. The bands of prophets resident at Bethel and Jericho have also divined that this is Elijah's last day on earth. Rolling his mantle Elijah strikes the Jordan with it and they pass over to the other side. Realising that the crisis is at hand, Elijah asks his servant what he may do for him as his parting gift. Elisha requests that he may inherit the share of the firstborn in his master's spirit. This would carry with it not only a share of that Divine

energy and illumination by which the prophet had been qualified for his mighty work, but it would place Elisha also at the head of the prophetic guilds. The request is not an easy one to grant ; it is not really Elijah's to bestow. But he knows the conditions on which God will grant it. If Elisha is gifted with the faculty of vision and can see the rapture of his master to heaven, then the boon he has asked will be granted to him. Elisha worthily passes the test and as he sees his master caught up by the whirlwind into heaven he cries, " My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof."¹ Rending his garments in mourning for his master, he takes up the magical mantle of Elijah and smiting the Jordan again cleaves the waters and returns to the other side dryshod. Fifty of the prophets of Jericho who had watched the scene afar off recognise in the repetition of the miracle a proof that the spirit of Elijah rests upon Elisha and prostrate themselves in homage before him. But like the servant of Elisha at Dothan their eyes are sealed to the wonders of the invisible world ; and

¹ In 2 Kings xiii. 14, the words are used by Joash to Elisha on his deathbed, implying that the prophet had been a protection to Israel like battle chariots and war-horses. Some scholars think that it was used in the first instance of Elisha, and was subsequently introduced into the story of Elijah. If the phrase originally suggested the idea of protection, it would suit Elisha better than Elijah. But in itself the exclamation might refer to the heavenly chariot and horses which appeared to take up Elijah ; and in that case the application to Elisha would be secondary. We should compare the very striking scene at Dothan, where there is a fine contrast between the horses and chariots of the Syrians round about the city and the unseen horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha (2 Kings vi. 17).

although they have seen the separation of Elijah from Elisha they have not seen the chariots and horses of fire. They fear that the incalculable Spirit of Yahweh has caught the prophet up and cast him away on some mountain or in some valley where he lies abandoned. Elisha whose eyes had been unsealed so that he knows the truth is unwilling to yield to their request that they may be permitted to seek for their master. At last yielding to their persistence he grants his permission, though he knows that the search will be futile—as indeed it proved.

I have thought it best to complete the narrative without lingering over the problems which it presents. To these I must now return. There is in the first place the question of chronological arrangement. It is clear, since the drought, the contest on Carmel, the journey to Horeb and the murder of Naboth are all assigned to the reign of Ahab, that the rebuke of Ahaziah as well as the closing scene are placed in their right position at the end. But the right arrangement of the earlier stories is not at all simple. In the present arrangement the first three of them hang closely together. The first opens with the announcement of the drought and illustrations of its severity drawn from the prophet's own experience. The end of the drought comes after the contest on Carmel. There can therefore be no question that these narratives form a unity. And in the present form of the story the journey to Horeb is linked to the scene on Carmel by Jezebel's threat of vengeance on Elijah for his slaughter of the prophets of Melkart. There is nevertheless very

real difficulty in this sequence. For that Elijah who had presented himself undismayed to Ahab and treated with him on equal terms, who had stood alone against four hundred and fifty priests of Melkart and taunted them with the impotence of their God, who had swung the people over to his side and had sealed his triumph by the massacre of the heathen priests, should now quail before the threat of Jezebel is very hard to understand. For the fact that the queen threatened was itself a confession of impotence. Had she dared to strike she would have struck without warning. But even the resolute, vindictive, and unscrupulous Jezebel would not have dared to touch the hero of Carmel—she who could not even put Naboth out of the way save by foul means. That there should be reaction after a tremendous strain one could well believe. Yet Elijah shows no sense of strain in his conflict with the priests but rather an easy mastery of the situation. And it is indeed surprising that, if he was the victim of reaction, his reaction should take this form. He looks back on his work as a failure. Utterly exhausted he prays that he may die. He is no better than his fathers, he is a weak mortal like them. And at Horeb he explains that he has left his post because of the universal apostasy of the people, the slaughter of Yahweh's prophets and the menace to his own life. "I have been very jealous for Yahweh, the God of hosts : for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword, and I, even I only, am left ; and they seek my life to take it away." After the successful issue of a test

which he had himself imposed, such utter despair does not suit the actual situation. If, however, we detach the narrative from its present connexion where are we to place it? The easiest suggestion would perhaps be that it belongs to an earlier period in Elijah's career. It presupposes a widespread persecution of the prophets such as is mentioned by Obadiah and this may well have preceded the announcement of the drought. The sequence of events might then have been as follows: Jezebel not only secures the erection of a sanctuary for Melkart, at which she and her suite and other Phœnicians may carry on their worship, but uses her position to gain for her own god a prominent place in the worship of the people. This, while not actively opposed by the people generally, arouses violent antagonism among the prophets, which Jezebel counters by active measures against them, the uxorious Ahab, presumably, not wholly approving, but dominated by the demonic energy of his wife. Then Elijah leaves his home on the East of Jordan and goes to Horeb that there he may renew his strength and courage at the scene of the original revelation of Yahweh to Moses. He has himself laboured in the cause but is utterly despondent as he contemplates the havoc wrought by Jezebel, the acquiescence of the people, the widespread persecution of the prophets, from which he alone has escaped. Then reassured he confronts Ahab and announces the drought.

Against this reconstruction, however, it may be urged that the triple commission which the prophet receives at Horeb carries us much further down in his career. It is

thought by some scholars that the command to anoint Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha is explicable only if Elijah's work is nearly done. But this is not necessarily implied. The appointment of Elisha as his successor might have been made some time before his end and the narrative suggests that Elisha was for some time in attendance upon him. But the references to Jehu and Hazael do suggest a late point in Elijah's life. The narrative in its present form is fragmentary and the original may have told how the prophet himself executed the commission. But, as the Biblical story stands, it is difficult to believe that Elijah anointed either Hazael or Jehu. For Hazael is taken quite by surprise when Elisha pours the oil on him, and he is to be reserved for a destiny so great? And Jehu betrays no knowledge that his anointing by Elisha's messenger was but the repetition of a consecration he had previously received from Elijah. The combination of the commission with the vision at Horeb may perhaps be only editorial.

Nor have we any definite evidence as to the period in Ahab's reign to which the murder of Naboth should be assigned. That it was earlier than the drought is possible, but scarcely probable. For Elijah is already recognised by Ahab as his enemy which points to earlier collisions between them. If we look at the narratives in themselves, apart from the order in which they come, the impression we get is that the announcement of the drought belongs to the early stages of Elijah's relations with Ahab. The description of him as the "troubler of Israel" would be

amply accounted for by the distressing situation to which the nation had been reduced by the prolonged failure of rain. Ahab's description of the prophet as "mine enemy" points to a later stage still.

From the problems of chronology we must now turn to those of historicity. It is admitted by practically all scholars that Elijah was a historical character. Hölscher goes to the extreme of scepticism in this, as in so many other Old Testament questions. We must accordingly be thankful for small mercies. But while he believes that the tradition about him is almost entirely legendary and that the narratives are throughout unhistorical, he allows that he must be recognised as a historical figure.¹ He considers that the stories told about him were originally attached to Elisha and were only subsequently transferred to Elijah. The ideals which prevailed in prophetic circles after the revolution of Jehu found their representative in the figure of Elijah. Other scholars take a more favourable view. Wellhausen's brilliant critical investigations and historical sketches have exercised great influence and are typical of the somewhat advanced, though not extreme, standpoint occupied by many contemporary critics. He insists upon the legendary character of the narrative, but finds in this a proof of the prophet's greatness. "In lonely splendour this prophet towered above his time, a majestic figure of heroic stature, as no other in the Bible; legend could preserve a firm impression of him as history could not."² Critics of a

¹ *Die Profeten*, p. 177; *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*, p. 95.

² *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (7th ed.), p. 73.

more conservative tendency, such as Kittel and Sellin, admit the legendary character of the narratives and allow that some are without historical value. But they maintain the historicity of his conflict with Jezebel and the priests of Melkart, culminating in the contest on Carmel which ended in the prophet's victory, his journey to Horeb, and his denunciation of Ahab for the judicial murder of Naboth.

Difficulties confront us at the outset when we consider the miraculous element in the narrative. Our decision here will depend partly on the general attitude we take towards miracle, partly on the question whether the crisis was of sufficient magnitude in the history of the religion to justify abnormal action, partly on the question how far what was originally intended as poetry may have been interpreted as prosaic fact, or what was capable of natural explanation has been exaggerated into a miracle. But it would be unwarranted to argue that if the miraculous element is unhistorical there can be no kernel of historical fact. The narratives about Elisha abound in miracle, though miracle far more homely and commonplace; but they have not been found useless in reconstructing the later prophet's career.

It is further urged that the parallelism between the stories told of the two prophets is suspicious. Each prophet restores to a mother her only son. In each case there is a miraculous multiplication of the widow's oil, and also a miraculous multiplication of food. The New Testament student will remember how Schneckenburger drew up a much more impressive list of parallels between

the stories about Peter and Paul in the Acts of the Apostles ; and what a place this filled as part of the foundation for the imposing structure erected by the Tübingen critics. The memory may inspire a salutary caution. We have to deal with the argument from parallelism much as we deal with testimonials, which are often even more important for what they omit than for what they say. When we apply this principle we are much more struck by the fact that so many stories which are told of Elisha have no parallel at all in the history of Elijah. Instinctively we feel that several of them would be quite out of keeping with the gigantic figure of the earlier prophet. Moreover, Hölscher himself allows that the story of the cruse of oil and that of the restoration of the dead to life are widely current stories, so that any derivation from the Elisha narratives is unnecessary. And even if direct dependence had to be admitted it would by no means follow that the Elijah cycle must be indebted to the Elisha cycle. The relationship might be reversed.

But to this it would be not unnatural to retort that other considerations point to the greater originality and the more trustworthy historical character of the stories told about Elisha. There is in fact real ground for supposing that actions are attributed to Elijah which are elsewhere correctly attributed to Elisha. In the first place we have the commission attached to the theophany at Horeb. Here Elijah is instructed to anoint Hazael king over Syria and Jehu king over Judah, while Elisha is to be anointed as Elijah's own successor. We need lay no stress on the

fact that, so far as we know, prophets were not anointed and that the ceremony does not seem to have taken place in the case of Elisha. The word must be used loosely here ; but the commission is sufficiently satisfied by the story of Elisha's call. We have already seen, however, that no anointing of Hazael or Jehu by Elijah actually took place. The only historical justification for the representation in 1 Kings xix. 15-18 would be that Elijah, unable to fulfil the commission himself, passed it on to his successor.

Even more serious is the problem raised with reference to the conflict with Melkart. The real triumph over the foreign worship is won by Jehu under the inspiration of Elisha, and the story of Carmel, whatever the kernel of actual history, gives, it is urged, a greatly exaggerated version of Elijah's actual achievement. So spectacular a demonstration of the Divinity of Yahweh ought to have left nothing for his successors to accomplish.

Undoubtedly there is force in this argument. But there may be exaggeration on the other side. Is it correct to attribute so much to Elisha and Jehu ? The history suggests that the worship of Melkart had actually lost much of its prestige and its vogue before the revolution of Jehu. Critics have been too indiscriminate in this respect. From the fact that a single temple accommodates all the worshippers of the Baal in Israel in response to Jehu's summons they have drawn the conclusion that the worship of Melkart had never secured a large body of Hebrew adherents. They have quoted the consultation of the four hundred prophets of Yahweh, just before

Ahab's fatal expedition to Ramoth-gilead, as proof that there could have been no such persecution of the prophets as is attributed to Jezebel. But it is obviously illegitimate to assume that we can argue from the situation at one period to the situation several years previously. It is very significant that Ahab's own son Jehoram, while his mother Jezebel, with all the queen-mother's prestige, was still alive yet "put away the pillar of Baal that his father had made" (2 Kings iii. 2). It would be much easier to understand the facts mentioned if the Tyrian cult had received a great set-back in the reign of Ahab.

Nor may we ever forget that no criticism of the narratives can be finally satisfactory which fails to account for the impression that Elijah made on his countrymen. If legend has been busy with the figure, this testifies to its magnitude; and to argue that around some slender historical nucleus imagination constructed a colossal personality, which embodied a later ideal and was tricked out with features borrowed from the tales told about Elisha, is to do no kind of justice to the grandeur of a man who left an impression on his countrymen so deep that the history of Israel furnishes extremely few parallels. The dramatic scene on Carmel, where the solitary prophet confronts and vanquishes the four hundred and fifty prophets of Melkart, at least has this advantage that it worthily explains the unique position he filled in the imagination and hopes of the people. And it also accounts for the set-back to the worship of the Tyrian Baal which indisputable facts in the later history seem to require. And if, as we shall see reason to believe, the

narrative was committed to writing about half a century after the prophet's time, the memory of the events would be too fresh to permit of the story of Carmel being related unless it contained a substantial nucleus of fact.

Nor is there any reason for doubting that he visited Horeb. The parallelism with Moses, which appears not only here but to some extent in the story of his end, justifies no scepticism ; indeed it may be retorted that such a parallelism, if invented, requires a historical figure comparable with Moses to make it appropriate. But that Elijah, conscious that he stood for Yahweh's claim to the sole allegiance of Israel, should go back to the wilderness, to the spot where the original revelation had been given, is entirely in harmony with what we might expect. The close of the story does, however, present difficulties. The judgment on Israel is to be inflicted first by Hazael, king of Syria, then by Jehu, and finally by Elisha. The result is to be that only seven thousand will survive. It is true that Hazael was actually at war with Israel while the dynasty of Ahab still held the throne ; but his attacks on Israel were continued through the reign of Jehu and subsequently. Moreover, the work of Jehu was in no sense a continuation of the work of Hazael. It was limited to the extirpation of the family and associates of Ahab and such worshippers of the Tyrian Baal as attended the festival to which the usurper summoned them. The reference to Elisha's completion of the task fits nothing recorded in the later history. It may be inferred, either that the author is writing long after the event, when the true sequence and the actual facts were no longer clearly re-

membered ; or that the narrative is early just because it has not been adjusted to the events. The former alternative is exposed to the difficulty that no writer in the later period is likely to have constructed a forecast so inconsistent with notorious historical facts.

It is, in fact, generally allowed, even by advanced critics, that no long interval separates the prophet from the record of his activity. Duhm, for example, says that the Books of Elijah and Elisha cannot have originated very long after the activity of these men.¹ A similar view is expressed by Steuernagel,² Sellin,³ and Gunkel.⁴ The general critical opinion is that the narratives were fixed in writing by the close of the ninth century. For they do not reflect the ideas of the great eighth century prophets. There is no attack on the worship of the calves, no insistence on the necessity for the centralisation of worship at a single sanctuary, no attack on astral worship. Gunkel says that the figure of Elijah is on the whole faithfully preserved and not sketched from the standpoint of the later literary prophets. The saga could not have invented so mighty a figure apart from a historical background ; and how in the few decades which lie between the events and the narratives could any complete distortion have taken place ? He points out that we gain a good deal of confirmation from the narrative of Jehu's revolution, from the story of Athaliah and her downfall,

¹ *Israels Propheten* (2nd ed.), p. 84.

² *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 370.

³ *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus*, p. 18 ; *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 124.

⁴ *Elias, Jahve und Baal*, p. 44.

and from the quotations made by Josephus from Menander of Ephesus.¹

It remains to speak of the significance to be attached to the incidents in the prophet's career and to his work as a whole. The prediction of the drought established the prestige of the prophet and corroborated his claim to speak in the name of Israel's God. For it was made good through a long period of ever-increasing dearth. The Second Isaiah gives great prominence to the argument from prophecy in Yahweh's controversy with the heathen gods. The fact that Yahweh can with unerring certainty predict the future is, he means, a proof that He is the supreme Lord of Nature and of History. Only He who can control the future is able with absolute confidence to predict it, for otherwise His predictions may always be thwarted by a higher power. This argument belongs to a later stage in the development of the religion ; but even in the time of Ahab the successful prediction of a catastrophe on this scale must have been very impressive. Yet it might be argued that it was Melkart and not Yahweh who had sent the drought, especially as we learn from Josephus that Phœnicia also suffered under it—a fact illustrated by the story of the widow of Zarepath—and that when the king of Tyre "made supplication there came great thunders."² On Carmel, accordingly, the issue is decided. It is Yahweh and not Melkart who answers by fire, and it is Yahweh who sends the longed-for rain. The narrative raises the question whether Elijah anticipated the great prophets from the

¹ Pp. 43 f.

² *Antiq.*, VIII. xiii. 2.

eighth century onwards in the belief that Yahweh was the only God. It suggests rather strongly that he regarded Melkart as possessing no real existence and that, like the later prophets, he could have described the heathen deities as "nonentities." Such contemptuous mockery of their god as Elijah addressed to his prophets would scarcely, we may feel, have been uttered if he had believed that Melkart really existed. Yet we have to reckon with the possibility that the actual language is that of the narrator rather than of the prophet. And even if the language was the prophet's own, it is not inconceivable that Yahweh's protagonist, who owned allegiance to the God of Israel alone, may have mocked the god of a foreign state whose worship on Hebrew soil he hotly resented, even though he may not have denied his existence. But the question whether he had formulated the belief that Yahweh was the only God is of minor importance. For what the crisis demanded was that, whether other gods existed or no, Israel was Yahweh's people and should serve Him alone.

But this service was not completely rendered in acts of worship. The religion of Israel had from the first been an ethical religion. It included as essential elements the fulfilment of the common duties of man to man, especially justice, mercy, and the avoidance of oppression. It was these ethical requirements which Jezebel had contemptuously flouted in the murder of Naboth. Without hesitation or delay Elijah denounced the king who, though not cognizant of Jezebel's plot, was aware that she meant to secure the vineyard for him, "and that since his own fair

means had failed, foul means were likely to be employed by the queen." In this denunciation of the king Elijah no doubt had the people on his side. They would feel that their own rights were in peril, and it was their habit to resent any tampering with them ; moreover their conscience approved the stand Elijah had taken as true to the ideals of Israel's religion.

The story of Elijah's pilgrimage to Horeb is one of amazing power. The grandeur of the theophany is scarcely to be surpassed. Utterly discouraged, the prophet leaves his native land that he may visit the mountain where Yahweh had appeared to Moses. There, in a cleft of the rock, Moses, the creator of the nation and the founder of the religion, had stood. Passing by in all His majesty and shielding with His hand His servant from the fatal vision of His unveiled face Yahweh withdraws the hand when He has passed and the peril is over and permits him to see His back (Exod. xxxiii. 18-23). Probably it is in the same cleft of the rock that Elijah desires to stand where Moses once had stood and to recapture the experience of his mighty predecessor. It was the manner of Yahweh to appear in awe-inspiring elemental phenomena. He had come to His people in thunder and lightning, in fire which set the crest of the mountain on smoke so that it "burned with fire unto the heart of heaven, with darkness, cloud and thick darkness" (Deut. iv. 11). So terrified were the people that they implored Moses to act as their representative and let God not speak with them lest they die. So "the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where

God was" (Exod. xx. 21). And later poets describe how again and again Yahweh comes forth attended by tempest and earthquake, by thunder and lightning. Here then where Yahweh had disclosed Himself to Moses Elijah seeks Him, assured that if he can but meet Him at the mountain where He had first made Himself known and where communion with Him could be realised in its intensest form he might regain the power and the courage he needed for his superhuman task. The elemental forces are unleashed—hurricane, earthquake, and fire. But the prophet feels that not one of them has brought the experience which he craves. God Himself is not to be found in any of them. Was then this display of Nature's stupendous forces a mockery, eviscerated of the Divine presence with which in earlier days they had been charged? No, for while God Himself is not in them they are the harbingers of His coming. Suddenly the appalling uproar ceases and the utter stillness of the desert returns. There steals to his ear a soft whisper and he knows that now at last Yahweh Himself is here. But what is meant by this impressive contrast between the wild havoc of natural forces in which God is not present and the gentle murmur in which His voice is heard? The lesson which it is often thought Elijah should learn from it is that the slaughter of the prophets of Melkart was a deed of violence utterly out of harmony with the nature and the will of God. For the most congenial medium in which the Divine nature expressed itself was not the furious hurricane, the disastrous earthquake or the raging flame. Not through such forces,

loud yet inarticulate, but in the human voice, gentle yet distinct, was He most truly to be heard. Therefore His Servant must learn to abandon for the future all methods of violence. But this can scarcely be the lesson intended. If the commission of triple anointing was given as the immediate sequel, it is clear that a judgment was contemplated far more terrible than Elijah himself had executed, so devastating that all the worshippers of Melkart will be exterminated and only the seven thousand who have stood firm in their loyalty to Yahweh will survive. It is true that a rebuke is implied ; but it is conveyed in the question "What doest thou here, Elijah?" He had been wrong in leaving his post, wrong in thinking that Yahweh was more truly to be found at Horeb than in Palestine. His attempt to experience for himself what Moses had experienced was an error. If Horeb was the Mecca of Hebrew religion, yet a pilgrimage to Horeb was no part of Elijah's duty. The ancient forms of the theophany are revived but their ancient virtue has gone out of them. They belong to a more primitive stage of revelation and they have now become obsolete. It is useless to dwell on the dead past or seek to reanimate it. His task is in the present, his mission is to create the future, his place is in his own country, his mission to his own contemporaries. He must not seek the living among the dead or imagine that a return to Moses is other than a retrograde step. The God of Moses is indeed the God of Elijah, but through the centuries which stretch between them His purposes have been unfolded and His nature more clearly revealed. He is rebuked in the question

“What doest thou here, Elijah?” He receives his marching orders in the command “Go, return.”

The work which Elijah did was of incalculable value for the religion of Israel. It was the lofty privilege of that people to be the trustee for monotheism. Even if at that time monotheism was not the prophet's explicit and formulated creed, yet the monolatry which he undoubtedly championed took him a long way on the road. If the policy of the Court had been accepted, the religion would have lapsed into polytheism and the cause for which Israel stood would have been grievously compromised, if not irretrievably ruined. He did not indeed stand alone, but he towered far above all his fellow-workers in his vindication of Yahweh's right to the sole allegiance of His people. And his monolatry was an ethical monolatry. This found striking expression in his fearless denunciation of Ahab for the crime of Jezreel; but also in his protest against the worship of Melkart. For that worship was stained by dark and revolting impurity and its establishment in Israel would have inevitably led to a disastrous corruption of morals. Not without reason did later generations find in him the fittest companion to couple with the great founder of the religion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The best literature on Elijah is to be found for the most part in works of a more comprehensive scope. The student should consult the following: the Dictionaries of the Bible; the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (eleventh edition); the commentaries on Kings by Benzinger, Kittel, Burney, Skinner, Barnes, Gressmann (*in Die Schriften des Alten Testaments—*

the second edition has been considerably revised), Eissfeldt in Kautzsch's *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (fourth edition, edited by Bertholet); Histories of Israel by Stade, Wellhausen, Kittel, H. P. Smith, Guthe, Sellin; Introductions to the Old Testament by Kuenen, König, Driver, Cornill, Steuernagel, Sellin; Histories of the Religion of Israel by Smend, Stade, Marti, Kautzsch (in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible: Extra Volume*), H. P. Smith, König, Welch, Hölscher; Works on Hebrew Prophecy by W. Robertson Smith, Cornill, A. R. Gordon, Hölscher, Duhm, Gunkel, Sellin, T. H. Robinson, J. M. P. Smith.

Wellhausen's discussions and sketches in his large additions to the fourth edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1878), later incorporated in *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (1885); in his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*; in his article "Israel" in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, later expanded into his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* (1894; seventh edition, 1914), are of fundamental importance and have exercised great influence on subsequent discussions.

To these should be added Gunkel, *Elias, Jahve und Baal* (1906); Broegemann, *De fonte, qui est de Elia, quaestiones selectæ* (1910); Meinhold, *Der Heilige Rest* (1903), and *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (second edition, 1926). On the Rechabites, see Lucien Gautier, *Etudes sur la Religion d'Israel* (1927), pp. 104-129.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.¹

IF we are seeking to ascertain the course which Old Testament criticism is taking and rightly appreciate its significance, we shall do well if, at the outset, we look back over the path it has already travelled. For the movement is continuous; each new stage of the way, every fresh direction along which the explorers advance, will be conditioned by the earlier development. The story is now a long one and I must limit myself to the outstanding landmarks.

I begin with the criticism of the Pentateuch. It is to this that attention has been chiefly directed, and it is also the most important branch of our subject. I do not mean, of course, that the Pentateuch is intrinsically the most valuable element in the Old Testament. But the view we take as to its critical analysis, the chronological order of the documents from which it has been compiled, and the dates to which they should be assigned, is momentous for our reconstruction of the development of

¹This contains the substance of a lecture delivered at the John Rylands Library, with which are incorporated several extracts from Professor Peake's Presidential Address delivered to the Society for Old Testament Study, 1 January, 1924. First printed in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 12, 1928.

Hebrew literature and religion. If we adhere to tradition and affirm the Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Bible, we shall obviously envisage the history of Israel's literary activity and the growth of its religion quite otherwise than if we accept the critical theories which deny the unity of authorship and assign the documents they disengage to different periods of the national development. On the traditional theory a highly organised system of worship and an elaborate code of laws formed the basis on which the nation was constituted and the religion was established. A far from rudimentary theology was formulated simultaneously with the birth of the nation and the founding of its religion. On the critical theory little, if any, of the Pentateuch goes back to the time of Moses. A large section of it is not much earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem, a larger section is probably more than a century later still. This difference involved a corresponding difference in the estimate of the prophets. According to the traditional hypothesis the prophets were much later than the Law and subordinate to it. Their function was to enforce its precepts, to upbraid their contemporaries for transgression of its injunctions, to foretell the future fortunes of God's kingdom on earth and its consummation in the coming of the Messiah. Not only were they later than the Law, they had behind them much of the poetical and wisdom literature. Sage and Psalmist were also themselves dependent on the Law; but before the era of the great prophets, David and other sweet singers of Israel, Solomon and his fellow-experts in wisdom, the

poet to whom we owe the Book of Job, had given to their people their hymns and aphorisms and their meditations on the deeper mysteries of life. If then the traditional theory of the sequence in which these classes of literature had appeared should be radically disturbed, it is obvious that far-reaching results would follow. Whereas the prophets had been regarded as secondary and derivative and the Law as primary and original, this relationship would have to be reversed. The significance of the prophetic movement would be immeasurably enhanced while our estimate of the Pentateuch would be lowered. It was towards this radical revision of the accepted values that the course of criticism steadily moved.

Quite early in the history of criticism attention had been called by various writers to elements in the Pentateuch which seemed inconsistent with Mosaic authorship; and the intensive study of later scholars has brought more evidence of the kind to light. There are things which Moses can hardly have written, there are references which carry us down later than his time. It would be possible to explain away this evidence by the hypothesis that a fundamentally Mosaic work had been edited at a much later date, and that these indications of non-Mosaic or post-Mosaic origin were due to this editorial revision. Such an explanation, however, would be legitimate only if we had decisive independent evidence that the work as a whole was Mosaic. But it is precisely evidence of this kind which is lacking. In the absence of any trustworthy external testimony to the

authorship and date, we must scrutinise the document itself. And if we treat it as we treat other documents, these features, so far from being dismissed as later accretions, will assume a primary importance as testimony to the later origin. The presence of these non-Mosaic and post-Mosaic elements must be held to prove that the Pentateuch itself is non-Mosaic and post-Mosaic.

This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence which demonstrates composite authorship. The Pentateuch has been analysed into different documentary sources. The evidence is to be found in discrepancies in statement of fact or in legislation, in repetitions, in stylistic differences, in change of dominant interest, and divergence in point of view. These various differences are associated; they appear and disappear together. They cannot reasonably be explained otherwise than by a change of writers.

The starting-point for the modern critical analysis was given by Jean Astruc¹ in 1753. He called attention

¹Astruc's work is entitled *Conjectures sur les Memoires Originaux Dont il paroît que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genese. Avec des Remarques, qui appuient ou qui éclaircissent ces Conjectures*. The work is now rare. I might mention as a matter of bibliographical curiosity that my own copy contains some pages in duplicate but with variations. It may be added that the author was a Roman Catholic physician, and that his work was unfavourably received by contemporary critics including J. D. Michaelis.

In the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* for 1925 Professor Adolphe Lods calls attention to a German predecessor, Henning Bernhard Witter, a pastor at Hildesheim. In a work published in 1711 he drew attention to the alternation of the Divine names, the presence of doublets and the diversity of style. He inferred from these phenomena

to the difference in the use of the Divine names, Yahweh and Elohim, and on this basis carried through the analysis of Genesis and the first two chapters of Exodus. He did not challenge the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but supposed that Moses had employed documents for the earlier history. It was not till just a hundred years later that in 1853 Hermann Hupfeld established, in his *Die Quellen der Genesis*, the existence of two writers who used Elohim as a proper name, though this had been pointed out by K. D. Ilgen¹ in 1798. J. G. Eichhorn, the teacher of Ewald, in his *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1783) reached independently results similar to those of Astruc. Dr. Alexander Geddes in the first volume of his translation of the Old Testament (1792), while rejecting Astruc's clue to the analysis, recognised that the Pentateuch was not the work of Moses, though it incorporated his journals along with other early writings. De Wette² in 1806-

the difference of authors. The first two of these criteria were employed by Astruc, the third does not reappear before Eichhorn. But Witter was concerned only with the Creation story and not with the whole of Genesis. His views were attacked in the following year by Hermann von Elswich; but they quickly passed into oblivion and Professor Lods has not been able to trace any reference to him as a precursor of Astruc except in works by Scharbau (1758) and Sixt (1782).

¹ Ilgen's work had an extremely long title of which I give the opening words: *Die Urkunden der Jerusalem'schen Tempelarchiv in ihrer Urgestalt*. Cheyne says in his *Founders of Old Testament Criticism* (1893), that he had not been able to see the work; "Ilgen's book is, in fact, rarer than Astruc's *Conjectures*." I was fortunate enough to secure a copy a number of years ago.

² The title of De Wette's work is *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*.

1807 identified the book of the Law, discovered in the reign of Josiah, with Deuteronomy and compared the religious institutions in the earlier historical books with the laws of the Pentateuch. After Hupfeld's demonstration of the existence of two Elohist documents had been accepted, the analysis of the Pentateuch was in its main lines complete. In addition to Deuteronomy, which obviously stood by itself, a Yahwist document now commonly known as J and two Elohist documents, usually designated E and P, were recognised. The generally accepted view was that the Priestly Document was the earliest, Deuteronomy the latest, while J and E came in between. Although the distinction between E and P had not been established till the nineteenth century had run half its course, already in 1833-1834 Eduard Reuss¹ had divined the late origin of the Priestly

¹ Reuss was Professor at Strasbourg, and he had formulated a certain number of theses which he communicated to his students but had not ventured to publish. They were of great historical importance because they formed the starting-point for Graf and others who had heard them enunciated in his lecture-room. He gave the most important of them to the world in 1879 in the first volume of his translation of the Old Testament, *L'Histoire Sainte and la Loi*, Vol. I., pp. 23 f. The English reader will find them more readily in the translation of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, p. 4. In the German original they will be found on pp. 4 and 5 of the third edition (1886). It should be added that in all these cases the twelve theses quoted are given in French. In the posthumous German translation of the Old Testament (1893) Reuss gives an interesting statement as to his own relation to the criticism of the Pentateuch later associated with the name of his pupil Graf (*Das Alte Testament*, Vol. III., pp. 19 f.). See also his *Geschichte des Alten Testaments* (1890), pp. 485-493.

legislation embodied in P while in 1835 Vatke¹ and

¹ Vatke's work was the first part of the first volume of a projected treatise on Biblical Theology entitled *Die Biblische Theologie Wissenschaftlich Dargestellt*. It is a curious coincidence that Geddes' translation of the Old Testament was never completed; that of Ilgen's remarkable work only the first volume appeared; that Vatke's great work remained only a considerable fragment; and that of Wellhausen's *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. II., was never published. (In 1894 his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* appeared. This grew out of his article "Israel" in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and served as a substitute for the unpublished second volume.)

Vatke's influence as a lecturer was deeply appreciated by several students who were to reach great eminence. Hilgenfeld enumerates Strauss, Zeller, Biedermann, Holsten, Holtzmann, and himself. His *Biblische Theologie*, however, produced little result at the time, partly through the uncouth Hegelian jargon in which it was written, partly because the time for appreciation was not ripe. At a later date Wellhausen spoke of him with enthusiasm. Referring to the attacks on the Grafian theory he says, "The firemen never came near the spot where the conflagration raged; for it is only within the region of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas—the region which Vatke in his *Biblische Theologie*, had occupied in its full breadth, and where the real battle first kindled—that the controversy can be brought to a definite issue" (*Prolegomena*, p. 12). A little later he says: "My enquiry proceeds on a broader basis than that of Graf, and comes nearer to that of Vatke, from whom indeed I gladly acknowledge myself to have learnt best and most" (i.e., p. 13).

One of the strangest incidents in the history of the controversy is that Vatke himself abandoned his position at a later time. His final view is to be found in the posthumous *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1886) based upon his lectures. He dates the Priestly Document after E, that is after 716, towards the end of the eighth or at the beginning of the seventh century, probably in the closing years of Hezekiah (p. 388). On p. 402 he has an interesting reference to his earlier work and the volume published by J. F. L. George in the same year—*Die älteren Jüdischen Feste mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuch*.

George had published a similar anticipation of what is known as the Grafian theory. This theory was put forward by K. H. Graf, a pupil of Reuss, towards the end of 1865,¹ at first in the form that the narrative in the Priestly Document was early but the legislation late. Then in deference to Kuenen's criticism he advanced to the position that the document as a whole was the latest element in the Pentateuch. Kuenen² argued powerfully for this position and was supported by Duhm³ and other

¹ Graf's volume was entitled *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. The title-page bears the date 1866, but Kuenen informs us that "as a matter of fact it appeared towards the close of 1865" (*The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, p. xix). I mention this because, in forgetfulness of Kuenen's statement, Dr. Orr once challenged the accuracy of my statement that it was published in 1865. On the change in Graf's view, in deference to Kuenen's criticism, see his *Hexateuch*, pp. xix-xxiv.

² Kuenen's *De Godsdienst van Israel* (1869-1870) was the first to present the development of Hebrew religion on the basis of the Grafian theory. It was translated into English under the title *Religion of Israel* (1874-1875). He carried on the investigation in detail in articles in the "Theologisch Tijdschrift." Writing in 1885 Robertson Smith speaks of these articles as "perhaps the finest things that modern criticism can show." The first edition of Kuenen's Introduction to the Old Testament was published in 1861-1865, the second edition, which was not completed, began to appear in 1885 with the section on the Hexateuch. This was translated by P. H. Wicksteed in 1886. The book is too detailed for all except special students; but the general reader who is interested in the development of the subject should by no means fail to read the important introduction which sketches the history of the criticism of the Hexateuch during the interval which elapsed between the publication of the first and the second editions.

³ Duhm's work bore the title *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der Israel-*

scholars ; but it was not till 1878 that Wellhausen's demonstration was published which lifted the Grafian theory from the position of a critical heresy and established it as the orthodox critical view.¹

While great scholars such as Dillmann and Nöldeke, Baudissin and Kittel, remained unconvinced, the Grafian theory became, for an increasing band of students, the unquestioned basis on which the reconstruction of the history of Israel's literature and religion rested. It was naturally rejected by those who adhered to the traditional view ; but they rejected the earlier forms of the critical hypothesis also. Several adherents of the traditional school recognised, however, that, if the documentary theory had to be accepted, its most logical form was that given to it by Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen. The reasons which led to the change of view were very cogent. When the different codes were compared, in order that the history of religious institutions might be

itischen Religion. The author was, as Kuenen says, the first to break the consensus of the German critics. He was twenty-eight at the time.

¹ Julius Wellhausen, who had been one of Duhm's teachers, published his first researches on the Composition of the Hexateuch in 1876-1877. He had learnt of Graf's thesis in 1867 and, thanks to the course of his own studies, he was prepared to accept it, since he had discovered that the generally accepted view that the Law was prior to the historical and prophetic books was not borne out by his investigations, but only threw things into confusion. The decisive blow, however, was struck in his *Geschichte Israels* Erster Band (1878). In its later editions it appeared under the title *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. This was translated into English from the second edition of 1883 under the title *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885).

reconstructed, it was found that there was a development from the legislation in the Book of the Covenant to that in the Priestly Code which could be accounted for on the assumption that the Deuteronomic legislation stood chronologically between the two. Deuteronomy, in its original form, was universally recognised by critics as the code on which the Reformation of Josiah was based. It was believed to have been written not very long before its discovery. This gave a fixed period for the origin of the book. But the centralisation of the cultus at Jerusalem and the suppression of the high places or local sanctuaries had consequences which the authors had not anticipated. They had provided for the priests of the suppressed sanctuaries (Deut. xviii. 8), but the priests at Jerusalem refused to carry out the contemplated arrangement (2 Kings xxiii. 8, 9). Deuteronomy does not draw any distinction between priests and Levites. But we find this distinction recognised in the Priestly Document. To the descendants of Aaron alone is the right to offer sacrifice committed. The other members of the tribe of Levi perform the menial service of the tabernacle. The origin of this distinction is to be found in Ezekiel xlv. 10-16. He draws a distinction between the sons of Zadok, that is the priests of the temple at Jerusalem, and the Levites who had gone astray, by whom he presumably meant the priests of the local sanctuaries. In the new constitution, which is to be set up after the return from captivity, the right of offering sacrifice is restricted to the sons of Zadok, while the Levites are

degraded from the Priesthood. It is obvious that the order of the documents must be Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, Priestly Code. Deuteronomy tries to preserve the status of the priests of the local sanctuaries and make provision for their maintenance. Its provisions being found impracticable, Ezekiel deprives them of their status as a punishment for their misconduct, but secures a livelihood for them. The Priestly Code adopts this distinction, but carries it back to the wilderness period and extends the priesthood to all the descendants of Aaron. In the Priestly Code the position of the Levites is attained by elevation above the other tribes and constitutes a signal mark of the Divine favour ; while Ezekiel treats it as a degradation from the priesthood due to the Divine displeasure at their ritual misconduct. Had Ezekiel been aware of the regulations in the Priestly Code there would have been no problem for him to solve. But with the sequence adopted by the Grafian critics each stage naturally evolves from the preceding. Deuteronomy legislates for the priests, deprived of their work and emoluments by the suppression of their sanctuaries. The arrangement is thwarted by the priesthood at Jerusalem. Ezekiel proposes a compromise. The priests of the suppressed sanctuaries lose their priestly status, as their conduct deserved ; but employment at the Temple is found for them. This solution is later incorporated in the Priestly legislation ; but since that legislation is dated in the wilderness period it cannot be represented as inflicting punishment for offences committed long afterwards. It must therefore

be treated as conferring an honourable distinction on the tribe to which Moses and Aaron belong.

The conclusion which is suggested by these facts is confirmed by numerous phenomena derived from a comparison of the Law with the historical books and the prophetic literature and by a detailed investigation of the relation in which the different codes of law stand to each other. I am not stating the detailed argument for the truth of the Grafian hypothesis and therefore do not follow out these lines of proof. But in order to make the account of the later developments intelligible, it has been necessary to touch somewhat fully on the sequence of documents suggested by the legislation on the Levites.

My main purpose, however, is to indicate the recent developments, whether those developments have been in the direction of a more conservative or a more radical criticism. It is desirable to anticipate some misunderstandings. It is not unusual to see statements to the effect that some of the Old Testament critics have admitted the breakdown of the Grafian reconstruction. Gunkel and Sellin are perhaps the names most frequently cited in this connexion. But both these scholars accept the truth of the Grafian theory as I have defined it. The use of the term "Grafian" should be restricted to the view that the Priestly Code is the latest of the Pentateuchal documents and is later than Ezekiel.¹ But since

¹ I have referred to this point in my Introduction to the translation of Sellin's *Introduction to the Old Testament* and in the Introduction to *The People and the Book*. I may add that when, more than twenty years ago, I called attention to

the scholars most closely identified with this reaction are themselves Grafian critics, it is clear that the term must be used by them in a wider sense. Now it is true that such leading representatives of this critical theory as Kuenen, Wellhausen, Stade, and Duhm, also agreed in holding a rather radical theory as to the development of Hebrew religion, characterised by a depreciatory estimate of the Hebrew religion from its foundation by Moses to the rise of the great eighth century prophets. It is of this that such scholars as Sellin and Gunkel are specially thinking when they use the kind of language to which I have referred. It is rather regrettable that they should use it, since it is possible to quote their language to suggest the repudiation of a position which they really accept. It is much to be desired, in the interests alike of clearness and of accuracy, that the term "Grafian" should be restricted to the theory as to the order and date of the documents which I have explained above ; and that it should not be extended to cover a theory of Israel's early religious history which the most eminent and representative Grafians held. The critical hypothesis of Kuenen and Wellhausen does not stand or fall with their reconstruction of the religious development from Moses to Amos. It is at the same time true that both Gunkel and Sellin exhibit a certain conservative strain in their criticism to which I must direct further attention.

the same point, Dr. Driver wrote a letter to me expressing his concurrence with my plea for the restriction of the term to its proper significance.

I may begin, however, with a reference to the attempts which have been made to discredit all forms of the critical theory and to rehabilitate tradition. The analysis of the Pentateuch into its constituent documents started from the observation that the use of the Divine names Yahweh and Elohim was due to the employment of different sources, while with the discovery that two documents employed Elohim as a proper name the accepted analysis into four main documents first became possible. It has been asserted that the basis on which this rested was insecure. For it was assumed that the Divine names were correctly transmitted in the Hebrew text, whereas the evidence of the Septuagint made it clear that these names were in not a few instances different in the Greek text from the names given in the Hebrew. The impression has accordingly been sedulously fostered that since the critical analysis rests on the distribution of the Divine names it is vitiated by the uncertainty of the text.¹

¹The names to be specially mentioned here are B. D. Eerdmans, J. Dahse, and H. M. Wiener. The first of these published in 1908, *Die Composition der Genesis*. This was the opening issue of a series entitled *Alltestamentliche Studien*. It broke with the documentary analysis, repudiating the criterion afforded by the difference in the Divine names. Three more instalments of the work have appeared, *Die Vorgeschichte Israels* (1908), *Das Buch Exodus* (1910), *Das Buch Leviticus* (1912). His discussions contain a great deal that is valuable in detail. I have expressed my judgment on his conclusions on the point before us in *The Bible: its Origin, its Significance, and its Abiding Worth* (1913), pp. 170-172. Dahse followed up an article in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (1903), pp. 305-319, with the first part of a work entitled *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuch-*

But such a conclusion is wholly unwarranted. We must not confuse the starting-point with the foundation. The observation that now Yahweh and now Elohim predominated, where no distinction in significance could reasonably be attached to the choice, naturally suggested that documents had been combined which were characterised by a preference for one or the other title. The employment of this clue led to encouraging results ; but it was wholly inadequate to achieve the analysis of the Pentateuch into four main documents. In the first place the studious avoidance of the name Yahweh by the Elohist writers ceases after the revelation of the name in Exodus vi. Secondly, it could not lead to the discrimination between P and E. For both of these documents used Elohim and avoided Yahweh down to the opening chapters of Exodus. But it is much easier for critics to distinguish P from E than E from J in spite of the fact that in the former case the Divine names are identical and in the latter case distinct. It is clear accordingly that the analysis must be guided by other

frage (1912). H. M. Wiener has published a number of works of which his *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism* (1909) may be mentioned here. Dr. Skinner criticised their views, so far as they had been published at the time, in his commentary on Genesis (1910), pp. xxxv-xxxvii, but with very great thoroughness in his volume, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (1914). See also Driver's *Introduction*, 9th edition (1913), Addenda, pp. xxvi-xxxiii. More recently Canon J. Battersby Harford has published a series of articles in "The Expositor" entitled *Since Wellhausen* (July-December, 1925). These are strongly to be recommended for their searching examination of the attempts recently made to discredit the critical theory.

clues ; and these are in fact present in considerable numbers. While the use of the Divine names set critics on the track, it is frequently not the most important criterion for discrimination of documents, and for a hundred years it led critics on a false scent because it induced them to regard as constituting a single document compositions so distinct and indeed incompatible as P and E.

Nor can we attach much importance to the objection that the analysis is so detailed and minute that no confidence can be felt in the results. Critics themselves insist that as the analysis passes to its more delicate division of sources, it is frequently only tentative and hypothetical. If the critic is convinced, however, that he has a double thread before him it is quite legitimate to push the separation as far as he can take it, so long as he makes clear the stages by which he passes from the region of reasonable probability to that of the nebulous and uncertain. The strength of the case rests on the general evidence for the composite character of the passage and the presence of well-marked criteria by which the constituent elements can be discriminated. The fingers gain deftness with practice and delicacy of touch, so that the expert may train himself to detect and follow the finer clues which would elude the observation of the unskilled. It is not, however, on the last refinements of analysis, but on the broader and plainer indications, that the case for documentary dissection can safely rest.

Before I pass to the chronological arrangement and

the approximate dating of the documents I may mention a revision of the generally accepted theory that apart from Deuteronomy three main documents J, E and P were to be recognised. Students have long been familiar with the view that different strata can be detected within J. In this connexion the work of Schrader, Wellhausen, Budde, Gunkel, may specially be mentioned. But in his elaborate work on *The Narrative of the Hexateuch* (1912), Smend analysed the whole of the narrative sections into four independent documents, J 1, J 2, E and P. In this, as I learn from Eissfeldt, he had been partially anticipated by Bruston in some articles he wrote in 1885. Eissfeldt has worked on similar lines in his *Hexateuch-Synopse* (1922). In this he publishes a German translation of the narratives arranged in four columns. For J 1 he uses the symbol L. The choice of this symbol has been suggested by the use of P for the Priestly Document, L standing at the other extreme is so called to indicate its lay character. I do not linger on the hypothesis, for even if it should be generally accepted, it would not, in spite of its interest mark any revolutionary development.

At this point I think it would be well, before passing to the more crucial issues in the criticism of the Pentateuch, to touch upon the more general features of the situation. We hear a good deal about the reaction in Old Testament criticism. It may be well to recall a New Testament parallel. In 1897 Harnack published the first volume of his *Chronologie*. It was introduced by a preface which was hailed with what I cannot but think an

extravagant delight and sense of relief. We were, it would seem, moving on a full flood back to tradition. Dr. Sanday hastened to give it prominence and to express his pleasure that what British scholars had for so long asserted was now endorsed with the weighty authority of Harnack's range and depth of knowledge and mastery of critical method. But the actual discussions of critical problems in the book itself quickly showed with what grave qualifications of the optimistic interpretation put upon it Harnack's preface had to be read. When from general assertions the reader passed to detailed problems it was quite another story. And so it is with Old Testament criticism. No doubt there is an element of truth in the assertion that here also there is a reaction. When a candid friend said to Burnand, "*Punch* isn't as good as it used to be," he made the retort, as effective as it was witty, "It never was." And if we are told that the long-predicted event has at last come off and that there is a reaction in Old Testament criticism, I can only reply, "There always has been." It is just as true that there is an advance. Within the critical movement itself we must recognise on either side of the main body a radical and a conservative wing.

The scholars who, while accepting the main critical results, yet plead for a more conservative attitude than has been commonly taken, urge that the older criticism was far too provincial. It explained the literature and religion of Israel too much as the result of forces restricted to Israel. From this insularity they desire to rescue the study and to set it in its larger context. Gunkel's volume,

Schöpfung und Chaos (1895), was very significant here. Whatever may be thought of the actual conclusions reached, the book was undeniably important for its method and point of view. It had a decisive effect on the criticism of the Book of Revelation, since some phenomena which had been explained as due to the combination of different sources received another explanation. Gunkel argued that the old Babylonian creation story of the conflict between Marduk and Tiamat, the demon of chaos, had left its mark very deeply on the later literature. The tradition had had a long history and to this might be traced the origin of some features which earlier critics had attributed to purely literary causes. The publication of the book suggested that Gunkel might be counted on as a formidable opponent of analytic criticism. This unlucky anticipation was completely falsified by his commentary on Genesis (1901, 3rd ed. 1908-1909), in which the generally accepted critical results were adopted and developed by a still finer analysis. It was none the less momentous that attention should be directed not simply to the dissection of the documents but to the long history, largely pre-literary, through which the tradition had gone.

It was obvious that foreign sources had to be taken into account. The influence of the pagan antecedents and environment had more and more to be reckoned with. It is true that this had not been neglected. Two of the outstanding champions of the Grafian theory, Wellhausen and Robertson Smith,¹ had given much

¹ Wellhausen's *Reste Arabischen Heidentums* (1887), second edition (1897). Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in*

attention to the roots of the Hebrew religion in Semitic paganism, especially as represented by Arabia. Egypt was believed to have contributed nothing of importance.¹ The affinities of the story of Creation and the Flood with the Babylonian myth, were, of course, recognised, but variously explained; and a good deal of reserve was felt in recognising direct Babylonian influence on the religion of Israel. The problem of origins was regarded as relatively simple. But such notable discoveries as the Tell el-Amarna documents and the Code of Hammurabi, together with much besides which was less sensational but still important, widened our horizons and enabled us to realise more fully the complexity of the issues. For a time attention was mainly directed to the peoples in

Early Arabia (1885), second edition edited by Dr. Stanley A. Cook (1903); *The Religion of the Semites* (1889), second edition (1894). A new edition enriched by more than two hundred pages of additional notes has been prepared by Dr. Stanley Cook (1927).

¹ See what Kuenen says on this point in his Hibbert Lectures, *National Religions and Universal Religions* (1882), pp. 59-61, and the pungent sentences in Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*, p. 440. He admits that it was not inconceivable, though quite incapable of proof, that Moses was indebted to the Egyptian priests for personal culture or external details in matters of ritual. He continues, "But the origin of the germ which developed into Israel is not to be sought for in Egypt, and Jehovah has nothing in common with the colourless divinity of Penta-Ur or with the God-forsaken dreariness of certain modern Egyptologists." In the first edition of his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* (1894), he says that Moses and Phineas bore Egyptian names. In other respects there is no trace of Egyptian influence on the oldest History of Israel, and Yahweh is as un-Egyptian as possible (p. 14). In the seventh edition (1914) he speaks with much greater reserve (pp. 31 f.).

surrounding countries, but recently it has been specially concentrated on Canaan itself. Here numerous races have mingled and different forms of civilisation and religion have been in contact, so that the conditions which the Hebrews found when they settled in Palestine were unusually complex. All of this had a direct bearing on the reconstruction of the history of Hebrew religion.

But this in its turn affected the solution of the critical problems. I will illustrate this from a subject on which I have previously spoken at length¹—the question as to the origin of Hebrew eschatology. It was argued along quite different lines by Eduard Meyer and Gressmann² that this eschatology was borrowed early in the history of Hebrew religion from a foreign source which Meyer, on the basis of certain Egyptian prophecies, asserted to be Egypt. This hypothesis came directly in conflict with the accepted view. Under Wellhausen's influence it was widely held that eschatology was a late development. It had a literary origin in the study of the earlier prophets and the harmonising and systematising of the forecasts in their unfulfilled prophecies. Ezekiel had set the example. A presumption was accordingly created that eschatological sections in the earlier prophetic literature were exilic or post-exilic insertions. And this was pushed by some scholars, notably of course by Duhm

¹ *The Roots of Hebrew Prophecy and Jewish Apocalyptic* (1923), pp. 75-110.

² E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906), pp. 451-455; H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905).

and Marti, to much greater lengths than Wellhausen himself had taken it. If, however, eschatology was a very early ingredient in the religious beliefs of the Hebrews, then an eschatological passage might still, of course, be assigned to a late date, but not simply on the ground that it was eschatological. I am myself inclined to be sceptical about this pre-prophetic eschatology, and in any case think that inferences should be drawn from it with great caution. But it is clear on the other hand that equal caution should be displayed in drawing the inference that because a passage is eschatological it must therefore be late. This is one of the most noteworthy illustrations of the bearing on literary problems of conclusions as to the development of the religion based on a study of Israel's pagan environment.

I can now return to the more recent developments in the criticism of the Pentateuch. For more than a hundred years the point of Archimedes in this subject has been the identification of the Law Book of Josiah's Reformation with some form of Deuteronomy. For Grafians and pre-Grafians alike this was axiomatic. The contention between the Grafians and their opponents turned on the place in the series to be assigned to the Priestly writing. And even as a matter of the internal criticism of the Pentateuch itself the Grafian view that P represented the final stage in the development and presupposed the Deuteronomic Law seemed the more probable of the two alternatives. But the identification of Deuteronomy with the Book of the Law discovered in the reign of Josiah has been challenged by various

scholars and most recently and elaborately by Hölischer.¹ The lower limit for the main body of the Deuteronomic Code was thought to be fixed by the correspondence of the reforms effected by Josiah with the regulations of Deuteronomy, and by the influence of the Law Book on Jeremiah and Ezekiel. But none of these three bases has been untouched by later criticism. The earlier critics, it would seem, were too trustful and built on the narrative of Josiah's Reformation in the Second Book of Kings, taken pretty much at its face value. On the revolution in the criticism of Jeremiah I must speak later; but at this point I may say that I recognise that the relation between Deuteronomy and the Book of Jeremiah presents a very difficult and complex problem and believe that some of the passages which exhibit Deuteronomic affinities most clearly belong to the secondary sections of the Book. I must also touch later on Hölischer's criticism of Ezekiel, limiting myself at present to the bare fact that he brings down very large sections of the Book of Ezekiel to a much later date than Ezekiel's own time. I have already pointed out that the Grafian criticism arranged the documents in this order, JE, Deuteronomy, Ezekiel's legislation, the Priestly Code. If this sequence is to be retained and we attribute the regulations in the

¹ Gustav Hölischer, *Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums* in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Band 40 (1922), pp. 161-255; *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion* (1922), pp. 130-134. I may add that this volume provides the most convenient conspectus of the author's very radical and far-reaching theories. It is crammed with information and very rich in Biblical and other references.

last nine chapters of Ezekiel to the prophet himself, we must put the kernel of Deuteronomy before the Exile and indeed identify it with the code of law which gave the impetus to Josiah's Reformation. If, however, the Deuteronomic Code is dated about 500, then such portions of Ezekiel as presuppose Deuteronomy must be brought down to a later date and the Priestly Code must be later still. Possibly the most interesting result which emerges is that Hölscher does retain the Grafian sequence. He realises that the development goes from Deuteronomy to P with Ezekiel as its middle term. But the original P he takes to have been a historical work, the legal portions being later additions. The story of Ezra's activity he regards, with Torrey, as altogether legendary.

A reconstruction so far-reaching and audacious can obviously not be examined here. I must simply express my grave doubts as to the correctness of any of the crucial contentions. I am out of sympathy with his sceptical handling of the story of the Reformation, with his argument for bringing down the date of Deuteronomy to the close of the sixth century, with his radical criticism of Jeremiah, and the still more drastic handling of Ezekiel. The identification of the Deuteronomic Code with the programme of Josiah's Reformation seems to me to remain secure, and this is the pivot on which the Grafian construction turns.

But the dominant theory is attacked by those who regard it as too extreme as well as by those who blame it for its conservatism. It is specially Deuteronomy

which is in question here. Professor A. C. Welch in his *Code of Deuteronomy* (1924) has argued for a much earlier date for the great majority of the laws. It has been generally held that the main object of the legislator was to purify the worship by the centralisation of the cultus at Jerusalem. Dr. Welch argues that if we look at the individual laws they do not lend themselves to that hypothesis. The idea of centralisation is not to be found in most of them, they are concerned with the worship at the local sanctuaries which were scattered all over the country. The conflict which the author has in mind is that between Yahweh and the local Baalim, and he connects the Code, as some others have done, with the Northern Kingdom rather than the Southern and takes it back to the early monarchy or perhaps even to the time of the Judges. It is not forgotten, of course, that when the legislative section begins with the twelfth chapter the centralisation of the worship is definitely commanded. But it is answered that this was prefixed to the Code when the reforming party was engineering the Reformation in Josiah's reign. Several scholars have argued that Jeremiah was referring in viii. 8 to elements in Deuteronomy with which he was not in sympathy. His words are "How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the LORD is with us? But, behold, the false pen of the scribes hath wrought falsely." Dr. Welch thinks that Jeremiah is referring to the prefixing of the law of centralisation to the Code.

It is difficult to discuss in a very general statement like the present a theory which rests on the investigation of so

many points of detail. But some general remarks may be offered. It is not the view of critics that the Deuteronomic Code was a collection of entirely new laws. Far from it ; it embodies and expands the laws already contained in the Book of the Covenant. The Priestly Code itself recognises institutions and religious conceptions which can be explained only by going back to a condition of things far more primitive and indeed savage than that at which Hebrew culture stood. And while it is the case that some laws, which have been commonly regarded as corollaries of the edict of centralisation, are perhaps to be otherwise explained, it is far from likely that this applies throughout. Moreover, since the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 23-xxiii. 33) precedes the Deuteronomic Code, and this earlier legislation was apparently composed after the settlement in Palestine, we must beware of placing the Deuteronomic Code too early. Nor must it be forgotten that several arguments, quite apart from the law of centralisation, point to a date not earlier than the latter part of the eighth century. Moreover, we are entitled to attach the greatest weight to the fact that this demand for centralisation does stand at the beginning of the Code. Unless very grave reason to the contrary can be offered, we are justified in the inference that this section lays down a fundamental principle for the legislation as a whole. There is no doubt that Josiah and those who collaborated with him understood the law in this way. Even if an earlier date for many of the individual laws could be made good than I believe to be probable, it would still not radically alter

the generally accepted critical position. The Grafian sequence would remain ; so, too, the identification of Josiah's Law Book with the Deuteronomic Code which was the pivot on which the development turned.

Before leaving the question of the Pentateuch I may refer to Löhr's investigations which began to appear in 1924 with a study of the Priestly Code in Genesis.¹ The author is a well-known Old Testament scholar, and it is remarkable that at the age of threescore he should launch out in a novel direction and one so revolutionary. His object is to discredit the view that the Pentateuch has been put together out of four main documents. He regards it as the work of Ezra and his associates. Ezra had at his disposal a great mass of pre-exilic material—material of very various kinds, some of it already worked up into cycles of narrative. He believes that on the whole the Pentateuch has been the literary creation of one man—with assistance from helpers—composed with a definite plan and design. Yet he admits that it is the result of a complicated literary process and—what is much more surprising—that after Ezra many insertions were made, including the whole chronological scheme of Genesis and not a few chapters, and that innumerable glosses were inserted and detailed alterations were made. It will be clear that any appeal to Löhr as a champion of tradition would be quite illegitimate. He regards Eerdmans as his truest predecessor, but confesses a special debt to Dahse and

¹ Max Löhr, *Der Priestercodex in der Genesis* (1924).

Wiener which, we are afraid, is not likely to predispose critical readers to anticipate very sound results from his investigation. On Deuteronomy he is more conservative, regarding the law of centralisation as Mosaic and attributing to Moses also certain portions of the legislation.

In this connexion it may be of interest to refer to Dr. A. E. Cowley's discussion of the bearing of the Elephantine papyri on our question. In his standard edition of the documents, entitled "The Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C." (1923), he has an important statement on the origin of the Pentateuch (pp. xxv-xxviii). It will be remembered that a reaction from critical results had been anticipated from the evidence supplied by these papyri. Special stress has been put on the linguistic argument they supply for the early date of Daniel.¹ On

¹ In the eighth edition of his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (1909), pp. 514 f., Driver dealt with the bearing of the Aramaic papyri on the date of Daniel, supplementing what he had said on pp. 502-504. I may add that in the ninth edition (1913), Addenda, pp. xxxiv-xxxviii, he replies to the strictures made by Dr. R. D. Wilson on the treatment of the Aramaic of Daniel in the eighth edition. It is an example of the strange carelessness with which these subjects are sometimes discussed that in a paper read before the Victoria Institute (1921) Dr. St. Clair Tisdall should refer to no later discussion by Dr. Driver than his *Commentary on Daniel* (1900) and the fifth edition of the *Introduction* (1894), and proceed to say that much water had since flowed under the bridges. It had, indeed; but it is very strange that it never occurred to him to enquire whether Dr. Driver had taken account of it, although his sixth edition (1897) had been greatly revised, the eighth edition had been considerably revised, and in it and the ninth edition (1913) the bearing of the newly-discovered Aramaic papyri had received careful attention.

this aspect of the subject Dr. Cowley does not dwell. But he emphasises the apparent ignorance of the Pentateuch which the documents betray ; and he infers that this ignorance was shared by the Jews in Judæa up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. He believes that documents, undoubtedly written in cuneiform and probably in the Babylonian language, existed from early times and eventually formed part of the Torah. They were unknown to the masses of the people and later still the prophets made little reference to a written law or the early history. In the time of Nehemiah we find the complete law in existence. Presumably it did not exist in its present form till Ezra drew it up. With the assistance of his colleagues he arranged the cuneiform tablets containing the various sources, translated them into Hebrew, welded them into a more or less consistent whole, and wrote down the result in the simple Aramaic alphabet. It had to be represented as originally revealed to Israel by Moses, and therefore its novelty could not be admitted. Possibly it was not new. "Various documents," he says, "of different dates, must or may have been in existence, from which the complete work was produced very much in the manner on which modern criticism insists—only that previously the documents had not been generally accepted, and that the final redaction took place at one definite time, and not as a gradual and rather undefined process" (p. xxviii). On one important issue he makes the radical suggestion that the house of Aaron may have been a late post-exilic invention. It will be clear from all this, as well as from

other views expressed, that one of the foremost living authorities on the papyri considers that their evidence favours a rather radical construction of the history of the Law which, while it is quite independent, goes very much on the lines which modern criticism has followed.

From the Pentateuch I turn to the Prophetic Literature. To make the present position plain it will be necessary to go back several decades. If we take the names of the great critics from a point about a hundred years ago and coming down half a century—I think especially of Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig, Dillmann—certain results were generally accepted. The last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah were attributed to a prophet writing during the Babylonian Exile; and it was recognised that related sections in the former part of the book belonged to the same period. The work of Zechariah, the contemporary of Haggai, was believed to close with the eighth chapter. Other passages might be denied to the authors whose names they bore; but in the main the general attitude on the other prophetic books was conservative. In the eighties a forward movement could be clearly detected, specially associated in Great Britain with the name of Cheyne, in Germany with the name of Stade. 1892 marked the opening of a new era. It was in this year that Duhm's *Isaiah* and Wellhausen's *Minor Prophets* were published. I speak more especially of the former because it represented new developments in a radical direction. In the former part of *Isaiah* he denied to Isaiah prophecies which had previously been attributed to him; in prophecies which he did not deny

to Isaiah he frequently detected later insertions or additions—especially happy endings ; and he relegated quite a considerable part of Isaiah i.-xxxv. to the Maccabean period. In the treatment of the last twenty-seven chapters various scholars, notably Cheyne, had recognised that a considerable proportion had to be credited to a writer or writers later than the Second Isaiah. Duhm divided these chapters between two prophets, the work of the Second Isaiah closing with chapter lv., while chapters lvi.-lxvi. were attributed to a writer whom he designated Trito-Isaiah. The restriction of the Second Isaiah's work to xl.-lv. has met with very wide acceptance ; but several scholars decline to believe that chapters lvi.-lxvi. can be the work of a single author. Within the chapters attributed to the Second Isaiah Duhm isolated four passages commonly called the Servant poems, which he regarded as the work of a later author. This delimitation of the Servant poems has also met with very wide acceptance, even among the scholars who take an entirely different view of the Servant from that advocated by Duhm. In his massive *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1894) Cheyne largely agreed with Duhm's results except that he refused to accept his Maccabean datings. In Marti (1900) Duhm found a zealous supporter, except that he carried out Duhm's principles in an even more drastic way.

The problems of the Book of Jeremiah are quite different from those presented by the Book of Isaiah. Anyone who has worked through Graf's Commentary on Jeremiah (1862) will have been struck by the unbending

conservatism of his treatment, which is specially striking in view of the association of his name with what for long seemed the extreme of radicalism in the criticism of the Pentateuch. Giesebrecht (1894) pointed the way to a more critical handling of the book. Professor N. Schmidt, of Cornell, outlined a criticism of unexampled ruthlessness in his article on Jeremiah in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Duhm's Commentary on Jeremiah (1901) exhibited his qualities on their weak as well as their strong side in a remarkable degree. Whether in other respects he reaches the angelic ideal need not be discussed, but beyond almost all our Old Testament scholars he has had the gift of troubling the stagnant waters. And where a Biblical writer is fortunate enough to secure his approval, one can rely on an exceptionally fresh, penetrating, and stimulating interpretation. But while Duhm had a singular insight into the personality of Jeremiah and depicted it with exceptional sympathy, he was limited even here, and perhaps still more in his estimate of the prophet's message, by his arbitrary hypercriticism. He restricted his authentic prophecies to those which were written in the so-called Qinah rhythm and thus regarded only 268 couplets as his genuine work. It is antecedently improbable that Jeremiah should have uttered no prophecies in prose; but even if this could be conceded to Duhm, it is improbable in the last degree that a poet so gifted as Jeremiah should, through his whole career of forty years, have limited himself to one rhythm. The most serious blot on his Commentary was his acceptance of the opinion previously put forward by Stade and Smend, that the

prophecy on the New Covenant was no part of the prophet's message. In this respect his position was successfully assailed in the masterly commentary of Cornill (1905) in which the authenticity of this striking anticipation of the Gospel was triumphantly vindicated. Cornill himself belonged, with certain reservations, to the advanced wing of critics ; but his commentary on Jeremiah was characterised by sobriety of criticism as well as by its power of sympathetic appreciation.

In his notable work on the Prophets (1914) Hölscher advanced to a position analogous to that of Professor N. Schmidt. While Duhm had left the prophet in possession of those poems which are now often spoken of as the "Confessions of Jeremiah," Hölscher regarded them as later insertions. He thus immeasurably impoverished our material for the characterisation of Jeremiah. He leaves us with a sadly shrunken figure and greatly dwarfs his significance for Israel's religion.

I might add a reference to the bearing of this on the problem of the Pentateuch. While Hölscher went far beyond Duhm in his drastic reduction of the authentic utterances of Jeremiah, he considered that Duhm's results were sufficient to destroy the basis of the argument for the generally accepted date of Deuteronomy. Although I am very conscious that the problem of the relation between Deuteronomy and the Book of Jeremiah is one not easily solved, and recognise that the Deuteronomic affinities are most clearly marked in the later additions to the book, I am even more firmly convinced that Duhm's criticism is the element of least permanent value in his

Commentary and should regard any radical inference from it as insecure in the last degree.

The Book of Ezekiel was for long regarded as the one impregnable rock in the prophetic literature, against which the waves of a disintegrating criticism would beat in vain. That matters are not quite so simple has been for some time recognised ; but the authenticity of the book in the main has been generally admitted. It was clear from Hölscher's discussion in his volume on the Prophets that he had detected not a little spurious matter in the book. He has since reached much more definite and more revolutionary results. He rejects, it is true, the suggestions which have occasionally been made that the book is completely spurious ; yet he says that in its present form it is essentially a later pseudepigraphon. Its first draft was written between the composition of Deuteronomy (about 500) and Nehemiah (445), and after that date it received many additions from later hands. The original author incorporated Ezekiel's literary remains, which formed only a small proportion of the work and had, in addition, been drastically worked over.¹ It is quite impossible for me to discuss an issue of this kind, depending so much on detailed analysis of the text. The future will show how much or how little of this destructive criticism will commend itself to Old Testament scholars. I cannot myself anticipate that such sweeping reductions of Ezekiel's authentic prophecies will be accepted, though it does not seem likely that the long-

¹ *Hesekiel: Der Dichter und das Buch* (1924).

established opinion as to the complete authenticity of the book will be maintained in its former rigour. So far as the relation to the criticism of the Pentateuch is concerned, it is naturally the last nine chapters, with their sketch of the organisation of the restored community, that come into consideration. And here the case is perhaps clearest for a revision of the older attitude. It is noteworthy that in his commentary on Ezekiel (1924) Johannes Herrmann declines from want of space to discuss the relation of this section to the Pentateuch; but in view of the probably composite character of the section he adds that the material can be used for this purpose only with the greatest caution and that the problems of Pentateuch criticism are less settled than ever (P. xxxiii.). It should, of course, be remembered that Hölscher regards the post-exilic date of P as convincingly proved by Wellhausen.¹

In view of all this revolutionary scepticism, I welcome Hölscher's firm opposition to second-century datings for a considerable section of the prophets. He adds, "I believe that a date in the Hellenistic period cannot really be proved for one single section in the prophetic literature."² I have perhaps devoted more space to Hölscher's hypercriticism than its intrinsic value may seem to justify. But it is bound to receive serious and thorough discussion; and even where solutions may be entirely unacceptable the resolute search for difficulties and the sharp formulation of new problems provide an incentive

¹ *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*, p. 142, note 1.

² *l.c.*, p. 159.

to a renewed scrutiny of positions which have perhaps been lazily accepted as axiomatic. If Hölscher's work is all too meagre as nourishment, it is exceptionally rich in stimulus. In his repudiation of the second century dates for large sections of the prophetic literature he is in line with what I take to be the attitude at present dominant among critics, though there are notable exceptions. Few who have worked at the prophets will doubt that there have been numerous insertions in their writings, designed to enhance their utility for edification and adjust them to the conditions and problems of a time later than their own. But it is illegitimate to detect later insertions as an inference from far-reaching principles, such as that passages eschatological in character must necessarily be late. If the closing passage of *Amos* is judged to be a later appendix to the book it is not because it is eschatological, but because it so completely contradicts the prophet's anticipations of the future. The last chapter of *Hosea* seems to me to be in general harmony with the prophet's standpoint and I see no solid reason for treating it as a later edition. *Joel* is now regarded by almost all scholars as post-exilic, and there is a growing tendency to analyse it and assign it to two distinct authors. On the other prophets I must not linger.

In the Hebrew Canon the Book of Daniel is not included among the prophets; it is found in the third collection, technically known as "the Writings." The explanation of this is probably that when the canon of the prophets was closed the Book of Daniel had not yet been written. There are scholars who still uphold the

traditional view ; but the main body of critics is solid in accepting its Maccabean date. There is a growing tendency, however, to regard the book as composite and to date the historical narratives considerably earlier than the apocalyptic visions. Eduard Meyer¹ believes that the book has been compiled out of very varied materials and has a fairly long history behind it. He alleges the presence of doublets both in the narrative and the prophetic sections. He regards the book as dependent on Persian sources. It has been generally supposed that the four beasts are to be identified with the four empires which the author believed to have covered the period from the fall of the Jewish monarchy—the Chaldean, Median, Persian, and Greek Empires. This identification, it is true, involves a historical inaccuracy ; and Meyer argues that it must be set aside. The four beasts were borrowed from the apocalyptic tradition and are not a symbolic representation starting from the historical phenomena of the period covered by the vision. It is not probable that the interpreters of *Daniel* will follow him in this opinion. But I refer to it because it raises the larger question as to the interpretation of apocalyptic symbolism. If the author started from history and related what he took to be the actual facts in the figurative language of Apocalyptic, then we are justified in seeking to retranslate his imagery into historical narrative. But where he is starting from an ancient apocalyptic tradition, we are obviously not

¹ *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (1921-1923), Vol. II., pp. 184-189.

entitled to assume that he is seeking to convey historical narrative through this bizarre symbolism. He feels himself to be entrusted with a sacred mystery which it is his first duty to transmit. He has then to interpret it ; and since it is the fixed conviction of apocalyptists that the crisis is near, he must adjust his interpretation to the conditions of his own time. He may, indeed, include a minute sketch of events near to his own day as we find that the Book of Daniel has done. But periods more remote can be treated without the same regard for exact correspondence with history as to which, indeed, the author might be much less fully informed. The question emerges on a larger scale in the Book of Revelation, the secret of which cannot be solved by following any one of the different methods which have been applied to it to the exclusion of the rest. We cannot regard it as merely a reflection of contemporary history and a forecast of the immediate future ; nor find the key to its problems simply in the view that the book has been put together from sources of different date ; nor yet conclude that the author has drawn merely on ancient apocalyptic tradition. These lines of approach have all to be followed if we are to reach our solution. It is not so clear in the case of the Book of Daniel as in that of the Book of Revelation that we must reckon with a combination of documents dating from different periods ; but presumably some influence of the apocalyptic tradition must be recognised, and certainly the attempt to cast history into a symbolic form.

It has been widely held by critics that little or nothing

in the Psalter dates from the period before the destruction of Jerusalem. It was indeed regarded by many as composed almost entirely after the return from captivity. A certain number of the Psalms were believed to belong to the period of the Maccabean struggle. Some assigned a large part of the Psalter to this period. Duhm¹ went even further and dated some Psalms in the first century B.C. He regarded a number of these Psalms as party songs—we might almost say lampoons—directed by Pharisees or Sadducees against the members of the rival school. There is a marked reaction not simply against Duhm's extravagant dating but also against the more widely-spread opinion that no pre-exilic psalms are preserved in the Psalter. It is probable that in the main the opinion would still be held that the Psalter is the product of post-exilic religion. But the presence of a not inconsiderable pre-exilic element would be widely recognised. The question whether any of the Psalms may be traced back to David is interesting rather than important. David was not only a musician but a highly-gifted poet, as his elegy on Saul and Jonathan demonstrates. And presumably he used his talents in the service of Yahweh before whom, king though he was, he danced with a corybantic enthusiasm and a disregard for decorum which shocked the more fastidious Michal (2 Sam. vi. 14-23). And there must have been some foundation for the tradition which associated his name with the authorship of psalms. We cannot, however,

¹ *Die Psalmen* (1899) in *Kurzer Hand-commentar zum Alten Testament*, edited by Karl Marti.

argue from the probability that David was a psalmist to the conclusion that any of his compositions are preserved in our Psalter. That some Davidic Psalms are included especially in the early Books is not at all unlikely, but they cannot be identified with certainty. They are also probably few in number. The type of psalm we should expect a man like David to write would as a rule probably be too crude for inclusion in the final collection. No sound reason can be assigned why sacred poems, composed in the period of the great prophets, should not have been worthy of inclusion in the Psalter. It is, of course, not improbable that pre-exilic hymns frequently underwent revision in the later period to render them more congenial to the ideas and the piety of the community and more appropriate to the worship in the Second Temple.¹

I have touched on the outstanding problems in Old Testament criticism, and I need not deal with the remaining books. The net result of the recent critical movement, it seems to me, is that we are left in the main very much where we were a quarter of a century ago. Reactionary and radical conclusions have still their representatives, new theories make their appearance from time to time. They probably contain their elements

¹ Two recent volumes on the Psalms may be mentioned here: *The Psalter in Life, Worship, and History*, by A. C. Welch (1926), and *The Psalmists* (1926), edited by D. C. Simpson. The latter volume contains essays on their religious experience and teaching, their social background, and their place in the development of Hebrew Psalmody by Hugo Gressmann, H. Wheeler Robinson, T. H. Robinson, G. R. Driver, and A. M. Blackman.

of truth and necessitate minor readjustments. I believe that critics will tend steadily to retreat from the extravagances of criticism represented by such names as Duhamel, Marti, and Hölscher. But I am disinclined to anticipate that we shall see any great movement in the direction of reclaiming Deuteronomy for the pre-prophetic period, to say nothing of the Priestly Document. The relative dating of the codes advocated by the Grafians will, I am convinced remain, and the absolute dating will also, I think, not be seriously altered. And in the other departments of Old Testament Criticism I anticipate a similar maintenance of what I may call a central position.

It may seem as if all the labour spent on critical investigations is largely wasted. Even if greater unanimity could be secured and so much had not to be left in uncertainty, it might be argued that problems of this kind are remote from our spiritual life and that their solution will contribute little of religious or moral interest. But the very nature of Scripture renders the critical study of it imperative. Careful examination would soon convince us that the revelation enshrined in the Old Testament has been disclosed through a slow historical process. History has been the chosen medium for the Divine self-unveiling and self-communication. But this means that we must know the history if we are to disengage the revelation. It was given not all at once but slowly through a development which stretched over centuries. And as it attained its higher reaches it found its congenial vehicle, no longer in the nation as a whole, but in the

experience of individuals gifted with religious genius, men of rare insight into the Divine nature and the Divine purpose and sensitive to the delicate leading of the Spirit. We must, so far as we can, place the historical movements and the great personalities in their correct order and their actual setting. But this can be done only as criticism arranges the documents themselves in their true order and enables us to follow the movement from point to point. Old Testament criticism for its own sake would have its intellectual interest as the unravelling of a tangled skein ; but if that were all it would assuredly not repay the colossal labour which has been lavished upon it. It is because it is the indispensable preliminary to the reconstruction of the history, which in its turn can alone enable us to follow the movement of revelation from its lowly origins to its supernatural heights, that the literary criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures is completely justified by its works.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Many of the most important works have been mentioned in the Lecture and the Notes. I desire specially to recommend as covering the ground, though in a different way, the very instructive article, "The Present Position of Old Testament Criticism," contributed to *The People and the Book* (1925), by Professor J. E. McFadyen. The position as it existed nearly a quarter of a century ago was sketched in my lecture, "The Present Movement of Biblical Science," published in *Inaugural Lectures Delivered by Members of the Faculty of Theology* (Manchester, 1905). A comparison with the present lecture would, I think, prove reassuring to those who are tempted to doubt the stability of the central position in Old Testament criticism.

For the history of criticism the following may be recommended: T. K. Cheyne, *The Founders of Old Testament Criticism* (1893); J. Estlin Carpenter, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century* (1903). On the history of the criticism of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch), A. Westphal, *Les Sources du Pentateuque* (1888); W. E. Addis, *The Documents of the Hexateuch* (1892-1898); H. Holzinger, *Einleitung in dem Hexateuch* (1893); J. E. Carpenter, *The Composition of the Hexateuch* (1902).

The critical problems themselves are discussed in the Introductions to the Old Testament; those by S. R. Driver (1st ed. 1891, 9th ed. 1913); Cornill (Eng. transl. 1907); Steuernagel (1912); Sellin (Eng. transl. from 3rd ed. 1923), may be specially mentioned; also W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (2nd ed. 1892); J. Meinhold, *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (2nd ed. 1926); and on the conservative side by J. Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament* (1906); in the relevant articles in the various dictionaries of the Bible and the "Encyclopædia Britannica": and in the commentaries.

For special sections of the Old Testament the following may be mentioned: A. Kuenen, *The Hexateuch* (Eng. transl. 1886); J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885); A. T. Chapman, *An Introduction to the Pentateuch* (1911); D. C. Simpson, *Pentateuchal Criticism* (1914); together with the works by Westphal, Addis, Holzinger, and Carpenter mentioned above; T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* (1891), *Job and Solomon* (1887), *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1894).

More elaborate bibliographies are given in *Peake's Commentary* (1919) and *The People and the Book* (1925), and in *A Scripture Bibliography* (prepared by a Committee of the Society for Old Testament Study and published by Nisbet & Co.). Extensive and valuable bibliographies are given in Mr. N. H. Baynes' excellent volume, *Israel among the Nations* (1927).

THE MESSIAH AND THE SON OF MAN.¹

THERE is no problem more momentous for the student of Christian origins nor one more keenly debated than that which is to engage our attention. Jesus challenged His disciples with the question, "Who do you say that I am?" But for us it is far more important to discover what Jesus believed and claimed Himself to be. The ultimate question, indeed, is what He really was. But the answer is to be sought not on one line of enquiry only but on several. For we must estimate the impression He made on His contemporaries, whether friendly or hostile; the influence He exerted on those He selected for companionship and training; the record of His activity; the presentation of His personality; the quality of His teaching; His death and His triumph over death. To these we must add the movement He created, the men He transformed, the worship He evoked, the place He has filled in universal history. But the issue with which we are concerned must fill its indispensable place in the enquiry. The secret of His own consciousness will always in a measure elude us; but so far as He explicitly disclosed it or we can with justice divine it, so far we must appropriate it and give it its full weight in our theory of His person.

¹The substance of two lectures delivered in the John Rylands Library in 1919 and 1921. First printed in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 8, 1924.

So much will probably be on all hands admitted. For whatever our personal attitude to the ultimate problem may be, the view which Jesus Himself took of His Nature and His task is a datum of undeniable significance. But many will wonder why I should speak of a problem, on which much debate has been concentrated. For is it not clear from the records themselves that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, the Son of David, the Son of man, the Son of God? But a historical student has to investigate not only the contents but also the truth of his sources. Even if for himself he held that the documents were Divinely protected from the least taint of error, he could not evade the obligation to establish their truth for those who did not share this conviction. Since the conviction itself is in our own day more and more widely abandoned, we must treat the question, so far as the subject itself permits, as a historical problem to be solved by the methods proper to historical enquiry. And when we take up the literature of the subject we quickly discover that there is scarcely any point which is not disputed by scholars of great eminence.

Since the only sources of our information are documentary, it would be necessary in any extended treatment to investigate the literary problems which the documents present. For our purpose and in our space this would be inappropriate, so I must simply indicate the critical pre-suppositions. It is well known that the large majority of critics regard Mark as our oldest Gospel and as a source employed by the authors of the first and third Gospels. It is also widely, though not quite so widely, held that these

two Gospels employed a second source, no longer extant. This, which is now usually indicated by the symbol Q, consisted largely of sayings and discourses of Jesus. The relation between these two primary sources, Mark and Q, is variously estimated, some assuming Mark to be the earlier, others Q, while others again regard them as nearly contemporaneous. Of course it does not follow that, if one of them was appreciably older than the other, it would have been employed by the later writer, though some scholars hold that there was dependence on one side or the other. Other possibilities to be borne in mind are that the documents themselves, notably Mark, may have passed through successive editions, and been known to Matthew in one form and to Luke in another. And while chronological priority may not unreasonably be held to imply on the whole greater historical trustworthiness, this principle needs to be applied with more caution than has often been exhibited. I must also regard it as highly probable that Luke had access to a very valuable set of reminiscences whether in oral or in written form. We cannot forget that he accompanied Paul to Jerusalem on the visit which was terminated by his arrest and was with him on his voyage to Rome. It does not follow that he was in Palestine for the whole of the intervening period; but he had first-rate opportunities for gathering reminiscences of Jesus from members of the Palestinian Church.¹

¹ I should perhaps add that Synoptic criticism is passing into a new stage. In this stress is laid on the necessity of investigating the problem of form and determining the literary

It is now more and more widely believed that the Fourth Gospel is to be almost entirely set aside by those who are seeking to reconstruct the career and teaching of Jesus. This attitude has been for a long time prevalent in Germany, and it has made great headway among scholars in Great Britain and in America. In recent years, especially since the work of Wellhausen, Schwartz and Spitta, the problem of its composite structure has more and more engaged the attention of scholars. A comparison of the first with the second edition of Loisy's *Le Quatrième Évangile* will show how far opinion has travelled in the interval. Probably the student will do well, in a subject so rapidly moving, to adopt an attitude of extreme caution towards theories which have yet to be thoroughly tested, all the more that different types in the first three Gospels. The following books may be mentioned: Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1919); Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (1919); Martin Albertz, *Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche* (1921); Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (1921); Georg Bertram, *Die Leidensgeschichte und der Christuskult* (1922). In his *Kyrios Christos* (second edition, p. 33) Bousset says that he hardly needs to emphasise that he assumes the two-document theory as the basis of his investigation. But he adds that there are far more difficult and still more important problems which have scarcely yet been attempted. Previous criticism has been too much occupied with analysis into sources. A new method must be adopted which will put stylistic criticism in the foreground and investigate the laws of oral tradition. The problem is to trace the process by which Mark and Q grew up. This will no doubt prove a fruitful field of investigation, and it may have important bearings on the future investigation of the Gospel history and religion. But since the discussion of it is only in its initial stages, it is better, in the investigation of our special problem, to leave it out of account.

analyses proceed upon different principles. But whatever the truth may be about the authorship, the date, or the unity of the Fourth Gospel, I believe that it has preserved for us a number of precious reminiscences. In the present state of opinion, however, it is desirable to build on our earliest sources in the first instance. It must of course be recognised that we cannot exclude the possibility that the Christology of the Church may have affected the report of the sayings or activities of Jesus.

I begin with the problem of the Messiahship of Jesus. It is undeniable that the Church from its earliest days regarded Jesus as the Messiah.¹ Our oldest sources take back this belief into the lifetime of Jesus. They represent Jesus Himself as accepting the title. The belief is said to have been formulated by Peter at Cæsarea

¹ Since some readers may question my right to assume this, I may refer to the opening paragraph of Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* in which he says that, however much the self-consciousness of Jesus Himself might be contested, it may be taken as fully assured that the community at Jerusalem was established from the outset on the basis of the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah expected by the Jewish people. I might add that while he refuses to go so far as to say that Jesus never used the title Son of man of Himself, this negative being incapable of proof, yet in very numerous cases he believes that this self-designation did not go back to Jesus, but originated in the tradition of the community, and that here if anywhere, we have before us in the confession of Jesus as the Son of man the conviction of the primitive community (second edition, p. 5). In view of Bousset's extremely negative position with reference to the view that Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah and Son of man, his testimony may presumably be deemed sufficient warrant for my statement.

Philippi (Mark viii. 30); and the people are aware of it, at least from the time of the triumphant entry into Jerusalem. In spite of this, it has been doubted by some modern scholars whether Jesus ever made any claim to be the Messiah or even was so regarded by the disciples in His lifetime. I take the case of Wrede as illustrating this position, especially since he called attention to phenomena in the Gospels which had received insufficient consideration.¹ He put great emphasis on the injunctions to secrecy recorded in the Synoptic Gospels and especially in Mark. The demons are

¹W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (1901). The book attracted great attention in Germany. English readers should consult Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, chap. 19. Wrede's work and his own little work, *The Secret of the Messiahship and the Passion (Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis* (1901), which, with its curiously similar title, was published on the same day, are used by Schweitzer to point the moral of his historical investigation that we must choose between Wrede's radical scepticism or J. Weiss's and his own radical eschatology. For a severe criticism of Wrede see Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, pp. 69-76. Jülicher's *Neue Linien in der Kritik der Evangelischen Überlieferung* has an important discussion of Wrede, as also of Harnack and Wellhausen. The work opens with a very sarcastic estimate of Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, Bousset in his discussion of the Messianic secret absolutely agrees with Wrede's presentation of the facts but differs in his estimate of them (*Kyrios Christos*, second edition, pp. 66 f.). In particular, while allowing that Mark's tendency in this respect has coloured the narrative of the confession at Cæsarea Philippi, he disagrees with Wrede's inclination to regard the whole story as an invention. "Peter's Messianic confession must stand as historical. But owing to the evangelist's tendency to paint the picture over, the answer of Jesus has been unfortunately lost to us." The first sentence is a noteworthy concession to historical truth.

forbidden to disclose the Messiahship, and similarly the disciples after Peter's confession. He laid stress also on the difficulty caused by the prolonged delay in the disclosure itself. The solution which he offered was that Mark devised the theory of the Messianic secret to account for a difficulty. The disciples, having attained the conviction that Jesus had risen from the dead, drew the inference that He was the Messiah. A difficulty, however, was created by the fact that it was not known that Jesus had made any such claim in His lifetime. Confronted by this difficulty, Mark put forward the theory that Jesus was conscious of His Messiahship from His Baptism, but guarded it as a secret; it was divined by the demoniacs with their psychical sensitiveness, and later declared by Peter, who had been illuminated by Divine revelation. In each case silence as to the secret was rigidly enjoined. Thus it came to pass that, although Jesus had known Himself to be the Messiah and the secret had been divulged to a limited circle, it had remained, outside of it, entirely unknown.

Wrede's solution has met with little if any acceptance. And rightly, for it involves a scepticism as to the trustworthiness of our narratives so radical that, if it could be justified, we could hardly trust them for anything. His account of the origin of the conviction in the primitive Church is exposed to the gravest objections. He asserts that the early Church based its identification of Jesus with the Messiah on the belief that He had risen from the dead. But the consequence by no means follows. We have no ground for supposing that the belief in Messiah-

ship would be a likely inference to draw from the belief in a man's resurrection. The Old Testament knew cases of resurrection in which no one dreamed of such an inference. And there is a contemporary case which is quite conclusive. Herod and some of the people thought that Jesus was John the Baptist who had risen from the dead. But not one of them hit upon the idea that He was therefore the Messiah. Further, the conviction entertained by the disciples that Jesus had risen from the dead needs itself to be explained. If the resurrection actually occurred, the problem does not exist; but as Wrede did not regard it as an actual fact, it must be explained in some other way. The belief is supposed to rest on the visions, and these are regarded not as objective but as subjective. But how would these be generated? They could be explained only as effects of the impression made by Jesus during His lifetime. But a conviction so amazing in the circumstances, to the consideration of which I will return—the accursed mode of His death, the verdict of the religious leaders, the apparent ruin of His cause—requires us to postulate that the impression they had formed of His personality was of a wholly exceptional kind. This creates a strong presumption in favour of the view that Jesus was in His own lifetime regarded as Messiah; and, if so, certainly not without His own knowledge and approval. Wrede's theory of the Messianic secret is accordingly untenable. But at this point it is best to merge the special in the wider discussion, and to state the grounds on which the view, not of Wrede alone, but of other scholars, that Jesus never

claimed to be the Messiah, must be rejected. We can then return to the problem of the Messianic secret.

The story of the Baptism raises several critical questions. But the fact that Jesus was baptised by John may be taken as quite certain since it cannot have been invented. For had it never taken place, it would not have occurred to any follower of Jesus to relate that his Master had submitted to baptism at the hands of John, since this might be interpreted to imply a recognition of His dependence on John and inferiority to him. And this all the more that the baptism administered by John was a repentance-baptism received for the remission of sins. It is quite clear from the addition of the conversation between John and Jesus in Matt. iii. 14 f. that this difficulty was acutely felt in the early Church. We cannot be sure that Q recorded the baptisms since the texts of Matthew and Luke can be accounted for without the assumption that they used Q. Yet it is probable on general grounds that Q did relate the story. It included the account of the detailed temptations, and this becomes intelligible only from the story of the Baptism and the heavenly voice. Moreover, since Q recorded the ministry of John it is scarcely credible that it omitted what was for Christians the act in which that ministry culminated. But unless we hold that Mark at this point drew upon Q, we have no evidence that either Matthew or Luke derived their story of the Baptism from it. Fortunately, however, for our purpose this is not serious, since the declaration of Divine Sonship is guaranteed by the fact that the first two temptations start

from it. We can accordingly assert with considerable assurance that both of our earliest sources related that Jesus heard the Divine declaration, "Thou art my beloved Son."

A statement critically so well attested ought, it would seem, to command our confidence. Yet very eminent critics have doubted it. Replying to the question whether this was the oldest form of the tradition, Harnack says: "I share with Wellhausen the conviction that it was not, that it has rather taken the place of the more ancient story of the Transfiguration" (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 138). This judgment rests on the assumption that the story of the Baptism and that of the Transfiguration are parallel and give mutually exclusive accounts of the Divine declaration of the Sonship of Jesus. But as the two accounts stand in Mark, there are noteworthy differences between them. Wellhausen recognises these, but attributes them to the skill with which Mark has incorporated them and made them distinct incidents (*Das Evangelium Marci*, first edition, p. 75, second edition, pp. 69 f.). But there is no conclusive reason for adopting this view. The appropriateness of the difference in language, which Wellhausen attributes to the skill with which the author adjusted the language to the different situations he had created, may just as well be explained on the more obvious assumption that the situations were, in fact, different. And even if the oldest tradition knew of one occasion only on which the heavenly voice was uttered, it still would not follow that this occasion was the Trans-

figuration rather than the Baptism. Indeed, we may hesitate all the more to follow Wellhausen that he believes the story of the Transfiguration to have been originally the account of an appearance of Jesus after the Resurrection! And the probabilities of the case speak strongly for the view that at the Baptism Jesus attained the consciousness of Divine Sonship. The definite conviction of a Divine call to a special mission could alone have justified to Him the acceptance of His vocation and the entry on His public ministry. The experience in the wilderness follows naturally, one might almost say inevitably, upon this. And Q's story of the Temptation, if authentic, guarantees the story that in the Baptism Jesus attained the conviction of His Sonship. The denial of the experience on the banks of the Jordan logically carries with it the rejection of the triple temptation, which would then lose its occasion and starting-point, and thus one act of critical violence logically leads on to another. In view of all these considerations, we may with some confidence accept the representation of our sources that with the submission to John's Baptism there was linked the consciousness of Divine Sonship; that its sequel was retirement into the wilderness and temptation there; and that this temptation took the form which it received in Matthew and Luke, who at this point were drawing upon Q.

The consciousness which Jesus attained in His Baptism was not of a Sonship shared by others, for this had all along been central in His religious life, but of a Sonship which was unique. It probably included the conviction

that He was the Messiah, for this seems to be implied in the third temptation ; but it need not have been exhausted by this.

This conclusion is corroborated by the account of the immediate sequel to the Baptism. Under the constraint of the Spirit who had descended upon Him, He went into the solitude of the wilderness. The object of His retirement was that He might meditate on all that this new consciousness involved, might discern clearly the task to which His vocation committed Him, and the means by which He was to achieve it, and withal that He might be tested to the uttermost and remain sure alike of Himself and His mission. The first two temptations, if I correctly understand them, are directed to the same end, while approaching it by opposite ways. They test the conviction of His Sonship, which must rest on the inward witness of the Spirit and the voice of God, a conviction which must, to be of avail for Him, stand above all need of confirmation by signs and wonders. If He yields to the suggestion to reassure Himself by such expedients, the battle will have been already lost, since the attempt would imply that He had already begun to doubt. Caught in the period of reaction from His ecstasy, with His physical forces at their lowest and the apparent indifference of God to His fate only too plain, He maintains His conviction unshaken. But now His second problem emerges. Secure in the knowledge He has won of the secret of His personality and the nature of His vocation, there is the possibility that His mission may prove a failure if it be pursued along false

lines. It is in this third temptation, to do homage to Satan for the sovereignty of the world, that the Messianic element in His vocation is most clearly implied. For the Messianic hope of His countrymen looked forward to a mighty conqueror who should break the yoke of the oppressor and establish the sovereignty of the Jewish people over the other nations. And it was naturally a real temptation to Jesus to accept this conception of Messiahship with which He was familiar ; and a striking proof of His spiritual insight that He refused to compromise with a lower ideal and remained steadfast in uttermost obedience to what He knew to be the will of God.

This account of the Baptism and the Temptation commends itself by its internal consistency, by its harmony with the situation, and by its fitness as a prelude to what is to follow. If it is correct, it establishes the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, and whatever else may be involved in the consciousness of Divine Sonship, as His secure possession before His ministry began. But the case for His Messianic consciousness has other supports than this, and to these I must now turn.

The triumphal entry into Jerusalem implies His Messianic consciousness. For it must have been intended as a fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy : " Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion ; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem : behold, thy king cometh unto thee : he is righteous and victorious ; poor, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt, the foal of an ass " (Zech. ix. 9). We need not insist that Jesus instigated the popular en-

thusiasm by any disclosure of what the act meant for Himself. It is quite conceivable that He desired no popular demonstration. The main intention of the act was to conform to the Messianic rôle as the prophet had depicted it. The consequences of the action did not so much concern Him. It is not quite clear, in fact, that the demonstration was designed as a welcome to the Messianic King. In our oldest source the acclamations are reported in this way: "Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, *the kingdom* of our father David: Hosanna in the highest." This need not imply more than that Jesus was regarded as a harbinger of the Kingdom. The later documents definitely make the identification with the Messiah, Matthew using the term "Son of David," Luke, "the King," John, "the King of Israel." But John adds the significant words, "these things understood not his disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him" (xii. 16). The difficulty in regarding the triumphal entry as a Messianic demonstration is that the authorities took no action upon it; and apparently no reference was made to it at the trial of Jesus, though it would have greatly strengthened the case against Him. But, whatever the attitude of the people may have been, and however the disciples regarded the action of Jesus, it seems to be clear that in His own mind the action was imposed upon Him by the necessity of fulfilling Messianic prophecy; and that He felt the pressure of this necessity

and acted in accordance with it, demonstrates that He believed Himself to be the Messiah.

The case is even stronger when we come to His trial and crucifixion. The trial before the Jewish authorities may be dismissed by some as yielding untrustworthy evidence. It is open to a critic to argue that, in the nature of the case, we have no authentic evidence. But even if there was no one among His judges from whom the information could have been directly derived, it would betray a singular lack of familiarity with actual life to suppose that the facts would not have leaked out. Moreover, His accusers must have stated such relevant evidence as they had secured when they brought Him to Pilate. And the confession of Messiahship, if such it is, bears intrinsic marks of genuineness. Its peculiar form as reported by Matthew (xxvi. 64) and Luke (xxii. 70) guarantees its authenticity. Matthew's "Thou hast said" and Luke's "Ye say that I am" seem to be intended as an affirmative reply and are so taken by the High Priest and the judges. This sense is, in fact, fixed by the use of the same formula to Judas in Matthew xxvi. 25. It was not a common formula to express affirmation; and probably there is a shade of meaning in it which distinguishes it from a bare affirmation.¹ In the Greek, at any rate, the second personal pronoun is emphatic, and the suggestion seems to be that the mean-

¹ See Thayer, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xiii. pp. 307-313, Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash: Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, pp. 990 f.

ing is : "It is you who employ the term ; I should not have used it myself ; but I admit that it is correct." This guarded and almost ambiguous statement is so apt to the actual situation in which Jesus found Himself, that it is difficult to think that it was put into his mouth by a later writer.

But the trial before Pilate and the Crucifixion supply still more decisive evidence. Very few who acknowledge the historical existence of Jesus have had the hardihood to deny that He was put to death by crucifixion. But since denial has not been altogether wanting, though based on the flimsiest grounds, I will briefly explain why the crucifixion must be regarded as a historical fact. When I was considering a number of years ago whether we could devise arguments to prove the historical existence of Jesus which would be quite independent of evidence derived from the Christian documents, it occurred to me that we could infer the fact with certainty from the form which the Jewish Messianic doctrine had received in the Christian Church.¹ It may be argued that already by the first century A.D. Judaism had developed the doctrine of a suffering and slain Messiah, though this is dubious. It is, however, quite certain that it could not have represented the Messiah as put to death by crucifixion. For this mode of death is accounted as accursed in the Hebrew law which says : "he that is hanged is

¹ I first stated this argument in my lecture *Did Jesus Rise Again?* (1902); see also *Christianity: Its Nature and its Truth*, pp. 156-158; *The Bible: its Origin, its Significance, and its Abiding Worth*, p. 318.

accursed of God" (Deut. xxi. 23). This mode of death has, in fact, seemed to the Jews to negative decisively the Messiahship of Jesus. If, then, we find a Jewish sect which has for its central dogma the Messiahship of one whom it asserts to have been crucified, there can be only one explanation for this. The story of the founder's death by crucifixion obviously could not have been invented. For it presented an insuperable difficulty to the propaganda of the sect. To the Jews it seemed to place an impassable barrier in the way of the acceptance of Christianity, while to the Greeks the story seemed the extreme of folly. The leaders of a new movement do not create gratuitous difficulties for themselves; nothing but sheer necessity could have forced the Christian leaders to go to their Jewish countrymen with the story of a crucified Messiah. Only in one way can we account for the form their message took. They must have been adherents of a leader whom they believed to be Messiah, who had been executed on the Cross. And in spite of the verdict of the Law, which was for them the verdict of God, they must still have believed Him to be Messiah. By this line of argument we establish not only the historical existence of Jesus but also His death by crucifixion. For in no other way could we account for the abnormal development which the Jewish Messianic belief received in the Christian Church.

To the fuller implications of this for our particular subject I shall return; but I am at present establishing the fact of the crucifixion. While the more merciful Jewish law made stoning the normal form of capital punishment,

crucifixion was a Roman mode of execution. The question is accordingly, How did Jesus come to be executed by this Roman mode of death? He was, we are told, delivered to the Roman authorities by His fellow-countrymen. Now, however worthy of death the Jewish rulers may, from their own standpoint, have felt Jesus to be, they could not expect a Roman Governor to condemn and crucify Him on the ground that Jewish law required His death. They had to charge Him with a crime of which Roman administration could take cognizance. His claim to Messiahship afforded them the plausible pretext they needed, since this could be represented to Pilate as high treason against the Emperor. Pilate realised that Jesus was not an ordinary Messianic revolutionary, and was, therefore, willing to release Him. At the same time Jesus did not disavow but apparently admitted the truth of the charge, so that Pilate finally gave way. Here, again, we have in all our Synoptists the curious formula of affirmation "Thou sayest." Jesus throws on Pilate the responsibility for using the term, while admitting that it was correct. Had He repudiated the charge, it is very questionable if Pilate would have yielded to the Jews. He could have securely defied them if he had satisfied himself that the accusation had no substance. What seems to have determined his final action was the fact that the prisoner would not deny His Messiahship, and, indeed, appeared to admit it. Pilate realised that, however innocent the Messiahship in question might be, it would be a serious matter for him if he should be proved to have released a man charged with claiming to

be the Messiah, who had Himself chosen to go to the cross rather than to plead innocence. We may, accordingly, infer with practical certainty from the fact of the crucifixion that Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah. This is further corroborated by the title over the cross which represented Jesus as King of the Jews. There is no valid reason for doubting its authenticity.

A case so strong stands in no need of further evidence. And yet one of the strongest proofs remains to be mentioned. I have pointed out already in reply to Wrede that the conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus held by the Church was in the circumstances so amazing that it can be explained only on the basis of the impressions His disciples had formed of Jesus during His lifetime. The circumstances I enumerated were "The accursed mode of His death, the verdict of the religious leaders, the apparent ruin of His cause." Their mood was one of terrible disillusion. They had followed Jesus to the capital hoping that He would set up the Kingdom of God. They had entered Jerusalem in triumph ; but the days slipped by and the hate of His enemies, in alliance with the treason of a disciple, had secured His downfall. So this was the end of their Messianic dream. They could not be indifferent to the fact that His claims had been rejected by the appointed custodians of religion, who were charged with the duty of adjudicating on such pretensions. And all this had been endorsed by the mode of His death, for this had brought Him under the law's anathema, "He that is hanged is accursed of God." That with such overwhelming evidence against it, His

disciples should have recovered a faith in His Messiahship, which they had held before His death is itself amazing ; but that after His accursed death such a faith should have been for the first time created is, we may surely say, a sheer impossibility.

We may then infer with confidence that already before His death His disciples had believed Jesus to be the Messiah. But if so, we may take the further step of affirming that this cannot have been without the knowledge and the approval of Jesus. For Jesus could not have been unaware of the views entertained by His followers. And sooner or later He must have taken up a definite attitude to them. If He did not believe Himself to be the Messiah He could not have countenanced the belief of His followers that He was. And even if in His lifetime they had believed Him in spite of His own disclaimer to be the Messiah, itself a barely credible hypothesis, the tragic sequel would once for all have disabused them of their belief. And this would have equally been the case if the judgment of Jesus had been in suspense. We are left accordingly with the only remaining possibility that Jesus Himself had put His seal of approbation on their faith. And it is all the more necessary to assume this, that it was after all not so easy for a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus to spring up spontaneously in the minds of His disciples. It was one of the difficulties which early Christian apologetic had to face that He had not fulfilled the Messianic rôle as foreshadowed by Old Testament prophets and elaborated in Jewish theology. In the momentous scene at Cæsarea Philippi the disciples

enumerate the popular identifications of Jesus (Mark viii. 28). Men had thought of Him as John the Baptist or Elijah or one of the prophets. From this it is clear that while the people recognised something so extraordinary in Jesus that they readily believed Him to be a great prophet who had returned from the realm of the dead, they had not identified Him with the Messiah; and if we can trust the record in Matthew, Jesus accounted for Peter's confession of His Messiahship as the result of a divinely given insight into His vocation (xvi. 17). But in any case it is clear that the career of Jesus did not naturally suggest to the Jews that He would prove to be the Messiah. We may accordingly regard it as incredible that the disciples should have maintained a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, unless they were aware that this was His own belief about Himself. Such knowledge of His own mind was the sheet-anchor of their faith when they affirmed it to hostile priests and incredulous rulers.

Thus by several lines of mutually independent arguments, each of them weighty and some sufficient if they stood alone, but irresistible in their combination and their concentration from different angles on the same conclusion, we have demonstrated beyond all reasonable question that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah. This conclusion will be corroborated in the sequel, and the significance of His conviction will be more fully disclosed. But the fact that the conclusion has been doubted warns us that the reasons for this doubt have to be explored more fully. And with this I return to the problem of the Messianic secret.

If Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah why did He Himself maintain such secrecy about it and enjoin such secrecy on others? Why did He elicit the confession of His Messiahship from His disciples at so late a point in His ministry? Why was it that He did not declare Himself to the people? Why had the confession to be extorted from Him at His trial? The view has been taken that the silence of Jesus was due to His own uncertainty. Only when His ministry was far advanced did He become sure in His own mind. Through prolonged hesitation and acute inward struggle He had to reach the conviction that He was the Messiah. He may have felt that the Messianic category did not fit His self-consciousness; or He may even have shrunk from Messiahship as unwelcome. But this suspense and indecision and inner conflict have to be read into the narratives. Jesus rather impresses us as one whose own mind was fully made up and whose way stretched plainly before Him. And if I have been right in arguing that the story of the Baptism and the Temptation may be trusted, then we must believe that Jesus left the Jordan and entered the wilderness with a certainty of His Messianic vocation so deep that no doubt could touch it. There is no need to hesitate about this, if the reserve of Jesus can be satisfactorily accounted for in another way than the assumption of His own uncertainty.

The usual explanation that He avoided the disclosure to the people because His conception of the Messiahship was so different from theirs seems to be adequate. He could not have proclaimed Himself as Messiah

without evoking the popular enthusiasm which was in a very inflammable condition. Revolution against Rome might easily have broken out, and a life and death struggle might have been its inevitable sequel. In such a struggle Jesus could have had no share. His refusal to participate in it would have ruined all chance of winning the people for His cause; and disillusion, especially if attended by military defeat, would have embittered them against Him. Nor could His purpose have been accomplished if He had explicitly declared that, though He was the Messiah, He was not the kind of Messiah they anticipated. This would have been practically equivalent in their eyes to a denial that He was the Messiah at all. They neither understood nor desired any other than the hero of their imperialist dreams. To make a claim so interpreted would have rendered them still more inaccessible to His message.

And this is true also of His reticence with His disciples. Had He disclosed the secret of His vocation, the associations which gathered about the title would have set them from the first on the wrong lines for understanding Him. If He desired to lead them to the conviction that He was the Messiah but to reinterpret the idea for them, the best way was taken. They became familiar with Himself, His ideals, His mode of action and His teaching. When the time came for the Messiahship to be revealed, they could recognise, though even then with great difficulty, that Jesus was a Messiah other than the Messiah of national expectation. They could now control their interpretation of His vocation by

their impression of His Person. They could see the doctrine in a new light because they read it through their knowledge of Him. And it was far better that Jesus should lead them through intimate familiarity with Him, though watching His actions and listening to His words to form their own judgment of Him, rather than by premature disclosure to force the truth upon them before they were ready for it, and when they would have inevitably misunderstood it.

So far then I have sought to establish the fact that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, without entering on the question what this consciousness really involved. We have seen that Jesus clearly recognised a deep divergence between His own and the traditional conception of the Messiah. In meeting His third temptation He definitely set aside the ideal of gaining the Empire of the world. To this renunciation He remained loyal throughout His ministry, and died because He would not disclaim His Messiahship or be untrue to His ideal. If we are to understand His vocation as He Himself interpreted it, we must widen the scope of our enquiry and investigate the other terms which He employed.

The title which most clearly expresses the definite Messianic idea is the title "Son of David." It is rather striking that it is infrequent in the Gospels. The genealogies in Matthew and Luke trace His descent through David. Paul lays stress on the fact that He was born of the seed of David, and in this he follows the primitive Christian apologetic as recorded in the Acts of the

Apostles. Stress is also laid on it in the birth stories. Jesus does not repudiate the title when it is addressed to Him, but He does not use it with reference to Himself. In one passage, indeed, He is believed by many to controvert the idea expressed by it. On the Scribes' definition of the Messiah as the Son of David He comments with the question, How is this to be reconciled with the 110th Psalm? For if the Messiah is the Son of David, He is by that very fact David's inferior and yet David speaks of Him as his Lord. It does not necessarily follow that Jesus was conscious that He had no claim to Davidic descent, or that he was depreciating the Davidic descent of the Messiah. It may quite well be that He wished to bring out that Davidic origin was not the full truth about the Messiah. He was David's son—Yes, but He was also David's Lord. In any case it was not the dominant element in His Messianic consciousness.

Of greater importance was the title "Son of God." In a general sense Jesus proclaimed the universal Fatherhood of God, and this involved a corresponding universal sonship. His own religious experience was in His earlier years illustrated by His reply to Joseph and Mary when they found Him in the Temple, "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" But to this consciousness of a sonship which He shared with others, there was added in His Baptism the consciousness of a unique relationship to God. He was the beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased. The reference in the latter words is to the first of the Servant poems (Isa. xlii. 1).

The title might be equivalent to Messiah. It is so used in the Gospels. An interesting case is to be found in Luke iv. 41. The demons cry out to Jesus, "Thou art the Son of God." The evangelist continues, "And rebuking them, he suffered them not to speak because they knew that he was the Christ." Matthew's version of the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi runs, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (xvi. 16). At the trial the two terms are coupled together; the high priest puts the crucial question to Jesus in the form, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (Mark xiv. 61). Whether the term is limited to this in the stories of the Baptism and the Temptation is uncertain. It seems from the third temptation to have at least included His Messianic vocation, but we cannot be sure that it was restricted to this. We have a very remarkable passage (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22) which seems to carry with it a more than Messianic consciousness, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." Here a uniqueness and intimacy of relationship is expressed which seems to transcend that which belonged to His Messianic vocation, and to involve a higher valuation of His Person than is expressed by the strictly Messianic titles. In this connexion we may remember the striking confession of ignorance which we find in the utterance on the time of the Second Coming, in which He places Himself in an ascending climax above men and angels alike.

The problems presented by the title Son of man are more difficult and complex than those presented by the other titles. In the Old Testament the term son of man is simply equivalent to "man." This is clear from the parallelism of the two terms. Thus Balaam says :—

God is not a man, that he should lie ;
Neither the son of man, that he should repent.
—(Num. xxiii. 19.)

The Psalmist, overwhelmed by the majesty of the starry sky, expresses his wonder at God's care for a creature so insignificant as man and the dominion he has entrusted to him :—

What is man, that thou art mindful of him ?
And the son of man that thou visitest him ?
—(Ps. viii. 4.)

And this usage is in accordance with Hebrew idiom. In the Book of Ezekiel the prophet is constantly addressed by God as "son of man." The suggestion is that of human frailty, contrasted with the overwhelming glory and greatness of God. We might freely render it "Frail mortal" or "Child of earth."

More important for our purpose is the use of the term in Dan. vii. 13. The passage runs : "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him." The writer proceeds to describe his reign over all nations : "His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (14). It is in this figure that

the vision of the four beasts culminates. These are said to represent four kings ; but really they are four empires, as is clear from vii. 23. This suggests that the "one like unto a son of man" also represents an empire ; though taken by itself the more natural interpretation would be that a personal figure is intended. The collective interpretation is confirmed by vii. 18, 22, 27, in which "the saints of the Most High," or "the people of the saints of the Most High" are those to whom the kingdom is finally given. The significance of the whole vision is accordingly this. The four successive empires of heathenism are symbolised by beasts, to indicate that they are military powers, greedy and ferocious. To them succeeds the kingdom of the saints. This is symbolised by a man, to indicate its humane character in contrast to the brutality of the empires which had preceded it. The figure in Daniel is accordingly not to be interpreted as personal or identified with the Messiah. Israel is intended.

When, however, we turn to the section of the Book of Enoch known as the Similitudes (chs. xxxvii.-lxxi.), the Son of man is personal and stands for the Messiah. He is a pre-existent heavenly Being, the Righteous One, Divinely chosen for pre-eminence, gifted with power to reveal all the treasures of what is secret. Seated on the throne of glory He judges the kings and the mighty and slays all the sinners. He delivers the oppressors of the righteous to the angels of punishment ; and though they appeal for mercy their repentance is in vain. It is probably not from Psalm viii. or from Ezekiel that the use

of the title in the Gospels is derived, but from Daniel though with a sense transformed by the later development, so that in place of the collective people we have the personal Messiah.¹

In the New Testament the title is used by Jesus alone, apart from Acts vii. 56 where the words of Stephen in his ecstasy echo, with a significant change, the words uttered by Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Mark xiv. 62, Luke xxii. 69). In the Gospels it occurs, according to Holtzmann's reckoning eighty-one times, sixty-nine in the Synoptists and twelve in John. The instances in John are not parallel to those in the Synoptists. The latter may be reduced to forty distinct utterances (so Driver); another estimate gives forty-two. It is, therefore, undeniably represented as a very characteristic expression on the lips of Jesus. It is not only significant that it occurs so frequently, but it is attested by all our sources. It is found in Mark and Q, in sections peculiar to Matthew and in sections peculiar to Luke, and finally in John. It is true that the number of instances on which we can rely is less than forty in the Synoptists. For in some cases the term may not be used in its technical but in a more general sense; while in other

¹ It is possible, of course, that originally the figure of the Son of man may have been individual rather than collective, and that the collective significance, as we find it in Daniel, has been imposed on the original sense. There are features in the description in the Book of Daniel itself which do not suit Israel. See Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905), pp. 340-349; Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, fourth edition, p. 60. But for our purpose it is unnecessary to discuss this.

cases, where one evangelist reports it, another does not include it in his version of the same utterance. It is also possible that where it is used in its technical sense, and the evangelists agree in recording it, it may have been absent from the actual utterance of Jesus. But any reasonable deduction on these lines still leaves us with a great mass of sayings which, so far as the grounds mentioned are concerned, leave no room for question.

Nevertheless, some scholars doubt or even deny that Jesus applied the title in its technical sense to Himself. The most serious objection to the authenticity of sayings in which it bears this specific sense as opposed to the general meaning "man" is the philological. Assuming that Jesus spoke Aramaic it is argued that the distinction between "man" and "son of man" which can be expressed in Greek is incapable of expression in Aramaic, since *Barnasha* is the term which would have to stand for both. In some cases the sense "man" can be fitted into sayings in the Gospels in which the term occurs; but numerous sayings will not bear this interpretation. It might seem to follow that these sayings are not authentic, if Wellhausen's canon is to be accepted that whatever sayings attributed to Jesus are authentic must be capable of retranslation into Aramaic. We must, however, leave the possibility open that Jesus regularly employed the Hebrew term taken direct from the Old Testament, and presumably familiar to His hearers. This would not sound strange in an Aramaic discourse. That He used the Greek rendering would be credible only if the discourse was in Greek. Such solutions,

however, while they ought to be recognised as possibilities, can hardly inspire any confidence.

But it is not necessary to infer that on this ground the sayings must be regarded as spurious. For a time Wellhausen believed that Jesus spoke of Himself as "The Man," though he recognised that this mode of self-designation was strange. After the publication of Lietzmann's discussion, he advanced to the position that Jesus never used the term with reference to Himself.¹ The

¹Wellhausen expressed his earlier view in the article on *Israel*, reprinted from the expanded German form in the English translation of his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885). Speaking of Jesus as the firstborn of the Father he says: "He stands in this relation to God, not because His nature is unique, but because He is man; He uses always and emphatically this general name of the race to designate His own person" (p. 511). This is repeated in his classical chapter "Das Evangelium" in his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, first edition, 1894 (p. 312). He adds an important footnote in which he argues on philological grounds that Jesus spoke of Himself as "The Man," though he recognised that this was an extremely peculiar mode of speech. This was repeated in the second edition, but in the third edition (p. 381) he broke with this view since he had come to the conclusion, previously drawn by Lietzmann, that Jesus never employed the term in place of the first personal pronoun, but that this mode of address had been attributed to Him by the redactors of the evangelic tradition. This was followed in 1899 by a very important discussion of the whole problem in the sixth part of his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (pp. 187-215), to which he added several pages in his preface (IV.-VIII.) handling Dalman without the gloves. With this should be taken his references in his commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels, but especially the discussions in his *Einleitung in die drei Ersten Evangelien* (first edition (1905), pp. 96 f., second edition (1911), pp. 95 f.). It should be observed that the second edition contains a great deal of additional matter including a special section on the Son of man (pp. 123-130) in which some of the matter already given in the *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* is reproduced.

point of the objection is that in Aramaic the distinction between "man" and "Son of man" could not be expressed. This is intrinsically rather improbable; some way might surely be found of conveying in language a distinction which had been made in thought. And it is certainly nothing less than startling that Wellhausen came to the conclusion that the distinction *was* made by the Jerusalem Christians in Aramaic. In the second edition of his *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (1911), he closes his section on the Son of man with the words: "But that the Son of man gained its Messianic significance in Greek I doubt, although it was easier to distinguish it from 'man' in this language than in Aramaic. For this would involve too late a date and it does not follow from Mark ii. 10, 28. The Christians of Jerusalem will already have distinguished the specific Barnascha from the ordinary Barnascha" (p. 130). This, however, implies that the distinction *could* be made in Aramaic; and if the primitive community could make and express it, there seems to be no insuperable objection to the belief that this step might have been already taken by Jesus, or even that He found it already made in the religious terminology of His time. Moreover, it is difficult to doubt that the distinction was made in the Aramaic sources which lie behind the Gospels. It is remarkable that the writers distinguish so surely between "man" and "Son of man"; we may well ask whether they would have been so sure-footed, if their sources had left them to pick their own way. Lastly, it must be remembered that our

knowledge of the actual language spoken by Jesus is imperfect, and that expert opinion as to the linguistic possibilities is by no means all on one side.

But however strong the philological objections may be, we have no right to settle the question on this ground alone. We must let other considerations have their weight; and these make it extremely difficult to deny the authenticity of all the sayings. This has, it is true, been denied, or gravely questioned on other grounds. Bousset in his *Kyrios Christos*¹ sets aside the philological argument and fully accepts the view that the technical significance was already attached to the term in Aramaic. He believes, in fact, that it was current in the primitive Aramaic-speaking Church of Jerusalem. But while he will not deny outright that Jesus ever applied the term to Himself and says that we can never attain complete certainty on the point, the whole drift of his discussion is directed to the reduction of genuine instances to the vanishing point. Partly this is done by wholesale elimination of passages in the secondary sources, partly by a process of critical attrition applied to the passages in the primary sources one by one.² It would not be possible in my space to follow his argument in detail; I am bound to say, with all the respect due to a scholar so learned and so stimulating, that the discussion impresses me as written by one who had to find reasons for a conclusion which he had reached largely on *a priori* grounds. It is accordingly not to be

¹ Second edition, pp. 11 f.

² His discussion of the whole problem is to be found on pp. 5-22.

wondered at that so loyal an ally as Reitzenstein should break away from him at this critical point. He says in his work, *Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (1921), that, on Bousset's view, both the individual passages and the development as a whole appear to him a riddle (p. 117). He says later that it is quite intelligible to him that barnasha really was the self-designation of Jesus (pp. 118 f.). He reaffirms his belief that Jesus was conscious that He was the Son of man, and adds that without this self-consciousness neither His later activity nor the employment of the title would be intelligible (p. 130). And Edward Meyer in his very independent and stimulating work, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (1921), emphatically asserts his conviction that Jesus applied to Himself the designation Son of man (ii. 345).

It is, in fact, difficult to conceive a case much stronger on its positive side than that for the application of the title to Himself by Jesus. The evidence that He used it, it has already been pointed out, is drawn from every one of our documentary sources. To deny with Bousset the validity of the philological objection, and yet to question the use of the title by Jesus is to fly in the face of all our testimony. And this consideration is reinforced by the total disappearance of the title (save in Acts vii. 56) in the whole of the New Testament literature apart from the utterances of Jesus Himself. Had it been a designation coined by His followers, the restriction of its use to utterances falsely attributed to Him, and the failure to employ it in their narratives about Him would be inexplicable. Its

complete absence from the Epistles and probably from the Apocalypse is on the hypothesis of its later invention also surprising. Nor can any reasonable hypothesis be devised to explain the unwarranted introduction of this feature into the evangelic records and especially on such a scale. The only reasonable explanation of the facts is that the use of it by Jesus was so characteristic and familiar that in any record pretending to faithfulness it was impossible to ignore it ; though the evidence of the early chapters of Acts suggests that it was not congenial to the Palestinian communities in which the evangelic tradition took shape.

The result then seems to be that general considerations make it almost incredible that Jesus should not have used the term in a specific sense as His own self-designation, while the philological objection, even if pressed to the full, does not interpose an absolute veto.

Assuming then that Jesus employed the term in this way, what meaning did He put upon it ?

In the first instance, at any rate, it is desirable to start from Mark's evidence. It is certainly remarkable that, with two possible exceptions, Jesus does not use the term in its specific sense till after the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi. The exceptions are Mark ii. 10, 28. In ii. 28 the view that the Son of man simply means "man" is plausible though by no means certain. In ii. 10 it is less plausible, although possible ; still the people may have understood Jesus to mean this (cf. Matt. ix. 8).¹

¹On these two passages see, in addition to the commentaries, E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*,

In any case we have no certain instance of the specific sense in Mark before viii. 31. This follows immediately on Peter's confession of the Messiahship of Jesus. It is noteworthy that in our earliest source two only of the fourteen instances occur before Cæsarea Philippi. The twelve instances which remain are viii. 31, 38; ix. 9, 12, 31; x. 33, 45; xiii. 26; xiv. 21, 41, 62. The two leading ideas are the Passion and the return in glory, the former type of passages being considerably more numerous, though possibly the number ought to be reduced on the ground that predictions of the Passion have been duplicated. This, however, does not affect the main conclusion that these passages fall into two groups. There is no serious ground for suspecting their authenticity.

Further, the passages unmistakably identify the Son of man with Jesus. The Passion group, with its prediction of betrayal, suffering, rejection, death, resurrection, unquestionably makes the identification. If viii. 31 and xiii. 26 stood alone, it would be possible to argue that Jesus did not identify Himself with the Son of man. He speaks quite objectively of the Son of man, and in the same sentence speaks of Himself with the first personal pronoun: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me . . . the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him" (viii. 38).

i. 104; ii. 345. He finds Wellhausen's view that the term Son of man in these passages simply means "man" incomprehensible. He thinks that in virtue of its mysterious esoteric character Jesus could, even before the confession of Peter, employ it without the disciples drawing the conclusion that He was the Messiah.

The apparent distinction is noteworthy and needs explanation ; but we ought not on the ground of it to infer that Jesus did not identify Himself with the Son of man. Quite apart from the identification in the Passion group of sayings, the same seems to be implied in xiv. 62. Here the answer to the high priest's challenge, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" is "I am, and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven." Here, again, we have the perplexing use of the Son of man alongside of the use of the first person singular. But it is difficult to resist the conclusion that in this context Jesus means to identify the two. He could scarcely in one breath have affirmed His identity with the Messiah and implied His distinction from the Son of man. This is not to say that the Son of man is necessarily equivalent to Messiah ; but, if the ideas are distinct, Jesus was conscious that both were fulfilled in Him, just as He was at once Messiah and Servant of Yahweh.

The previous history of the term in Daniel and Enoch accounts for those passages which represent Him as returning with the clouds of heaven ; but its connexion with the Passion is His own contribution.

The passages common only to Matthew and Luke are not numerous. They are Matt. viii. 20 = Luke ix. 58 ; Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 34 ; Matt. xxiv. 27 = Luke xvii. 24 ; Matt. xxiv. 37 = Luke xvii. 26 ; Matt. xxiv. 44 = Luke xii. 40. The last three of these fall into the eschatological group ; while the first, "The Son of man hath not where to lay his head," has some affinity with

the Passion group though it does not belong to it. The second passage, "The Son of man came eating and drinking," is remote from both groups. Yet through the comparison with John the Baptist an official suggestion is conveyed by the title. Jesus is not merely a prophet. The same applies to Matt. xii. 40, Luke xi. 30, where the Son of man is a sign, as Jonah was to the Ninevites. Both of these passages, as well as Matt. viii. 20, Luke ix. 58, identify Jesus with the Son of man.

There is one passage which belongs to all three Synoptists (Mark iii. 28 f., Matt. xii. 31 f., Luke xii. 10), though it occurs in Luke in a different connexion than in Mark and Matthew. On the other hand Matthew and Luke agree in introducing the Son of man, though Mark is without it. This is the well-known passage on the unpardonable sin. All agree in the statement that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven. Matthew and Luke agree that whosoever speaks a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him. But this is absent from Mark. Instead of it, however, he says: "All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme." This is a very interesting passage for the problem in literary criticism that it presents. But it is interesting for our purpose. At first sight Mark seems original. The ambiguous *barnasha* meant simply "men" in this instance. The blasphemy against men is contrasted with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and this was really just the charge that Jesus cast out demons by demoniacal agency. Matthew and Luke took the term

to mean Son of man, and drew a contrast between Him and the Holy Spirit which was the opposite of what Jesus intended. Yet in favour of the originality of Matthew and Luke it may be urged that a Christian writer would not have treated blasphemy against the Son of man as less serious than blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, unless the words of Jesus had warranted the distinction.

Of the passages peculiar to Matthew, x. 23, xiii. 41, xix, 28, xxv. 31 are eschatological. xxvi. 2 is a Passion reference. In xvi. 13, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" the title is almost certainly an insertion. Not only is it absent from the parallels in Mark and Luke; but its introduction here is most inappropriate. Otherwise the usage in these passages conforms closely to that common in Mark. In some other passages than xvi. 13 the term is inserted where the parallels omit it.

Of the passages peculiar to Luke, xii. 8, xvii. 30, xviii. 8, xxi. 36, are eschatological. xvii. 22 is akin to these. vi. 22 refers to persecution for the Son of man's sake, but the parallel in Matt. v. 11 has "for my sake." xix. 10, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost," is, of course, not eschatological; but it also seems to have no connexion with the Passion. It expresses the sense of a mission, and is not unnaturally understood of His coming into the world.

In the Synoptic Gospels that class of passages which can be directly connected with Daniel and the later apocalyptic development may be taken as coming with full claim to authenticity; though individual sayings may

have the term where it was not actually used. In this group the Son of man is represented as a heavenly being who sits at the right hand of Power, who comes on the clouds with the angels to be the judge of men.

But if we can assume that Jesus really predicted His suffering and death, there is full justification for believing that He connected the idea of the Son of man directly with His Passion. He may have combined with it the idea of the Servant of Yahweh.¹ This would be natural as soon as He had realised that He could come as Son of man on the clouds, only if He had first passed through suffering, death, and resurrection to the right hand of God. The Passion is thus taken into His vocation as

¹ The Servant of Yahweh is the figure of the prophet and martyr depicted in the Servant passages in the second Isaiah (Isa. xlii. 1-4, xlix. 1-6, l. 4-9, lii. 13-liii. 12). On the original significance of the figure it is not necessary to dwell; probably it stands originally for Israel regarded from the point of view of its function, its place in the Divine plan of God for the world. But the Servant is probably in any case to be sharply distinguished from the Messiah, and it is desirable not to speak of these passages as Messianic. The two lines of thought met in Jesus but it only leads to confusion, if the two in their pre-Christian development are not kept apart. In view of the immense importance which has been attached in Christian doctrine and apologetic to these passages, and above all to the fourth, it is very astonishing that they have left so little impression on the New Testament. Paul in particular makes practically no use of them. That they were early applied to Jesus is clear from the use of the term "Servant" to designate Him in the early chapters of the Acts, and from the incident of Philip and the Ethiopian. For the sake of the general reader it may be emphasised that the fourth passage begins with lii. 13, not with liii. 1. The arrangement in the Authorised Version is perhaps the most unfortunate example of incompetent division of chapters in the whole Bible.

Son of man. A title which had originally a purely eschatological reference, so far at least as manifestation on earth was concerned, received an extension backward into the earthly career of Jesus. This being so, we need not hesitate to recognise a still further extension, and to admit that Jesus used the term where neither the return in glory nor the Passion was in question. It had been held by several scholars that Jesus did not regard Himself as Messiah or Son of man during His earthly life. He believed that He was to be the Messiah, but was not so as yet. This, however, does violence to the documents. The confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi and Jesus' own confession at His trial, imply that He was already Messiah. If so, there is no insuperable objection to the view that Jesus, conscious of His present identity with the Son of man, should have used the term of Himself in connexions where neither the eschatological nor the Passion reference was involved.

Many have understood Jesus to mean by this title the representative man or the ideal man, the representative of the whole race, not merely of a nation. This is antecedently improbable on account of its abstract, philosophical character. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that the term can be detached from Dan. vii. in view of the coincidence between it and the language of Jesus with reference to the Parousia. We are safest if we start from the eschatological associations of the phrase, and recognise that extensions of the meaning were given to it by Jesus in consequence of His conviction as to what the vocation involved ; while further extensions

were due to the consciousness of His identity with the Son of man. Naturally, those instances in which the title has special reference to the vocation come to us with the greatest presumption of authenticity. By this it is not meant that the sayings in which it is used without such reference are suspicious ; but that there is more probability that the term has been inserted when Jesus simply used the first personal pronoun.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The literature is so extensive that only a selection can be made. The student should be warned that in the case of German works it is essential to use, wherever possible, the latest editions, since the successive editions are frequently much revised and brought up to date, and in some instances largely recast. It ought to be added, however, that in the present distress it has been sometimes found necessary to omit sections from the previous editions to reduce the cost of production. Thus the third edition of Feine's *Theologie des neuen Testaments* contains matter excluded from the fourth or abbreviated in it, though the fourth edition takes account of the literature which appeared during the three years' interval which separated the two editions. The editions are indicated in the following list by a small superior number.

The subject is discussed at length in the larger works on New Testament Theology. The following may be mentioned : B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,⁷ 1903, English translation, 1882-83, and *Die Religion des Neuen Testaments*, 1903 ; Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*,² 1896, English translation from the first edition of 1891-92, *New Testament Theology*, 1895 ; G. B. Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 1899 ; Bovon, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, 1893 ; Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*,² 1911 ; Schlatter, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1909-10, the first volume has been recast and published under the title *Die Geschichte des*

Christus, 1921; Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,³ 1919,⁴ 1922, and *Die Religion des Neuen Testaments*, 1921; Weinel, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,³ 1921.

Other general treatises are Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, 1904, English translation from the first edition of 1901, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1903-04, and *Einführung in das Theologische Studium*,³ 1921; Jülicher, *Die Religion Jesu und die Anfänge des Christentums bis zum Nicaenum in Geschichte der Christlichen Religion*,² 1909 (*Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Teil I., Abteilung IV. 1); Pfeiderer, *Das Urchristentum*,² 1902, English translation, *Primitive Christianity*, 1906-11; Knopf, *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, 1919 (a second edition has been prepared since the author's death by Lietzmann and Weinel); Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*,¹ 1913,² 1921. Wernle replied to the first edition in *Jesus und Paulus*, 1915, to which Bousset retorted in *Jesus der Herr*, 1916. He was fortunately able to revise the first four chapters for the second edition of *Kyrios Christos* which was prepared for publication after his death by G. Krüger; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 1921.

Works on the teaching, or the life and teaching, of Jesus also contain discussions of the problems. The following may be mentioned: Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*,² 1901, English translation from the first edition of 1886-90, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1892, omits the critical investigation; Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, 1889; Denny, *Jesus and the Gospel*,⁴ 1913; Moffat, *The Theology of the Gospels*, 1912; Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 1907; Bousset, *Jesus*, 1904, English translation, 1906; Wernle, *Jesus*,² 1916; Loofs, *Wer war Jesus Christus?* 1916 (a thoroughly revised edition of the American Lectures, *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* 1913); Headlam, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, 1923; T. Walker, *The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age*, 1923. The articles on Jesus in the dictionaries and encyclopædias should be mentioned here: in Hastings', *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Sanday; *Encyclopædia Biblica*, by Bruce; Hastings, *One Volume Dictionary*, by W. P. Paterson; Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, by Douglas Mackenzie; *The Standard Bible Dictionary*, by Denny; *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, by Heitmüller. The article by Sanday has been issued in a separate form, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, 1906; similarly that by Heitmüller, *Jesus*, 1913.

Works especially bearing on the subject of this lecture : Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*,² 1892. Of the third edition the first part *Die Messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums* appeared in 1903, but nothing further has apparently been published ; H. J. Holtzmann, *Das Messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, 1907 ; Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901 ; A. Schweitzer, *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis*, 1901 ; *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*,² 1913, English translation from the first edition, 1906, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1910 ; J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*,¹ 1892,² 1922, *Christus : Die Anfänge des Dogmas*, 1909, English translation, *Christ : The Beginnings of Dogma*, 1911 ; Pfeleiderer, *The Early Christian Conceptions of Christ*, 1905 ; Warfield, *The Lord of Glory*, 1907 ; J. E. Carpenter, *The Historical Jesus and the Theological Christ*, 1911 ; Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, 1907 ; Shailer Matthews, *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament*, 1906 ; E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, 1911 ; Bacon, *Jesus the Son of God*, 1911, *Jesus and Paul*, 1921 ; Leitzmann, *Der Menschensohn*, 1901 ; Schmiedel, *Protestantische Monatshefte*, for 1898 and 1901 ; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898 (reviewed by A. A. Bevan, *Critical Review*, 1899), English translation, *The Words of Jesus*, 1902 ; E. A. Abbott, *The Son of Man*, 1910 ; Causse, *L'Évolution de l'Espérance Messianique dans le Christianisme Primitif*, 1908 ; C. A. Scott, *Dominus Noster*, 1918 ; Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes*, 1916 ; Foakes Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I., Vol. I., 1920 ; Gore, *Belief in Christ*, 1922 ; Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 1913. The articles "Son of God" (Sanday), and "Son of Man" (Driver) in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and on the same subjects by N. Schmidt in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* are important. The discussions by Wellhausen and some others have already been recorded.

THE QUINTESSENCE OF PAULINISM.¹

WHEN we speak of Paulinism we imply, first that Paul had a theology, and secondly that this theology was so distinctive that we are justified in using a specific name for it. Both contentions are exposed to criticism. Some would deem it a grave injustice to describe Paul as a theologian. He was rather a prophet, or even a poet, who felt deeply and had a keen insight into religious experience but was careless of logical consistency and indifferent to the creation of a system. Now it is true that Paul was gifted with the mystic's vision, and that in moments of ecstasy his utterance glows with a lyrical rapture. But it is part of his greatness that his thought is set on fire by noble emotion, and that emotion is redeemed from vagueness and incoherence by thought. Indeed, the belief that Paul was a seer but no thinker could hardly survive a careful study even of one of his more characteristic writings. But, it may be retorted, Paul was in a sense a thinker, the sense in which a debater must be a thinker. In other words he is master of the argumentative style, and shows great skill in

¹An elaboration of the lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library, 11 October, 1916. First printed in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 4, 1918.

marshalling objections to the position of his opponents. He is a pleader rather than a philosopher. For my own part I believe that this is a profound mistake. Paul was not a mere controversialist who took the arguments that might be convenient for disposing of one antagonist without reference to their consistency with those he had used against another. Behind his occasional utterances there lies a closely knit and carefully constructed system of thought. He moves in his attack with such speed and confidence because he is in possession of a standard to which he relates each new issue as it confronts him. No series of hastily extemporised defences could have produced the same impression of unity and consistency unless they had belonged to a system. But in saying this I desire to disengage the word "system" from any unfortunate association. It would be a serious misapprehension were we to think of Paulinism as representing for its author a complete and exact reflection of the whole realm of religious reality. He was indeed so convinced of the truth of his Gospel that he did not shrink from hurling an anathema at any, though it might be an angel from heaven, who should dare to contradict it. But his certainty as to the truth of his central doctrine did not blind him to the imperfection of his knowledge, or quench the sense of mystery with which he confronted the ultimate realities. He was conscious that beyond all the regions which he had explored and charted there stretched an illimitable realm, the knowledge of which was not disclosed in time but was reserved for eternity. Here he could prophesy only in part, because

he was aware that he knew only in part ; and though he soared, free and daring, in the rare atmosphere of speculative thought, he veiled his face in the presence of the ultimate mysteries. " O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God ! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out."

Paul, then, believed himself to be in possession of a system of interdependent facts and ideas, arranged in due proportion and controlled from a centre. His epistles do not present us with a number of detached and independent ideas, still less with fluid opinions, fluctuating in response to changing conditions. He who builds on the Pauline theology, be that foundation false or true, ample or inadequate, is building on firm granite, not on sinking and shifting sand. But some will challenge our right to use the term " Paulinism." It is, of course, true, they would say, that Paul had a coherent, self-consistent, and true system of thought. But this was just the same body of revealed truth as is present everywhere, explicitly or implicitly, in the New Testament, or even in the whole of Scripture. The traditional attitude to the Bible is that it everywhere says substantially the same thing on matters of doctrine, and that differences of expression involve no material disagreement. Now it may be argued, and with some measure of success, that beneath the various types of theology we find in the New Testament there is a fundamental harmony. But the science of Biblical Theology has demonstrated that these various types

exist. It is accordingly our duty to study and estimate each of them for itself before we try to work behind them to a more fundamental unity. There is no type more distinctive, there is none so fully worked out as Paulinism.

The term "Paulinism" might, of course, be used to cover the whole range of Paul's teaching; but I am concerned specially with those elements in it which were Paul's peculiar contribution to the interpretation of the Gospel. That contribution had its source, I believe, in the experience through which Paul passed. But he owed much to other influences. These affected, however, the distinctive elements of his teaching much less than those which he shared with his fellow-Christians. On this part of the subject I will dwell briefly, since it is rather my purpose to disengage from Paul's teaching as a whole that which is most characteristically his own. Of the external influences which originated or fashioned his doctrines I think we should attribute more to Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian theology than to Gentile philosophy or religious mysteries. It was inevitable that he should be profoundly impressed by the Old Testament. Apart from it, indeed, his theology could not have come into existence. It is the basis on which it rests, it largely supplied the moulds in which it was cast, and the substance as well as the form of much in the teaching itself. He presupposes the Old Testament, and regards his own doctrine as in continuity with it. When he became a Christian, he did not abandon the religion of Israel, but he saw in the Gospel the fulfilment and

expansion of it. Yet it is a mistake to over-emphasise the Old Testament factor in the origin or formulation of Paulinism. Indeed, that theology in one of its leading features is, from the Old Testament standpoint, a startling paradox. The estimate of the law in the Old Testament is strangely different from that given by Paul. The Law inspires the Old Testament saints with a passionate devotion, as we may see from the glowing panegyric in the latter part of the nineteenth psalm, or the prolix enthusiasm of the hundred and nineteenth psalm. The ideal of the righteous man is the student whose delight is in the law of the Lord and who meditates upon it day and night. It is the safeguard and guide of youth, the stay of manhood, the comfort of age. It commanded more than sober approval or quiet acceptance ; it drew to itself a passionate loyalty, an enthusiastic love, which nerved martyrs to face the most exquisite torture for its sake. But how different it is with Paul, who had himself in his earlier days experienced the same fervour as his countrymen, and indeed surpassed them in his zeal for it ! It is true that even as a Christian he admits the sanctity and righteousness of the Law and the excellence of its purpose. He recognises in his philosophy of history a Divinely appointed function for it. But for him the Law is no fount of refreshment and joy, it is a yoke and a burden, from which the Christian rejoices to be set free. It brings with it not a blessing but a curse. It is the instrument of sin, from which indeed that fatal tyrant draws its strength. It breaks up the old life of innocence

by creating the consciousness of sin ; it stimulates antagonism by its prohibitions, which suggest the lines of opposition along which the rebellious flesh may express its hostility. It was interpolated between God's gracious promise and its glorious fulfilment that by its harsh and servile discipline men might be educated for freedom. So foreign, indeed, is the attitude of Paul to that of the Old Testament and Judaism, that one can easily understand how some Jewish scholars feel it hard to admit that anyone who had known Judaism from the inside could ever have written the criticism of the Law which we find in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. I believe that this is not so difficult if the problem is approached from the right starting-point ; but it emphasises the revolutionary character of the Pauline doctrine. Similarly, I regard it as a serious error to interpret Paul's conception of the flesh by that which we find in the Old Testament. In the latter case it stands for human nature as a whole, the weak and perishable creature in contrast to the mighty immortals. The contrast gains occasionally a moral significance, but this is wholly subordinate. In Paul, however, instead of a metaphysical we have an ethical contrast. The flesh is not the synonym for man in his creaturely infirmity, whose moral lapses are indulgently excused by God as simply what must be expected from a being so frail and evanescent. It stands for one side only of human nature, that is the lower. It is evil through and through. It is so irretrievably the slave and instrument of sin, it is entrenched in such deep and abiding hostility

to God and His will, that no redemption or even improvement of it is possible ; it must be put to death on the cross of Christ. To reduce Paul's doctrine to the Old Testament level is to miss its tragic intensity and eviscerate it of its bitter moral significance.

If from the Old Testament we turn to the contemporary Judaism, there also we are constrained to admit a measure of influence on the apostle's thought. He had been a Pharisee, trained by Gamaliel. Naturally he did not break completely with the past when he became a Christian. He brought over current Jewish ideas and modes of argument. His Rabinical interpretation of Scripture has been long familiar, but it is only within recent years that a fuller acquaintance with Jewish literature has revealed more fully the affinities he has with contemporary Jewish thought. Few things in the Epistles have been more richly illustrated from this source than his doctrine of angels and demons, which now stands before us in quite a new light. But I am less disposed than some scholars to rate the influence of contemporary Judaism high, at least so far as Paul's central doctrines are concerned. We have all too slender a knowledge of Judaism in Paul's day. The literary sources for the study of Rabbinic theology are much later, and the question arises how far we may use them for the reconstruction of a considerably earlier stage of thought. It may be plausibly argued that we can confidently explain coincidences with Paulinism much more readily on the assumption that Paul was the debtor. It is unlikely that the Rabbis consciously adopted Christian ideas. But

this by no means settles the question. The amazingly rapid spread of Christianity quickly created a Christian atmosphere, in which it would not be unreasonable to suppose that Judaism itself experienced some modification. We know that there was considerable controversy between Jews and Christians. And we may well believe that its inevitable result would be that where Christians fastened on the weak points of Judaism and demonstrated the superiority of the Christian view, the Jew would be naturally tempted to change his ground and persuade himself that really these views were his own. It is also possible that we have commonly over-estimated the hostility between the adherents of the two religions, and unduly underrated the extent to which friendly relations existed in the early period. In this way Christian influence may have filtered into contemporary Judaism. We have, however, a number of Jewish Apocalypses, earlier than Paul or roughly contemporary with him. These, it must be remembered, represent a peculiar tendency ; how far Paul stood under its influence we hardly know. But where we find coincidences, Paul's indebtedness can hardly be denied. In determining the extent to which we can rely on later Rabbinical documents in reconstructing the Judaism of the first century, it must not be forgotten that the appalling catastrophes which overwhelmed the Jewish race in the first and second centuries of our era must have changed the conditions profoundly in the theological as well as the political world. The Judaism of the later centuries was hardly identical with the Judaism in which Paul was trained.

At present it is fashionable to make much of Greek influence on Paul. Not so long ago one of the most eminent exponents of Paulinism explained it as a mixture of Rabbinical and Alexandrian Judaism, in which the incongruous elements were so badly blended that the theology contradicted itself on fundamental principles. Radical contradictions in the system of such a thinker as Paul are antecedently improbable and to be admitted only on cogent evidence. This verdict rests on no assumption as to Paul's inspiration ; it is simply a tribute due to a thinker of the highest eminence. Alexandrian Judaism contained a large element of Greek philosophy. Nowadays it is specially in Stoicism and the Greek mysteries that the source of much in the Pauline theology is discovered. The presence of Greek elements would not be in any way surprising. Paul was born and bred in a famous university city ; he mixed freely with Greeks, converted and unconverted, in his evangelistic work. It would not have been astonishing that one who became a Greek to the Greeks should have incorporated in his theology ideas derived from Greek philosophy. I am by no means concerned to deny points of contact, but I believe that it is here as with Jewish theology, that these are to be found not so much in the centre as in the outlying regions of his theology. I may quote on this point the pronouncement of Harnack, whose judgment is exceptionally weighty. He says, with reference to Paul : " Criticism, which is to-day more than ever inclined to make him into a Hellenist (so, e.g., Reitzenstein), would do well to gain at the outset a more accurate knowledge

of the Jew and the Christian Paul before it estimates the secondary elements which he took over from the Greek Mysteries. It would then see at once that these elements could have obtruded themselves on him only as uninvited guests, and that a deliberate acceptance is out of the question." I will illustrate this point from a notable instance in the last century. I choose this because it concerns the right interpretation of a crucial element in Paulinism. I have already explained why I cannot accept the view that Paul's doctrine of the flesh is to be interpreted through the Old Testament. Several scholars derived it from Greek philosophy, and among them the name of Holsten deserves special mention. He discovered in Paul's doctrine the Greek contrast between matter and spirit. The flesh he identified with the body, explaining that when the body was spoken of as "flesh" the emphasis was on the material of which it was composed, and when the flesh was spoken of as "body" the stress lay on the form into which it was organised. It is very dubious if this interpretation can be successfully sustained in detailed exegesis. But, apart from that, there are more general difficulties which appear to me to be insuperable. In the first place Paul's language varies very significantly when he is speaking of the flesh and when he is speaking of the body. The flesh is so thoroughly vicious and so utterly hostile to God that Christianity does not redeem but crucifies it. But while the flesh is crucified, the body of the Christian is the temple of the Holy Ghost and destined to share in the spirit's immortality. Further, when Paul enumerates the works

of the flesh he includes sins which are not physical, especially sins of temper. Again, his doctrine would surely have taken a very different turn if he had regarded the body as the seat of sin. The way of salvation would have lain through asceticism, a starving and a crushing of the body under the rule of the spirit. And I am not sure that a rigorous logic would not go still further. If the body is the seat of sin then death is the means of redemption. And this would have had a twofold consequence, that while men were in the body they could not be free from sin, and on the other hand, that complete redemption might be at once secured by suicide. Now Paul drew neither of these conclusions; on the contrary it was a commonplace in his theology that while a man was in the body he might have ceased to be in the flesh. On these grounds I am compelled to reject the view that for Paul the flesh and the body were identical, and that his doctrine of the flesh embodies the antithesis of matter and spirit borrowed from Greek philosophy. And finally, as indicating how improbable it is that Paul should have derived his fundamental doctrines in general, and this in particular, from Greek philosophy, we have his whole treatment of the question of the resurrection. In discussing it he speaks as if the resurrection of the body and the extinction of being were the only two alternatives, and does not take into account the third possibility, the immortality of the disembodied spirit. The importance of this fact will be more clearly seen, when we remember that the Greek doctrine of immortality was closely connected with that view of matter as evil, and

the antithesis of body and spirit, which Paul is supposed to have derived from Greek philosophy. If he borrowed the one why should he be so unconscious of the other ?

I pass on to the question of the relation of Paulinism to the teaching of Jesus. The view that Paul owed little to the teaching of Jesus was more fashionable at one time than it is to-day, though it still finds advocates. We are told that the apostle had but little interest in the earthly life of Jesus. His attention was fixed on the Pre-existence, the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Session at God's right hand. His thought and emotion were concentrated on these great theological facts ; to the details of His earthly career and to His teaching he was almost entirely indifferent. Although the remarkable silence of the Pauline Epistles on the life and teaching of Jesus renders such a view plausible, I cannot believe that it will bear searching scrutiny. The extent of the silence may be exaggerated. Paul appeals to the sayings of Jesus as finally settling certain questions of conduct. His knowledge of the facts of Christ's career and the details of His teaching was probably more extensive than has often been admitted ; and his attachment to His person, the depth of his gratitude to Him, were too profound for such indifference to be at all natural. I do not institute any detailed comparison between the utterances of Jesus and the epistles of His apostle, but I remind you of the situation in which Paul was placed. There is unquestionably a change in the centre of gravity. Paul's emphasis is thrown much more fully on the great facts of redemption,

the Death and the Resurrection. This indeed is not unnatural. Jesus was naturally reticent as to the theological significance of facts the possibility of which His disciples were unwilling to contemplate. And the Cross itself inevitably put the teaching into a secondary place. The deed of Jesus was mightier than His word. At first an insuperable objection to the acceptance of Him as Messiah, it had become for Paul the Divine solution of his problem, his deliverance from condemnation and from moral impotence. It contained a deeper revelation of God's nature and His love than the loftiest teaching of Jesus could convey. Here was the climax of God's slow self-disclosure, manifested not in words however sweet, tender, and uplifting, but in a mighty act, which filled that teaching with wholly new depth and intensity of meaning. And if it is true that the greatest contribution which Jesus made to religion was just the personality of Jesus Himself and His supreme act of sacrifice, then Paul was right in placing the emphasis where he did, even though one might wish he had drawn more fully on the words of Jesus when writing his epistles. Those epistles, however, were written to Christian communities, the majority of them founded by Paul himself, and in any case in possession of a background of information as to Jesus. But the situation of Paul had a peculiarity which must never be overlooked in considering this question. However content he may have been with his own experience, however deeply convinced of its evidential value, he could not forget that it was incommunicable, and that his own bare word was insufficient to substantiate the truth of his message. Through much of

his career he was on his defence against those who stigmatised him as no genuine exponent of the Gospel. The other apostles looked coldly on his presentation of Christianity. He had to fight the battle of Christian freedom not only against them but even against his own trusted comrade, Barnabas. His enemies followed him from church to church, to poison the minds of his converts against him. Is it conceivable that, placed in this situation, Paul could have been indifferent to the life and teaching of the Founder? Even if he had not needed the knowledge for his own satisfaction, it was a strategic necessity to him. How could he have afforded to insist on his right to be a genuine apostle of Jesus, a true herald of His Gospel, if all the time he was presenting his opponents in the Judaizing controversy with the opening given to them by such ignorance and indifference? Often contrasted unfavourably with the other apostles, he could not have failed to diminish by diligent inquiry their advantage over him as companions and pupils of Jesus. We must infer therefore that he had an adequate knowledge of the historical facts and the Founder's teaching, whatever view we take as to the evidence of such knowledge afforded by the epistles.

Something he must have owed to the apostles, notably to Peter. Much of his knowledge of the facts of Christ's life, His Passion and His Resurrection, would be derived from this source. He shared with them the belief in certain fundamental facts, but their agreement went beyond this point. There was an element of theological interpretation common to them. Paul explicitly mentions,

not only the fact that Christ died, but the vital interpretation, which turned the fact into a Gospel, that Christ died for our sins. From them he derived the institutions of Baptism and the Lord's Supper and the expectation of Christ's speedy return. Yet Paul emphatically asserts that he did not receive his Gospel from man but that it came to him by revelation. His distinctive presentation of Christianity was accordingly original, not borrowed; and the fullest recognition of that fact is not incompatible with the admission that there was not a little in his thought which he owed to others. That which he received from others by no means accounted for Paulinism. It is not so difficult to accumulate parallels to this detail and that; what is not possible is to discover a parallel to the system as a whole. Views which Paul did not originate he treated in an original way, stamped them with his own genius, and fused them into harmony with his general point of view. He was a speculative thinker of no mean order, not the second-rate eclectic whom some would make him out to be.

Paul's original contribution to Christian theology grew directly out of his own experience. This will be most clearly seen if, so far as we can, we trace the development of that experience. He had been trained as a Pharisee in the most rigorous type of Judaism. He had sought for righteousness, for a right standing before God, with a burning passion and unflagging energy. The standard of righteousness had been laid down in the Law, and he sought to fashion his life in strict and punctilious conformity with it. He achieved such success that he

could claim to have outstripped all his contemporaries in the pursuit of righteousness, and could describe himself as blameless with reference to the Law. Yet his efforts, so strenuous and outwardly so successful, left him with a sense of desires unsatisfied and a goal always unreachd. In the classic fragment of autobiography that he has given us in Romans vii., he has sketched with inimitable insight, and in graphic and telling language, his spiritual career while he was under the Law. It was the flesh that made him weak ; sin had seized it and used it as a base of operations, had conquered and brought him into captivity. It had not always been so with him. He looked wistfully back to the time when he was alive in childish innocence, wholly unconscious of sin. From this he was roused by the coming of the Law into his life. Conscious now of the holy Law of God, he realised his own disharmony with it. Moreover, he felt that the Law's prohibitions were turned by sin into suggestions of transgression. Such then was his bitter experience. He had lost his innocence, his happy unconsciousness of a moral order had given place to a sense of disunion with it ; he felt himself sold in helpless and hopeless captivity to sin, and the fact that the Law forbade a certain course of action became, in this perversion of his moral nature, the very reason why he should follow it. But all this implied that a higher element was present within him ; otherwise he could never have felt the wretchedness of his condition or been sensible of the tragic schism in his soul. Looking more deeply into himself, he realised that within his own personality competing powers struggled

for supremacy. On the one side there was his lower nature to which he gives the name "the flesh," wherein sin had lain in a sleep like that of death till the Law had come and provoked it into revolt. While the mind consented to the Law of God that it was good, it was overmatched by the flesh which constantly insisted on his disobedience to it. The utmost strain of effort never altered the inward conditions; the sense of defeat remained. Now, as a pious Jew, this state of things must have seemed inexplicable to him. With a conscientiousness so acute, a nature so strenuous, and an ethical standard pitched so high, a moral tragedy was inevitable. The fault could not rest with the Law of God which could set forth no unattainable ideal, and therefore it must lie in himself. And yet how could he be at fault, since in his zeal for righteousness nothing had been left undone? This experience became clear to him later and supplied him with a large section of his theology, but at this time it could only have been an insoluble puzzle.

Then he came into contact with the Christians, and was stirred to the depths by their proclamation of a crucified Messiah. Their preaching would fill him with abhorrence, for the curse of the Law rested on him who was hanged on a tree. It was not simply that the religious leaders of the nation had decided against Jesus; the decisive verdict had been given by God. It was conceivable, however improbable, that God's Messiah should have been executed; it was unthinkable that He should have been executed by such a death. The doctrine of

a crucified Messiah was a blasphemous paradox. But if he pressed the Christians with the dilemma their position seemed to involve, they must have escaped it by their confident assertion that God Himself had intervened in the resurrection of the Crucified to vindicate His character and establish the truth of His claim. But they would not leave the death itself without attempt at explanation. It was not for them simply an ugly and unwelcome incident, an inexplicable mystery, its burden lifted, but its obscurity unremoved, by the Resurrection. It was not an irrational accident violating the moral order ; it was a deed that testified to the sin and ignorance of man, but also a part of God's plan for human redemption. But they did not realise, as Paul did, how fundamental were the problems which their position involved, and to what radical solution they must be carried if they maintained their belief in Jesus. Hate sharpened Paul's insight into the instability of their position, and it was his interest as a controversialist to push the logical conclusions from it to an extreme. With the swift intuition of genius he realised that to accept the Cross was to bid farewell to the Law. His ruthlessness as a persecutor is not to be palliated by the plea that he had failed to understand the Gospel. We may excuse it on the ground that he understood it so well. To a certain extent we may even say that one side of Paulinism was a theoretical construction formed by Paul in the period before he became a Christian. For if Jesus was indeed the Messiah, how did it stand with the Law ? In condemning the Messiah, the Law condemned itself. But not on this ground alone would

the acceptance of Christianity carry with it a renunciation of the Law. So tremendous a fact as the Messiah's death, and a death in this form, must have an adequate explanation. Such an explanation was actually given in the theory that the death of Jesus was to atone for sin and establish a new righteousness. It was obvious that a new righteousness through Christ would supplant the righteousness of the Law, and thus the privilege of the Jew disappeared and he sank to the level of the Gentiles.

Now, however strongly Paul pressed the Christians with the logic of their position, he could hardly help feeling as the controversy went on that his own position was not impregnable. He could not help being impressed by the constancy of the Christians under persecution, and the serenity with which they met their fate. Nor could he deny the possibility that their case might be true, however he despised and disbelieved it. As a Pharisee he could not reject the possibility of the Resurrection, or evade the inference that it would neutralise the curse of the Law. The assertion that the Messiah had died to atone for sin was not intrinsically incredible, and it met very well the need of which he was himself conscious. To deny the fact of the Resurrection in face of the unwavering testimony of the Christians must have become always more difficult. Even in his rejection of their belief as blasphemous, there was probably an undercurrent of uneasy questioning whether they might not be right after all. And this was strengthened by his consciousness of dissatisfaction with his own life under the Law, his realisation that the Law had not brought him happiness, or

assured him of his standing with God. Subconsciously at least it would seem probable that the issue had narrowed itself to this, Had Jesus risen from the dead or not? We may then sum up his position just before his conversion in this way: he passionately held fast the Law as God's appointed way of righteousness, but was conscious of inability on his own part to attain his ideal. For himself personally righteousness had not come through the Law. On the other hand he held Jesus to be a blasphemous pretender to Messiahship, cursed by the Law and therefore by God, but with misgivings whether after all He might not be the true Messiah; in which case His death was intended as an atonement for sin and to create that righteousness before God, which in Paul's own experience at least the Law had been unable to do. In which case again the Law was abolished, and Jew and Gentile were placed on the same level before God.

There came to Paul in this state of mind the overwhelming experience on the road to Damascus. The Nazarene, whom his countrymen had sent to the Cross and whose followers he had persecuted to the death, appeared to him in a blinding blaze of heavenly glory. In that experience the Pauline theology came to birth. The full and radiant conviction now and for ever possessed him, that the crucified Jesus had risen from the dead and now reigned in glory, and was therefore the Messiah whom He had proclaimed Himself to be. The inferences he had previously drawn in order to fortify himself in his rejection of Christianity and persecution of

the Christians still held good. When he accepted Christianity, he accepted the conclusions which he had previously regarded as inevitable. Once for all he abandoned the belief that righteousness could come through the Law. He acquiesced in the abolition of the Law, which had pronounced its curse upon his Master, and he freely admitted the universality of salvation and the abolition of all distinction between Gentile and Jew. But theoretical inferences, drawn from the standpoint of Judaism, were wholly inadequate to express the fulness of blessing which had come to him in his conversion. The splendour of illumination which had flooded his soul was miraculous to him, matching the marvel of the light which burst on the primæval chaos, when God began to deliver the earth from darkness and disorder. It had brought to him the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ. A description of his experience even more pregnant and suggestive is given in the Epistle to the Galatians: "When it pleased God, who before my birth set me apart for His service and called me through His grace, to reveal His Son in me." It would be vain to attempt a psychological analysis of the inmost fact in Paul's experience, and enquire in what way this revelation was imparted. But the words are full of significance. The passage carries us a long way into the heart of the Pauline theology. It was God who had taken the initiative in this great act of revelation. Thus the Gospel was not a wholly new thing. It did not make an absolute breach with the past but stood in continuity with it; it was the God of the Old Covenant

who was also the God of the New. Thus Paul secured the inclusion of the Old Testament revelation in Christianity. His disciple Marcion at a later period rejected the God of the Jews and the Hebrew Scriptures, and regarded Christianity as a sudden irruption of the new order into the old without any preparation in history. For Paul the new religion proclaims the ancient God. And this God reveals His Son. Jesus is thus not merely a national Messiah. The Messianic category, true so far as it goes, is inadequate. Paul claims for Him a loftier title. Thus, while his monotheism remained, it was not a bare monotheism, but a monotheism which, while maintaining the unity of the Godhead, found room for distinctions within it. And this revelation was made within him. It is an inward revelation that the phrase is intended to express ; and we can hardly be wrong in finding here his deepest experience in conversion, the vital and mystical union of his spirit with Christ Himself. But out of this certain consequences inevitably flow. If he was one with Christ then Christ's experiences had become his own, and Christ's resources were in a sense placed at his disposal. Thus he was free from the Law, and in Christ he stood righteous before God. And with the Law he had died in Christ to the flesh ; and therefore to sin which, apart from the flesh, had no foothold in man. We may then summarise the positions held by Paul at his conversion or given in it as follows : Monotheism, qualified by the recognition of distinctions within the Godhead ; the choice of Israel and revelation to it, qualified by the inability of the Law to produce righteous-

ness ; the reign of sin in the individual by means of the flesh, against which the struggles of the mind were quite ineffectual ; the recognition of righteousness as a free gift of God apart from the merit or effort of the recipient ; the union of the human spirit with Christ, the crucified and risen Lord ; and through this union the forgiveness of sins, victory over sin, and power for a new life.

From this sketch of Paul's spiritual history we must now pass on to a more systematic and detailed exposition of his fundamental doctrines. We must of course remember that his recognition of a Divine revelation already given to Israel compelled him to adjust to the Old Testament as best he could the theology derived from experience. His experience before conversion, interpreted in the light of the Gospel, shaped his doctrines of sin, the flesh, and the Law. Of the flesh I have spoken already when considering the alleged derivation of Paul's conception from the Old Testament and Greek philosophy. On it therefore I need add only a few words. In his experience the flesh had been the seat and the instrument of sin. Apart from the flesh there could be no sin in man. Flesh without sin was also unknown. Now the flesh, unlike the body, is not a morally indifferent thing, which may become the slave of sin or the temple of the Holy Ghost. It is completely antagonistic to God and righteousness. In it there dwells no good thing ; it has a will and intent which leads to death ; it lusts against the spirit ; cannot be subject to God's law. Its works are altogether evil, and exclude those who practise them from the kingdom of God. Those whose life is lived in

accordance with it are inevitably on the way to death ; and those who sow to it will of it reap corruption. Those who are in the flesh cannot please God. This dark and lurid picture shows us clearly how irretrievably evil a thing Paul considered the flesh to be.

But reflection on his own experience had taught him to find in the Law the stimulus which wakened this hateful impulse to its malign activity. In this he detected one of the darkest shades in the character of sin. Nothing brought out its true heinousness more clearly than this, that it perverted into an instrument of its baneful energy God's holy law itself. Thus the Law could not secure obedience because it was weak through the flesh, while it proved in experience to be the strength of sin. So there emerges one of the most paradoxical features in the Pauline theology. It would have seemed as though there could be but one answer to the question, Why had the Law been given to Israel ? For what purpose could it have been given, save to teach man the way of righteousness, and guide and stimulate him as he sought to tread it ? But though such was its obvious design, Paul felt that in his own career it had failed to achieve it. It would not have been so strange had he simply said that the Law was given to convince man of his own sinfulness by setting before him a moral ideal of which he fell lamentably short. But he goes further than this and teaches that it was given for the sake of transgression, and came in besides that the trespass might abound. We must, it is true, maintain the distinction between sin and trespass, and not understand him to mean that the Law

was given in order that sin might be increased. It was in order that the sin already latent in man should reveal itself in its true colours through abundant manifestation in acts of transgression. Such he had found it to be. He says, "I was alive apart from the Law once : but when the commandment came, sin sprang to life and I died." In his innocent childhood, when he was just a creature of impulse and knew the restraint of no moral law, he lived his happy untroubled life, conscious of no schism within his own breast. But when he came to years of moral discernment, and realised that he was placed in a moral order, the flesh chafed at its pressure, and the sin which had been slumbering in it woke to life and disclosed its native antagonism to God. Thus the Law, holy, just, and good, so framed that obedience to it would have brought life and righteousness, had issued in condemnation and death. It had brought the consciousness of sin, it had become its strength and stronghold. Thus Paul is led to the paradoxical doctrine that the Law had not been intended to produce righteousness, but to produce the effects which it had in fact achieved. God had meant it to give sin its opportunity, to prove an incentive to transgression. It is not strange that Jewish writers, for whom the Law is not an intolerable yoke and brings not a curse but a blessing, should criticise Paul's doctrine as utterly contrary to the facts. Indeed we can hardly wonder that some should doubt whether anyone capable of formulating it could ever have known Judaism from the inside. Yet it is not difficult to see how Paul was driven to take up this position. It is one of

those cases where the necessity of adjustment to the Old Testament has shaped the doctrine which yet it did not create. There is nothing to show that he ever contemplated the solution adopted by Marcion that Judaism with its law and Old Testament Canon should be frankly abandoned. We cannot doubt that he would have utterly repudiated it. But, realising that Christianity stood in continuity with Judaism, and that for it too the Old Testament was sacred Scripture, and that the Law had actually been given by God, though through angelic intermediaries, he had the difficult task of combining his conviction of its Divine origin with the fact that it had proved to be the strength of sin. He solved his difficulty by the bold contention that the Law had never been intended to bring righteousness, for God could not have adopted a means so ill designed to serve His end. Now it may be urged that this is just a piece of desperate apologetic, to which Paul would never have been driven but for a certain morbid strain in his own piety. With a conscience more robust, less scrupulous and sensitive, he might have had a happier life under the Law, more free from incessant strain and sense of failure. And no doubt it is true that Paul's case was quite exceptional. Yet the following considerations must be borne in mind. Paul as we know him in his epistles is remarkably sane and balanced in his handling of ethical questions. It is not easy to believe that the man who holds the scales so evenly between the strong and the weak, who shows himself so conscious of the merits and perils of both, should himself have been the victim of a too scrupulous, not to

say diseased, conscience. Further it may be freely granted that in multitudes of instances legalism worked well. Judaism could point, and can point, to a noble roll of saints and martyrs. Yet legalism is not, I believe, the highest type of religious experience ; and the defects which Paul believed it had shown in his own case are such as might have been theoretically deduced. A legal religion may with shallower natures produce self-satisfaction on too low a level of attainment, while in the more strenuous and sensitive it may create a depressing sense of failure. With Paul this depression passed into despair. Are we unjust to others if we say that this was rooted in a wholly exceptional realisation of the lofty standard which the Law challenged him to reach, and a keener sense of his own shortcomings ? Surely, remembering that Paul is one of the greatest personalities in history, a religious genius who ranks among the foremost of his order, we may hesitate before we dismiss his judgment on the Law with the cheap explanation that Paul was the victim of ethical nightmare.

His doctrine of salvation and the new life is similarly an interpretation of his own experience. I have already expressed the opinion that when Paul uses the words "it pleased God to reveal His Son in me" he was speaking of that mystical union with Christ, which was fundamental in his doctrine as it was central in his experience. This is not merely a moral union, that is a union of will and thought. Such a union of course is involved ; he wills the things which Christ wills and judges as He judges. But the union of which Paul

speaks is deeper and more intimate ; it is a blending of personalities in which, while in a sense the personalities remain distinct, in another sense they are one. To express a merely moral union he must have chosen other language. The language he actually uses would be too extravagant. Christ is in the believer, the believer in Christ. He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit. Paul even says, "I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." He has transcended the narrow limits of his personality, and become one with a personality vaster and more universal. He has been lifted into a larger life, and in that life he has found an answer to the problems which had been insoluble. As one with Christ he makes his own the experience through which Christ has passed. He suffers with Christ, he is nailed to His Cross, he dies and rises with Him, he sits with Him in the heavenly places. He shares Christ's status before God, His character, and His destiny. In Christ he is a new creature ; the old life with its claims and its sin, its guilt and its condemnation, has passed away and all is new. The secret of this mystical union is hidden from us in the thick darkness where God dwells. It is an ultimate fact of experience which admits of no further analysis.

In his life under the Law Paul had a passion for righteousness, that is for a right standing before God. But he was conscious that he fell short of what God required, and was not justified as he stood at God's bar. But having passed from the old life to the new he realised that because he was one with Christ, Christ's

righteousness was his. He was justified or acquitted or pronounced righteous in Christ ; or to put the thought in its negative form, there was no condemnation for him. The verdict God utters on Christ, He utters on those who are identified with Him. This doctrine of justification is of course important, but it is secondary rather than primary ; it is part of his larger doctrine of mystical union. And when we understand this we have the answer to the criticism that the doctrine involves a fiction and is therefore immoral. To pronounce the sinner righteous is apparently a fiction. But this does no justice to Paul's meaning. The act of trust creates the mystical union and it is the new man, who is one with Christ, on whom the verdict of justification is pronounced. Union with Christ creates the new character which requires the new status. Paul was conscious that the life in harmony with God's will, which he had sought to gain by the works of the Law, had become his possession without effort of his own. And he shares also in Christ's blessed immortality. To these points I must return in connexion with the larger aspects of the theology.

These larger aspects we may consider as Paul's philosophy of history. This also is intimately associated with his experience. He starts from the individual, from himself, and regards his own history as typical. As he had sinned and found salvation, so had others. But he was not content till, with the philosopher's instinct, he had pressed behind the multifariousness of phenomena to a principle of unity. The individual he generalises into a racial experience. He explains sin and redemption

through the acts of Adam and Christ. The moulds into which his thought is poured were given him by history, yet his doctrine is essentially a philosopher's generalisation of experience.

I do not accept the view that Paul attached little importance to his doctrine of Adam, since he introduces it incidentally and as an illustration of the act of Christ. It was rather of fundamental importance. To do it justice we must detach ourselves completely from modern interpretations. We must not read Romans in the light of the story of Eden, nor yet the story of Eden in the light of Romans. The ideas are quite different in the two passages. Nor must we suppose that the validity of the Pauline doctrine depends on the historicity of the story in Genesis. Unquestionably Paul took that story to be literal history ; nothing else could be reasonably expected from him. What I find remarkable, however, is that substantially his doctrine is so constructed as to be unaffected by our answer to the question whether the narrative of the Fall is history or myth. So far as Adam has any significance for Paul it is not Adam as a mere individual, but as one who is in a sense the race. It is surely improbable that Paul could have been content to regard the whole of humanity as committed by the accidental act of one unit in its many millions. To assign such momentous significance to the arbitrary and the capricious, would be to take the control of history out of the hands of reason. For him Adam is typical of the race. He does not think of man's moral nature as damaged by the act of Adam, nor does he suppose that

the moral status of humanity is fixed by what was nothing more than the act of an irresponsible individual. What alone could rightly make the act of Adam the act of the race, stamping humanity as good or evil, would be an identity of Adam with the race, so that in his acts the whole quality of humanity is manifest. The act of Adam is crucial just because it is typical ; the nature of Adam is our common nature ; he is the natural man, moulded from the dust. The sin latent in us was latent also in him, and at the touch of the Law it was roused to life and activity. Only because Adam was truly representative, could the individual act be charged with universal significance. His act involved God's judgment of the race as sinful, and brought on all men the penalty of death. Such is the tragic history of the natural man left to himself. But it was not from the Old Testament in the first instance that Paul learnt this doctrine, as will be clear to anyone, if he does not read the third of Genesis through Pauline spectacles. Closer parallels may, it is true, be found in Jewish theology. But it was his own experience that was his starting-point. We should read the discussion of Adam and Christ in the light of the autobiographical fragment in the seventh of Romans. As he pondered on the conflict within his own nature, the struggle between the flesh and the mind, the victory of sin, the impotence of the Law for righteousness, its capture by sin for its own evil ends, he sought the explanation at the fountain head of history. In his own heart he found the key to the long tragedy of man's sin and guilt. As he was so was mankind. His own

breast was a tiny stage on which the vast elemental conflict of good and evil was re-enacted. So had it been with the first man, so from the very outset of the race's history at the touch of the Law the sin that slumbered in the flesh had sprung to consciousness and revolt. And all the generations, as they came and went, had but vindicated by their universal transgression God's treatment of that first disobedience as a racial act.

But before the second racial personality could come, and by his act reverse the verdict on humanity and release new streams of energy to cleanse and redeem it and lift it from the natural to the spiritual plane, a long interval had to elapse. Another pair of contrasted figures, Abraham and Moses, play a subordinate part in the drama. With the former is associated the promise of the Seed and the election of Israel, with the latter the Law. Against those who claimed that the Law was permanent and not abolished by the Gospel, that both it and circumcision were essential to justification, Paul urges the case of Abraham. Long before the Law was given, the promise of God had been made to Abraham, a promise of the Seed in whom all nations should be blest, a promise fulfilled in the Gospel. But the very principles of the Gospel were already in operation, for Abraham was justified by faith and not by works, and while he was still uncircumcised. And the promise by its very nature offered a contrast to the Law. For Law has within it an element of bargain, the performance of its demand implies a corresponding right to receive a reward. But the promise stands on the

higher plane of free grace ; it guarantees a gift bestowed by God's bounty apart from any desert in the recipient. The promise then is not only more ancient than the Law and cannot be superseded by it ; it belongs also to a loftier moral order. And with the promise there comes the election, the choice of Abraham's descendants. But not of all of them ; for the principle of election still works on, choosing Isaac and Jacob, passing by Ishmael and Esau. And in the chosen people itself it still works ; not all of Israel after the flesh constitutes the spiritual Israel. The Old Testament more than once speaks of a remnant, and now the Israel of God is identical with the Christian Church. Yet the natural Israel is not ultimately rejected, for Paul looks forward to the time when it shall accept its Messiah, and form part of the elect people once more.

But why, it may be asked, if already in Abraham the principles of the Gospel found expression, could not the Messiah have come at once, and why was there any need for the Law ? It was because a prolonged period of discipline was necessary to educate the chosen people and prepare for the coming of the Messiah. The weakness of human nature had to be revealed by its inability to fulfil the Law, so too, the ineradicable vice of the flesh and the exceeding sinfulness of sin. It was only the Law that could disclose the mutinous character of the flesh, or wake to evil activity the sin that was dormant within it. But while on the one hand the Law disclosed to man his true nature and exhibited sin in its true colours, it also served as moral discipline. It

revealed man's duty, though it gave no power to fulfil it. It was a "paidagogos" to bring us to Christ. The paidagogos was charged with the moral supervision of children. By the use of this term Paul suggests the menial and temporary character of the Law. Israel was like a child in its tutelage under harsh and ungenial tutors. But with the coming of Christ the period of bondage is over, the heir achieves his freedom, and passes into that liberty for which Christ has set him free. The Law itself by its very imperfections pointed forward to Christ ; it set before man a moral ideal, and since it gave no power to fulfil its own commands and was the weak, unwilling tool of sin, it pointed to a new revelation, in which the moral ideal should be united with the power of fulfilment.

In the fulness of time the promise, so long obstructed by the Law, came to realisation. God sent His Son into the world in the likeness of sinful flesh, a member of the human race and of the Hebrew people. He did not begin to be with His human origin ; a heavenly life lay behind His life of humiliation and suffering on earth. Image of the invisible God, firstborn of creation, sharing the Divine essence, God's agent in the formation of the universe, He did not clutch greedily at that equality with God, which was nevertheless His right, but emptied Himself and for our sake exchanged His heavenly riches for our earthly poverty. Stooping to our human estate He obediently accepted the cross which God appointed Him, and has in recompense been highly exalted and received the name above every name.

While the act of Adam had been critical and representative, since it expressed our common nature, the act of Christ was a critical and racial act in virtue of His self-identification with us. As Adam in this crucial act is the race, so also in His crucial act is Christ ; and as the act of one is valid for the race, so also the act of the other. Each of them is the fountain-head of humanity, the one of the natural, the other of the redeemed. Their significance is not merely individual, it is universal. The point of expression is in each case personal ; it is Adam who eats the forbidden fruit, it is Jesus of Nazareth who hangs upon the Cross. But when viewed, not from the standpoint of historical incident, but of eternal significance, Adam and Christ are co-extensive with humanity.

Yet the question emerges whether we can rightly draw a parallel between the racial function of the first and the second Adam. Obviously they do not seem to stand in the same relation to the body for which they act. There is clearly no such hereditary connexion in the one case as obtains in the other. But it is not on the hereditary connexion that Paul's thought rests, so much as the possession of a common nature. Yet is there not a difference here also ? The act of Adam was not in violation of his nature ; it sprang spontaneously from it : and it was a racial act because his nature and that of all other men were identical. There is, it is true, a higher element than the flesh within us, but it makes no successful stand against the lower. In Christ, on the contrary, the higher element is all powerful ; He is the spiritual man of heavenly origin. Here then, it might

seem, that the parallel between the two Adams breaks down, since while a natural man might fitly represent the sinful race, a spiritual man could not do so. On this the following suggestions may be offered. In the first place Paul does hint at an essential relation subsisting between the pre-existent Christ and the human race. In the next place the element of spirit is not absent even from sinful humanity, so that what is needed is not so much the introduction of a new element as such a readjustment of the old as shall emancipate the higher nature from the dominion of the lower. And thirdly, if such a readjustment is not only realised in Christ but through him becomes possible to the race and to individuals, He may be regarded as acting for the race with as much right as Adam. In fact the "much more" which rings so loudly in Paul's great passage on Adam and Christ is perhaps the key to this difficulty. Christ acts for the race not simply because He shares its nature and its fortunes, but because there dwells within Him a spring of redemptive energy, which makes it possible for the achievements He accomplishes in His own case to be repeated in the experience of the race and of individuals. We need to hold fast as our guiding clue not simply that Christ reverses all that Adam did, but that He much more than reverses it.

But what was the significance of Christ's racial act? Paul describes it as an act of obedience. As such it reversed Adam's act of disobedience and the consequences that followed from it. These consequences Paul took to be the penalty of physical death and Divine condemna-

tion of the race as guilty. Through the obedience of Christ, physical death is cancelled by the resurrection of the body, and God now passes a new judgment on the race as He sees it in Christ. The act of Christ stood also in a relation to the old order under which men had lived. That order had been under the control of inferior spiritual powers. There was a kingdom of evil with Satan the god of this world, the prince of the power of the air at its head. Still the Christian finds that his "wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual *hosts* of wickedness in the heavenly *places*." Clad in the armour of God he may be able to withstand the wiles of the devil, and equipped with the shield of faith to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. Behind the whole system of idolatry Paul sees the baneful activity of the demons ; to them the heathen sacrifices are offered, and the Christian who feasts in the idol's temple enters into ruinous fellowship with demons. But there were also the angels. It is not easy for us to enter into Paul's thought here. Paul's conception of angels has been borrowed from Jewish theology, and it has little in common with our popular notions of angels. They are the elemental spirits who rule the present world. They are not sinless, they have shared in the effects of Christ's redemption and therefore it is clear that they needed to be redeemed. They are to stand before the judgment bar of the saints. Women are in danger from them if they pray or prophesy in the Christian assemblies with uncovered head, and therefore

need the protection of the veil, to which a magical power is often assigned. In particular the angels had been concerned with the giving of the Law. This was a tenet of Jewish theology and references are made to it in the speech of Stephen and in the Epistle to the Hebrews ; while Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, accepts the belief and it underlies much that is said in the Epistle to the Colossians. The angels, as the world-rulers, brought Christ to His Cross, for they are absorbed in their function and have no significance beyond it. If then there rests on Jesus the condemnation and the curse of the Law, when we pass from the abstract to the concrete, the responsibility rests with those who are the givers and administrators of the Law. And these are not primarily the Jewish or Roman authorities. Just as behind the Empires of Persia and Greece the Book of Daniel shows us their angelic princes, so angelic principalities and powers stand behind their human tools, the priest and the procurator. They act not in malevolence but in ignorance. Had they known the wisdom of God, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. The ignorance of the angels is mentioned also in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Through the Church the variegated wisdom of God is to be divulged to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places. But their action in bringing Christ to His Cross recoiled upon themselves. The Law launched its curse against Christ, but in doing so its curse was exhausted and its tyranny was broken. In His death Christ spoiled the principalities and powers, exhibited them in their true position of

inferiority, and led them in triumph in His train. Foolishly then did the false teachers at Colossæ worship these deposed potentates and look to them for help. For the fulness of Godhead is not distributed among a multitude of angels. It exists in its undivided totality in Christ, it dwells in Him as a body, that is as an organic whole.

But while the Law has thus been abolished by being nailed to Christ's cross, sin and the flesh have also been brought to nought. For the crucifixion of the physical flesh carries with it the destruction of the carnal nature. And similarly the death of Christ broke the dominion of sin. For while the sinful flesh was crucified, the sin which dwelt within it was done away. Thus the death of Christ was a death to sin. And just as the physical death, so also the physical resurrection was the efficient symbol of a spiritual fact. The one broke with the past, the other inaugurated the future. The resurrection involved the resurrection to a new life. The negative death to sin is completed by the positive life unto God. And what Christ thus achieved, the race achieved in Him. It atoned for its sin, broke loose from its power, and was pronounced righteous as it stood before the bar of God.

So far, then, I have spoken of the two great racial acts. I have pointed out already that Paul traces certain consequences to these acts, which automatically affect the whole race apart from any individual choice. But other consequences, and these more momentous, depend on such choice. As a matter of historical fact, all men have

by personal choice endorsed the act of Adam and made it their own, and thus vindicated the treatment of it as a racial act. But all do not by a similar act of choice so endorse the racial act of Christ and make it their own. It lies within the option of the individual whether he will remain a natural man, and live in the flesh on the level of Adam, or whether he will take his stand with Christ and become a spiritual man. If he does so, then by an act of faith he becomes one with Christ. Faith is a very rich idea with Paul, it is that act of personal trust and self-surrender, the movement of man's whole soul in confidence towards Christ, which makes him one spirit with Him. And thus the great racial act of Calvary is repeated in the believer's experience. Because he is one with Christ he is dead to sin ; for the flesh in which it lived and through which it worked has been crucified on Christ's cross. He has also in death paid the penalty of his sin, and is thus free from its guilt and its claim. And since he is one spirit with Christ he has risen to the new life of holiness, and there works within him the power of Christ's resurrection life. No condemnation rests upon him before God's bar, he is justified in Christ. Thus not only sin and the flesh but the Law also has passed away. For where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty ; and Christians have died to the Law in which they were holden. For they have escaped into the freedom of the Spirit and dwell with Christ at the right hand of God. Christ has taken the place of self as the deepest and inmost element in their personality ; they have been crucified with Christ and it is no longer they

that live but Christ that liveth in them. Conduct thus ceases to be the studied and even painful adjustment to an external code of laws. It is the joyful, instinctive, spontaneous expression of the new personality. With the abolition of the Law the great barrier between Jew and Gentile has been broken down and Christianity stands revealed as a universal religion.

At present, it is true, the Christian realises that his redemption is incomplete. What is ideally concentrated in the ecstatic moment of vision and emancipation, may in actual experience be achieved only through a tedious process. And complete redemption is not possible till the consummation. At present we groan beneath our burden ; and all Nature moans also, looking eagerly for final redemption. At present we have but the earnest of the Spirit, but this is the pledge that all His fulness will be granted to us. For God, who did not spare His beloved Son but freely surrendered Him for our sakes, cannot withhold any good from us. If the status of Christ and His character become ours, we must share also His blessed immortality and His heavenly reign.

The secret of the spell which the theology of Paul has cast on such multitudes is to be found in the illumination which it has brought to their own spiritual history. They have understood their bondage and their deliverance, their misery and their rapture, as they have entered into his despair or watched him as he passed from that strain of inward conflict and sense of failure to harmony of spirit and untroubled peace with God. A theology created by experience speaks with directness and power to those

whose pilgrimage has taken them along the same way. The influence of Paul ebbs and flows across long stretches of history. It shrinks and seems as if it would vanish, and then all suddenly it gathers volume and velocity and the arid waste becomes a garden of God.

PAUL THE APOSTLE : HIS PERSONALITY AND ACHIEVEMENT.^{1, 2}

THE uncertainty in which the chronology of Paul's life is involved makes it impossible for us to say with any con-

¹An amplification of the lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library, the 14 December, 1927. First printed in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 12, 1928.

²The sources for our knowledge of Paul and his work are his own Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. Of the former I regard as genuine all but the Pastoral Epistles. Genuine Pauline material is to be found in 2 Timothy and perhaps in Titus. This is confirmed by P. N. Harrison's elaborate investigations, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (1921). Harnack's most recent pronouncement is in his *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus* (1926). He thinks that Dr. Harrison greatly overestimates the value of lexical statistics (pp. 74 f.); but he reaches a similar result; they are pseudo-Pauline writings in which Pauline material has been embodied, most of all in 2 Timothy, which may on the other hand be an interpolated Pauline Epistle (pp. 14 f.). On the other hand E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Vol. III. (1923), pp. 132-4, rejects the authenticity absolutely, and regards the attempt to find trustworthy material even in 2 Timothy as completely untenable.

I have always regarded the *Acts of the Apostles* as the composition of Luke; but in spite of the work of Ramsay, and even of Harnack, the critical tide has all along continued to flow strongly in the other direction; and Loisy has outstripped his German colleagues in the negative character of his criticism. It was refreshing to find that E. Meyer, in the work mentioned above, with his wide experience, immense erudition, and all the prestige which belongs to our foremost historian of antiquity, had come down decisively on the side of tradition at this point; all the more so that at other points his views are often quite radical.

vidence how it was apportioned between his pre-Christian and his Christian period. But before his conversion he had carried on an energetic persecution of the Christians in Palestine and had been entrusted by the High Priest with letters authorising him to undertake an extension of this persecution to Damascus. He can hardly, then, have been quite young at the time ; if we think of him as from thirty to thirty-five we shall perhaps not be far from the mark. We do not depreciate the revolutionary effect of his conversion, if we recognise that his personality and character were by this time largely formed. The personality received a new direction, he was dominated by new motives, his character was deepened and enriched. But there was a fundamental unity beneath the differences which marked the two stages of his career.

He was a Jew of Tarsus and a Roman citizen. Whatever his pride that he had been born and bred in Tarsus—"no mean city"—and that by birth he was also a Roman citizen, his pride of race and religion went far deeper. He gloried in the purity of his blood, he was a Hebrew, the child of Hebrew parents, sprung from the tribe of Benjamin. Even after he had become a Christian and received his commission as Apostle to the Gentiles his patriotism was intense ; his love for his own people, which pursued him with such rancorous hate, burned with a constant and passionate glow. He yearned for the salvation of his kinsfolk. His heart ached for them with unceasing pain. He, for whom to live was Christ and who poured out on Him all the wealth of adoration and love of a nature so rich in loyalty and affection,

could yet be willing to be anathema from Him if only by so supreme a surrender he could secure their salvation. He was, it is true, very conscious of the defects of his nation. In pungent language he speaks of the Jews as those "who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved; to fill up their sins always: but the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (1 Thess. ii. 14-16).

He was profoundly conscious, none the less, of Israel's religious and moral superiority to the Gentiles. The advantage of the Jew was "much every way." To his kinsmen, according to the flesh, had been entrusted the oracles of God; they bore the proud name of Israelites; to them belonged the adoption and the Shekinah, the covenants, the Law, the Divinely ordained ceremonial, the precious promises; they had the patriarchs for their ancestors and from them sprang the Messiah on the human side of His being (Rom. ix. 3-5). Apostle to the Gentiles though he is, he insists that it is Israel which has been and remains the true olive tree; the Gentiles are grafted in, but in order that Israel may be incited to accept the Gospel. He desired to carry over what he could from the old religion into the new. He had a strong sense of continuity; and here we note his balance as contrasted with his radical disciple Marcion, who regarded the Law as the gift of an inferior God, a rigid and pedantic legalist, and thought of Jesus as making a completely new beginning. He constantly appealed to

the Old Testament in his correspondence even with the Gentiles, and referred scarcely at all to Greek writers. He had all the recoil of the Jew from pagan vice, his horror of polytheism and idolatry, his passionate monotheism. He was proud of his training under Gamaliel, though the fanaticism of the disciple stood in glaring contrast to the tolerance of his master. Born and trained a Jew, he remained a Jew to the end.

He was a Jew—but a Jew of the Dispersion. He was proud of his city, Gentile city though it was. In those early impressionable years he was in constant contact with Gentile life. His mastery of the Greek language was such as he could hardly have acquired in later years. Not improbably Aramaic might often be heard in his home, but in any case he must have become familiar with it in Palestine and Syria. He may have had some knowledge of Greek literature and philosophy and of various types of Gentile religion. But his Jewish conditions would insulate him from Paganism to a greater extent than is often recognised. I find it difficult to believe that the rigid Pharisee, brought up by parents who belonged to that straitest of sects, can have studied at the University of Tarsus. Nor is it likely that he would know much about Gentile religion in any intimate way. He would learn about it in conversation; and public ceremonial he could observe. But he would never visit a heathen temple, still less would he have any contact with Mystery religions.

Naturally these two factors, Jewish and Greek, did not remain distinct and flow side by side without mingling.

They were blended by the unity of his personality. But he was also a Roman citizen, with an imperial outlook. To his pride of race was added the pride of possessing by birth a privilege, to which great advantage and prestige were attached and for which large sums were willingly paid.

Physically he does not appear to have been impressive. He was in bodily presence weak. Apparently he suffered during a long stretch of his ministry from some serious physical trouble. This may have been malarial fever, or possibly ophthalmia; we have scarcely sufficient evidence for diagnosis; but the medical evidence seems not to favour the view that it was epilepsy.¹ Yet the immensity of his labours, the burden of the responsibility which continually rested upon him, the perilous experiences through which he passed with safety, the privations from which he suffered, the cruel mishandling he had repeatedly to endure²—all testify to the toughness of his constitution. The suggestion of physical insignificance is confirmed by the fact that the people of Lystra identified Barnabas with Zeus and Paul with Hermes. A famous description in *The Acts of Paul and Thecla* is more detailed, but while it corroborates the suggestion as to his size and physical appearance, it adds what we might otherwise have expected as to the charm and attractiveness of his personality. He is described as “a man little

¹ See Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul* (1913), Section XLVIII, “The theory that Paul was an epileptic.”

² See especially the amazing catalogue of labours and sufferings in 2 Cor. xi. 23-33 (cf. iv. 8-12, vi. 4-10).

of stature, thin-haired upon the head, crooked in the legs, of good state of body, with eyebrows joining, and nose somewhat hooked, full of grace : for sometimes he appeared like a man, and sometimes he had the face of an angel." (Quoted from Dr. M. R. James' translation in *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 273.)

I pass on to consider his intellectual qualities and equipment. According to the statement in the speech he is said to have made to the Jews from the stairs of the castle, he was brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3). This is not recorded elsewhere ; and Loisy sets it aside because it occurs in a speech which he regards as an invention by the redactor of Acts. He adds that there is nothing to suggest that Paul had been a rabbi though he may have listened to discourses by the rabbis. The redactor's motive in making the statement was that he wished to claim for Paul that he was perfect in Judaism, and so he asserts that the apostle had had the best Jewish education. Loisy's whole attitude to the redactor, whose very existence is extremely doubtful, is so morbidly suspicious and sceptical that we may well distrust any conclusion based on the general premiss which seems to underlie his criticism, that unless we have independent corroboration we must approach his statements with a resolute will to disbelieve. The statement in Acts xxii. 3 is quite incidental. If it had been one of his "fictions," the redactor would presumably have made more of it, and introduced it when his hero was introduced.

This is connected, however, with the denial that Paul

had any contact with the Palestinian Church before his conversion. Mommsen inferred this from Gal. i. 22,¹ "I was still unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa which were in Christ." Loisy takes the same view. Bousset adopted it in the first edition of his *Kyrios Christos* (1913), but abandoned it under Wellhausen's influence in *Jesus der Herr* (1916), p. 31 (see also *Kyrios Christos*, 2nd ed., p. 75). It would be just as legitimate to infer from the words in the following verse, "he who once persecuted us," that the victims of his persecution were to be found in Judæa. Indeed Wendland, whose treatment of the New Testament narratives is often pretty sceptical, says, "Gal. i. 23 completely establishes the fact of his residence in Jerusalem before his conversion. There he became a fanatical zealot for the Law."² Moreover, the attempt to deny outright or even to minimise this hostile collision with the community in Jerusalem involves far too violent a handling of the narrative in Acts. Nothing can be based on Paul's failure to mention the actual scene of his persecution. He does not mention Damascus itself in the reference to his conversion (Gal. i. 15 f.); and it is only from the incidental remark, "and again I returned to Damascus," that we learn that Damascus had been the starting-point for his journey to Arabia, and therefore the

¹ *Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft* (ZNTW), 1901, p. 85. See on the other hand J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (1913), p. 136; with this Von Dobschütz expresses agreement, *Der Apostel Paulus*, I. (1926), pp. 49, 57. Feine, *Der Apostel Paulus* (1927), p. 420 f., also rejects the view, arguing that "Judæa" is used to distinguish the province from Jerusalem, the capital city.

² *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur* (2nd ed., 1912), p. 242.

scene of his conversion. But for this, and the similarly incidental reference in 2 Cor. xi. 32 f., Loisy might very well, on his critical principles, have treated the whole story of Paul's connexion with Damascus as one of the innumerable fictions which he credits to the account of his unspeakable redactor.

I should not have tarried so long on these points, but for the fact that they are pressed against the generally accepted beliefs that Paul was a student in the Rabbinical schools of Jerusalem, and therefore trained in the type of Judaism current there; and that he persecuted the Christians in Jerusalem and therefore gained his earliest knowledge of Christianity from his contact with the mother church. His Judaism would on that supposition be Judaism of the Dispersion; and the Christianity with which he first came into contact would also be Christianity of the Dispersion and not of Jerusalem. It would therefore be possible to suspect that it was already somewhat Hellenised or at least de-Judaised.¹ It must be

¹ Heitmüller (ZNTW, 1912, p. 330) says, "Paul is separated from Jesus not only by the primitive community, but by yet another link. The development runs in this series: Jesus—primitive community—Hellenistic Christianity—Paul." Bousset had independently reached the same conclusion, and warmly approved of Heitmüller's formulation (*Kyrios Christos*, 2nd ed., p. 75, cf. *Jesus der Herr*, pp. 30 ff.). The Christians at Damascus may have represented Hellenistic Christianity; but if we can trust the narrative in Acts—and in its main features we have found it trustworthy—then Paul's contact with that group was later in time than and much inferior in importance to his contact with the primitive community. The question might also be raised whether Paul had been in contact with Jesus Himself. This has been generally—and in my judgment rightly—regarded as

remembered that this is not disinterested criticism. Its object is, by discrediting Paul's contact with the Palestinian Church before his conversion, to detach his interpretation of the Gospel from that of the primitive community. This involves the rejection of the whole representation that he had anything to do with the persecution of the Palestinian Christians; and this again is made much easier if the whole story of his residence in Jerusalem can be set aside, with the incidental advantage that the type of Judaism in which he was trained was not that of the Rabbinical schools in Jerusalem, but the Judaism of Tarsus affected by its Gentile environment.

It is, of course, obvious that he was familiar with

improbable; but among ourselves the affirmative view has been taken by Ramsay and J. H. Moulton. It has been defended most thoroughly by J. Weiss in his *Paulus und Jesus* (1910, pp. 22 ff., Eng. transl. *Paul and Jesus*, 1909, pp. 28-56). Cf. also his note in *Das Urchristentum*, p. 137. I cannot refrain from adding how deeply I deplore the premature death of a scholar so gifted and so stimulating, which deprived us of his own conclusion of *Das Urchristentum*, of the contemplated companion volume dealing with the religious background of primitive Christianity and the life and teaching of Jesus, and of his commentary on 2 Corinthians. Von Dobschütz agrees with J. Weiss' contention (*Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 50), and says, "If Paul was not accidentally absent from Jerusalem, scarcely anything else is possible than that he himself saw Jesus there and perhaps was even present at His execution. The former may be inferred from 2 Cor. iii. 16; the latter would best explain the central significance which the Crucified later possessed in the preaching of the apostle" (p. 3). See also the striking discussion in Feine, *op. cit.*, pp. 431-5, reaching the same conclusion. Loofs (*Wer war Jesus Christus?* 1916, p. 163) favours this view, but adds that the question is one of subordinate significance. E. Meyer (*op. cit.*, III., 339) regards it as very dubious.

Judaism as it existed in Tarsus ; but it would be specially with its religion, ethics, and peculiar customs, that he would be in contact as a boy ; the knowledge of Judaism as a theology, of the scholasticism of the Rabbis and their exegetical method and dialectic he would gain in Jerusalem. There, too, he would become acquainted with Christianity, as it existed in its primitive form.

He was, accordingly, thoroughly educated on Jewish lines. The positive value of this education consisted not so much in the intrinsic value of what he actually learnt as in the intellectual training which the discipline gave him. At the same time it did equip him very effectively for dealing with his Jewish Christian critics when he was contending for the freedom of the Gospel. His controversial passages exhibit great subtlety of argument and skill in dialectic. If we feel, as at points we must, that the reasoning does not impress us, we ought not to criticise the apostle on that account. He was not writing for us but for men of his own age and race. He met them on their own ground and turned their own weapons against them. As we come to know him, we realise more and more how thoroughly Jewish he was—a truth of which we ought not to lose sight when we are reconstructing his theology.

But he was not lost in intricate subtleties, nor did he concentrate on minutiae. He handled large subjects in a large way ; he could lift them clear out of all littleness and narrowness. He dealt with trivial things in a great way, not with great things in a trivial way. He treated them in the light of eternal principles. He was a

controversialist of the first order, in virtue not only of the keenness and resourcefulness with which he analysed the position of his opponents or the skill with which he expounded and the cogency with which he defended his own positions, but in virtue also of his sweep of view and his gift of relating the particular to the universal.

Nor can we deny him the virtue of originality. However much he drew from various sources—and the extent of his debt and the identity of his creditors are the subject of animated debate—we ought to recognise to the full how largely his presentation of Christianity was his own. He was a pioneer of the first rank. He felt that Christ had made all things new and he was deeply conscious how fresh and new his own message was.

But we should do him a grave injustice if we thought of him as simply formulating new ideas. He had the systematic gift and built his ideas into a coherent structure.¹ The Gospel which he preached did not consist of a number of disconnected doctrines; it was a system in which the ideas were intimately related to each other and fused into an organic whole. To him we owe the first Christian theology, apologetic, and philosophy of history. But though the theology is a great intellectual achievement and could have been created only by a pro-

¹ I am well aware that a strong current runs in the opposite direction, represented in an extreme form by such scholars as Wrede, but stated in a more moderate form by others. I adhere to the position I stated in my *Quintessence of Paulinism* (1918), pp. 5 f.

found and original thinker, it would be a serious error to think of it as the product of pure reasoning. It was rooted in a great religious and ethical experience, and we can understand and do it justice only as we have entered into the spiritual conflict which darkened his life under the Law and have passed on into his radiant assurance of inward peace and reconciliation with God. That personal experience gave him his central doctrine of a mystical union with Christ, achieved by an act of self-renouncing trust in which he died to his old life and rose again to the new, attaining in Christ a new status, a new character, and a new destiny. It supplied him with his interpretation of his old life without Christ. The futile struggle between the higher and the lower nature, which ruptured the inward harmony of his personality when he awoke to the consciousness of a moral order and instinctively rebelled against it, suggested his doctrine of the flesh, that wholly evil side of him in which sin slumbered till it was wakened by the coming of the Law. That this individual experience found its explanation in a racial experience, is true, and that in formulating this explanation Paul went into history and discovered it in the two racial personalities, Adam and Christ, is also true. And that in doing so he drew upon doctrines which he received from others and did not entirely create may be freely recognised. But Paul's theory did not start with these representative figures ; it had its rise in the drama of tragedy and of rapture which had been enacted within his own breast. But naturally, with his philosophic interest, he could not rest content without

moving behind the experience of individuals to discover a universal cause. It may seem a trivial matter whether we suppose that he started with the universal and deduced from it the particular instance, or whether the individual case came first and led on to the generalisation. But really it is not trivial. For our estimate of Paul it matters much whether his central doctrines were born out of his own moral struggle and victory, or whether the personal doctrine was but the logical application of a philosophical theory. The doctrine which is born out of experience comes to us with other credentials than one which is created by theological speculation, and it speaks to us a far more intimate message. Paul was not the incarnation of cold inhuman thought, there was a profoundly emotional element in the experience which lay behind his doctrine. To this aspect of the apostle's personality I must now turn.

He had an emotional nature of exceptional depth and richness. He loved his people, who had spurned him and crucified his Lord, with a love far surpassing the common measure. I have already reminded you that he bore unceasing pain and sorrow in his heart for his kinsfolk according to the flesh ; and if only they could be saved was willing to become himself anathema from Christ. He loved his Churches and prayed constantly for them ; he was heartbroken over their failures, but filled with joy when he heard of their moral and spiritual triumphs. He was able to inspire deep affection in his converts. He had a remarkable attraction for younger men whom he gathered about him. They served him with filial devotion ;

he returned it with kindness and generous confidence and loved them with a deep and tender affection. He counted love the finest grace of the Christian character, the loftiest virtue of the Christian life, apart from which all spiritual gifts, however splendid, lost their value. He sang of its excellence in sweet and noble strains, whose matchless phrases still strike on our ears as at once an inspiration and a challenge.

In Paul strength and sweetness met together. For he was not all sweetness. He had a virile character; he was a dominant and masterful personality. He knew his own mind and was prepared, if necessary, to impose his will. He could on occasion cow his opponents into submission. He had great moral courage. He did not shrink from rebuking even Peter, the most commanding personality among the immediate disciples of Jesus, the most revered and influential member of the apostolic band. Paul was Peter's junior and his apostolic status was by no means universally conceded. The attempts of this upstart, once a rigid Pharisee and resolute persecutor, to force the pace were hotly resented. The Jewish Christians who had followed Peter in his liberal attitude towards the Gentile converts now shared the moral cowardice of his retreat. Even Barnabas had been carried away and had given a misplaced exhibition of a conciliatory temper towards the emissaries of James, but of bigoted exclusiveness towards his Gentile brethren. Then the long-suffering Paul, who had watched with pain the growing rift within the fellowship, could keep silent no longer. He withstood Peter to his face before them all and in

incisive words brought home to him the inconsistency with his principles which his timorous narrowness involved.¹

Yet, where principle was not at stake, Paul himself was conciliatory. He displayed a sympathetic imagination in his attitude to views which he did not share ; a tender consideration for the scruples of weaker brethren, which his robust good sense brushed aside as in themselves insignificant. These weak brethren for whom Christ had died were very dear to him. He flames out in indignation at the selfish and flippant lack of consideration shown to them by the strong, the men who rightly saw that such scruples had no substance and encouraged the weak to

¹ Loisy judges Paul to have been more to blame for his lack of moderation than Peter and Barnabas for their concession to Jewish prejudices. He supposes that the Church of Antioch did not stand by him, and that he no longer had any connexion with it. The evidence of Acts xviii. 22 f. to the contrary is set aside (see his *L'Épître aux Galates*, 1916, pp. 124 ff., *Les Actes des Apôtres*, pp. 607-11, 614-6). Loisy, it must be remembered, is very unsympathetic with Paul. He says that Barnabas was at least as great a man ; greater, he thinks apparently, if he wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews (*op. cit.*, p. 616). Von Dobschütz, on the other hand, believes that we must infer from Paul's way of telling the story and from the later course of events that the victory lay with Paul, but that Paul had lost his joy in co-operation with Barnabas (*op. cit.*, p. 9). E. Meyer, reminding us here of the Tübingen critics, argues that the controversy left a permanent breach between Peter and Paul, the senior apostle attacking Paul in his own churches (Galatia, Corinth) and finally in Rome (*op. cit.*, III., 424-6, 432-6, 441 f., 455-9, 464, 493-500). It is not likely that this will find much acceptance. Paul's subsequent relations with Jerusalem, especially his zeal in raising funds to relieve the impoverished members of the mother Church, make the theory of a bitter and permanent feud with Peter very difficult.

disobey their conscience. "Who is tripped up," he exclaims, "and I do not burn with indignation at the outrage?"

This sense of the sanctity of conscience and the tender regard for it even when morbid and suffering from moral hyperæsthesia leads on to the consideration of his ethical principles and practice. His superb intellectual power, his intense emotional glow were matched by moral insight and moral passion. Even before he became a Christian he had the advantage of a great body of elevated ethical teaching in the Old Testament and the current Judaism. He must also have attained some familiarity with Greek ethics, in particular, it would seem, with Stoic ethics. But when he became a Christian the teaching and the life of Jesus made an ineffaceable impression upon him. Thus he stood in the true succession not only of the Hebrew prophets but of Jesus. He had thus new principles to apply and the situation to which he applied them was also new.

As a strict Pharisee of the better type he sought to attain a perfect conformity with the Law as this had been developed by the Scribes into the traditions of the elders. Our distinction between the ceremonial and the moral law was not recognised; all the commandments of God were binding. It is essential for us to remember this when we are dealing with the Apostle's doctrine of the Law. It is a grave misapprehension of his thesis that for Christians the Law is abolished, if we imagine him to be speaking simply of its ritual directions. Naturally these were included. It is not on these, however, that his

thought dwells, but on the moral law, especially as embodied in the Decalogue. And so far as could be observed, Paul was singularly successful in satisfying its exacting standard. He tells us himself, that as touching the Law, he was found blameless. He says, "I advanced in the Jew's religion beyond many of mine own age among my countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers." We must credit him with an exceptionally high standard of moral conduct, quite apart from his punctilious observance of the ritual requirements of the Law. He had a tender and scrupulous conscience; his life was largely absorbed in understanding the statutes of God as the Rabbis had defined them, and observing them with unflinching precision. He was nevertheless acutely aware of a tragic schism in his own inner life. The conflict between the higher and the lower nature, the flesh and the mind, went on unnoticed by the world, which little guessed that beneath the smooth and triumphant surface elemental powers were locked in deadly struggle, and that outward conformity to the Law was strangely united with the constant experience of moral defeat. The will of the mind or higher nature was set on obedience to the Law of God, but the irretrievably evil lower nature, the willing thrall of Sin, again and again vanquished the higher. This inward torment of the divided self, this losing battle of the mind with the flesh, drove him to despair: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Sin was no doubt for him a perplexing phenomenon to be explained, but primarily it was something to be fought.

But what, with all his strenuous yet ineffective struggle, the Law could not do for him, grace triumphantly achieved. Renouncing all trust in his own righteousness and forsaking all efforts to establish it, he cast himself upon Christ in adoring trust, in a transport of wonder, love, and praise. As he looked back on that critical moment so saturated with emotion, so stored with spiritual and moral energy, he was conscious that a fusion of his own spirit with Christ had taken place, so that it was no longer he that lived but Christ that lived within him. The union between himself and Christ was so close, so intimate, that he could say, "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." It is not of a moral, but of a mystical union that he is thinking. We can define it only in the language of paradox; there is an identity in which distinction survives. Thus whatever Paul had been, belonged in a sense to the past. The decisive thing was his Christian experience. He had a vivid sense of its revolutionary character. In Christ he was a new creature, the old things had passed away, behold they had become new. Since he had become one with Christ he shared His status before God. He had died to the old life, its guilt no longer clung to him, he was "justified in Christ," there was no longer any condemnation for him. And the moral problem of the future was also solved, for in this union with Christ he shared Christ's character. Christ indeed was the real centre of his new personality, and the new life was the instinctive expression of that new personality formed by the fusion of Paul with Christ. Thus Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant was

fulfilled. The prophet had made the decisive advance of recognising that the moral ideal was to be attained, not by conformity to a code of external commandments, but by the writing of the Law upon the heart. In other words the moral Law was to become a part of the personality itself, known by immediate intuition, instantaneously available for every situation and spontaneously obeyed as the instinctive expression of the renewed personality. But the prophecy was more than fulfilled ; for not only was there the new knowledge of God's will and the spontaneous fulfilment, secured by renewal of the heart on which it was written, but there was the mystical union of the redeemed personality with the personality of the Redeemer. Thus the moral life of Paul was rooted in his religious experience and his ethical theory was rooted in his theology. His theology also had its roots largely in his religious experience.

Since Paul was pre-eminently the Apostle of the Gentiles, the problem of ethical training was very different in his Churches from the problem which confronted the leaders of Jewish Christian Churches. A far higher standard of conduct could be presupposed in those who had been educated in Judaism than that which obtained in the Pagan world generally. In the Epistle to the Romans Paul gives a lurid picture of the moral conditions to which idolatry led ; and after mentioning several types of sinners he reminds his Corinthian converts that before their conversion some of them had been found in these classes. Many of these converts needed to learn the very rudiments of Christian morality. To avoid contact with

pagans addicted to sins of the graver kind, he tells his converts, they would need to go out of the world altogether. Such was the mire from which they had been extricated and in which their friends and neighbours still wallowed. The Apostle tolerated no compromise in these matters. If members of the Church were guilty of such offences he ordered their fellow-members to break off communications with them. But he dealt faithfully with the sins which were less gross in character but not therefore less morally and spiritually ruinous. The works of the flesh were not simply the coarser physical sins, but included idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, faction, party spirit, envy. And against many of these he testifies again and again. They are nearly all direct sins against love, and it is in love that he finds the all-inclusive principle of morality. He is shocked by the scandal of Christians going to law with each other before heathen tribunals. They should rather suffer wrong and permit themselves to be defrauded. He is horrified at the scenes which occurred at the Lord's Supper in Corinth, when distinctions of wealth or class ruined the fellowship and contradicted the whole meaning of the service. The party-spirit which split the Church at Corinth into four cliques was not simply a sorry exhibition of radically unchristian temper, it degraded Christ from the sole Lordship of His Church which could be shared by no merely human leader. He strongly condemns manifestations of temper such as anger and railing. He forbids rancour and vindictiveness, urging his converts to practise meekness, patience, forbearance, and forgiveness. Sympathy and compassion, kindness,

philanthropy and hospitality, are also virtues to be cultivated. Ambition, self-assertion and inflated self-esteem, are to be avoided ; they must practise rather the humility which esteems others better than oneself and the unselfishness which will prove a safeguard against invasion of the rights of others. Of the courtesy which he commends to others the Apostle gave not a few examples ; a shining illustration of this quality is afforded by his letter to Philemon. His delicacy of feeling may be seen in his denunciation of the ostentatious greed with which the wealthier coteries feasted on their luxuries, while the poor had nothing, or at the best but coarse and scanty food which they had to eat under the supercilious observation of their wealthier brethren. "Ye put to shame," he says, "them that have nothing." The insufficiently esteemed virtues of sincerity, truthfulness, and honesty were pressed on his readers. At the same time the Apostle knew only too well the distressing possibilities of the candid friend, and insisted that while they dealt truthfully it must be in love. Love is, indeed, the bond in which perfection consists ; it binds all Christians together and so the ideal of Christian perfection is attained. His emphasis on joy as the constant mood of the Christian life is true to the temper of primitive Christianity. When he asked the disciples whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed, the question was presumably prompted by his realisation that the enthusiasm and rapture which normally characterised the Christian, whatever his outward circumstances, was missing in them. The radiant happiness which triumphed over persecution,

tribulation, pain and death, was more triumphantly exhibited by no one than by the Apostle himself.

The question not unnaturally arises how with Paul's principle that in mystic union with Christ the believer shares His death to sin and His resurrection to a new life, these moral exhortations should have been needed at all ; and still more that they should have been so flagrantly transgressed. The Apostle himself was not conscious of any inconsistency ; indeed he bases his exhortations on the participation of his converts in these redemptive experiences of Christ. Presumably then the exhortations were the practical applications of the absolute principle. Ideally it had been achieved in a moment of conversion, actually it must be realised in a long process.

In this connection it is appropriate to speak of his principle of freedom. Freedom is the Christian vocation. For freedom Christ set us free. Paul asserts his own freedom, nor will he allow that his liberty may be judged by the conscience of another. Against the false teachers who were troubling the Church at Colossæ he urges its members not to allow themselves to be censoriously judged with reference to meat or drink, to feast-day, new moon or Sabbath. But this is qualified by the principle of love. "We that are strong," he says, "ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves." This principle is enforced by the supreme example ; Christ did not please himself though He was Lord of all. And Paul himself acted on the same principle. Though he was free from all, he brought himself under bondage to all that he might gain the more. If the strong use their

liberty recklessly and the weak brother is emboldened to act against his conscience, he perishes. And such a sin against the brethren, wounding their conscience when it is weak, is a sin against Christ. To gratify one's appetite and assert one's liberty, one ought not to ruin him for whom Christ died. After all the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. The characteristic failing of the man with enlightened intellect and robust conscience is to despise the weak and timorous brother obsessed by silly scruples ; the temptation of the weak brother is to pass censorious judgment on the strong ; and both, in doing so, sin against love.

The elevation of Paul's ethical principles will be apparent ; but of their wealth only a meagre impression can be given in my space. I must add that in this as in other respects his treatment is marked especially by its sanity and balance and by its firm grip upon realities. And while his ethic is as uncompromising in its application as it is lofty in its principle, it is not pressed to the merciless extreme. If the flagrant offender at Corinth must be solemnly excommunicated and handed over to Satan, it is that his spirit may be saved at the Second Coming. If the rebel leader, who had so grossly insulted him, has been repudiated and disciplined by the Church, Paul pleads that he may now be forgiven and not swallowed up in despairing sorrow because he feels that his sin has been irretrievable.

I pass on to speak of Paul's apostolic vocation. He strenuously affirms that his apostleship had no human

source and came through no human medium. He was vividly conscious that God had called him without human intervention. And he had the same sense of election from his birth as Jeremiah and the Servant of Yahweh. More specifically this was a call to apostleship among the Gentiles. Though less than the least of all saints, the glorious commission had been given him to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. And apparently this consciousness of vocation went back to the time of his conversion. When God, who had set him apart from his birth, revealed His Son in him, it was with the intention that he should preach Him among the Gentiles. His language seems to imply that his course of action lay clear before him and that he took it without hesitation. He suggests that at the outset he maintained a studied aloofness from the Jerusalem Church and the apostles. The point on which he insists appears to be independence of action rather than independence of thought. At a later period he affirms that when his Gospel was in question the senior apostles added nothing to him. They recognised that his position was parallel to that of Peter, Peter being entrusted with the mission to the Jews and Paul with the mission to the Gentiles. Conscious of the part which he had played in persecuting the Church, he speaks of himself as the least of the apostles and not worthy to be called an apostle. Yet with a touch of sarcasm, as he thinks of his overrated colleagues, he claims that he was not a whit behind those superlative apostles. It is only the sober truth when he says, "I laboured more abundantly than they all." He claims no merit, for like Jeremiah he

feels the inward compulsion of his message. Necessity is laid upon him "for woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." When he is planning his visit to Italy he tells the Roman Church that the range of his mission had been from Jerusalem to Illyricum. He had, however, carefully avoided those districts where others had already preached, so that he might not be building on another man's foundation. He looked on his vocation as a stewardship and this involved fidelity to his trust. Whether he loyally performed his task was a matter which God alone could determine ; though he was conscious of no slackness on his part, he ventured no judgment on himself ; as to the judgment of others he was completely indifferent.

As an apostle he possesses rights which he is entitled to enforce, but which he is prepared to waive. While all things are lawful, not all are expedient. He is under bondage to all, but voluntarily since he is free. He has become all things to all men that he may win some. But he is conscious of authority and he claims obedience. He speaks to the Corinthians of "the authority which the Lord gave me for building up and not casting down." In writing to the Thessalonians he refers to the commandments he has laid upon them in the past and gives them fresh commandments. Writing to the more turbulent Corinthians he desires proof whether they are obedient in all things. He finds evidence of his apostleship in the sufferings and persecutions he is called upon to endure. The apostles are as men doomed to death, a spectacle to angels and to men, ill-fed, scantily clad,

homeless wanderers. He bears branded on his body the marks of the Lord Jesus.

We have little direct evidence on his quality as a preacher. Reports are given of sermons delivered in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch, at Lystra, and at Athens. Their authenticity is disputed in view of the well-known habit of ancient historians to compose speeches which they attributed to characters in their works. It is very precarious, however, to argue that Luke followed this practice; but in any case the speeches can only be summaries of much fuller discourses and are probably cast a good deal in the author's own language. The tactfulness of the utterances and the way in which the speaker finds common ground between himself and his audiences make a favourable impression of authenticity. His enemies said of him that he was unimpressive in appearance and of no account as a speaker. Preaching seems often to have been a painful experience to him. He refers to his sense of conflict and struggle and his need of courage to face his task. He came to Corinth not with eloquence or wisdom, but only with the message of Christ crucified. He shrank from any display of human wisdom or rhetoric which might put the cross of Christ in the background. For God had chosen the foolish, the weak, the despised, the nonentities; He had willed through the folly of preaching—means apparently so ill adapted to secure the end—to save them that believe. The missionary vividly remembered his weakness, fear and trepidation. But he was all the more conscious of the Divine power working mightily through his own feebleness.

In his relations with his converts his affection for them is very evident. The oriental exuberance of expression must not disguise from us the real depth and intensity of his emotion as though we were reading mere conventional hyperbole. They are his hope and joy, his crown of boasting, and his glory. When he was with them he was gentle and tender as a nurse ; when he is separated from them it is as though he had been orphaned ; he longs to revisit them. He cherishes them in his heart and longs after them all in the tender mercies of Christ. Their steadfastness gives him new life.

As an apostle he is entitled to claim maintenance from his Churches. He has the right, as the other apostles, to forbear working or to be accompanied by a wife and claim maintenance for both. But he has permitted himself none of these advantages. When he was at Thessalonica he accepted support from no one, but worked day and night that he might not be a burden to anyone. He would die rather than that his proud boast of independence should be nullified. Wherein, he challenges the Corinthians, had they been made inferior to the rest of the Churches except that he had been no burden to them ? adding with pungent irony, " Forgive me this wrong." From the warm-hearted Philippian, however, he again and again accepted help, knowing that in their case he would not compromise his cherished independence.

He was independent also in the sense that he did not seek to carry favour with men. If he were a pleaser of men he could not be a slave of Christ. He did not

flatter, nor were his utterances dictated by self-seeking. Yet in a higher sense he affirms that he pleased all men in all things, and directs that each should please his neighbour for that which is good to edification.

We know less than we could wish of the way in which the Apostle organised his Churches, nor for our purpose is it necessary to linger over this subject. But it is clear from his handling of the problems which emerged in his Churches that he must have been a very skilful organiser and administrator. The regulations which he laid down for the exercise of spiritual gifts display his sanity and balance in a striking way. For Paul was himself exceptionally endowed in this respect. He spoke with tongues more than any of the Corinthians, though that gift, which was highly esteemed, had run riot in the Church. But he insisted that the edification of the Church must be the supreme concern ; and that the speaker's desire to air his gifts or to enjoy the luxury of self-expression must not outbalance the common good. The gift must accordingly be practised only with the most rigorous limitations. A similar wisdom marks his treatment of the relations between the broad-minded and the over-scrupulous. The problem of the attitude which the Church should assume towards the Roman Empire was one which raised serious practical and theoretical issues. Paul sees it steadily and handles it with great discretion. Several thorny questions were raised about marriage, especially in view of the situation created when one member of the partnership became a Christian while the other remained a pagan. That

Paul should have dealt so wisely on the whole with the issues involved is the more remarkable that he seems to have been largely free from those impulses which men seek to satisfy in marriage.

In consequence of his wandering life Paul was compelled to keep in touch with his Churches by correspondence. His letters were for himself only a second best. They were unwelcome substitutes for personal contact with his Churches. That he was contributing to a specifically Christian collection of Scriptures, which would take its place beside the Old Testament and be read and studied for many centuries as scarcely any writings have ever been studied, would never occur to him. Happily for ourselves he wrote letters, some of which remain to us as part of our most precious heritage from antiquity. If I speak of them as great literature I may seem to be oblivious of much which would contradict such an estimate. In particular those arid stretches of argument, the fatiguing dialectic in which he discusses issues that have lost all interest for ourselves, might seem to negative all title to literary excellence. But it would be unfair to make our own preferences and interests a standard by which to judge him. To his original readers the questions which he discussed were of urgent and vital importance, and his handling of these questions would interest them just because it was relevant to their own stage of knowledge and thought. But even to us they would gain in value if we would be more patient ; since it is Paul's method to examine ephemeral issues in the light of eternal principles. And so beneath the

unfamiliar and perhaps repellent forms there may be discovered themes of perennial interest. Moreover, we cannot blame Paul for not employing eloquence where eloquence would have been inappropriate.

A Grecian of the highest rank, Professor Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, has described Paul as "a classic of Hellenism."¹ And we can rightly claim that much in the Epistles deserves to be ranked as great literature. But this was not because Paul aimed at literary excellence for its own sake. He had no use for empty rhetoric, nor did he study form for form's sake. His letters are so great because they are the unstudied expression of so rich, so many-sided, a personality. It was because a noble nature was set on fire by noble thoughts, emotions, and aspirations, that his sentences glowed with such radiance and throbbed with such power. His thoughts are too swift for his words and the torrential rush of his dictation may sometimes have left his amanuensis panting vainly to overtake him. His syntax may be broken, the thread of his argument snapped, as new thoughts flash into his mind. It may be that only with severe effort we wring all the meaning out of his closely-packed sentences, or unravel his concentrated and apparently tangled arguments. We watch with suspense the nimble but sure-footed logic with which he bounds from point to point of his argument, neglecting,

¹ *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache* (1905) in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, p. 157. The whole of his brilliant description of Paul's style well deserves to be read.

it may be, not a few stepping-stones on the way. That his dialectic was skilful, if at times paradoxical, will be clear to anyone who studies his argument that the Law had not been given to produce righteousness.

He was a formidable controversialist. If his arguments do not always appeal to us, they were much more effective for his readers and admirably designed to confute his opponents. The force with which he wields the bludgeon is equalled by the dexterity with which he uses the rapier. Neither weapon is congenial to him, for love is apt to be forgotten when a man is engaged in clubbing his opponent or running him through. His opponents recognised the power of his letters ; but they may well have been dazed by the unexpected resourcefulness of his scathing invective, his blistering sarcasm, and his devastating irony. The situation was critical, the provocation was extreme ; and too gentle controversialists may meditate on the significance of Napoleon's remark that to have used blank cartridges on a certain famous occasion would have involved a culpable waste of life. But no one knew better than Paul that we should overcome evil with good, or practised that principle more consistently.

But it is not on his controversial passages with all their dexterity and their power, their scorn and indignation, or even their tender appeal, that our memory dwells when we speak of the great literature he has given us. Great chapters stand out before us like the eighth of Romans or the thirteenth and fifteenth chapters of 1 Corinthians. But all the Epistles contain passages, some of them not

long, of sustained and noble eloquence. Some may think it paradoxical to speak of Paul as a poet, but there was a strain of poetry in him. Call to mind his sombre picture of the whole creation enslaved in the bondage of corruption and groaning and travailing in pain together, eagerly waiting for our redemption in which its own deliverance will be involved. Or think of the lyrical rapture of some of his great passages. He may have been discussing some perplexing problem or dealing with some squalid situation. But suddenly his soul takes flight and he soars away from the mean and the sordid, from the arid and the commonplace, bearing his readers upward in his swift and eager flight to those regions of peace and rapture where his treasure and his heart abide. From the miserable party squabbles of the Corinthian Church he escapes into the larger air reminding them how foolish it is to limit themselves to one party leader, when the world and all things belong to them all, time and eternity, while they belong to Christ and Christ Himself to God. So at the end of that famous discussion of the problem created by the election of Israel and its rejection of the Gospel he bursts into his adoring confession of the depth of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God.

If then we enquire wherein the greatness of Paul consisted and what he achieved there is one general consideration to be emphasised at the outset. He was not simply borne on the current of a movement which would have existed independently of him. To a large extent he created the current and controlled its direction. He cut the channel which the Church was in a great measure to

follow. The Church would, no doubt, have continued to exist if Paul had never become a Christian. But without a leader of Paul's penetrating insight, commanding intelligence, moral courage and depth of spiritual experience, it might have taken centuries to do what he did in a single generation. It was he who detached Christianity from Judaism. It was not only that his amazing energy as a missionary planted Christian Churches over so wide an area; others co-operated in this work, though he laboured more abundantly than they all. But Paul supplied a reasoned defence of the independence of Christianity. He showed that freedom from the Law and its works and salvation through faith in the work of Christ alone were involved in the very nature of the Gospel. And at the critical moment he stood for freedom and unity against fanatical Judaists and intimidated leaders. To insist that no table-communion was possible between Jewish and Gentile Christians unless the Gentiles would accept Judaism was to turn the Church into a Jewish sect and ruin its prospects of acceptance by the Gentiles on a large scale. Humanly speaking it was Paul who rendered the incomparable service of delivering the new religion from so fatal an entanglement.

Not only did he supply the theoretical vindication of the independence of Christianity and defeat the policy which would have bound the two together; but more than anyone else he planted the new religion firmly in the Gentile world. He had a keen eye for strategic positions. He selected the important centres of population and from these the Gospel radiated into surrounding districts. In

some of these centres, for example Corinth and Ephesus, he made a long stay. He knew the necessity of this if solid work was to be done and a firm basis laid for future development.

He did much to secure the unity of the Church. Not only did he defeat the bigotry which would have relegated those Gentiles who stood without the Jewish covenant to an inferior class, denied intercommunion with the Jewish Christians; but he laboured strenuously to promote friendly relationships with the mother Church by occasional visits and by collections in his churches for the poor Christians of Jerusalem. He had a lofty conception of the Church. It was the body of Christ, it was His bride and the temple of the Holy Ghost. He gave it an organisation, sought to secure a combination of uniformity with liberty, curbed reckless developments and pruned unwholesome excrescences. He was deeply concerned for unity within the local Churches themselves. He set himself resolutely against cliques, factions and party spirit, since they denied the principle of love and might even threaten the supremacy of Christ.

He also worked out a Christian ethic. On this I have already spoken. Here I need only emphasise how great was the service rendered by Paul at this point. To have imposed upon the converts from paganism a Jewish ethic would not have been so difficult. But to create an ethic which rested not on legalism but on antinomianism, to preach a Gospel of emancipation and yet effectively to safeguard the claims of morality was no easy task. But Paul successfully achieved it for his Churches, and in

doing so has left a legacy of the highest value to later generations.

But his greatness is shown pre-eminently in the fact that he largely created a Christian theology and apologetic and a philosophy of history. Whatever view we take of the construction in itself—and it is often depreciated by those who have not taken the pains to understand it, though not by these alone—we must remember that it was largely pioneering work which could not have been accomplished except by a profound and massive intelligence. He had the first qualification for the interpretation of the new religion in that he had firmly grasped its colossal significance. The Gospel was revolutionary; it was the pivot on which history turned. It transcended and cancelled the most fundamental distinctions, race, social status, even sex—the most radical, the most influential of all distinctions on which depend the whole fabric of society and the perpetuation of the race. It went deeper than all of them. It was a mighty principle of unity. Jew and Gentile, slave and freeman, Greek and barbarian, imperial Roman and oppressed provincial, all became one in Christ. All found in Him their common centre, in love to Him they discovered a force which drew them irresistibly to all their fellow-Christians. Of the theology itself it is the less necessary for me to speak now since I sketched my own construction of it in my lecture on “The Quintessence of Paulinism.”

He has also left us the heritage of his letters. Eduard Schwartz has expressed the view that Paul's main importance consisted in the posthumous influence he exerted

on the Church through his Epistles. I should certainly hesitate to endorse this, and indeed it is not possible to speak with any confidence on such a question. The influence Paul exerted by the line of action which he took and the work which he did in his lifetime was colossal. It largely determined the policy and the direction the Church was to follow, and but for Paul the difference would have been stupendous. It remains true that the Epistles have exercised an incalculable influence on the doctrine, the ethics, and the organised life of the Church. If the New Testament is the most important book in the world, it is worth our while to remember that had Paul never become a Christian, our New Testament would have been deprived of his Epistles, of more than half of The Acts of the Apostles, probably of 1 Peter, possibly of other sections of the New Testament. And some of the books which would remain would probably have been different from what they are.

When we are speaking of Paul's influence we cannot forget that much of it was indirectly the influence of Jesus exerted through Paul. I cannot discuss at this point the problem of the relation in which Paul stood to Jesus. Nothing could have been more distasteful to Paul than to have been put in any kind of rivalry with Jesus. The full tide of affection and adoration, of which a nature singularly rich in both qualities was capable poured forth in full and perennial flood towards his Lord. All of worth that he had, all he could ever be, he owed to Him. It is not infrequently said that Paul depraved the simple and beautiful religion of Jesus. He substituted Christo-

logical speculation for the Gospel of the Fatherhood of God ; and the plan of salvation for the Master's message of God's free forgiveness. And so with Paul the new religion was in a few years transformed into a mythology. In his hands the message of Jesus became a harder, coarser, and narrower thing. It is recognised, however, by some who find this gulf between Paul and his Master that this account of the responsibility for the difference cannot be sustained, and so the transformation is thought to have taken place before Paul touched the religion. Really it would be necessary to cut deep into the Synoptic Gospels themselves to eliminate from the teaching of Jesus utterances about Himself and His work which in principle go a long way towards the Pauline position. It is, of course, true that these are only pregnant utterances and that the development of them into systematic doctrine was the work of Paul himself.

We must all recognise that Paul's impact on history has been tremendous. But we may think of it too exclusively in terms of religion and the Church. Really he struck with amazing force into universal history. Christianity has become so large a factor in the secular life of nations, in earlier ages indeed perhaps more than in our own, that the man who beyond all others emancipated the Gospel from Judaism, planted it firmly in the Gentile world and gave a reasoned theory of it which has served as a basis for the structure of Christian theology, must have affected world-history on a very large scale. In any list of the world's greatest men he must, whether we judge by intrinsic qualities or by depth and range of

influence, be placed without hesitation in the foremost rank.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Since the present lecture is not concerned, save incidentally, with the Pauline Theology (as I still venture to call it), nor with the problems of the Higher Criticism of the Epistles, these subjects are excluded from the list which follows. Articles in periodicals are also omitted.

In Dictionaries and Encyclopædias: Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible* (G. G. Findlay); Hastings, *One-Volume Dictionary of the Bible* (A. J. Maclean); *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (A. Menzies and W. Edie); *Encyclopædia Biblica* (E. Hatch with regrettable additions by W. C. van Manen); *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* (J. Stalker); *A New Standard Bible Dictionary* (J. Denney and A. E. Garvie); *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th edition (J. V. Bartlet); Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyclopædie für Theologie und Kirche* (T. Zahn); *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1st ed. W. Bousset; the 2nd ed. of this dictionary is coming out in parts and it is still in its early stages).

Of Histories of the Apostolic Age and kindred works the following may be mentioned: C. Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, 1886, Eng. transl. *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, 1894-95; A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897; J. V. Bartlet, *The Apostolic Age*, 1900; O. Pfeiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, 2nd ed. 1902, Eng. transl. *Primitive Christianity*, 1906-11 (Vol. I. of the translation is wholly occupied with Paul); P. Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, 2nd ed. 1904, Eng. transl. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1903-04; E. von Dobschütz, *Die urchristlichen Gemeinden*, 1902, Eng. transl. *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, 1904; P. Wendland, *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, 2nd ed. 1912, and *Die urchristlichen Literaturformen*, 2nd ed. 1912 (both in Leitzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*); H. Achelis, *Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1913; J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, 1913-17; R. Knopf *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, 2nd ed. edited and expanded by H. Weinel and H. Lietzmann, 1923; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Vol. III., 1923.

T. Lewin, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1851; W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1852; F. W. Farrar, *The Life and Work of Saint Paul*, 1879; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895; *Pauline and other Studies in Early Christian History*, 1906; *The Cities of St. Paul, their Influence on his Life and Thought*, 1907; *The Teaching of St. Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, 1913; A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, 1896; C. Clemen, *Paulus, sein Leben und Wirken*, 1904; B. W. Bacon, *The Story of St. Paul*, 1905; H. Weinel, *Paulus*, 2nd ed. 1915, Eng. transl. from 1st ed. *St. Paul, the Man and his Work*, 1906; W. Wrede, *Paulus*, 1905, Eng. transl. *Paul*, 1907; E. Schwartz, *Antike Charakterköpfe*, Zweite Reihe, 2nd ed., 1911; A. Deissmann, *Paulus: Eine Kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze*, 1st ed., 1911, Eng. transl. by L. R. M. Strachan, 1912, 2nd ed., 1925, Eng. transl. by W. E. Wilson, 1926; *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*; A. H. McNeile, *St. Paul, His Life, Letters and Christian Doctrine*, 1920; D. Smith, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul*, 1920; T. R. Glover, *Paul of Tarsus*, 1925; W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, 1925; C. T. Wood, *The Life, Letters and Religion of St. Paul*, 1925; E. von Dobschütz, *Der Apostel Paulus: I. Seine weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung*, 1926; P. Feine, *Der Apostel Paulus*, 1927; F. J. Foakes Jackson, *The Life of St. Paul*, 1927.

PAUL AND THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS.¹

THE Christian religion grew out of Judaism. Its Founder was a Jew who was conscious that the unique Divine revelation which had been given to Israel was destined to culminate in Himself. Though He was far from sharing the ideals and hopes of the Jewish Messianic belief, He did identify Himself with the Messiah.² The Old Testament was for Him Holy Scripture. The God of Israel was the one true God. But within a very brief time not only had the religion passed beyond the bounds of Palestine and spread among the Jews of the Dispersion, but it had gained great success among the Gentiles. And these Gentiles were not required to become proselytes, to accept the yoke of the Jewish Law and submit to its indispensable ceremony of initiation. When we remember the tenacity with which the Jews held to the Law and circumcision, we shall realise that such a development calls for explanation. Our records show that while the emancipation of Christianity from Judaism was effected

¹ An amplification of the lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library, the 14th Nov., 1928, included in which is a note on the Apostolic Decree, previously published in the *Holburn Review*. First printed in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 13, 1929.

² On this see *The Messiah and the Son of Man*, pp. 194-237.

more rapidly than we might have anticipated, it was at the cost of not a little internal friction. Presumably the new religion would in any case have finally achieved its detachment from Judaism ; but that its independence was gained so quickly and so decisively was due pre-eminently to the Apostle Paul.

But the reconstruction of the stages through which the movement passed is a matter of exceptional difficulty. The problems are created by critical questions touching our documentary sources, by grave doubts as to text and interpretation, by the difficulty of attaining certainty as to chronological sequence, and by the adjustment of our different sources of information to each other. Our chief sources of knowledge are the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Galatians ; but other epistles of Paul have been drawn into the controversy and other New Testament books, especially the Book of Revelation. At one time the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions played a considerable part in the debate.¹

The issue had arisen to some extent before the conversion of Paul. It is not unlikely that the dispute between the

¹ I have not thought it necessary to discuss either the Revelation of John or the Clementine literature. These were prominent in the Tübingen theory ; but the view that the Apostle John attacked Paul in the former has long been obsolete ; while the Clementine literature is later than Baur thought, and of little, if any, value for estimating the relations between the original apostles and Paul. E. Meyer denies that at any point in it Simon is the mask of Paul (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, III. pp. 301 f.); but I have always felt it difficult to deny that Paul was in the author's mind in the nineteenth chapter of the Seventeenth Book of the Homilies.

Hebrews and the Hellenists, that is the Aramaic- and the Greek-speaking members of the Church, went deeper than the mere neglect of the widows of the latter section in the administration of the charitable fund. This may well have been the point on which the difference came to a head; but it is probable that there was a tendency to liberalism on the part of the Hellenists which seemed dangerous to the narrower Hebrew Christians. No schism resulted; but it is possible that, while the relations between the two sections remained cordial, they may have thought it wisest to hold separate meetings. It is noteworthy that though the Seven were appointed to administer relief, the two of whom further information is preserved to us—Stephen and Philip—were specially noteworthy for their aggressive evangelism. Stephen defended the Christian case in the Hellenist synagogues of Jerusalem. His propaganda provoked an opposition much more serious than that with which the apostles had been confronted. This culminated in the trial and death of Stephen and a persecution which scattered the Hellenists, while it left the apostles and presumably their section of the Church untouched.¹ It seems to follow from this that there was an element in the preaching of Stephen which was recognised to be more inimical to the fundamental principles

¹ The statement that all were scattered except the apostles is scarcely credible if rigidly pressed. If the persecution was directed against the Church generally, the ringleaders of the movement would not have been left unmolested. If the apostles remained undisturbed, their immediate adherents would presumably have been free to remain. The apostles may have gone into hiding, but this would be equally possible for others.

of Judaism than that of the apostles. The withdrawal of the Hellenists, who were apparently the more liberal wing, would strengthen the reactionary element in the community at Jerusalem.

It is often supposed that Stephen had largely anticipated the position reached by Paul; it has indeed been asserted that he had gone beyond it.¹ This seems to me much exaggerated. We are not entitled to build without caution on the testimony of the "false witnesses." There was, no doubt, a large element of truth in their indictment; but no device of controversialists is more familiar than to saddle an opponent not only with the opinions which he has himself expressed but with

¹ So especially W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*. Stephen's speech "amounts to the doctrine that Our Lord has revealed that both the Law and the Temple were from the outset false developments." His system "would have justified a much more serious accusation." His speech is "entirely non-Pauline in its view of the O.T." He went to "lengths which the Christian Church has never upheld" (p. 51). "The whole implication of S. Stephen's speech is that the historical development has been entirely false." This is only to be paralleled in the Epistle of Barnabas. His method involves "a completely arbitrary selection of certain passages in the O.T., and a radically false interpretation of them;" logically it leads to a Marcionite distinction between the God of the O.T. and the God of the N.T. (p. 54). The author charges him with "daring perversion of the O.T." (p. 55).

I was glad to find in reading Wellhausen's *Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte* (1914) that he confirmed the view I had long taken, as to the significance of the speech on this point. His conclusion is, "He seems accordingly to have been radical in his attitude to the Temple of Solomon, and conservative in his attitude to the Mosaic Law" (p. 13). It is immaterial for our purpose that he rejected the authenticity of the speech.

inferences which seem to them to follow, though no part of his own case and perhaps explicitly disowned by him. We have no report of Stephen's utterances in the synagogues, and are therefore driven back on the speech he is said to have made in his defence. In spite of the scepticism often expressed, I believe that it faithfully indicates the general line which he took. The speech is no random collection of incidents from Hebrew history but a skilfully selected series of episodes designed to bring out the ingrained rebelliousness of the people, but also the connexion of Divine revelation and action with places outside Jerusalem and the Holy Land. The Law is scarcely touched upon ; no hostility is expressed towards it nor any anticipation of its abolition. Stephen does not go substantially beyond the position taken by Jeremiah, Micah, and the author of Isa. lxvi. 1. Jesus Himself had been charged at His Trial on a similar count so far as the Temple was concerned, though probably His language was garbled by the witnesses.¹

¹ A saying of this kind was probably uttered by Jesus, but it has to be reconstructed from the varying forms. Probably Jn. ii. 19 is more correct in giving the imperative "Destroy" than the prediction "I will destroy." It was this vital change which made the testimony of the witnesses false. But their version is to be preferred in the substitution of "another" and the addition of "made with hands" and "not made with hands" (Mk. xiv. 58). The meaning is, "Destroy this temple by continuing to desecrate it more and more and in its place I will rear another temple, spiritual and immaterial." The statement "But he spake of the temple of his body" (Jn. ii. 21) can hardly give the original significance. This reference did not occur to the Jews (v. 20) nor to the disciples till after the resurrection (v. 22). "Made with hands" is inappropriate to the body (it is, of course,

But in any case He had predicted that of the massive Temple masonry not one stone should be left upon another.

Stephen's colleague, Philip, is known to us chiefly for his mission to the Samaritans and his encounter with Simon. Though the Jews hated the Samaritans and denied the legitimacy of their sanctuary, they could not regard them just as uncircumcised heathen. The Samaritans accepted the rite of initiation into the Covenant and regarded the Law as binding. Hence their admission to baptism involved no breach of principle on the part of Philip. Peter endorses the work and bestows the gift of the Holy Spirit on those who had been previously baptised.

A further step was taken by some of those who had been driven from Jerusalem by the persecution which followed the death of Stephen. According to the generally accepted text¹ some of these, natives of

omitted by John); and unless Jesus pointed to His body, His words could in themselves and in this situation refer only to the actual Temple; while if He had pointed to it there would have been no doubt as to His meaning.

¹The best attested text in Acts xi. 20 reads Ἑλληνιστᾶς "Hellenists" (R.V. mg. "Grecian Jews"), and this is accepted by Westcott and Hort, Von Soden and Ropes, but the great majority prefer Ἕλληνας, "Greeks." Loisy thinks that Luke wrote this but that the redactor altered it. The context seems to require a contrast to the action of the missionaries recorded in v. 19, "speaking the word to none save only to the Jews." This is not provided if those mentioned in v. 20 were also Jews. Ropes suggests that the rare word means "Greek-speaking persons" who may be non-Jews. "The specific meaning 'Greek-speaking Jews' belongs to the word only where that is clearly indicated

Cyprus and Cyrene, when they reached Antioch made a large number of converts from the Gentiles. The report of this reached Jerusalem and Barnabas was sent to investigate. He was gladdened by what he saw, participated with great success in the work, and then went to Tarsus to enlist the co-operation of Paul.

The remaining case was that of Cornelius. He was a devout Gentile, a "God-fearer" eminent for prayer and almsgiving. In consequence of a vision he sent for Peter who had also been instructed through a vision to visit him, waiving the scruples he would naturally have felt at doing so. While he is preaching to Cornelius and his friends, they receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost and speak with tongues. Peter feels warranted by this to baptise him, and when his conduct is criticised by the Apostles and brethren at Jerusalem they recognise that the gift of the Holy Ghost was sufficient justification for what he had done. It must be remembered with reference to this and other incidents that their chronological sequence is open to doubt because the author has

by the context, as is certainly not the case here" (*The Text of Acts*, p. 106, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I., Vol. III.). But the contrast with "Jews" in *v.* 19 suggests that the term in *v.* 20 carries with it an explicit racial connotation, and does not merely indicate a difference in the language spoken. Even in Jerusalem this distinction had existed from a very early period and Luke expresses it by the terms "Hebrews" and "Hellenists." That he should have used "Hellenists" in this sense in *vi.* 1 makes it unlikely that he would have used it in *xi.* 20 to mean "Gentiles" in contrast to "Jews." A decisive new departure is made at this point; an unambiguous term is required to make this clear.

to follow several distinct strands in this part of his story.¹

The impression which is made on us by the story is that the Church at Jerusalem was very narrow in its outlook ; and this narrowness was presumably intensified when the expulsion of the Hellenistic section took place. It must be remembered, however, that the apostles had been with Jesus, they had listened to His teaching and observed His practice. They remembered vividly His controversies with the Pharisees and had heard Him uttering far-reaching principles. But they were slow in drawing the legitimate inferences. It was, nevertheless, very helpful to their progress if they could see that a step which contravened their prejudices could be justified by the precept or example of their Master.

When Paul became a Christian he did not return to Jerusalem for some three years and apparently did so only because Damascus was no longer safe for him. He took the opportunity, however, to visit Peter with

¹ It is possible that the incidents in the career of Peter (Aeneas, Dorcas, Cornelius) related in Acts ix. 32-xi. 18 followed rather than preceded his imprisonment by Herod and release from impending execution. Some, including E. Meyer (*op. cit.*, pp. 169 f., 196), place the conference at Jerusalem recorded in Acts xv. before the missionary tour of Barnabas and Paul recorded in Acts xiii. f. The crucial problem of the identification of Paul's visits to Jerusalem as recorded in Acts and Galatians is notorious, and will call for discussion below. It has even been argued that Peter's visit to Antioch (Gal. ii. 11) should be dated before Paul's visit to Jerusalem recorded in ii. 1. The problem is further complicated by the uncertainty as to the date of Galatians, which is to some extent bound up with the question as to the locality of the Churches addressed in that Epistle.

whom he stayed for a fortnight. He saw no other member of the Twelve ; but he saw James, the brother of Jesus, who was to play so important a part in the later development. From his own account we should infer that he had but little contact with the Church in Jerusalem. This was probably the case, though the historian indicates that he saw several apostles, mingled with the brethren and disputed with the Hellenists.¹ After a brief stay he went to Tarsus and carried on his work in Cilicia, his native country, and Syria. Barnabas brought him from Tarsus to Antioch where they began a period of fruitful collaboration.

The Acts of the Apostles proceeds to tell us that Barnabas and Paul were sent to Jerusalem with money collected to relieve the poor Christians of the mother Church in a famine predicted at Antioch by Agabus, a prophet from Jerusalem. Whether Paul mentions this visit or not in Galatians is a subject of keen controversy. The next visit after his stay with Peter which he

¹Jerusalem would not be the safest place for Paul to visit after he had not merely failed to fulfil his commission from the High Priest but had gone over to the Christians. The account in Galatians suggests that Paul avoided contact even with his fellow-Christians in Jerusalem, apart from James and Peter, not to speak of the Jews. We should naturally infer from it that he remained in Jerusalem only a fortnight ; but his visit to Peter may have been terminated by Peter's departure from Jerusalem (so W. L. Knox, *op. cit.* pp. 103, 121 f.), but this is not the natural impression the passage makes in itself. It would make it easier to reconcile Paul's statement with the account in Acts or at least to reduce the discrepancy. But the moral of the discrepancy ought not to be forgotten when we are considering the identification of the later visits.

mentions in Galatians is that recorded in Gal. ii. 1-10. The generally accepted view has been that this visit is to be identified not with the Famine Visit of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, but with that of Acts xv. 1-30. This view had been challenged by some earlier scholars ; but the opposition to it has increased during the last thirty years. The argument which several scholars regard as decisive is that the case for his independence necessitated the mention of every visit to Jerusalem down to that recorded in Gal. ii. 1-10. If this visit is identified with that in Acts xv. it is urged that Paul would have been disingenuous in omitting the visit in Acts xi.¹ If we assume that in Gal. ii. 1-10 Paul is still arguing for the independence of his Gospel, this objection to the identification of the visit in Gal. ii. with the visit in Acts xv.

¹ So (very emphatically) W. L. Knox : " Either we have different incidents or two contradictory accounts of the same incident, one of which is either utterly inaccurate or else deliberately falsified. S. Paul insists that he only consulted the leaders of the Church while S. Luke insists that the whole body was consulted. . . . The identification of the visit of Gal. ii. with the Council of Jerusalem is really fatal to S. Luke's accuracy. It also involves S. Paul in deliberate perjury, since Gal. i. 20 is entirely unjustifiable if S. Paul is in fact suppressing all mention of a visit to Jerusalem at the time of the famine" (*op. cit.*, p. 188). But where does Paul insist that he consulted the leaders only? A few scholars, it is true, think that his language favours this. But most commentators on Galatians think that a private and a public consultation are implied, so e.g. Loisy, " Paul indicates two kinds of conference, (one) with a larger group, the whole community or the elders of this community, and (another) with a more restricted group, i.e. James, Cephas, and John" (*L'Épître aux Galates*, p. 164). On the reasons for this distinction, see Burton, *Galatians*, p. 71.

is undeniably cogent. But that it is conclusive is not at all so certain. For the inference may be evaded in various ways. It is quite possible that the apostles were one and all absent from Jerusalem at the time of the Famine Visit. It may be significant that the narrative in Acts says nothing of the apostles but simply mentions the elders (xi. 30). Or it is quite possible, though it may be improbable, that in view of its purpose Paul ignored this visit as irrelevant to his argument. It is also quite conceivable that the Famine Visit is to be identified with that in Acts xv., if Luke drew the accounts from different sources and erroneously supposed that two distinct visits were intended.

But is the assumption that in Gal. ii. 1-10 Paul is still demonstrating his independence of the apostles so certain as is commonly assumed? I have long felt great doubt on this point. After all Paul had spent fifteen days with Peter on his first visit, and it seems as if any argument for the independence of his teaching based on prolonged absence from Jerusalem after that date would be of little value. For in a fortnight there was ample time for Paul to learn everything that Peter had to teach him. If, then, the proof of the independence of his Gospel based on avoidance of contact with the apostles closed with Gal. i. there was no need for a complete enumeration of subsequent visits to Jerusalem, and the chief argument for the identification of Gal. ii. 1-10 with the Famine Visit disappears. And scrutinised more narrowly the Famine Visit seems not to satisfy the conditions. It is true that Paul mentions a private conference with "those of repute,"

presumably James, the Lord's brother, Peter, and John. And if this had been all, Luke might very well have omitted it in his account of the Famine Visit. But Paul's language implies that in addition to the private conference there was a discussion in which the Church generally was involved. There was obviously a heated controversy which centred upon the person of Titus,¹ and the demand was pressed upon Paul that he should be circumcised.² Moreover, Paul asserts that he went up by revelation to lay his Gospel of freedom before the authorities at

¹ I assume that the usual view is correct that the struggle about Titus took place at Jerusalem. F. Rendall, however, argues that it took place at Antioch (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. III., pp. 143-158). He thinks the aorist answers to the English pluperfect, "Howbeit even Titus who was with me had not been compelled to be circumcised." He regards this sentence as simply parenthetical. The reference to the false brethren in Gal. ii. 4 is then taken as a continuation of *vv.* 1 f., which asserts that it was on account of the mischievous activities of the false brethren at Antioch that Paul went up to Jerusalem. In *v.* 5 he proceeds to state that to these agitators neither he nor Barnabas had made the slightest concession at Antioch. In so desperately difficult a passage as this all suggestions should be welcomed; but, so far as I have observed, the view that the reference to the case of Titus is to a conflict at Antioch has met with no acceptance.

² It is not decisive against the identification with the Famine Visit, but it is at least an objection, that the occasion was not very suitable for raising a controversy as to the circumcision of Titus. Nor is it probable that on a mission of philanthropy Paul should deliberately have taken an uncircumcised Gentile to Jerusalem, and by this gratuitous challenge thrown the apple of discord into the Church. When the object of the deputation was to discuss the relation of the Gentiles to circumcision and the Law, as in Acts xv., it was perfectly appropriate to bring the issue out sharply by presenting it in a concrete case.

Jerusalem ; whereas on the Famine Visit he and Barnabas were deputies appointed by the Church to carry alms to Jerusalem.¹

On the other hand the identification of the visit in Gal. ii. 1-10 with that of Acts xv. is favoured by a comparison of the two narratives, if we remember that Paul is writing with the inside knowledge of one who had been a party to the discussion and who was stating his own position as he saw it, while Luke describes the events as they appeared to the community in general. Paul is not concerned with the general assembly of the Church, though his language seems to imply that the larger body met ; much more important to him is the private conference at which the leaders of the mother Church recognised the vocation of himself and Barnabas and delimited their spheres of work. There is no inconsistency between the statement of Paul that he went up by revelation and of Acts that he and Barnabas were sent as a deputation by the Church. In this case the vision and the action of the Church were concerned with the same problem. And a revelation to Paul may well have accompanied the decision of the Church. The Famine Visit, accordingly, if it is to be distinguished from

¹ In itself there is, of course, no reason why Paul should not have taken the opportunity of a philanthropic mission to discuss the Gentiles and the Law with the three leaders. But Paul's language implies that this was the primary object of his visit, and that it was undertaken in consequence of a revelation. There is no difficulty in combining this with Acts xv. 2, but assuredly it was not the primary object of the visit recorded in Acts xi.

that in Acts xv.,¹ is irrelevant to our discussion. We are simply concerned with the visit at which the so-called Apostolic Council was held. It must be conceded that Paul, in perfect good faith, is telling the story from his own point of view, and that if we had had the account of Peter or James the impression of the incidents and the discussion might be modified. But be this as it may, it would be perilous to use the narrative in the Acts to discredit, or even to modify, the account given by Paul. Luke had no first-hand knowledge of the facts but was dependent on what information he could collect when in Palestine; and as a Gentile he was less qualified to grasp the full significance of the events than a Jew would have been. Moreover, Paul's narrative, though written down later, seems to have been composed with a very vivid recollection of his feelings at the time. He lives through those painful hours once more while he puts the record of them on paper.

The allusiveness of the language is perhaps best explained on the hypothesis that he had already told the story to his readers. But whether this is the true explanation or not, the story is told in such a way that the

¹ In order not to complicate the discussion unduly I refrain from discussing this point. What is vital in the view I am taking is that the visit recorded in Gal. ii. 1-10 is identical with that recorded in Acts xv. It would mitigate some difficulties if this were identified with the Famine Visit. In that case it would perhaps be preferable to accept the date given in Acts xi. But there are real difficulties about the identification, and if we reject it we must either deny the historicity of the Famine Visit, or recognise that Paul paid two distinct visits to Jerusalem, each for a distinct purpose.

action taken on the test case cannot be determined with certainty. Paul tells us that he took Titus with him. The suggestion seems to be that he selected him deliberately as an illustration of the results of his work and as a challenge to the Judaisers. He must have known perfectly well that a demand for the circumcision of Titus would be made as a condition of his admission to the fellowship. He must have deliberately intended the consequences of his act and determined to force the issue on a concrete case. If so, it is incredible that he should have surrendered the ground he had deliberately chosen or that he should have compromised his crucial principle by yielding on the individual case. It is well known, however, that some eminent scholars have argued that at this point Paul did yield to the pressure put upon him and consented to the circumcision of Titus.¹ But the

¹I may mention specially J. Weiss (*Das Urchristentum*, pp. 202-204), W. L. Knox, and F. C. Burkitt among recent scholars who have inclined to this view. W. L. Knox thinks that Paul and Barnabas made a somewhat serious error in underestimating the influence wielded by the Judaisers at Jerusalem, when they took Titus with them (p. 181). That he was not circumcised was known to the rulers of the Church but had not been made generally public. The author's reconstruction of what follows is admittedly "largely based on conjecture"; others will regard it as largely fanciful, like some other hypotheses in this elaborate and ingenious work. Some members became suspicious and discovered the truth in what Paul felt to be a grossly dishonourable way. A vigorous demand was made that Titus should be circumcised. Paul opposed it with equal vigour. To his disgust the autocratic Paul found that the Jerusalem leaders could not control their own followers. He had no choice but to submit and allow Titus to be circumcised that the unity of the society might be preserved. He was filled with the

better attested text is entirely unfavourable to this, and to wring this meaning out of it would require a very unnatural interpretation of some of the expressions employed.¹ Those who adopt this view suppose that since Paul had won his case on the validity of his Gospel, it was urged by the apostles, who were with him in principle, that a graceful concession might be made in the individual instance. But it was precisely this concession which he could not afford to make. And if he had made it, it would have been very much more difficult for him to have so vehemently insisted that for the Galatians to

deepest indignation at this defeat; and the ineffectiveness of the leaders "considerably diminished his respect" for them. Mr. Knox admits that the opposite interpretation is not impossible (pp. 182, 189 f.). Prof. Burkitt, referring to "the circumcision of Titus by Paul," adds in striking language, "for who can doubt that it was the knife which really did circumcise Titus that has cut the syntax of Gal. ii. 3-5 to pieces?" (*Christian Beginnings*, p. 118). The thought is that the incoherence of Paul's language is due to the bitter humiliation he felt as he remembered the concession which had been wrung from him. The great majority of scholars do doubt this account of it, and suggest other explanations. And naturally we must give proper weight to Paul's actual statements, which cannot without violence be accommodated to the view that Titus was circumcised.

¹ Eminent scholars, such as Klostermann and J. Weiss (Zahn also but with a curious interpretation) accept the text which omits the relative pronoun and the negative (*οἷς οὐδὲ*) getting the sense "we yielded." But the text without this omission is preferable. Those who accept it but hold that Titus was circumcised explain it to mean, We yielded, but not in the way of subjection, we freely made a gracious concession. And similarly the unambiguous phrase, as the unsophisticated reader would feel it to be, "But not even Titus . . . was compelled to be circumcised" has to be strained to mean, Titus was circumcised, but not by any compulsion.

submit to circumcision would be to forfeit their Christian freedom from the Law.

Paul's narrative accordingly may be interpreted in this way. He and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem fourteen years after his previous visit. Paul had chosen Titus, an uncircumcised Greek, to accompany them. The impulse for the journey, so far as he himself was concerned, was supplied by a revelation. Its object was to secure both his previous and his future mission from the risk of failure. By this he does not mean that he had any misgivings as to the truth of his gospel or thought that his seniors could correct any mistaken view which he might hold.¹ He was indeed so certain of its truth that he pronounced an anathema on anyone who would preach another Gospel, even though it were a being so august as an archangel from heaven. But he was well aware how disastrous might be the consequences for his mission if a different form of the Gospel should be preached in the Gentile world with the prestige of the original apostles attaching to it. Had he failed to win them to his side he would no doubt have continued his apostolic labours, even if his unyielding

¹ Paul's words are "Lest I should run or had run in vain" (Gal. ii. 2). Mr. Knox says, "Gal. ii. 2 appears to mean that S. Paul would have been ready to change his attitude on this question if the older apostles could have shown that it was contrary to the teaching of Our Lord" (p. 189); also "Saul offered to revise his system, if it could be shown that it was contrary to that revealed by the Founder of the Church" (p. 182). All we know of Paul seems to me to rule out the idea that he would have admitted that his Gospel stood, or could stand, in need of revision.

attitude had cost him the comradeship of the more conciliatory and pliable Barnabas. But he realised how much he would be hampered if the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem, the apostles who beyond all others might be expected to know the mind of their Master, had thrown the weight of their influence against his presentation of Christianity. The situation called for very tactful handling. A larger meeting would have to settle the question; but to have thrown the whole question open in such an assembly without a previous consultation with the leaders would have been the height of folly.¹ Paul accordingly expounded his gospel to "those of repute," that is presumably to Peter, John, and James the Lord's brother. His contribution to their theological education led to no corresponding enrichment of his gospel by them.² They recognised that his success was a token of Divine grace and approval and gave to him and to Barnabas the right hand of fellowship with a general delimitation of spheres of influence. Paul and Barnabas were to take the Gentile world for their province, while the leaders on the other side were to work among the Jews. One request of a practical

¹ Some experience in the conduct of delicate negotiations might perhaps have saved some too academic interpreters from finding discrepancies where they do not exist.

² The words rendered in the R.V. "imparted nothing to me" (ii. 6) have been much discussed (see Burton's note for possible meanings). The compound verb seems to echo the simple verb in ii. 2, "I laid before them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles." Paul seems to mean that the leaders had no corresponding contribution of their own to make.

nature they made, that Paul and Barnabas should continue their philanthropic efforts for the poor saints at Jerusalem.¹ During this time, presumably, the Judaisers were agitating for the circumcision of Titus. Paul's language implies that very great pressure was put upon him. It is not unlikely that the authorities at Jerusalem pressed him to yield the point. In things

¹ Hans Achelis, whose discussion of the negotiations seems to me generally excellent, compares the collection for the poor with the Temple tax paid by Jews in the Dispersion. This would involve a recognition that the Christians in the Gentile mission were subordinate to James and the College of the Twelve Apostles. From this there followed the right of visitation of the Pauline Churches (*Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1912, pp. 47-49). This, I think, makes far too much of what was essentially a spontaneous expression of Christian philanthropy and brotherly love. The initiative in this had originally been taken by the Church of Antioch. It does not seem to have been a response to a claim that assistance to the mother Church might be rightfully demanded. The Apostles know from experience the sympathetic interest of Paul and Barnabas and the Church at Antioch, and they appeal that their help may be continued. The point is of importance for the general situation. Achelis says that this subordination "was the price Paul paid; he accepted external dependence for internal freedom" (p. 47). But, he continues, not only did the concordat suffer from internal obscurities; it meant different things to the two contracting groups, and each emphasised the point on which it had got its way—Paul the internal independence of his mission, the tribute being just an external concession, Peter and James the attachment of the Pauline mission to Jerusalem and the acknowledgment of the primacy of the mother Church. K. L. Schmidt in his contribution to the *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann* (1927), pp. 305-307, also puts the collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem on a similar basis to the Temple tax, and thinks that the apostles felt themselves entitled to require it. He also discusses the scene at Antioch between Peter and Paul (pp. 307-309).

indifferent his temperament was conciliatory ; but where principle was involved he was adamant. The result was a victory all along the line, though even after a long interval he cannot write without betraying a hot resentment at the tactics of his opponents and some resentment, not untouched I think with scorn, for the attitude of the Jerusalem leaders. It is the combination of these emotions which largely accounts for the broken and indeed incoherent style in the middle of the passage.

When we turn to the account in the Acts of the Apostles we read that Paul and Barnabas with their company were received by the Church, the apostles and the elders and related "all things that God had done with them." Certain Christian Pharisees then insisted that the converts must be circumcised and instructed to keep the Law. The apostles and elders met to discuss the matter and after considerable debate Peter recalled the incident of Cornelius in which he had been chosen to announce the Gospel to the Gentiles. On that occasion God made no distinction between Jew and Gentile but cleansed their heart by faith. Why then, with that experience before them, should they tempt God by imposing a yoke on the disciples which they had themselves found too heavy to bear ? For Jew as well as Gentile must be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus. Peter's intervention secured a quiet hearing for Paul and Barnabas, who tactfully refrained from discussing the principle at stake and limited themselves to a recital of the signs and wonders wrought by God through them among the Gentiles. After this impressive

demonstration that the Divine approval rested on their work, James pronounces the decision at which he thought the meeting should arrive. He recalls the incident of Cornelius, and quotes the Old Testament to show that the prophets had foretold the calling of the Gentiles. His judgment on the immediate problem is that they should not impose vexatious restrictions upon the Gentiles but enjoin them to abstain from pollutions of idols, from fornication, from what is strangled, and from blood. This meets with the approval of the apostles, the elders and the whole Church, and a letter is drafted to be sent to the Gentile Christians in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. In this letter they disown the action of those who had troubled the Church at Antioch, and explain that they had given them no such instructions. They have accordingly determined to send a deputation to accompany "our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." These representatives, Judas and Silas, will give them oral confirmation of the contents of the letter. The instructions themselves follow in these terms: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves it shall be well with you."

It is not to be wondered at that this account has occasioned much discussion. No objection can properly be taken to the arrangement for the debate itself. It

was obviously best that the controversial side of it should be restricted to the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem. Barnabas and Paul, and the latter especially, might easily have aroused resentment if they had dealt with the merits of the question; the most effective contribution they could make was to enumerate the striking tokens of Divine approval by which their mission had been endorsed. And it was well that the final word should rest with James. If the decision was to be on the side of liberty it was appropriate that it should be suggested by the leader who could least be suspected of a tendency to undue liberalism. Yet the debate itself has aroused considerable discussion. Peter, it is said, stands entirely on Pauline ground, and if he had reached so clear an understanding of the crucial issues his subsequent attitude at Antioch leaves a stain upon his character. This is better left over till a later point.

The question as to the decree and the four prohibitions is one of the most tangled problems in the history of the early Church. There is in the first place a serious variation of text. According to the generally accepted text we have apparently three food prohibitions combined with one ethical. But there are very early and important witnesses which omit the reference to "things strangled." If this text is correct it is still possible to suppose that, apart from the ethical, we have two food prohibitions. But the removal of "things strangled" makes it possible to take all three as ethical, that is as prohibitions of idolatry, murder and impurity. Most of the authorities which make the omission read the Golden Rule in its

negative form, "and whatsoever ye do not wish to happen to yourselves not to do to another," and after "ye shall do well" continue "being borne along by the Holy Spirit." Gotthold Resch, in 1905, published a very thorough investigation¹ in which he reached the result that the text which omitted "things strangled" and added the Golden Rule in its negative form was original. In this he had been anticipated by Hilgenfeld. This form is commonly spoken of as the Western Text. Harnack, who in 1899 had argued elaborately for the text with four prohibitions and without the Golden Rule (commonly called the Eastern Text), changed his view as a result of Resch's arguments, except that he took the Golden Rule to be a later insertion. In spite of some support, the verdict on Harnack's conclusion has been generally unfavourable. His arguments are given in his *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 193-196 (*The Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 255-259). They may be summarised as follow:—

(1) Elsewhere in sections dealing with the Gentile-Christian controversy Luke makes no reference to prohibited meats, but only to questions of capital importance, circumcision and the Law as a whole. (2) The combination of the prohibition of meats with that of fornication is unintelligible, not so that of idolatry, fornication, murder. (3) Food prohibitions form part of the Law, but it has just been said (xv. 19 f.) that nothing of the Law was to be imposed. Ethical prohibitions, it is true, were also in the Mosaic Law, but they were recognised as a part of

¹ *Das Aposteldekret nach seinen ausserkanonischen Textgestalt.*

the universal moral Law. (4) Why should just these abstinences from forms of food be regarded as essential, and the necessary condition of their doing well? This suits moral precepts. (5) "Things sacrificed to idols" is defined by xv. 20 where we read of "the pollutions of idols"; the reference is therefore to idolatry in general, and in xv. 29 the part is put for the whole. Participation in idol feasts is singled out for special mention as the crassest form of idolatry. (6) The prohibition of murder is not strange and superfluous, for the combination of the three elements depends formally on the Decalogue and the Two Ways; moreover, there were refined forms of murder (exposure of children, infanticide, abortion, murder of slaves), and Jewish teaching held that murder included every injury to the life of one's neighbour, cf. 1 Peter iv. 15, 1 John iii. 15, Rev. xxii. 15, Jas. iv. 2. Irenaeus says that the heathen needed to be taught the very rudiments of morality. (7) No law against partaking of blood is to be found in the earliest Christian documents before the Epistle from Lugdunum. This Epistle is not based on the Apostolic Decree which was in that part of the world regarded as a code of ethical precepts. (8) The whole Western Church understood the decree as an ethical rule, even those who (like Tertullian) regarded the prohibition of blood and things strangled as binding.

There are, however, weighty arguments in favour of the generally accepted text. Resch is probably wrong in accepting the Golden Rule in its negative form as part of the original text. For it is introduced in the most awkward way possible between the relative pronoun and

its antecedents. But if the Western text as generally attested (though Tertullian omits the Golden Rule) is wrong in its addition, it lies under suspicion of being wrong in its omission. For the two hang together; and although they may have originated separately, the more natural view is that both are connected with the attempt to change ritual into ethical prohibitions.

Further, in spite of what Harnack says, it can scarcely appear as other than extraordinary that the Gentile disciples should be told that nothing more would be required from them than to abstain from idolatry, murder and fornication. The reference to murder in particular is difficult to accept. It is hardly credible that it should be necessary to prohibit this in Christian Churches!

Moreover, it is hard to explain why the reference to "things strangled" was added if it was absent from the original text. It is much easier to think that it was dropped than to imagine the circumstances which would have suggested its insertion. As the conditions radically changed and the Judaistic problem became remote, it was not unnatural to drop the word and add the Golden Rule, and thus make of the decree a universally applicable moral rule; whereas it is not easy to see why a moral should be changed into a ceremonial rule, when the circumstances which had made ceremonial regulations so important had for ever passed away.

The weight of the textual evidence lies on the side of the Eastern Text, though the evidence for the Western Text is undeniably important. It is possible, however, that the original text may have been without "and things

strangled" and "the Golden rule."¹ If so we should still interpret "things sacrificed to idols" and "blood" as food prohibitions and not as standing for idolatry and murder. The vague term "pollutions of idols" ought not to determine the sense to be put upon "things sacrificed to idols." Primarily the decree refers to meats offered to idols, as to which there was far more room for doubt in the Christian community than as to idolatry itself.² To turn from idols to a God of life and reality

¹ So Ropes, *The Text of the Acts (The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I., Vol. III.)*. After his statement and discussion of the textual phenomena he continues: "The history of the text seems to have been as follows. In the East the decree was correctly understood in the second century and later to relate to food, and under the influence of current custom the text was at first expanded by the addition of *καὶ πνικτων*" (p. 269). Other scholars who regard the decree as containing food prohibitions think the reference to "things strangled" is just an explanatory addition to bring out explicitly what was really involved in the prohibition of "blood." So Wellhausen, *Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte*, 1914, p. 28; Preuschen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1912, p. 95. The latter leaves the possibility open that "blood" was added to explain "things strangled"; but in that case we should have expected some trace of the original absence of blood to have been preserved in the textual evidence. But probably neither should be omitted. Loisy says quite rightly that it is only from a theoretical and abstract point of view that the two terms appear as superfluous repetition. While from the point of view of Jewish ritual the prohibition of blood logically involves that of what is strangled, yet from the practical, i.e. the culinary point of view, the distinction is quite justified (*Les Actes des Apôtres*, 1919, p. 587). E. Meyer (p. 187), and Jacquier (*Les Actes des Apôtres*, 1926, p. 458) also retain both terms.

² This is clear from the fact that Paul devotes so much attention to this question in 1 Corinthians. We could not imagine him discussing whether Christians might participate in idolatry.

(1 Thess. i. 9) was among the very first requirements in missionary preaching, and to prohibit idolatry as such was quite superfluous. Further, the sense imposed by Harnack on "blood" is not that which naturally suggests itself. In view of the stress laid by the Jews on the strictest avoidance of any eating of blood, it is much the most obvious view that this is intended here.

We may conclude then that the text with four prohibitions is correct, three of these having definitely to do with forbidden forms of food, and that the difficulty occasioned by the conflict with the account in Galatians cannot be removed by the acceptance of the Western form of the text and interpretation of the prohibitions as ethical.

In Galatians Paul asserts that the "pillar" apostles added nothing to him except the wish that he and Barnabas should remember the poor. Paul would not feel that the demand for abstinence from murder, idolatry and fornication was an additional requirement, since it would be taken for granted by all in charge of Gentile congregations. But the food prohibitions might be so regarded. W. Sanday argues that Paul gave a careless passive consent, "he was indifferent," but "would not stand in the way of an agreement that made for peace." It was addressed to a limited area, and in that area it may well have soon fallen into comparative disuse. It had a temporary success, but soon became a dead letter. "The tide of events ebbed away from it, and it was left on the beach stranded and lifeless—lifeless at least for the larger half of the Church, for that Gentile Church which

soon began to advance by leaps and bounds.”¹ It is difficult to believe that this is the true account. If the prohibitions were laid down and accepted as terms of a concordat, Paul could scarcely have passed them by ; and certainly when the Epistle to the Galatians was written they could hardly have become a dead letter, at least if the account in Acts xxi. 25 is correct. Moreover, according to Acts xvi. 4 the decrees were delivered by Paul and Silas to the Churches of South Galatia to keep ; and these were probably the very Churches to which the Epistle to the Galatians was written. The statement may be incorrect, and certainly is so if the decree is fictitious or if it was enacted at a later time ; but if we are arguing for the historicity of Acts xv. 28 f., we can hardly take the line of assuming that xvi. 4 is incorrect.

Another objection is that if the question had been settled at Jerusalem and on the initiative of James, it is more difficult to understand the situation described in Gal. ii. 11-13. Peter and even Barnabas and indeed all the Jewish Christians except Paul, withdrew from communion with the Gentile Christians at Antioch, and withdrew under pressure of those who came from James. Some avoid this difficulty by placing the incident at Antioch before the Council at Jerusalem. This is a possible solution ; but that Paul should have inverted the chronological order is so contrary to the impression which his narrative makes upon us that I must regard it as

¹ *Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn dargebracht*, 1908, p. 332.

highly improbable.¹ The best line to take in dealing with this difficulty is to argue that the compact at Jerusalem did not really cover the situation which subsequently arose at Antioch. The Jerusalem compact recognised that Gentiles did not need to accept the Law and circumcision in order to be regarded as genuine Christians and members of the Church ; but Jewish Christians were in the same position as before and might argue that, though they did not question the status of the Gentiles in the Church, they would yet compromise their own position by sharing table communion with them.

A further question is raised by Paul's silence with reference to the decree when he dealt with the question of meats offered to idols. His general position was not so much at variance with the decree ; but his silence needs explanation. It may be a sufficient explanation that he did not attach importance to its observance in his own churches, so far away from Jerusalem and under his own control. The letter from the Council was, it must be remembered, addressed simply to the churches of Syria, Cilicia and Antioch.

The fact, however, that these difficulties have to be

¹This was the view of Augustine, and in modern times it has been advocated by Schneckenburger, Zahn and C. H. Turner. It is interesting to compare Sanday's reaction to this suggestion with that of W. L. Knox. The latter brushes it aside contemptuously. It "hardly needs serious discussion" (p. 191). The former says: "I confess that to me this solution is so attractive as to seem almost probable. I certainly do not think that in any case it can be excluded. There is nothing to make the sequence in Galatians stringently a sequence of time" (p. 333).

explained has not unnaturally created a suspicion that no such decree was issued by the Council. This view may take different forms ; the decree may be regarded as one of the redactor's countless fictions (so Loisy), or as historical but misplaced. The natural impression made by xxi. 25 is that the terms of the decree are here communicated to Paul for the first time. In that case the decree is historical ; but made by the authorities at Jerusalem, for the observance of the churches to which it was sent, at some time during the period between the Council and Paul's last visit to Jerusalem. These churches may have been those of Syria and Cilicia. This solution has been adopted by several scholars. It would be easier to accept if the theory of J. Weiss were admitted that only Acts xv. 1-4, 12, relates to the Council held with Paul and Barnabas at Jerusalem, the narrative of which is preserved only in a fragment, while xv. 5-11, 13-33 belongs to another situation.¹ This, however, is a rather drastic expedient and it is perhaps better to recognise that no quite satisfactory solution of the problem has yet been discovered.

The next stage in the development was occasioned by a visit of Peter to Antioch and the subsequent arrival of some Jewish Christians who had been sent by James. It is supposed by some that they arrived in Paul's absence, but there is nothing to indicate this and the natural assumption is that Paul was in Antioch all the

¹ *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 195-197, 235-238. E. Meyer, on the other hand, regards the narrative as a unity and the decree, with four prohibitions, as authentic (pp. 185 ff.).

time. The unity of the Church was not infringed by the separation of the Jewish from the Gentile Christians in their table communion. But the arrival of the emissaries of James changed the situation for the worse. Intimidated by these strict zealots, Peter withdrew from the common meal; and the leaven of his example spread rapidly till even Barnabas caught the infection. Then Paul before the whole Church expostulated with Peter. Peter had obviously been betrayed into inconsistency at Antioch. If his former unfettered fellowship with the Gentile Christians had been legitimate, then he was wrong in breaking off communion with them. The result of such conduct would either be that a split would develop in the Church itself, or that unity would have to be purchased by the submission of the Gentile Christians to circumcision and the Law. So Paul confronts him with the unanswerable question: If you, a born Jew, give up the Law and live like a Gentile, why do you insist that Gentile Christians should accept the Law and live like Jews?

It is important to realise that the question at issue was not that which had been decided at the Council of Jerusalem. At this the Gentiles in the churches addressed had been exempted from circumcision and obedience to the Law. But nothing had been said as to the relation in which the Jewish Christians stood to the Law. In a purely Jewish church the members would go on keeping it. In a purely Gentile church they would be released from obligation to it. But the question had not been considered what course should be followed in a

church with both Jews and Gentiles in its membership. The church at Antioch had solved the question by the abandonment of the scruples which would have prevented complete communion. Peter, who was temperamentally generous and impulsive, and who in principle had been brought into sympathy with Paul's standpoint, had followed his better instincts and shared in the full fellowship mindful, we may believe, of his vision and his visit to Cornelius. His retreat from this liberal attitude may be attributed partly to a deficiency in moral courage, but partly also to the fact that he did not see his way in confronting this new problem with the same clearness as Paul. The exposition of principle which follows (Gal. ii. 15 ff.) is of such uncertain interpretation that it is impossible to discuss it in my space ; but Paul is defending the position that the Christian experience of justification carries with it the renunciation of the Law as necessary to salvation. Judaism confers no advantage, the practice of the Law creates no merit.

It is a singular misfortune that Paul drifts away from the scene at Antioch without telling us how it ended. On this very important question the most divergent views are taken. Presumably his readers were aware how the controversy had ended, just as they knew whether Titus had been circumcised or not, so that inferences from Paul's silence on this point ought not to be too confidently drawn. Forgetful of this, some have argued that his failure to claim victory implies that he had been obliged to own defeat. Some have thought that Peter having no reply to make accepted his colleague's rebuke, or that he

may have been silenced but not convinced. Some suppose that to relieve the situation he and the Judaisers went back to Jerusalem leaving Paul in possession of the field. Loisy believes that Paul found little support for his extreme views and soon abandoned Antioch as his headquarters, striking out now on an independent mission. It was the view of the Tübingen School that the collision created an irreparable breach between Peter and Paul ; and Eduard Meyer, though at many points far removed from the Tübingen position, has revived this view.

There is, indeed, no certain answer to the question whether Peter or Paul remained in possession of the field at Antioch or, indeed, whether the result was inconclusive. It is, however, significant that in the later stages of the controversy between Paul and the Judaisers this issue disappears. We may perhaps infer that victory on this point remained with Paul.

Before passing on to the campaign against Paul conducted by the Judaisers in his own churches, it will be convenient to touch on the question how far Peter was personally engaged in the attack. E. Meyer supposes that Peter took the field against Paul and followed him into his churches.¹ In fact one is reminded of the activity of Peter as depicted in the Clementine literature where he is represented as following Simon Magus to confute his doctrine, expose his character, and neutralise his baneful activities. It is interesting that Meyer, unlike the Tübingen critics who made much of this literature

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 424-426, 432-436, 441 f., 455-459, 464, 493-500.

in their presentation of the case, entirely rejects the view that Simon is at any point to be identified with Paul (pp. 301 f.). He affirms that the passion with which Paul attacks Peter in the Epistle to the Galatians clearly demonstrates that he and no other was the leader of the Judaistic agitation, and that there can be no doubt that Peter himself visited the Galatian churches and resumed the conflict which had originated in Antioch (p. 434). It was the fact that the chief of the apostles led the attack on Paul which accounted for the rapid falling away of the Galatians. So, too, with the Church of Corinth. Meyer has no doubt that Peter visited Corinth, and unquestionably with a swarm of adherents, in order to oppose the false teaching of Paul. It is to him incomprehensible how any one can doubt that Peter came to Corinth (p. 441). Here, too, the battle was fought with embittered passion. The opponents regarded each other not as apostles of Christ but as instruments of Satan (p. 459). Peter was also in Rome during Paul's imprisonment there. When he reached the capital is uncertain, but in all probability he was already there when Paul arrived. The absence of any greeting to him in the Epistle to the Romans or reference to him in Philippians or Colossians proves nothing to the contrary, since their personal relations were of such a character as to forbid all intercourse between them (pp. 497-500).

This reconstruction seems to me most improbable in itself and to rest on extremely slender support. That Peter ever visited the Galatian churches is a hypothesis confirmed by no shred of evidence. Paul's narrative of

the collision at Antioch is amply accounted for by the way in which the Judaists pitted Peter's authority against his own. More, indeed, might be said for the supposition that Peter had visited Corinth. Others have argued for this from the fact that a party called itself by his name, as there were also parties of Paul and of Apollos who had both laboured in that city ; but there is no tangible reason to suppose that the presence of such a party implies that Peter himself had been in Corinth. That Peter was in Rome before his martyrdom is probable ; but that he was there when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans or when he wrote Colossians and Philippians—assuming that they were written from Rome—is most unlikely. Meyer's argument for the opposite view is that in Col. iv. 10 Mark sends greetings, but since Mark was the "interpreter of Peter" his presence in Rome proves the presence of Peter. But really the passage, if used to support Meyer's hypothesis, proves altogether too much. For if Paul and Peter were at daggers drawn, is it conceivable that Mark, Peter's trusted assistant, should have stood in such friendly relations with Paul ? And if Mark was as inseparable from Peter as his shadow, why should he be contemplating a visit to Colossæ and be so warmly recommended to the Colossians ? Was Peter intending to visit Colossæ ?

But apart from the flimsiness of the positive arguments the hypothesis is intrinsically improbable. It would do far too little honour to the character of either apostle to suppose that the scene at Antioch had poisoned their

relations so deeply and irretrievably. We have not the slightest proof that it led to a personal breach between them at all. But that for all the years which remained to them they were animated by such implacable hostility is in itself very difficult to believe. Peter may have been hasty and hot-tempered, but he strikes us as a generous soul, who would not harbour malice and who would be quite ready to admit that he had been in the wrong. All we know of Paul suggests that he too was magnanimous and incapable of nursing a grudge for the rest of a lifetime. And the way in which he refers to Peter in 1 Corinthians does not bear out Meyer's view. So high and unfettered an authority as Weizsäcker says on this point, "Paul never mentions Peter except with the greatest respect" (*Apostolic Age*, Vol. I., p. 328).

Moreover, Paul's relations to the Church at Jerusalem are hard to reconcile with the attitude towards Peter which Meyer attributes to him. He pays one visit to Jerusalem after leaving Greece and salutes the Church (Acts xviii. 22). He organises with great care a collection in his churches for the poor saints of Jerusalem. In spite of prophetic warnings of disaster and his own forebodings, he insists on taking the offering to Jerusalem himself. He is received with gladness by the Christians of Jerusalem and has a friendly interview with James and the elders of the Church. Now these were the men who, even more than Peter, represented the extreme Judaistic tendency among the responsible authorities. James was, in fact, partly responsible for the conduct of Peter which had brought about his collision with Paul.

How are these friendly relations possible with Mark and with James, if for years there had been this bitter feud between Paul and Peter? Moreover, the later references betray no consciousness of this antagonism. Paul and Peter are represented as fellow-labourers and fellow-sufferers who by their combined efforts built up the Church in Rome. We need have no hesitation then in setting aside this theory of irreconcilable antagonism between the two apostles.

We must now return to the developments which followed on the public rebuke to Peter at Antioch. The date of this was presumably in the interval between the return from the council at Jerusalem and Paul's departure with Silas on a fresh missionary tour. For it is scarcely likely to have been later than the rupture between Paul and Barnabas which led to their separation, since it is questionable if they were ever together again at Antioch. The dispute which led to their separation was, we may well suppose, so sharp as it was because Paul had been deeply annoyed by the defection of Barnabas, while Barnabas might not unnaturally resent the public castigation of Peter which affected all who had followed his example. In itself, however, this had not led to an estrangement, since Paul himself proposed that they should revisit their churches and Barnabas consented to do so. But for the difference about Mark the earlier episode would probably have had no permanent results. But this difference, acting on the suppressed irritation with each other, precipitated the rupture. Distressing as the separation was, it was

perhaps all to the good, since, hampered by his senior colleague, Paul might never have struck out into new fields as he did.

The controversy seems to have broken out first in Galatia. That Peter visited the Galatian Churches and initiated a campaign against Paul we have already seen to be highly improbable. But Judaising agitators have invaded the Church. They professed a warm interest in Paul's converts, they fascinated their simple susceptible victims, who now desired to be under the Law, to submit to the rite of initiation into the Jewish covenant. Misguided simpletons! do they not realise that to accept circumcision is to renounce all benefit from Christ, to surrender their Christian freedom, to commit themselves to a complete fulfilment of the Law? They made an excellent beginning in the Spirit, and are now seeking perfection in the flesh! Faith had supplied them with all that they needed, why turn aside to the Law by which no man can be justified? So strongly does Paul feel on this perversion of the Gospel that he launches his solemn and repeated anathema against any, be it himself or an angel from heaven, who should dare to pervert it.

But intimately associated with this attempt to impose on his converts a new version of the Gospel, was an attack on the apostle himself. His peculiar position lent itself easily to malicious misrepresentation. His opponents could urge with plausibility and force that the obvious source for an accurate knowledge of the true teaching of Jesus was the band of apostles whom he had trained during His lifetime. Certainly it was not to be learnt from

an upstart like Paul, who had begun his career as a persecutor, and who owed whatever correct information he possessed on the subject to the genuine apostles. Where he diverged from them or added to them, he was simply perverting by his own fancies the genuine truth as it was taught by Jesus. His claim to be an apostle was entirely illegitimate.

In his reply Paul begins by affirming his apostleship derived directly from Christ and God. He next asserts the independence of his Gospel. He had received it from no human source but by revelation from Jesus Christ. Till the time of his conversion he had been a persecutor of the Church and wholly devoted to the Jewish religion. Then God, who had from his birth set him apart for His service, revealed His Son within him. The Divine intention in this had been that he should preach Christ among the Gentiles. But instead of returning to Jerusalem to those who had been apostles before him, he had gone away into Arabia and then returned to Damascus. We are probably to understand that during this period he had been preaching, so that his message was clearly not derived from the earlier apostles. Having thus secured the independence of his teaching, he went up to Jerusalem and stayed with Peter for a fortnight. Of the other leaders he saw none with the exception of James the Lord's brother. After this brief stay he left for Syria and Cilicia to prosecute his work and remained unknown to the Judæan Churches.

Paul has thus completed his proof of the independence of his Gospel, and for this purpose an account of any

further visits to Jerusalem is irrelevant. With the second chapter he passes on to a new stage in his argument. He now proceeds to show that his presentation of the Gospel was endorsed by the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem who had no addition to suggest to it, who recognised his mission among the Gentiles, and gave to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. He then advances to a third stage and relates how, when Peter had been intimidated by the strict Judaists and had been followed in his retreat from the gospel of freedom by the other Jewish Christians and Barnabas, he had pressed home on Peter his inconsistency and demonstrated that justification came not by the law but through faith.

The Acts of the Apostles preserves no record of this Galatian episode, and we are not definitely informed as to the issue. Some uncertainty must rest on the matter owing to the uncertainty of the date to which the Epistle should be assigned. But the probability that Paul won the churches back to their allegiance is great. The very preservation of the Epistle favours this; and at a later date, as it would seem, Paul speaks of the churches in Galatia as sharing in the collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1, cf. Acts xx. 4).

We must now turn to the condition of things in the Church of Corinth. According to the usual and probably correct view there were four parties in the Church of Corinth calling themselves by the names of Paul, Apollos, Peter, and Christ. We are not concerned with the first two of these. The party of Peter was probably composed of Judaising Christians who had possibly been

in personal contact with Peter, but in any case appealed to him as the real leader of the Church. They do not, however, appear to have followed the tactics adopted by the agitators in Galatia. They did not, it would seem, insist on circumcision and submission to the Law. The real significance of the "Christ party" has been much debated, and despairing of reaching any tenable interpretation some have resorted to the expedient of striking out the words "and I of Christ." So drastic an expedient, however, is scarcely required by the real difficulty of the phrase. I do not feel that I can accept any view with confidence, but I may repeat what I have said elsewhere: "Possibly the party consisted of those who had known Jesus during His early life, though we should perhaps have expected, 'I of Jesus' rather than 'I of Christ.' Possibly their watchword expressed their dislike of the position accorded to human leaders, and disowned every leader but Christ. Since, however, this intrinsically sound attitude apparently falls under the same blame as the rest, they must have asserted their freedom from partisanship in a partisan way."¹ But there is nothing in the First Epistle to justify the view that there was any specifically Judaistic agitation in Corinth at this time. In 2 Corinthians the presence and activity of the Judaisers in the Church of Corinth is evident. It is especially in the last four chapters (x. i.-xiii. 10) that the references to them occur. These chapters probably form part of the severe Epistle sent to Corinth

¹ *Peake's Commentary*, p. 833.

as Paul's ultimatum to the Church which caused him so much anxiety when it had been sent, as he relates in 2 Cor. i.-vii. He does not mince his words in speaking of his opponents. They are "false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ." They preach another Jesus and impart a different spirit. They are the ministers of Satan. They taunt the apostle with the courage he displays in his absence and the humble tone he adopts when he is face to face with the Church. "His letters, they say, are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak and his speech of no account." His refusal to accept any support from them was explained in a sinister way. His failure to visit Corinth, as he had promised, is set down to cowardice. They do not seem to have put circumcision and the Law forward as had been done in Galatia. These requirements they probably kept in reserve, meaning first to undermine the authority of Paul and then to press them on the Church.

Paul's reply is unparalleled in his letters. Nowhere else in his correspondence can we match the wealth of irony, sarcasm and invective. If his other letters could be characterised as weighty and strong, this letter goes far beyond them in these features. But his exasperation with his opponents is combined with mingled feelings towards his converts. They do not escape the lash, but the love which Paul feels for them finds tender expression. And though he is too proud to vindicate himself except with reluctance, yet he feels that he is forced to meet the depreciation, falsehood, and innuendo, of his

critics by a detailed statement of his labours, his sufferings, and the visions and revelations by which he has been favoured. So eminent indeed had these been that a tormenting physical affliction had been Divinely sent that he might not be unduly exalted. He deserved better from his converts than he had received from them. It is to him that they owe their knowledge of Christ, and yet they are treating him with less consideration than they give to his enemies. He has been no burden to them nor will he be ; rather will he spend his substance and himself in their service.

This letter brought the majority at least of the Church back to its allegiance, and this glad news brought by Titus restored to the distracted apostle the peace of mind which he had lost since the letter went irretrievably out of his hands. That it was preserved by the Church is further proof that it had not failed of its desired effect.

There are echoes of the controversy in the Epistle to the Romans written about the same time. The systematic exposition of his doctrine is conditioned by the controversy, and at various points explicit reference is made to the criticisms and even the slanders of his opponents. The community to which the letter was addressed seems to have consisted for the most part of Gentile Christians, though it would naturally contain some Jewish Christians or proselytes. At the close he refers to those who cause divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine which the readers had been taught. He charges them with self-seeking and

with beguiling the simple by their insinuating speech. It is the Judaisers, presumably, whom he has in mind.

After the writing of this Epistle Paul carried out his purpose of visiting Jerusalem, taking the collection for the poor Christians of the mother Church, to which he had devoted so much attention. He had a friendly reception from James and the other authorities of the Church ; but in view of the reports which were in circulation about him that he taught the Jews in Gentile communities to refrain from circumcising their children and observing the Jewish mode of life, they suggested that he should participate in the completion of a Nazarite vow, which had been taken by four Christian Jews, and thus demonstrate the falsity of the rumours and his own adhesion to the Law. They communicated to him the four prohibitions which, in the Apostolic Decree, they had imposed on Gentile Christians. Paul accepted this advice, and on the false suspicion that he had taken a Gentile, Trophimus, into the Temple he was seized in the Temple and, but for the intervention of Claudius Lysias, the chief captain, he would have been killed. We are not concerned with his trouble with the Jews, but he was kept in confinement for two years and on appealing to Cæsar was sent to Rome. His reception by members of the Roman Church was friendly, from which we may infer that the Church was not, under Peter's influence, dominated by hostility to Paul.

In the Epistles generally believed to have been written by Paul from Rome it is only in Philippians that we have an attack on the Judaisers. This occurs in a

section iii. 2-iv. 1 which has been thought by several scholars to be a fragment of another Epistle.¹ Moreover, the Epistle to the Philippians itself has been believed by some authorities to have been written at Cæsarea. To add to our uncertainties the theory is rapidly growing in favour that the Epistle to the Philippians was written during Paul's stay at Ephesus and belongs therefore to the same period of his life as the letters to Corinth and Rome.² If the generally accepted view is correct it would seem either that Paul had been specially provoked by the Judaisers in Rome itself or had received some intimation that his readers might experience trouble from them. It is in favour of the former view that earlier in the Epistle he complains of those who preach Christ out of envy

¹ K. Lake, *Expositor*, June, 1914; A. H. McNeile, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1927, pp. 166-168; J. H. Michael, *Philippians*, in the "Moffatt New Testament Commentary," 1928, pp. xi f. Professor Michael argues that the interpolation ends with iii. 19.

² Two points are involved: (a) Did Paul suffer an imprisonment during his residence at Ephesus? (b) Was Philippians written during that imprisonment? E. Meyer (p. 482) says the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment rests simply on modern invention; but it has gained a considerable vogue in recent years. See in particular the elaborate list of books and articles in Deissmann's *Paul*, second ed., pp. 17 f. For the English reader the best discussion is probably C. R. Bowen's *Are Paul's Prison Letters from Ephesus?* in the "American Journal of Theology" for 1920. Those who believe that Paul was imprisoned at Ephesus are not agreed as to whether all the Imprisonment Epistles were composed during that confinement, and if not all, then which? A. H. McNeile (*op. cit.*, pp. 170-172), and in much fuller detail J. H. Michael (*op. cit.*, pp. 12-21), have recently advocated the view that Philippians was written by Paul while in prison at Ephesus.

and strife, hoping by their factious conduct to make Paul's lot in his imprisonment more burdensome to him. In any case the outburst in Phil. iii. 2-iv. 1 is one of the fiercest which has come to us from his pen. He describes the Judaisers as dogs and evil workers, enemies of the cross of Christ, with their minds set on earthly things, self-seekers who are destined to perdition.

We know nothing in detail of any further conflict with the Judaisers. Whether Paul's imprisonment in Rome closed with his release or his execution is still in dispute. In any case his race was now nearly run. We cannot overestimate the service which in his steadfast struggle with the legalists he rendered to Christianity and the Church. But for his clear insight into the grave issues which were at stake, his freedom from the fear of men and undue deference to authority, his courage and tenacity, the new religion might have been fatally stranded in a backwater of Judaism. It was of great moment that before the destruction of Jerusalem he had disengaged Christianity from Judaism and liberated Gentile Christianity from the bondage of the Law. That the Church has but imperfectly learnt the lesson its greatest theologian taught it is only too evident from its history ; but in his glorious writings we can still refresh our spirits and renew our flagging energy. Across the centuries which separate us from him we can still hear his ringing challenge : "For freedom did Christ set us free, stand fast therefore and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For the bibliography of the subject, reference should be made to the list of works appended to "Paul the Apostle: His Personality and Achievement" (pp. 317-318).

New Testament Introductions necessarily deal with the problems involved in this study; those by Jülicher, Zahn, Moffatt, Goguel, McNeile, may be specially mentioned; also K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 1911; G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, 1921.

Works on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Galatians are concerned with the problems. The following may be mentioned: A. Harnack, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1908, Eng. transl. *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1909, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1911, Eng. transl. *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, 1911; F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I., *The Acts of the Apostles*, Vols. II. and III., 1922-26; F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, 1924; C. H. Watkins, *St. Paul's Fight for Galatia* (1914).

Commentaries on The Acts of the Apostles by Knowling, 1900; R. B. Rackham, 1901; J. V. Bartlet, 1901; E. Preuschen, 1912; H. H. Wendt, 1913; A. Menzies (Peake's Commentary), 1919; T. Zahn, 1919-21; A. Loisy, 1920; A. W. F. Blunt, 1922; E. Jacquier, 1926; E. J. Bicknell (Gore's Commentary), 1928; Commentaries on Galatians, J. B. Lightfoot, 1865; F. Rendall, 1903; T. Zahn, 1905; A. Lukyn Williams, 1910; H. Lietzmann, 1910; C. Emmet, 1912; M. J. Lagrange, 1918; A. Loisy, 1916; R. Mackintosh (Peake's Commentary), 1919; E. De Witt Burton, 1921; A. W. F. Blunt, 1925; W. L. Knox (Gore's Commentary), 1928.