

The Journal of Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1924

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE HEAVENLY WISDOM AND THE DIVINE LOGOS IN JEWISH APOCALYPTIC :

A STUDY OF THE VISION OF THE WOMAN AND THE MAN-CHILD
IN REVELATION xii 1-5, 13-17

RECENT works on the Apocalypse have called attention to the vision of the Woman and the Man-Child as presenting the crucial instance determining the question of the use of 'sources' in the composition of this difficult book. It is generally agreed that the vision is to be regarded as a symbolic representation of the birth of the Messiah. The figure of the Man-Child is interpreted in xix 11-16 as 'The Word of God' who will descend from heaven at the end of the age to put all enemies beneath His feet; for in both visions the words of Ps. ii 9 are applied to Him: 'He shall break' (rule) all nations with a rod of iron.'

Further, a growing body of critical opinion holds that the author of the Apocalypse used a Jewish 'source' for this vision of chapter xii; and Dr Charles, upon the evidence of language, thinks it highly probable that this 'source', originally composed in Hebrew or Aramaic, had been already translated into Greek by a Jew before it came into the hands of the Christian seer.² The theory of a Jewish original best fits the peculiarities in the description of the Messiah's birth. No Christian would so have mythologized Mary, the mother of Jesus, as to make her 'a woman clothed with the sun, and with the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars'. This description, taken from some goddess of pagan mythology, would have made Mary a divine being. Neither would a Christian who was familiar with the story of the Incarnate life of Jesus have spoken of His rapture to the throne of God immediately after His birth, and of His concealment in heaven until the end of the age. A Jew might have described the Messiah of expectation in such a way, for in late Judaism there was a widely-spread Messianic faith which in some circles was of a very exalted type.

¹ Charles *Revelation* vol. i pp. 75, 76.

² *Op. cit.* pp. lxiii, 308 ff.

But while there is this general agreement among scholars that the 'source' of the vision was Jewish, and that its author made use of a pagan myth to set forth his beliefs in graphic form, there is considerable diversity of opinion concerning (a) the meaning which the visionary figures conveyed to the Christian seer, (b) the interpretation put upon the same figures by the Jewish authors of the 'source', and (c) the version of the myth used, whether Babylonian (Gunkel and Porter), Persian (Völter), Greek (Dietrich), or 'international' (Gunkel, Cheyne, Clemen, Charles).

With regard to (a) and (b), commentators have perhaps too readily assumed that the visionary figures conveyed similar ideas to both the Christian seer and his Jewish predecessor, and have therefore interpreted the Jewish 'source' in the light of the meaning that the Christian seer probably gave to it when he incorporated it into the Book of Revelation. For example, Dr Charles finds the Christian interpretation given to the figure of the Woman to have been 'the true Israel or community of believers' which 'embraces Jewish and Gentile Christians', and argues that 'this vision in its Jewish form dealt with the expected birth of the Messiah of the Jewish nation'.¹ Similarly, upon the assumption that there was a common factor in the Christian and Jewish interpretations, Weiss suggests that the Woman represented to both authors 'the heavenly Jerusalem, the mother of us all', i. e. of both Jewish and Christian Messianic circles.

But is it so certain that two apocalyptic writers, the one a Jew and the other a Christian, would have given kindred meanings to the same apocalyptic material? That was not the wont of even Jewish apocalypticists. The common material was capable of more than one interpretation, and there are many instances in Jewish writings of such diversity. For example, Daniel appears to have made his 'one like unto a son of man' significant of 'the people of the saints of the Most High'; but this figure in 1 Enoch and 4 Ezra is most certainly interpreted as the Messiah. To read back the meaning given to a figure in one apocalypse into the same figure in another is not warranted by apocalyptic usage in Jewry itself: accordingly there is no guarantee that similar interpretations would be given to such a figure by Christians and Jews. Our fundamental problem is therefore: What meaning for readers of Jewish faith had the figures of the Woman and the Man-Child in the Jewish apocalyptic 'source'?

We suggest that the Mother of the Man-Child represented the Divine Wisdom, and that her Son symbolized the Logos; and we shall try to prove that these two figures were well known in Jewish apocalyptic and rabbinic circles.

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 315, 317.

I

In the vision itself (*v.* 17) the words 'the rest of her seed' cause difficulty unless they mean the Messianic community—'the wise' of Daniel xii 3, 'the righteous, holy, and elect' of 1 Enoch—the 'brethren of the Messiah since He and they alike are 'sons' of the same Mother. But the Mother cannot be identical with her 'sons'; she is not the community, whether Jewish or Jewish-Christian! Moreover, she is pictured in the vision as a *divine* mother, goddess-like in her splendour—a feature which commentators have omitted when seeking her equivalent in Jewish faith. 'The heavenly Jerusalem' might be so described; but later in the Apocalypse she becomes 'the bride of the Lamb', and so can hardly be regarded as the Mother of the Logos with whom the Lamb is to be identified. To the Christian seer she could be representative of several mystical ideas, and the interpretations given of her shew this. On the other hand he may have left his readers to draw their own conclusions from the vision, for the Mother disappears on 'the two wings of the great eagle' to be seen no more: she has no further interest for him, and she may therefore have been unassimilated to any part of his Christian faith. But this was not the case for the Jewish author of the 'source', or for his readers. The mythological goddess-mother must have represented a very definite conception, probably traditional, certainly well-known and easily recognizable by readers of apocalyptic.

The author of Revelation is not concerned with events in the life of Jesus. For him the all-conquering Christ is the pledge of the ultimate victory of His Church. He will come soon from heaven to destroy the Church's foes; that is the central theme of the work. That the Logos-Messiah was, and is, Jesus, the author is well aware; but he thinks of the present and future, and not of the past. The story of the Incarnation, ministry, and humiliating passion of his Christ has no place in his book. His ideas are eschatological; and in his expression of them he is so much a Jew, albeit a Christian Jew, that his conception of the role of Jesus in the final drama is that of such a Messiah as is indicated in Isaiah lxiii,¹ and in certain of the Jewish pseudepigraphs,² where His function is to be the Warrior-Saviour of Israel from its foes. The Christian seer is so close to the Jewish faith in which he was brought up that he can employ its imagery and its ideas, with but little modification of them, to comfort his readers in their trial. Those readers then must have held opinions of the eschatological Messiah very like his own. He wrote for an apocalyptic circle of Jewish Christians.

¹ Cf. Rev. xix 13, 15.

² e. g. the Sibylline Oracles, the Similitudes of Enoch.

II

To return now to the figures of the Woman and Child, if they represented the Divine Wisdom and the Logos in the Jewish 'source', we ought to be able to trace their genesis in the Jewish 'Wisdom-literature'. The post-prophetic development of Jewish thought concerning 'Wisdom', as is well known, is the most strikingly un-Jewish of all the nation's religious ideas. Friedlander says: 'This hypostatization (of the Divine Wisdom) is here a downright sacrilege; it betrays the entry of an alien spirit into the domain of Judaism.' Whether this be so or not, for some reason or another the Jewish sages certainly felt the influence of Greek philosophy, and incorporated certain Platonic and Stoic ideas—modified by Jewish religious concepts—into their treatment of the Wisdom theme. But the most remarkable characteristic of this literature is the glory which is ascribed by late Jewish writers to the hypostasis of the Divine Wisdom. Personified as a woman, she sings her own praises in Proverbs viii; in Ecclesiasticus xxiv she compares her graces to the trees of the Holy Land; in the pre-Maccabean parts of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch she is compared to the trees in the Garden of the Lord; and in the Book of Wisdom she is hymned in glowing phrases as the companion of God from the beginning, the architect of the universe, the mother of all good things, the supreme splendour whose radiance surpasses that of sun, moon, and stars. This phraseology is noteworthy: it resembles the imagery used to describe the Woman in Revelation xii. Moreover, Wisdom describes herself as coming forth 'from the mouth of the Most High', His Holy Spirit indeed, an identification between 'Wisdom' and 'the Spirit' which was employed in subsequent Jewish and Christian thought.

The personification of the Divine Word in the Book of Wisdom is likewise remarkable, especially as it is found in such close association with the theme of the personified Divine Wisdom: but whereas Wisdom is equated with the Spirit of the Lord, the Word is equated with the Angel of the Lord—that Angel of the Presence who by his warrior-might had saved Israel out of all their afflictions. In xviii 15, the 'all powerful Word' of God who destroyed the Egyptian firstborn and saved Israel is described in terms of the Angel of the Lord who was seen by David bearing the sword of destruction.¹ The function of the Logos in the Book of Wisdom is therefore that of the Warrior-Logos in Revelation xix: he is the destroyer of Israel's foes!

It is true that no relationship is made between the Divine Wisdom and the Divine Logos in the Book of Wisdom; they are separate

¹ Cf. 1 Chron. xxi 16.

hypostases of two divine attributes, differing in sex and distinguishable in function; but their collocation in this work is worthy of note. Nor is the Warrior-Logos the Messiah here, though he exercises a Messianic activity, in that as Israel's Saviour from the Egyptians he has this qualification to become the eschatological Warrior-Logos of Revelation xix.

III

Is it possible to trace the stages in this development of Jewish thought? Perhaps not entirely; but there are indications of such stages in certain Jewish works, especially in the 'Similitudes' of 1 Enoch and the writings of Philo-Judaeus. These we now consider.

A. *The 'Similitudes'* contain fragments of a source which may be called the 'Wisdom-source'; and a study of this third section of the Book of Enoch suggests that this 'Wisdom-source' was an apocalyptic 'Vision of Wisdom'¹ containing an exalted doctrine of the Messiah soon to appear. The author of the 'Similitudes' was himself an ardent Messianist: unquestionably his compilation from Messianic documents proves this. He opens his 'Similitudes' with the announcement 'The Vision of Wisdom which Enoch saw', and yet he gives but three fragments of such a vision; his reasons for discarding the remainder of his 'Wisdom-source' will appear later.

The first fragment is as follows:—

'Wisdom found no place where she might dwell.
Then a dwelling-place was assigned her in the heavens.
Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the children of men,
And found no dwelling-place:
Wisdom returned to her place
And took her seat among the angels.'

(xlii 1, 2: Charles's translation.)

Here Wisdom is one of 'the angels', i. e. of the 'emanations' from God which one school of thinkers identified with angels: this belief is seen in the LXX of Ecclesiastes v 6, and in Philo, who calls the angels 'logoi'. It is probable therefore that the author of the 'Wisdom-source' regarded both the Divine Wisdom and the Divine Logos as such emanations—a belief which made no appeal to the author of the 'Similitudes'!

The second allusion to the Divine Wisdom associates her very closely with the Messiah, 'the Son of Man':—

'The wisdom of the Lord of Spirits hath revealed Him to the holy and righteous' (xlviii 7);

¹ This suggested apocalyptic 'Vision of Wisdom', as also the vision in Rev. xii of Wisdom and the Logos, opens the question anew concerning the nature and extent of the apocalyptic Messianic circles.

and the third reference to Wisdom again connects her with the Messiah:—

‘Wisdom is poured out like water, and glory faileth not before Him for evermore’ (xliv 1),

for this passage precedes a description of the Messiah which is based upon Isaiah xi 1, 2.

Now the Messiah in the ‘Similitudes’ is quite definitely a heavenly being, ‘the Son of Man’, ‘the Elect One’, ‘the Righteous One’, ‘the Anointed’, all these titles finding authorization from preceding Jewish works, the last three from the prophetic books of the Old Testament. He is not an abstraction, or emanation: He has definite personality, and functions to perform at the end of the age. It was impossible therefore for the author of the ‘Similitudes’ to make the Divine Wisdom the mother of this Messiah without reducing Him to the personification of an attribute. Neither could He receive the title ‘Logos’, even if the ‘Wisdom-source’ suggested this title, without running the same risk. This may be one reason for the author’s slight use of his ‘Wisdom-source’.

Yet the ‘Similitudes’ connect the revelation of the Messiah with the Divine Wisdom. Did the ‘source’ teach that Wisdom was the mother of the Logos? And if so, did the author of the ‘Similitudes’ reject this title for his Messiah because he found no earlier authority for employing it as a Messianic title?

There is a curious passage concerning ‘the hidden name of the Son of Man’ in lxix 26 which has a close connexion with a former passage where Michael is said to be the guardian of this ‘hidden name and the oath’ by which the universe was created and established (*vv.* 14–21). The whole reference is however fragmentary, and something has been omitted, either by the author of the ‘Similitudes’ from the ‘sources’ which he was using, or by a subsequent copyist of his MS. Michael does not tell ‘the hidden name’ in the creative ‘oath’ which he enunciates—and yet the ‘Similitudes’ declare that ‘the hidden name’ has been revealed! Some title therefore, some designation of the Messiah, has gone from the passage; and because ‘the hidden name’ belongs to the creative ‘oath’, we suggest that this title, this designation, was ‘the Logos’, the Creative Word of God! If this were so, it was omitted by the author of the ‘Similitudes’ for the reasons already suggested, and not by the copyist.

Confirmatory evidence for the theory that ‘the hidden name’ was ‘the Logos’ is found in the Book of Revelation xix 12. There the same two features are found: the Messiah ‘hath a name which no man knoweth’, and yet ‘His name is called, The Word of God’! It is a remarkable collocation, and various suggestions have been made by

commentators to remove the difficulty. Even if we regard the first clause as the insertion of an interpolator (Charles *Revelation, in loc.*), yet this interpolator must have had some reason for inserting it in this particular place; and we suggest that, in this very Jewish vision of the Logos-Messiah besprinkled with the blood of the foes He has slain, the clause concerning 'the hidden name' was inserted because it was found in a similar context in the 'Wisdom-source' of the 'Similitudes' of 1 Enoch. And if this be so, the doctrine of the Creative Logos, as found in the Fourth Gospel, had been already developed and given a Messianic significance in Judaism of the 1st century B.C.—which accounts for its Messianic use by the Evangelist.

B. *Wisdom and the Logos in Philo.* Philo of Alexandria was influenced by Greek philosophy in formulating his Logos-doctrine; yet the content of that doctrine is essentially Jewish and Rabbinic. Whether he held any Messianic doctrine or not—the question is greatly disputed—it is noteworthy that he interpreted the Messianic title 'the Branch' by referring it to the Logos; though in making the angels 'logoi' he probably emptied the doctrine of the Messiah of its 'personal' content.

But the point of importance in Philo's thought is the relationship which he declares to exist between the Divine Wisdom and the Logos. He says of Wisdom that God is her 'Husband', and that she is 'the mother of the Logos'¹ This is exactly the relationship which we have suggested for the two figures in the Jewish 'source' underlying Revelation xii, and (possibly) in the Jewish 'Wisdom-source' underlying the 'Similitudes' of 1 Enoch. Philo is sufficient evidence that in the 1st century A.D., the time of composition of the 'source' of Revelation, the idea of this relationship between the Divine Wisdom and the Logos was current in Judaism; and as Philo acknowledges his indebtedness to earlier Jewish thinkers, it may have been formulated in earlier times.

IV

We now pass on to consider the pagan myth in which the Jewish writer of the Revelation 'source' clothed his Messianic faith, bearing in mind that the figure of the Woman represented to him the Divine Wisdom, the mother of the Messianic Child, whatever version, or complex of versions, he employed.

In Babylonian mythology Damkina, the wife of Ea, was the mother of Marduk, conqueror of the chaos-monster Tiamat. Ea's home was 'the deep', the abode of wisdom, and both Ea and Damkina were wisdom-deities. Damkina was known as 'the lady of the heavenly

¹ *De Profugiis* xx, xxi.

crown', while another of her titles was 'the lady of the earth'.¹ These features—her crown of stars and her rule of the earth—find their counterparts in the description of the Woman in Revelation xii, for there she has 'a crown of twelve stars' and the earth aids her flight by swallowing the flood cast after her by the dragon; but the determinative factor which enabled her to become representative of the Divine Wisdom was that she had been the goddess of wisdom, and the mother of the conqueror of the dragon, in the ancient myth.

Now the figure of the dragon-conqueror had already suggested the imagery of at least one well-known apocalyptic vision of the last times, viz. that in Daniel vii of 'one like unto a son of man'. It is true that this figure is interpreted by Daniel as 'the people of the Saints of the Most High', i. e. 'the wise' in Israel who should form the final kingdom; yet a definitely Messianic meaning was given to the Danielic figure by the writer of the 'Similitudes' of 1 Enoch who named his Messiah 'the Son of Man'. This Messianic interpretation had therefore become current before the writing of the Apocalypse. Fragments of the same Marduk myth were likewise used by 4 Ezra (2 Esdras) with the same Messianic significance. The mythological figure was therefore part of the apocalyptic conventional imagery when the author of the Jewish 'source' of Revelation xii employed it to typify and picture his vision of the Messiah, the Logos of God, the Son of the Heavenly Wisdom.

It is nothing to the point that up to the present no Babylonian story of the birth of Marduk has been discovered, and that Gunkel has therefore abandoned his earlier reconstruction of the myth; this does not prove that the story was not traditional among the Jews. But even if the writer of the Jewish 'source' borrowed elements of his story from many versions of the legend, which by his day had become 'international', he yet went back to the Damkina-tradition in which she was the goddess of wisdom, the lady of the heavenly crown, the lady of earth, and the mother of the dragon-slayer who, as his meed of victory, received universal lordship from the gods. To this story Daniel, or tradition,² added details perhaps, such as the escort of 'the clouds of heaven' which brought the 'one like unto a son of man' before the Ancient of Days; though even this may have been a feature in the ancient myth since the suggestion of 'cherubim' in the word *anânâh*

¹ Jastrow *Rel. of Bab. and As.* pp. 143, 231 (ed. 1898). It may be added that though the seer sees the 'great wonder' in the heavenly sphere, the place of the birth of the Child is on the earth because that is Damkina's domain. Hence she flees 'into the wilderness'. The dragon when expelled from heaven finds her on earth.

² It may have been Hebrew and Jewish tradition: that is at least as probable as selection of details from many versions!

(clouds) recalls the Babylonian *anunnaki*, which were the cloud-spirits created by Marduk, who is styled their 'lord'.

V

But the mythology used by Daniel and Revelation finds no place in the 'Similitudes' of 1 Enoch. We cannot suppose that it was absent from the 'Son of Man source' or the 'Wisdom-source' of this work, because the former was based on this very mythological passage in Daniel, and the latter would almost certainly have used Damkina if it made the Heavenly Wisdom the mother of the Logos, as we have suggested. Both these 'sources' were undoubtedly apocalypses. The fragmentary quotations from the two 'sources' by the author of the 'Similitudes' suggest that he could not make great use of them; and possibly one reason for this was that he disapproved of their mythology. He was a firmly convinced Jewish Messianist, and his Messiah was intensely and wholly of Jewish expectation, not the Marduk of a myth, the son of a mythological Mother. But the author of the 'source' of Revelation xii had no such scruples concerning the employment of mythological imagery; neither had the Christian seer. Each used it to set forth in symbolic form his Messianic faith, probably because the apocalyptic circles had come to regard it as a part of the conventional apocalyptic language.

VI

The Jewish interpretation of the mythological figures as Wisdom and the Logos may have some bearing upon (a) two earlier Hebrew Messianic prophecies, and (b) certain later Christian developments in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

(a) *Hebrew prophecy.* Two predictions, and two only, of the coming of a mysterious son of a mysterious mother are found in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, viz. the 'Immanuel' prophecy of Isaiah vii, which makes the 'son' the child of 'the damsel' (*halmah*); and the prophecy of the Peace-bringer in Micah v, which makes him the son of an indefinite 'she which travaileth'. It is noteworthy that both prophecies are very closely connected with the Assyrian invasion of Judah; and it was at this time that the cult of the Babylonian Damkina and Marduk appears prominently in Assyrian life. Interest in Assyrian affairs would be quite naturally taken by Judah at this time, and especially by the prophets. It is not unlikely therefore that some Assyrian version of the Babylonian Marduk stories may have found its way into Judah to stimulate the popular hope of a Divine Deliverer from the threatening calamity, if any such hope already existed

(cf. Num. xxiv 17). The Davidic family of whom much had been expected was a disappointment, and the prophets were beginning to look elsewhere. We would call attention to the theory of Gressmann¹ and his school that there was a popular expectation current among the Jews of Isaiah's day concerning the advent of a great Deliverer to save the nation from its foes. There is no evidence, outside the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah, for this theory; but there is no apparent reason why the Babylonian stories of Damkina and Marduk should not have been known to the Hebrews of a far earlier time than the late Jewish apocalypses. If they were—and it is generally agreed among scholars that the apocalyptists used ancient traditional material—then Isaiah and Micah gave the stamp of the prophetic authority to the rightness of this popular expectation; but being prophets of Yahweh, they modified the idea to make it accord with the religion which they taught. They rejected the pagan mythological imagery whencesoever it had come, whether from Babylon in early days or from Assyria more recently; they left the Mother undesignated and undefined because there was no figure in Hebrew religion to correspond with the Babylonian Damkina²; they changed Marduk into 'Immanuel' and 'the Peace-bringer', whoever He might be, and in so doing allowed later prophecy to designate Him as 'the Angel of Great Counsel'³ and 'the Angel of the Covenant',⁴ and apocalypse to describe Him as 'the one like unto a son of man', 'the Son of Man', and 'the Logos of God'. But it was not until the Hakamim had hypostatized the Divine Wisdom that the apocalyptists could indicate her as 'the Halmah' of Isaiah, the 'she which travaileth' of Micah, and in such wise bring her again into the Messianic theme—the Mother of the Messianic 'Word of God'.

It would appear therefore that, even in this detail, apocalyptic was true to that mission which it believed God had given it, of being the interpreter of former prophecy to the people of its own day. This belief dominated all writers of the apocalyptic schools to such an extent that even the author of Revelation will recognize no break between prophecy and apocalypse: for him 'the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy', and he calls his book 'this prophecy'. There is much to be said therefore for Gressmann's theory.

B. *Christian Developments.* The birth of Jesus of the Virgin Mary naturally displaced for Christians the Jewish doctrine of the birth of the

¹ Buchanan Gray *Isaiah i-xxvi* (I.C.C.) gives a long account of the interpretations put upon the 'Immanuel' prophecy, but dismisses Gressmann in rather summary fashion.

² We cannot accept that interpretation of 'the damsel' which makes her equivalent to 'young mothers (collectively) in Israel'. The definite article both in Hebrew and Greek seems to imply an individual, well known and often spoken of.

³ Isa. ix 6 (Septuagint).

⁴ Mal. iii 1, 2.

Logos from the Divine Wisdom. St Paul, for example, calls Christ 'the Wisdom of God', allowing no separate hypostasis to Wisdom, but absorbing her personification and functions in Christ.

There was, however, another development given to the 'Wisdom theme' in Christianity which has to-day an antiquarian interest, but may also have some bearing upon the question why the canonicity of Revelation was so long in dispute in some parts of the Eastern Church.

Dr Burkitt, in his lectures upon *Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, has called attention to the Jewish-Christian church which flourished in Edessa, and held a form of Christian doctrine which in many respects was very primitive. Tradition said that Christianity was brought to Edessa by Addai, one of the Seventy; but whether this was so or not, the church produced scholars and martyrs from the second to the fifth century, and among its most learned and pious bishops was Aphraates who lived during the fourth century.

Aphraates taught the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in a form which is very strange to western minds: it approximated very closely to the Jewish doctrine of the Heavenly Wisdom, recalling that description of her in the Book of Wisdom which made her 'the mother of all good things' and equated her with the Holy Spirit. For Aphraates taught the doctrine of the Motherhood of the Holy Spirit as complementary to the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God.

In his treatise *Of Virginité against the Jews*¹ he discusses Matt. xix 5, and says: 'when a man hath not yet taken a wife, he loveth and honoureth God his Father, and *the Holy Spirit his Mother*'. But though Aphraates did not make the Holy Spirit the Mother of Jesus—his Christianity was too orthodox for that—'in the ancient *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as quoted by Origen and S. Jerome, our Lord Himself speaks of His Mother the Holy Spirit'. Both are reflexions of the Jewish Wisdom theme, Aphraates going a stage farther back than the 'Gospel' which takes over the Jewish Wisdom-Logos idea in its entirety, applying it to Jesus. It is not merely that 'there is very early Christian authority' for Aphraates's doctrine, as Dr Burkitt says; but the doctrine was essentially Jewish, and was a survival in the Christianity of the Mesopotamian valley, though it was modified to accord with historical facts in the life of Christ.

Again, this church apparently was the first opponent of the Manichaean heresy² which taught as one of its doctrines that Christ was God manifested in the *form* of man, but was not born of the Virgin Mary. It is a doctrine that goes back to the Jewish doctrine of 'emanations', which may have originated from the contact of the Persian religion with

¹ Burkitt *op. cit.* pp. 38, 39.

² See Ante-Nicene Fathers *Syriac Documents* pp. 280, 389 and note.

Judaism. The Apocalypse, by its omission of all reference to the Incarnation, and by its use of the Jewish Wisdom-Logos theme, may have been regarded by the orthodox as lending support to this heresy. It is not to be wondered at, that this part of the Church questioned and rejected for so long this Book.

But time passed, and with it the peculiarly Jewish elements which remained in the doctrines of the Christian Church. We have learnt to read the Apocalypse anew in the light of the rest of the New Testament teaching. The Jewish elements in it have been sublimated as to their original meaning; but they remain to indicate the essential unity in the revelation that God, who spake in times past by the prophets through His Spirit concerning His Son, gave at last in that Son, His Word Incarnate. The seer read that revelation aright when he declared, 'The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy'.

G. H. DIX.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(continued)

II.

Φέρειν in St Mark

Φέρειν is one of the words specially characteristic of the Second Gospel, and Sir John Hawkins rightly includes it in his list *Horae Synopticae*² p. 13. If we make abstraction of the technical usage of *φέρειν* 'to bear fruit', the figures for the four Gospels are Mark 14, Matthew 4, Luke 4, John 8. Sir John Hawkins leaves the matter there: but examination of the passages concerned reveals the secret of the disproportionate occurrence of the word in Mark. The other three Evangelists, in fact, limit the meaning of *φέρειν*, speaking generally, to the sense of 'carry': Mark, on the other hand, uses it also, and more frequently, in the sense of 'bring'. The difference is therefore a lexical one. It is well illustrated in the treatment of Mark 2 (ii 3) by Luke, and of Mark 7 (xi 2, 7) by both Matthew and Luke.

1. Mark i 32 *ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας*. Here *ἔφερον*, as in the parallel cases 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, means certainly 'brought', not 'carried': and therefore Matthew substitutes *προσήνεγκαν* and Luke *ἤγαγον*.

2. ii 3 *καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων*. So far is Mark from implying the sense of 'carry' in *φέροντες* that he finds it necessary to add *αἰρόμενον* to convey the further