THE HIDDEN WISDOM OF CHRIST.

VOL. II.

THE HIDDEN WISDOM OF CHRIST.

VOL. II.

10-24-38

11-28-38 J.A.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

CHAPTER VIII. (*continued*).

ORIGIN OF THE ROMAN CHURCH.

PAGE

'The Preaching of Peter'—Epistle to Diognetus—Conclusion . 1

CHAPTER IX.

THE GOSPEL AFTER MATTHEW.

Earliest Testimonies—Title—Secret and Public Sayings of Christ —Falsification of Scripture—The Good Deposit . . . 93

CHAPTER X.

THE GOSPEL AFTER LUKE.

Ingrafting of the Hidden Wisdom, as proclaimed by Paul, on the First Apostolic Gospel Record 115

CHAPTER XI.

THE GOSPEL AFTER MARK.

Mark's Original Gospel a Record of Peter's Preaching in Rome— The Gospel of Peace by Compromise—Conclusion on the Origin of the First Three Gospels 239

CHAPTER XII.

THE ACTS.

PAGE

Late Apostolic Cooperation—Stephen and Philip—The Apostles not Persecuted—Laying-on of Hands—Paul and the Roman Church 298

CHAPTER XIII.

THE GOSPEL AFTER JOHN.

Apostolic Record of the Secret Doctrine of Christ—Prologue—Doctrine—Historical Part—John the Baptist—Nathanael—General Plan—Commentary on Chapters II. to XVII. . . 310

CHAPTER XIV.

CHRONOLOGY.

The Seventy Weeks—The Seven Thousand Years—Probable Years of the Birth and Death of Jesus 453

CHAPTER XV.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

The Aryan Brothers—Apocrypha—Israel's Call—The Gentiles' Call—The Key of Knowledge—Jesus Christ—Another Comforter—The Prophet—Nature of Prophecy—On the Interpretation of Prophecy—Tradition and Canon—The Church—The Problem 470

ERRATA.

Page 3, line 29, 30 from top, *read*: Baur.
„ 77, „ 30 „ „ and confessedly strange.
„ 78, „ 24 „ „ is in the body.
„ 78, „ 31 „ „ in the world, but their . . . (continue line 33).

CHAPTER VIII.

ORIGIN OF THE ROMAN CHURCH—CONTINUED.

THE PREACHING OF PETER—EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS—CONCLUSION.

'*Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.*'—Eph. v. 14.

Introduction.

WE have seen that the secret or apocryphal doctrine of Christ was kept secret by the twelve Apostles, and that the difference between their Gospel and Paul's Gospel consisted in the latter's proclaiming openly the Hidden Wisdom of the Lord, which the former had not at once proclaimed from the housetops. Under the personal influence of Paul the Roman Church had began to be initiated in the more perfect principles of the hidden doctrine; and if we accept the Epistle of Clement as genuine, the latter, his disciple and successor, had continued the Apostle's reformatory work. Still, much of the old leaven must have remained, whilst on the other hand the influence of Alexandrian philosophy on Christianity, that is, as we have seen, docetic gnosticism, may already then have been dreaded by the rulers of the Roman Church. Even during the lifetime of Paul, and on the authority of no less a personage than Peter, the merely elementary doctrines of Christianity seem to have been preached in Rome, more or less to the exclusion of the more perfect doctrines which Paul was the first to

CHAP. VIII.

proclaim. We must, however, bear in mind that the Apostle Peter, who was deterred by James from joining Paul at Antioch, is the same Apostle who wrote the 'Epistle General,' although in this Epistle, as also by his addresses recorded in the Acts, Peter openly proclaimed the principles of secret doctrine, which in Jerusalem the Apostles were obliged to hide from the people. Yet it is quite possible, that for a time, and even whilst at Rome, Peter did not publicly profess principles so much in accordance with those propagated by Paul. As far as we know, Peter did not at any time join Paul in the declaration of righteousness 'without the works of the law;' and we may assume that in this respect he was, like James, of the opinion that 'faith without works is dead.'[1] During his stay at Rome, the Jewish and Judaising tendency of the Roman Church would naturally cause Peter to express himself with extreme caution respecting even the partial abrogation of the law, although in other places, like at Antioch, he may have made a somewhat nearer approach to the Paulinic doctrine on this subject. Anyhow, we should expect that the chief of the Jews, who had sufficient influence to prevent Paul's liberation, did closely watch Peter's proceedings, and that they acted more or less in the restricting spirit of James. In course of time the Judaising party in the Church of Rome would naturally be led to proclaim Peter as the founder of the same, and to refer to Paul, indirectly at least, as an enemy of Christ.

Recognitions and Homilies.

From this Judaising party in Rome originated a scripture, which was attributed to the Roman Clement, and of which some fragments may, perhaps, even refer back to the apostolic period, although the principal part seems to have been written about the middle of the second century.[2] The so-called 'Recognitions' of the Roman Clement,

[1] Jam. ii. 20.

[2] For further particulars we refer, first of all, to the latest elaborate work on this subject: 'Die Homilien und Recognitionen des Clemens Romanus,' von G. Uhlhorn, Gött. 1854, where the results of the different criticisms are clearly given and examined. Among other works we mention the follow-

although originally written in Greek, have been transmitted to us only in the Latin translation of Ruffinus,[1] whilst of the original text but a few passages are quoted by Origen, Eusebius, and others, not to mention the parallel passages contained in the homilies. Of the 'Homilies,' likewise attributed to Clement, we now possess the complete though corrupted text divided into twenty parts. In the form of a letter the homilies are stated to be addressed by Clement of Rome to the Apostle James at Jerusalem. These homilies are preceded by three separate documents; the first is a letter from the Apostle Peter to the Apostle James, in which the former requests the latter that the strictest secrecy may be observed with regard to his sermons which he has forwarded to him. The second shows in what manner James carried out the request of Peter; and the third is a letter from Clement, in which he informs James of the death of Peter, of his own succession in the Roman Episcopacy, and of Peter's command that he, Clement, should report to James the principal contents of the Apostle's preaching during his various journeyings. The twenty homilies are intended to be the report which Clement made to James, in consequence of Peter's commission, for the homilies bore the title, 'Epitome of Peter's public preachings by Clement.'[2]

ing:—Credner's Beiträge, pp. 279–323; Neander, 'die gnostischen Systeme,' Berl. 1818; Schliemann, 'die Clementinen,' Hamb. 1844; Rothe, 'Anfänge der christlichen Kirche;' Bauer, 'die Christus-Parthei in Corinth: tüb. Zeitschr. 1831, Heft 4: and 1836, H. 4;' Bauer, 'die christliche Gnosis,' 1835, and Theol. J. B. 1844, Heft 3; Dähne, 'die Christus Parthei,' 1841; Hilgenfeld, 'die clem. Recognitionen und Homilien,' 1848; Hilgenfeld, 'kritische Untersuchungen,' 1850; Hilgenfeld, 'apostolische Väter,' 1853; Schwegler, 'nachapost. Zeitalter,' 1846; Schwegler, 'Clementis Romani Homiliæ,' 1847; Ritschl, 'Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche;' Thiersch, 'die Kirche im apost. Zeitalter;' Merx, 'Bardesanes von Edessa und die clem. Recognitionen,' 1863; Gersdorf, 'Recognitiones' in his 'Patres apostol.;' Dressel, 'Patres apostol.'

[1] Born 345.

[2] Eusebius does not refer to any such writings edited by Clement, though he refers to 'the preachings and revelations of Peter.' He knows 'nothing of their being handed down as Catholic writings, since neither among the

CHAP. VIII.

It is evident that these statements cannot all be historical. Were we to regard them as such we should have to assume that Peter sent his sermons to James, that James took every precaution to ensure the strictest secrecy with regard to this apostolic doctrine, and that the dying Peter commissioned Clement to send to James an extract of his doctrinal addresses, of which the last might have been unknown to the chief of the Apostles at Jerusalem. Now, we know positively that James died in the year 44, and therefore about twenty years before the probable death of Peter in Rome. Moreover, it is now regarded by some as a settled point, that Peter was in Rome only once, and this during the last year of his life. In the face of such difficulties it may seem at first sight impossible to attach any importance whatever to writings which might in the outset be regarded as fictitious. And yet the certain fact, that the scripture we are considering can be proved to have been composed, probably in Rome, during the second century, sufficiently explains why ever since the year 1526, when the Recognitions, and the year 1672, when the Homilies were first published, they have received from the leading theologians a degree of careful attention, bestowed upon no other of the non-canonical writings of the Christian Church.

Before a century had expired after the death of Peter, perhaps not many years after Clement's death, and during the reaction against Paulinic Christianity, which must have taken place very soon after the date of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, the Judaising party in the

ancient nor the ecclesiastical writers of our own day, has there been one that has appealed to testimony taken from them' (H. E. iii. 3). But it has been fully shown that this statement is quite incorrect. For Clement of Alexandria made use of it as an authentic and apostolic scripture, which he generally quotes on the direct authority of Peter: 'Peter in the preaching says' (Credner's Beiträge, i., 351 f.; Schwegler, N. A. Z. i., 71 and 54). Eusebius may have had very different reasons for rejecting a scripture which referred to that antagonism between Peter and Paul, which already in the Acts had been entirely obliterated.

Roman Church seem to have been bent upon showing that Peter, and not Paul was its founder, and that the opinions of the latter were not shared by the former. For the unmistakable tendency of the Clementines is openly to proclaim Peter and James as the highest interpreters of the true doctrine of Christ, and to attack Simon Magus directly, and apparently also Paul, without however naming him, as a 'hostile man,' who preaches false doctrine. And in order to obtain general credence for his assertions, the writer invests himself with the name of Clement, shows that he was Peter's disciple and episcopal successor, that Peter stood in direct communication with James, the head of the Mother Church at Jerusalem, and that Clement carried on the traditions and usages of Peter. On the other hand, the writer purposely abstains from mentioning Paul's name, or from referring to his epistles, since the attacks against him and his doctrine, if they had been made more direct, might have wounded the feelings of those among the Roman Church who had maintained for Paul and his teaching a reverence more or less akin to that of which the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians was considered the authoritative exponent.

If, then, Clement had written such an epistle in the spirit of perfect reconciliation, that is, with equal reverence for Paul as for Peter, how could any writer of the Roman Church conceive the possibility of making his readers believe that there had existed an antagonism between Peter and Paul, based on an essentially different view of Christianity? Had no such dissension existed, the writer never could have hoped to make the members of the Roman Church believe that the circumstances referred to in his writings were based upon facts, whatever might be thought about the form in which they were brought to light. In order effectually to ingraft his principles on the Church of his day, and of the future, it was absolutely necessary, in the face of the Judaising tendencies then and there prevailing, to refer to the past in such

CHAP. VIII.

a manner as to show that the same tendencies prevailed in the time of the Apostles.

Secret doctrine.

We hope to have sufficiently proved that such Judaising tendencies did, for a time at least, prevail among the apostolic body, and that they were opposed in a rather uncompromising manner by Paul, the revealer of the Lord's secret doctrine, which the twelve Apostles continued to hide from the people, as the Pharisees had done before. And this, our view, receives a striking confirmation by the Scriptures we are now considering. In the introductory documents it is shown that Peter forwarded to James a report of his public preachings, and that he urged him to take care[1] that the books of his sermons, which he sent to the latter, were not given to a born Gentile, nor even to one of the Jewish tribe before he had passed his probation. A course is to be pursued similar to that which Moses observed with the seventy elders, which followed him in his office, and whereby a uniform interpretation of Scripture had been attained. Peter has been constrained to ask for this mode of proceeding, inasmuch as many of the Gentiles had repudiated his lawful preaching, and had accepted the unlawful doctrine of the hostile man (Simon), and since even during his (Peter's) lifetime they have tried, by artificial interpretations, to distort the sense of his words, to interpolate the same as sanctioning the abrogation of the law, as if even he himself secretly taught the same thing, against which assumption Peter solemnly protests. At the end he repeats his request that the forwarded books of his own sermons are only to be delivered to a born Jew, who, by the passing of his probation, shall have proved his worthiness. In the same sense James expresses himself in his so-called 'Contestatio,' about the Petrinic sermons. After receipt of the epistle, James proposes to the presbyterial college that these books shall only be delivered gradually into the hands of a circumcised believer, who has deter-

[1] Hilgenfeld, Rec. & Hom., p. 29 f.

mined to enter the office of a teacher, and that even this is not to be done before the same shall have passed his probation of six years; then, by the side of running waters, he shall, instead of an oath, solemnly call to witness heaven, earth, and water, by which all is encompassed, and also the all-pervading air, that he will conscientiously preserve the copy entrusted to him, and not communicate the same to anyone who shall not have passed the same probation, under the same conditions. During his journeys, he will either take the same with himself, or give it over to the bishop's safe keeping, but in no case leave it at home, &c. Once more is he to call to witness heaven, earth, water, and air, that if he should not fulfil his solemn promise all the powers of being shall be hostile to him; even if he should ever come to the knowledge of another God, then even he shall be called upon as a witness, and if he should break his word, he shall become a prey to the curse and to eternal damnation. Lastly, the handing over of such a copy shall be concluded by the taking of bread and salt.[1]

It is impossible to deny, that if the writer of the Clementines had no authentic writings of Peter to guide him, he had at all events a very accurate knowledge of the state of the Church in the time of the Apostles. Peter and James, and indirectly the elders of the primitive Church of Jerusalem, consider themselves as the trustees of a secret doctrine, the secrecy of which must be preserved by the most stringent measures. No 'other' gospel must be preached than that limited gospel which the Apostles had agreed to promulgate, with a view to the maintenance of that secrecy as regards the other doctrines of the Lord which had been rendered imperative by circumstances over which they had no control. Every tittle of the law

[1] C. 4. Comp. the practices of the Therapeuts in the chapter on the Jewish reform. If such care was taken to hide from the people the secret doctrine of Christ, we need not be surprised to find that the same is carefully excluded from the Gospel which Matthew wrote whilst Peter and Paul were at Rome, and which was embodied in the Gospel 'after' Matthew.

CHAP. VIII.

must be fulfilled, and 'the hostile man,' who preached the abrogation of the law must be defied as a teacher of false doctrine. This has become more than ever necessary, since the words of Peter have been misconstrued by the adherents of the illegal doctrine. Contrary to Paul's teaching, circumcision must be insisted upon. So much for the letter written, if not by, at least in the name of Peter, and addressed to James, who is made strongly to confirm whatever Peter has said or suggested.

How differently is Clement made to write by the same author! Paul has died, and with him the hostile feeling of the Apostles against him has, at least, abated. False teachers and prophets have taken the place of the 'hostile man,' and it is in order to face these 'heretics' that Clement is made to urge the necessity of unity in the Church government, through the episcopacy which in Jerusalem had worked so successfully. Presbyters, deacons, and catechumens, are to carry out the orders of the bishop, who is to be supported by the Church. James is no more spoken of as a mere bishop, but as the bishop of bishops; laymen are already mentioned, and the Church is compared with a vessel fully equipped, led by Christ as the pilot, through the stormy sea to the distant port. Thus the writer is made to refer to the time in which Clement lived, as Peter was made to refer to his own time.

Petrinic writings.

It has been rendered highly probable that the writer has made use of a Petrinic scripture, containing Peter's doctrinal addresses, and that he has worked up this apostolic material in the first parts of the 'Recognitions;'[1] and this view is also confirmed by the early Fathers mentioning a 'Gospel of Peter,' edited by Mark, or even dictated to him by the apostle himself.[2] Of this Petrinic gospel a falsified copy was used about the year 190, by

[1] Hilgenfeld, Rec. and Hom. p. 45 f.; comp. Photius, Biblioth. Cod. 112, 113; and Dodwell, 'Dissert. in Trenæum, Oxon,' 1689, pp. 441–443.

[2] Tert. adv. Marc. 4, 5; Hier. ad Hedib. qu. 11.

the Church at Rhossus, whose bishop, Serapion, is accused by Eusebius of having 'relapsed into Jewish narrowness,' because of his anxiety lest the so-called Gospel of Peter should contain anything beyond what he, Serapion, considered 'the sound doctrine of the Saviour,' that is, as we may assume, any additions to the original but incomplete apostolical gospel record. From this it follows that already in Clement's time there existed a scripture written by Peter's interpreter, and in which, according to Clement of Alexandria, the addresses of the apostle were epitomised with the tacit consent of the latter.[1] This Gospel 'of' Mark, although Eusebius identifies it with that 'after' Mark, which we possess, has perhaps been used and partly worked up by the writer of the Clementine recognitions. For these purpose to be an epitome of Peter's sermons, and to have been written with the consent of Peter. Again, what we miss in Mark's gospel we find here; not merely the life and doctrines of the Lord, with the principal incidents of his life, but longer and systematically, though not chronologically, arranged addresses and essays. And whilst Peter complained of his words having been falsely interpreted, we find that, before the end of the second century, a falsified Gospel of Peter was still in circulation.

Whether or not it be admitted that an epitome of the preachings of Peter, written with his sanction, and by him sent to James, may possibly have been partly inserted in the Clementine recognitions and homilies, the letter of Peter to James which precedes the same, and likewise the statement about James and the presbyters at Jerusalem may be essentially genuine in fact, if not in form. We may assume as possible that the former was written by Peter himself to James, though, perhaps,

[1] See 'the Gospel after Mark.' Peter could naturally not encourage the writing and publishing of his sermons, inasmuch as he insisted on their being kept secret in Palestine. And he could not discourage such a publication, since what he had spoken in public had been perverted.

CHAP. VIII.

not from Rome. But even if these documents, like the bulk of those that follow them, be merely regarded as essentially genuine writings of the middle or end of the second century, and as probably composed by a member of the Roman Church, they are valuable exponents of at least some of the opinions about Christianity then and there prevailing. We have, therefore, to consider the principal contents of the so-called Clementines. But, before doing so, we give the text of the first of the above-mentioned documents, which, if they were not written by, or with the consent of, the two leading apostles at Jerusalem, were certainly written in the second century, with a view of their being regarded as apostolic.

Peter to James.

'Peter to James, the Lord and Bishop of the Holy Church, from the Father of all things, through Jesus Christ, for ever in peace.'

'Since I know that thou, my brother, dost heartily strive after that which is of common interest to us all, I suggest and pray you not to hand over the books of my sermons, which I sent you, to any of the Gentiles, nor even to those who belong to our tribe, previous to probation; if, however, some one has been found worthy, after probation, then thou mayest give them over to him after the same manner according to which Moses himself has given over the tradition [1] to the seventy, the successors of his seat. Hereby it is that the fruit of caution shows itself, even unto this day: that is, the men of this nation everywhere observe the same rule in respect of the unity of God and the regulation of life; nor can anyone be drawn aside to another way of thinking by Scriptures open to different interpretation. For they try to harmonise the dissonant parts of the Scriptures according to the rule which has been transmitted to them, if anyone, ignorant of the traditions, feels paralysed in the presence of the words of the prophets which admit of different interpretations.

[1] It is clearly stated in the homilies that Moses did not himself write this tradition, but that he transmitted it to seventy wise men (H. iii. 47).

Therefore they do not permit anyone to teach if he has not before learned how the Scriptures must be used. For this reason, there is with them One God, One law, One hope.'

'In order, therefore, that it be done with us as it was with the seventy, hand over to our brethren the books of my sermons with the same mystery of proceeding, in order that they may furnish with necessaries those who wish to undertake the office of a teacher. For if it be not thus done, our word of truth will be divided in different opinions. But I do not know this as if I were a prophet, but because I already see myself the beginning of the evil. For some among the Gentiles have discarded my lawful preaching, embracing a frivolous and unlawful doctrine of the hostile man. And this some have attempted whilst I am still alive, to transform my words by different interpretations to the destruction of the law, as if I also meant such things, and yet did not dare openly to profess it; far let this be! For this is to oppose the law of God, which was spoken by Moses, and of the continued duration of which our Lord has been a witness, since he thus said: heaven and earth shall pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall not pass away from the law. But this he said, that all be fulfilled. Now I do not know how those professing to know my meaning try to interpret the words which they heard from me better than myself who has spoken them; saying to those whom they teach, that this is my opinion, what I have not even thought of. Now, if during my lifetime they dare to lie such things, how much more will those dare who will come after me?'

'In order then that nothing of the kind be done, for this reason have I suggested and expostulated, that thou mayest not give over the books of sermons which I sent you, either to one belonging unto our tribe, nor to a stranger, before probation; if, however, after probation one has been found worthy, then communicate to him according to the institution of Moses, according to which

CHAP. VIII.

he gave over (the tradition) to the seventy men, who took his seat after him;[1] so that they may thus preserve the faith, and everywhere transmit the canon of truth, interpreting everything according to our tradition; and that they may not, carried away by inexperience, led into error by the spirit of conjecture, precipitate others into the same abyss of perdition. I have already well acquainted you with my opinion; now what Thou mayest think right, my Lord, that carry out with propriety. Farewell.'

From this interesting document it follows, that the twelve Apostles taught, or that they were in the second century believed to have taught, that as the secret tradition of Moses was confided only to a limited number of chosen individuals, the doctrine of Christ, which is directly implied to have been at least partly a secret one, must not be made known to the Gentiles, and only to such of the Hebrews who after probation had been found worthy candidates for the office of a teacher. Thus the secret doctrine of Christ was directly connected with the secret doctrine of Moses. As the seventy were the depositaries of the mysteries of Moses, so are the twelve and their followers in the apostleship to be the guardians and not the proclaimers of the mysteries of Christ. As the Pharisees sat in the seat of Moses, so the Apostles sat in the seat (or pulpit) of Christ. Hereby the foundation was laid for the identifying of Moses and Christ, which we shall find to be the leading principle of the recognitions.

The hostile man.

It is difficult to deny that a person who, like Paul, openly promulgated the secret doctrine of Christ, and insisted on its necessary consequence, the abrogation of the law, could not but be regarded as a hostile man by the Apostles, who had been commanded by the Lord, according to the homilies, not to publish 'the true Gospel,' that is that which included his secret doctrine, till after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the mysteries of

[1] As the Pharisees did in our Lord's time.

Christ were to be secretly promulgated.[1] And there are other passages in the homilies which likewise seem at first sight not to exclude the possibility that they are intended to refer to Paul. Among these we mention the following :—'Our Lord, who sent us forth, has told us that the evil one, after having tempted him forty days, but having in nothing prevailed against him, at last had emitted the threat that he would send from among his own, false apostles for the committing of fraud. Be therefore mindful of this, if an apostle, or teacher, or prophet comes to you, who has not first laid his doctrines before James, the brother of the Lord, and who does not bring any credentials from him. Otherwise, the wickedness of the devil . . . might fall to the earth like a lightning from heaven, and send forth an herald, set up a promulgator of false doctrines, as the same now has set up Simon against us, who preaches in the name of the Lord, and with the credentials of Christian truth.'[2] Again, Peter is recorded to have said to Simon, 'If, then, our Jesus has appeared to thee in visions, and has spoken with thee, then he has done it because he was full of wrath against thee as an adversary; for this reason has he spoken with thee through visions and dreams, or through revelations coming from without. But can anyone be instituted to the office of a teacher through visions? And if thou declarest this to be possible, why has the Lord, during an entire year, continually spoken with those who are awake? And for what reason shall we believe thee, even if it were so that he appeared to thee at all? And how can he have appeared to thee since thou dost think in a manner contrary to His doctrine? Hast thou indeed been visited by Him, even though but for an hour, (hast thou been) taught by Him and made an apostle, then preach also His sayings and interpret them, love His Apostles, and do not dispute with me, who have associated with Him. Thou hast opposed thyself as an adversary against me, the firm rock,

[1] Hom. ii. 17. [2] Hom. xi. 35.

CHAP. VIII.

the foundation of the Church. If thou werest not an adversary thou wouldest not defame me and despise my preaching, that I may not find credence with that which I myself directly heard from the mouth of the Lord, as if I were judged, though I deserve praise. Or if thou callest me judged, then thou accusest God who has revealed Christ to me, and Him who because of this revelation has called me blessed. But if, indeed, thou willst co-operate for the truth, then learn first from us what we have learnt from Him, and as disciple of the truth become thou our fellow-worker.'[1]

Of Paul we know that he preached the abrogation of the law, that he did not ask James to give him credentials as a teacher or apostle, and that Christ appeared to him and taught him by outward revelations. But all this we know to be equally true of Simon, to whom the principal of the above passages is addressed by Peter, and to whom another of them refers by name as the first false teacher and enemy of the Apostles. All these passages, therefore, including that about 'the hostile man,' must be taken to refer to Simon, and not to Paul. The Apostles can never have spoken of Paul as an enemy, a false teacher, and an apostle of Satan, after that they had perceived the grace that was given unto him, and after that James, Peter, and John had given him the hand of fellowship. Nor need we be at a loss to account for the strange fact, that Paul is not mentioned in the recognitions or homilies. This seems to us to be but a proof of the essential genuineness of these writings, and confirms the view that they are based on originals dating from the apostolic period. We have seen that, according to Paul's own showing, more than seventeen years elapsed between the conversion of Paul and that meeting of the Apostles at Jerusalem, when the chief Apostles gave him the hand of fellowship. It is most probably during this time that Simon of Samaria, having been converted by Philip,

[1] Hom. xvii. 19.

preached in Rome, and was confronted by Peter, who would naturally communicate with James on the subject of his disputes. The Epistle of Peter to James, which is prefixed to the homilies, either is, or at least it purports to be, one of the very earliest communications, if not the first, which the former made to the latter. The strong recommendation to preserve in Palestine as a secret document the records of Peter's disputations with Simon, is best explained by the assumption that Peter had not previously written to James on the necessity of such precautions. The whole tone and tenour of the epistle shows that the unforeseen dangers arising from Simon's opposition led to unforeseen and not preconcerted measures. We therefore consider ourselves entitled to assert, that it is because in Mark's original record of Peter's preaching no mention was or could be made of Paul, that his name does not occur in the recognitions and homilies.

Preaching of Peter.

By our previous investigations we hope to have thrown some new light on the Epistle of Peter to James. But although we may thereby have succeeded in increasing the possibility of its being an apostolic record, in essence if not in form, yet for the fuller establishing of what we may term our apocryphal point of view, we are quite satisfied in accepting this document as an essentially genuine record of the second century, which nobody has ever denied. All agree, that the Epistle of Peter, and the statement of James' proceedings on the receipt of the same, are directly connected with even the latest versions of the homilies or announcements of apostolic doctrine, which in the form we possess them were falsely attributed to Clement of Rome. After a careful investigation of all that has been written on the subject, we have come to the conclusion that the recognitions, as well as the later homilies, are more or less dependent from a much earlier tradition, if not scripture, dating from the apostolic period, and containing, under different titles, the

CHAP. VIII.

essence of Peter's preaching among the Hebrews and Hebrew Christians. This original Petrinic verbal tradition or scripture must have formed a very valuable supplement to Peter's Epistle to the Churches of Asia Minor, where at least the majority seems to have been free from the yoke of the law, so that it was essentially a Church of Gentile Christians.[1]

We hope to render probable, that the written sermons of Peter to which he refers, or is made to refer, in the letter to James, contained such an exposition of the Lord's doctrine as was compatible with the continued recognition of the law's validity, which invariably Peter upheld, whether addressing Jewish-Christian or Gentile-Christian communities. But he would be more rigorous and cautious when among the former. This necessarily double policy would lead to a perversion of his statements, such as the Epistle to James complains of. But here the question arises, why should Peter's preachings to the Gentiles or Gentile-Christians be kept secret among the Hebrews of Palestine? It is evident that the sermons referred to in the latter cannot have been addressed to Hebrew-Christians; for in this case their being kept secret in Palestine, if not in other places, would have no sense. Peter must therefore in his addresses to Gentile churches have somewhat more fully developed the secret doctrine of Christ, which the twelve Apostles had agreed, probably under Pharisaical compulsion, to keep as a secret, at least in the beginning. In so doing the Apostle did what his Master had done, who did not confide his mysteries to all. Peter thus tried more gradually than Paul, to pave the way for the great mystery of Divine sonship, which the Jews, and likewise the Jewish-Christians, were not then ready to understand and receive. Peter would not have spoken in Palestine, and probably not in Rome, as he did speak in addressing the churches of Asia Minor, and others similarly circumstanced.

[1] Comp. Reuss; also Weiss 'Der Petr. Lehrbegriff.'

CHAP. VIII.

We shall now give a brief extract of the leading principles recorded in the recognitions and also in the homilies, the former of which we regard, in comparison to the latter, as an earlier record of a still earlier tradition. If there existed in pre-Christian times a secret tradition; if in course of time it was recorded in apocryphal or hidden writings; if it was confirmed, developed, and applied by Christ; if He confided His secret doctrine only to a few; if His apostles for many years continued to hide the full light of the gospel from the people, till Paul proclaimed the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven on the housetops: then we must expect to find in the scriptures we are now considering a confirmation of the hidden policy of the Apostles, and of the connexion between 'the Hidden Wisdom' of Paul, that is of Christ, and the apocryphal wisdom of the pre-Christian age.

The Creator.

'God is One, and He is the creator of the world; the equitable judge, rendering one day to everyone according to his deeds.'[1] 'He is seen by the mind, not by the flesh.' Angels see Him, because they are likewise spirits; men will see Him when they have put off the flesh.[2] God is a supernatural Being; He has a body,[3] which is conceived according to the analogy of the human form; but no one has seen his shape, and therefore those passages which refer to bodily apparitions of the Deity are declared to be later interpolations. At the same time God is described as a Being of light,[4] and therefore compared with the body of the sun, whose rays pervade all, distributing light and warmth; He is the heart of the world, the centre from which all life proceeds, 'the Father' whose 'fleshless form' the eyes of men cannot see.[5]

The mission of the Spirit.

It has been fully established by arguments which have not, in the main point, been affected by later researches, that in the homilies the Spirit or Wisdom of God is identi-

[1] Rec. ii. 36. [2] Rec. iii. 30. [3] Hom. xvii. 7.
[4] Hom. xvii. 7. [5] Hom. xvii. 8–9; 16–17.

CHAP. VIII.

fied with the Son of God.[1] This indeed is quite evident. Ever since the beginning the Wisdom (Sophia) was by the closest bonds united with God, as the human soul is united with the human body. Wisdom is the medium of creation and revelation. Inasmuch as she rests hidden in God, she is called 'Wisdom,' and inasmuch as she issues forth or proceeds from God she is named 'Son of God.' Thus far all expositors agree, and the disputed deductions from this fundamental principle have no bearing on the subject we are considering. The difference between the Holy Spirit or Wisdom and the Son of God is one of cause and effect, of Divine essence absolute and Divine essence applied, of the infinite apart and the infinite connected and more or less identified with the finite. This operation of the Divine Spirit in the flesh constitutes the Divine sonship of the believer, or as Paul expresses himself: It is the Spirit of God which bears witness to our spirit that we are children of God.

According to the homilies the Divine Wisdom is the spirit of life for creation generally, and the spirit of holiness for mankind. In the former sense the Wisdom or the Spirit of God is called both in the recognitions and in the homilies, 'the hand' or 'right hand' of God. 'The Spirit by the order of God, as the hand of the Creator himself, separated light from darkness.'[2] It is 'the will of God' which introduced the light, and the works of creation were accomplished 'by order of the Eternal will,'[3] 'by the only begotten from the beginning,' whose 'head' is the 'all powerful.'[4] And because the Spirit is not only the creative organ, but also the organ of sanctification and the mediator of the sonship, the Divine Spirit or Wisdom is called 'the Son of God from the beginning.' And whilst the creation of the world is

[1] In the following treatise on the mission of the Spirit the leading works above-mentioned have been largely and freely used.

[2] Rec. vi. 7; comp. Hom. vii. 3; xi. 22.

[3] Rec. i. 27.

[4] Rec. vi. 8.

attributed to the same Spirit of God[1] which has been manifested in Christ,[2] it is plainly said of 'the Son' of God, that He has 'created heaven and earth.'[3] No other inference can be fairly drawn from this and similar passages than that the Wisdom or Word from the beginning became flesh, that through Christ's perfect obedience, and therefore absolute holiness, the ideal union of the infinite with the finite was realised, that *the* Son of Man became *the* Son of God. The second Adam has regained what the first Adam has lost, that is the Divine 'image and similitude.'[4] But since the foremost object in these writings is, not to explain when the sin first came into the world, but to insist on the original purity of mankind, it is no where stated that Adam has sinned, and that from him sin has been inherited. On the other hand it is clearly shown, that in the beginning men 'lived the life of angels,' that is were 'just.'[5]

It is clearly developed in the recognitions what it is which constitutes, or is designated to constitute, the likeness of the creature to the Creator. God has breathed into him 'the breath of His Divinity,'[6] and through this medium mortal men have become 'the participators of His (God's) only begotten,' 'the friends' and 'adopted children' of God.[7] This Divine breath or spirit existed from the beginning, and therefore before man; it is called 'the internal species,' which was before him, and which constitutes his higher or Divine nature. 'God when He *had* made man after His own image and similitude,' that is, when He had created the earthen vessel, when He had prepared the body, 'inserted the breathing to His work.'[8] And this distinction between the casket and the jewel is more fully explained in the following passage: 'for in every man is the image of God, but not in everyone is the similitude, except where there is a

[1] Hom. xi. 22. [2] Hom. iii. 17, 20. [3] Hom. xviii. 6.
[4] Rec. iv. 9. [5] Rec. i. 29; comp. Hom. iii. 10.
[6] Rec. iv. 9; v. 23. [7] Rec. iv. 9. [8] Rec. iv. 9.

CHAP. VIII.

benignant soul and a pure mind.'[1] As the free will of man is the origin of all evil,[2] so is it the necessary condition of his adoption, which is the result of Divine grace and of human obedience. Perfect obedience leads to the identity of man's spirit and the indwelling Spirit of God. Through the grace of the Creator and through the obedience of the creature, the latter becomes a participator of the only begotten Spirit or Son of God. This participation is measured by the degree of human obedience. Though, therefore, it is the selfsame spirit which was in Adam and which was in Christ, yet Christ is 'the first of men,'[3] the ideal man, the type of humanity which God conceived in the beginning as the object of His Spirit's mission in the flesh. Because of His identity with the Spirit of God, because He is the One who obtained the prize of humanity's high calling, Christ is the only begotten Son of the Father, and those who are created after His image, those in whom 'the internal species' has been realised, in whom the germ of life eternal has been developed, the breath of Divinity restored, are newly created after the image of God.

Neither the recognitions nor the homilies countenance the existence of different persons in the Godhead. The Spirit of God has from the beginning and in all ages proceeded from the Father, and this for the purpose of raising men to the Divine sonship, in accordance with the ideal pattern conceived by God in the beginning. With regard to the Divine Spirit the same idea prevails which we have traced in 'The Shepherd;' the Holy Spirit is the Son, because the medium of the sonship. This Divine sonship is to become universal, and thus God is to be all in all. For this reason, the Spirit or Son of God is called repeatedly 'the King of future times.' It is a Divine power which proceeds from God and returns to Him, when the mission for which it was sent into the world

[1] Rec. v. 23; comp. Hom. xi. 4; x. 3 f.; iii. 7; xvi. 19.
[2] Rec. iv. 24; iii. 22 f. &c. [3] Rec. i. 45; comp. i. 18.

shall have been accomplished.[1] It is to bring men back from their fallen to their first estate. As it was in the beginning, men are to live the life of angels, who see the Father, because through the Spirit their terrestrial body has been changed into a spiritual body.[2] Death is not the consequence of sin, but was by God decreed from the beginning ;[3] it is the necessary transition from the life in the flesh to the life in the spirit.

The true Prophet.

As the Spirit of God is a witness of God in man, man is destined to be a true witness, an instrument of the Divine indwelling Spirit. And in order that a man who fulfils this high destiny should be recognised as God's chosen vessel, he is endued with the gift of prophecying. Without this gift of the Spirit no truth can be revealed.[4] All non-prophets who have come to any knowledge of Divine things, must have received this from the true Prophet or from His disciples.[5] It is therefore of the highest importance to find the true Prophet. This is not difficult, for God has made it easy, so that all can find Him out.[6] By this can all men know whether a man is a true prophet or not: he must possess the Spirit at all times, and he must have a clear knowledge of what he says.[7] He knows the truth because the Spirit of God dwells in him.[8] Therefore visions, as well as dreams, cannot be a medium of revelation; on the contrary, they are a sign of God's wrath.[9] Again, 'the prophet of truth is he who at every time knows everything, the past, the present and the future, even in the most exact manner, who even knows the thoughts of everyone.'[10] It is therefore the very nature of the true prophet to speak the truth ;[11] he is even incapable to speak what is not true.[12] Finally, the true prophet does not sin, because he cannot

[1] H. xiv. 12. [2] H. xvii. 16. [3] H. iii. 24; comp. ii. 15.
[4] H. i. 19. [5] H. ii. 12. [6] H. ii. 9.
[7] H. iii. 12–14. The opposition against the speaking in tongues, and against the Montanist view of ecstatic prophecy, is evident.
[8] H. ii. 10. [9] H. xvii. 14–18. [10] H. ii. 6; iii. 11; ii. 50.
[11] H. ii. 6. [12] H. xi. 11.

CHAP. VIII.

benignant soul and a pure mind.'[1] As the free will of man is the origin of all evil,[2] so is it the necessary condition of his adoption, which is the result of Divine grace and of human obedience. Perfect obedience leads to the identity of man's spirit and the indwelling Spirit of God. Through the grace of the Creator and through the obedience of the creature, the latter becomes a participator of the only begotten Spirit or Son of God. This participation is measured by the degree of human obedience. Though, therefore, it is the selfsame spirit which was in Adam and which was in Christ, yet Christ is 'the first of men,'[3] the ideal man, the type of humanity which God conceived in the beginning as the object of His Spirit's mission in the flesh. Because of His identity with the Spirit of God, because He is the One who obtained the prize of humanity's high calling, Christ is the only begotten Son of the Father, and those who are created after His image, those in whom 'the internal species' has been realised, in whom the germ of life eternal has been developed, the breath of Divinity restored, are newly created after the image of God.

Neither the recognitions nor the homilies countenance the existence of different persons in the Godhead. The Spirit of God has from the beginning and in all ages proceeded from the Father, and this for the purpose of raising men to the Divine sonship, in accordance with the ideal pattern conceived by God in the beginning. With regard to the Divine Spirit the same idea prevails which we have traced in 'The Shepherd;' the Holy Spirit is the Son, because the medium of the sonship. This Divine sonship is to become universal, and thus God is to be all in all. For this reason, the Spirit or Son of God is called repeatedly 'the King of future times.' It is a Divine power which proceeds from God and returns to Him, when the mission for which it was sent into the world

[1] Rec. v. 23; comp. Hom. xi. 4; x. 3 f.; iii. 7; xvi. 19.
[2] Rec. iv. 24; iii. 22 f. &c.
[3] Rec. i. 45; comp. i. 18.

effect of Divine grace and human obedience man is filled with the fulness of Divine power; and the necessary consequence of this is that man becomes a true prophet, by speaking the words of God which he hears and by doing the works of God which he sees. Every man, possessing by nature the germ of all truth, may receive the sanctifying Spirit from above, and may bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. Such a fruit of the Spirit, and the most perfect, is the character and office of the true prophet. In the case of 'the pious, the truth pours forth from the indwelling pure mind.'[1] The meaning of this remarkable passage is further exemplified in the homilies by the record of what Peter said, or was in the second century supposed to have said, about his own experience. For in direct connection with the above passage Peter is recorded to have said, 'Thus also to me was the Son revealed by the Father; therefore, I know by my own experience which is the power of revelation. For as soon as the Lord asked me whom men said that he was, and when I heard some say this, and others that,[2] then it sprung up (or "arose") in my heart, and I said, I know not how: thou art the Son of the living God. But he who called me blessed, discovered (or "revealed") to me, that he who had revealed it was the Father, and from that time I became aware that revelation is to comprehend without tuition, without visions and dreams. And thus, indeed, it is; for the entire truth is in that truth which like a germ has been planted by God in us. But the same is either hidden or revealed by the hand of God, God operating according as he knows the worthiness of each individual.'[3]

[1] H. xvii. 18.

[2] Mat. xvi. 13, 14.

[3] H. xvii. 18. If we connect this fuller account of the Holy Spirit's revelation to Peter with the secret or apocryphal interpretation, which Paul confirmed, about the 'spiritual rock' in the wilderness, the conjecture suggests itself that Christ may have given to Peter the name of 'rock' in consequence of his having become an organ of the Spirit, by the expression of what the same had revealed to him. Only He whose Spirit was one with the

CHAP. VIII.

Rock and Keys.

In all ages and from the beginning, the Spirit, Wisdom or Word of God has been sent from above to dwell in man as a germ of truth, the development of which depends on the joint action of Divine grace and human obedience. This is the doctrine of the sonship, which was dimly known by some chosen individuals in all ages, and which Christ has brought to light, not only by extending the knowledge of the same, but by exemplifying it in his own person by his perfect obedience unto death. Thus Peter was led by the Spirit of God to behold with open face 'the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;' that same glory which in measure was shown unto Moses, whose countenance consequently became so resplendent with glory that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold his face, and that Moses had to cover it with a veil.[1] This doctrine of the sonship is the rock on which the Lord will build His Church; it is the Hidden Wisdom which Christ preached in a mystery to His disciples, to whom He thus gave 'the key of knowledge' which had been taken away;[2] these are 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' which the Lord promised to Simon, 'the Rock.'[3]

Adam and Christ.

If in the recognitions and in the homilies a parallel is drawn between Adam and Christ, the same can only be understood from this point of view, that is, as referring to the Divine sonship which since Adam was lost, and which Christ regained. This doctrine of the sonship, and this parallel between Adam and Christ, is in the recognitions explained to the Jews and Jewish Christians of the Roman Church by the figure of the ointment taken from the tree of life. So new was the doctrine of the Divine sonship in all ages to those for whom the recognitions were written, or possibly recomposed from an apostolic record, that it could only be introduced in a figurative or suggest-

Divine Spirit could know the origin of that revelation, which 'poured forth' from Peter like water from the rock. Hom. 17, 18.

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 7–18; iv. 6. [2] Luke xi. 52. [3] Mat. xvi. 16–19.

ive form. Clement is here recorded to have asked Peter after the meaning and name of the Messiah. In his reply, Peter is made to state that in the beginning God set up an ideal type for every species of created beings; thus, as for the angels an angel, for the fish a fish, for the birds a bird, *so for men a man*, 'who is Christ Jesus.'[1] He has a right to this Messianic name, because with the Jews the kings are called 'Christ,' as with the Persians they are called Arsaces, with the Romans Cæsar, and with the Egyptians Pharaoh. 'Now, the cause of this denomination is this, that because he was the (ideal) Son of God, and the beginning of all things, (and because) he has become man, the Father has first anointed him with the oil which had been taken from the tree of life; because of this ointment he is called Christ. Afterwards he will finally also himself, according to the predestination of the Father, anoint with a similar oil (and), as a recovery from toils, all the pious as soon as they have come into his kingdom, as such who have overcome the rough road, that also their light may shine, and that full of the Holy Ghost, they may receive the gift of immortality.'[2] The anointing with this oil is described as the application of the 'spiritual ointment,' and the same is distinguished from 'the ointment composed according to the art of the apothecary,' with which Aaron was anointed.

'I remember,' says Clement to Peter, 'to have heard from you that the first man has been a prophet; but you have not said that he was anointed. If, then, without the anointing no one is a prophet, how can the first man have been a prophet if he be not anointed?' Thereupon Peter is recorded to have smilingly answered: 'If the first man has been a prophet, he certainly was also anointed;

[1] This is the Philonic and originally platonic view, according to which the *ideal types* of the things *to be* created issued forth from the mind of God in the beginning. Jesus is the realisation of the Divine ideal and aboriginal man, and as such he is the Christ, of whom Paul said, that of Him 'the whole family in heaven and earth is named' (Eph. iii. 13).

[2] Rec. i. 45.

CHAP. VIII.

if it be that the recorder of the law has observed silence towards us with regard to his (Adam's) anointing, he evidently leaves it to us to add the same in our minds. For as, if he had only reported his anointing, it would not be doubtful that he be a prophet, so, as it is certain that he was a prophet, it is not less certain that he is also anointed, because, without anointing, he could not be a prophet. You ought, therefore, rather have objected, that the artificial ointment has been first composed by Aaron, therefore much later.' Hereupon says Clement, 'You do not deceive me, Peter, for I do not speak of that composite oil which passes away, but of that simple and eternal oil.' And Peter says, 'How can you think, Clement, that we all can know all things before the time?'[1] It is evidently implied that the doctrine of the Divine sonship was the principal secret doctrine which Peter suggestively and cautiously introduced in the Roman Church at a time when the public preaching of the apocryphal or Hidden Wisdom continued to be forbidden. And it is because the Spirit which was in Christ was also in Adam that a parallel is drawn between the two. Yet they are clearly distinguished, not exactly in the words of Paul as the first and second Adam, as the natural and the spiritual, yet in such a manner that this view is clearly implied. 'Christ, the eternal, is the first of men.'[2] 'Christ, who was from the beginning and at all times, although hidden, was always present to the pious, especially to those by whom he was expected, and to whom he often appeared.'[3] Thus he is stated to have appeared to Abraham and to Moses. But only in Jesus, the anointing Spirit, Wisdom or Word of God, from the beginning, the eternal Christ, whose object it is to make men prophets, friends and sons of God, has appeared in its full glory. He is the perfect organ of the Spirit. 'Christ is *alone* the faithful and true prophet.'[4] So far above Moses and the prophets is Christ, that even John the Baptist, who

[1] Rec. i. 47–48. [2] Rec. i. 43–45. [3] Rec. i. 52. [4] Rec. iv. 36.

is greater than all of them, is only the forerunner of him.[1] Yet so anxious is the writer to establish the similarity between them, that he quotes the prophecy in Deuteronomy[2] in these words: 'A prophet God will raise from among you, whom ye shall hear as (ye hear) me.'[3]

It is evident that the difference is one of degree only, and does not affect the parallel between Christ and Adam, of whom it is said, as we have seen, that at first he and his descendants lived the life of angels. As the only true prophet or organ of the revealing Divine medium, Christ must be and is identified with the eternal Spirit of God; it is Christ (that is the Spirit in Christ) who was in Adam, and who by anointing him made him a prophet. Because Christ is the perfect incarnation of the Divine Spirit, inasmuch as cause and effect have become one, it may be said that from the beginning the truth has been revealed through Christ, that he appeared to and in chosen men, and that at last he appeared himself on earth 'because it was impossible by another to purge the evils of mortal men.'[4] He became flesh,[5] wandered among men as a 'lowly' one, and for this reason He was not recognised as the Messiah by the majority of the Jews;[6] He suffered and died, but rose from the dead;[7] He continually governs His Church, and will return a second time to judge all mankind.[8]

This parallel between Christ and Adam, and the implied identity in essence, though not in measure, of the Divine Spirit in Christ, and in every other man, is more fully developed in the homilies than in the recognitions. As the number seven especially refers to the Godhead so there are seven periods of the world which are called the 'seven pillars' of the same, and each of them is successively represented by a chosen individual, by a man especially called to be the organ of the truth-revealing spirit of God. These seven pillars of the truth, these seven prophets, are

[1] Rec. i. 59–60. [2] Deut. xviii. 15. [3] Rec. i. 36. [4] Rec. i. 51.
[5] Hom. xvii. 16. [6] Rec. i. 49, 50. [7] Rec. 41, 42. [8] Rec. i. 49; ii. 42.

CHAP. VIII.

Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses. Adam might have been a perfect organ of the Holy Spirit, a perfect incarnation of the same, a true prophet, had he not sinned and therefore fallen from his first estate. Till sin came into the world, by man making a wrong use of his liberty, Adam was a true prophet, a perfect organ of the Spirit. He taught his children how they could love God and be loved by him; that is he transmitted to them the aboriginal revelation of God as an internal one. After that the only good God had created all things well, and had given them over to the man created after His image, man, filled by the divinity of his Creator, lived as the true prophet who knows everything, to the glory of God the Father, who had given him all, and to the best of the Sons which descended from Him, as the genuine Father among His children. 'Full of benevolence, he showed them the way which leads to the love of God, so that they might love God and be loved by him; He taught them by which of men's deeds the One and All-commanding God is caused to rejoice; and He gave them an eternal law, which can neither be destroyed by wars nor falsified by a godless person, nor kept secret in one place, but which can be read by all. As long as they were obedient to the law they had everything in abundance.' So also did Noah live with his sons 'as a king after the image of the One God.'[1] God has revealed Himself in the beginning to man by creating him to His own image,[2] and since every man possesses the Spirit of God he possesses the germ of truth. But being a free agent, it is in his power to cover up or to discover the truth.[3] Thus a continuing revelation became necessary because of sin. This continuing revelation through chosen prophets has for its object to pave the way for a renewed, if not for a more perfect proclamation of the aboriginal revelation by the true Prophet. If Adam did not realise (or did not perpetuate) the eternally conceived image of God, other organs of the

[1] Hom. viii. 10 f. [2] Hom. xvi. 10. [3] Hom. xvii. 36.

same spirit must from time to time be raised up among men, till in the fulness of time the fulness of the Divine Spirit may rest upon the true prophet, as the perfect incarnation of the same, so that by Him, as the ideal man, the aboriginally-conceived ideal image of humanity may be realised. All the seven prophets from Adam till Moses were therefore but imperfect incarnations of the Eternal Spirit, and thus forerunners of Christ.

'Let us look back upon the first speech of truth. If anyone will not concede to that man, who was created by the hand of God, that he possessed the Holy Spirit of Christ, how is he not the most impious man, if he concedes to another man, born from an impure tribe, that he has him. Most pious, however, he would be if he does not concede to the other this spirit; but if he affirms that he alone possesses him, who from the beginning of time, changing the form of things with the name, runs through the time, until having arrived at his time (and), anointed with the long-suffering of God because of his toils, he shall partake of eternal rest. This one is imbued with the honour to rule over and to command all that is in the air, on the earth and in the water; for this purpose he had the breath of Him who created man, the unspeakable vestment of the soul, that he might be immortal.'[1]

Here evidently a distinction is made between those who possess the Divine Spirit in measure only and the eternal Christ, that is, as we have seen, the eternal Spirit of God, whose fulness became incarnate in Jesus Christ during the latter days. It is the Paulinic doctrine, that the natural Adam was before the spiritual Adam.[2] Adam was the true prophet till he sinned, but Christ alone is the true prophet, and therefore the only perfect revealer of all truth. For according to the homilies, as well as the recognitions, the truth can only be known through the medium of prophecy. 'If one does not recognise the unfailing prophecy in its greatness, one cannot attain to

[1] Hom. iii. 20.

[2] 1 Cor. xv.

CHAP. VIII.

the highest good. Let the highest good be called eternal life, continued health, perfect mind, or light joy, intransmutability, or what else is, or may be, the most beautiful in the nature of being, it cannot be otherwise attained than by first knowing that which is as it is; but this knowledge cannot be attained, except by first knowing the prophet of truth. The prophet of truth is he who knows everything absolutely, that which has come to pass, how it is come to pass, that which comes to pass, how it comes to pass, that which is coming, as it is coming. He is without sin, full of compassion, and to Him it belongs exclusively to show the way of truth. Let anyone read, and he will find how it is with those who by themselves thought to find the truth; for that is the peculiarity of the prophet, that he makes known the truth, as it is the peculiarity of the sun that it brings the day. As many, therefore, as ever had a longing to know the truth, but who were not so fortunate to become acquainted with the same through him, have died, without finding her (and), whilst seeking for her. For how should that man be able to find the truth, who though he seeks her is bent upon attaining the same merely through his ignorance? Even if he did find her, not knowing her, he would pass by the same, as if it were not itself. No more can she be made his own through another, who (being) equally ignorant promises him the possession of her; unless it be that common-sense-knowledge, which can be known by reasonable meditation, inasmuch as the wish not to be affronted leads everyone to know that he is not permitted to offend another.'

'For this reason all who sought the truth, and were of opinion that they could find her by themselves, have deceived themselves. Thus it happened with the philosophers of the Greeks, and with the more zealous among the barbarians. As by their conjectures they took hold of the visible, they gave explanations about the unknown, and regarded as true whatsoever happened to cross their

minds. As if they had known the truth, whilst, however, they were seeking the same, they partly assented to the thoughts which presented themselves to them; partly they rejected them, without knowing what is true or false. Thus they set up positive canons about the truth, without considering that he who seeks the truth but from his error cannot know her. For as we have said, even if she is facing us, we cannot recognise her, because we know her not. Everyone who tries to know the truth by himself only, does not follow that which is true, but that which is pleasant, Now as to the one this is pleasant, and to the other that, so it is now this and now that which causes itself to prevail as truth. That, however, which is true is that which the prophet considers as such, not what is agreeable to every individual. Were it otherwise, if the agreeable were the true, the multifarious would be the one, which is impossible. Therefore the Greek philosophers (who are), not philosophers, have set up many and very different opinions with their conjectures, by regarding as truth the result of their suppositions, without considering that if the suppositions are wrong the end also cannot be different from the beginning.'

'Therefore, giving up everything, we must confidingly and solely give up ourselves to the prophet of truth, in respect of whom we can all judge, be we ever so little taught and cultivated, whether he be a prophet. According to his providence God has arranged for all, that all barbarians and Greeks can easily find him. It is with this as follows. If a man is a prophet, and knows how the world is made, what is in her, and what will be in future, then as soon as that has come to pass which he has predicted, we can after that which has already taken place give him also credit in respect of the future, as one who does not only know it but who knows it before. Who then should be so feeble in spirit as not to see that we may believe him above all things, even in respect of the Divine intentions, since he alone, among all men,

CHAP. VIII.

knows the same, without having first learnt them. If then we will not assume that such an one knows the truth, who knows the future beforehand by the Divine Spirit which is in him, in the case of what other man should we assume it? Is it not the greatest proof of poverty of spirit to ascribe to one who is not a prophet a knowledge which we do not ascribe to a prophet? It is therefore clear, that we must seek the prophet above all with the help of the prophetic announcement, and having recognised him, we must follow without hesitation his other doctrines, and with confidence live according to the same, being convinced that he who has said this has no nature to lie. And even if with respect to the rest of his sayings something should not appear to have been rightly said, we must know that it has not been by him wrongly said, but rather that we have not understood that which has been rightly said. For ignorance cannot pass a right sentence on knowledge. Even knowledge is not capable truly to judge prescience; but prescience gives knowledge to the ignorant.'[1]

Jesus the true prophet.

This theory is in another passage applied to Jesus. 'The true prophet knows all things, knows the thoughts of all, is without sin, and entirely pervaded by the consciousness of Divine judgment. Therefore we must conceive his prescience as absolutely independent from all outward things. . . . . Thus our teacher and prophet knew all by means of the Spirit which dwelt in Him, and which ever remained the same. Therefore He has with all confidence expressed Himself about the future, and has fixed events, places and times. An unerring prophet, He reviews all with the unlimited eye of the Spirit, and *He knows also the things that are hidden.* Were we with the majority also to assume that even the true prophet does not always know things before, but only at times, and when he has the Spirit (as also), for this reason, and that he is ignorant when he has Him not, we should deceive

[1] Hom. ii. 5–11.

our own selves by this assumption, and bring others into danger. For this happens only with those who by a spirit of disorder are translated into an enthusiastic madness, are drunk at the altars, and filled by the smoke of sacrifice. . . . But our teacher is not a prophet of this sort; . . . for about the temple He has thus prophecied:'[1] From this it follows, that according to the recognitions and homilies the Divine principle in Christ is not essentially different from the Divine element in all other men. If, then, God has breathed into every man 'the breath of His Divinity;' if thus all men possess 'the germ' of all truth, the development or non-development of which depends on his obedience; if through this indwelling Divine agency, which was in the beginning with God, all men have in all ages possessed the capability of becoming 'the participators of God's only-begotten,' the 'friends' and 'adopted children' of God; then He in whom alone for ever dwelt the fulness of the Divine Spirit must be the only true prophet, the perfect organ or advocate of the revealing spirit of adoption; he must be in perfect unity with the same, and thus with the Father from whom it proceeds; He must be, He is the Son of God.

According to the writings we are now considering the old and the new covenants are essentially identical. But in the fulness of time the second Adam revealed anew and far more fully what had been but elementarily revealed to the first Adam, and which had been veiled over by the sin of man. To remove this veil Christ came into the world. This renewed and more perfect revelation of all truth had become necessary, as we have seen, by the consequences of sin. 'The will of God has become unknown in different ways. Bad education, a wrong way of living, injurious association, evil habits, wrong opinions, caused error to prevail. The consequences of this were want of fear, infidelity, immorality, love of money, vanity, and a

[1] Follows reference to Mat. xxiv. 1; Luke xix. 43; Hom. iii. 11-15.

CHAP. VIII.

thousand other evils of this sort, which like a dense smoke filled the world as a house, and darkened the visage of the men dwelling therein, and prevented them from looking up in order to recognise God the creator of the world from the image of His being, and to become acquainted with His will. Therefore the friends of truth who are within must, with a truth-loving mind and with all their powers, cry for help, in order that One who is within the house filled with smoke may approach the door (or window) and open the same, so as to let the light of the sun enter from without, and the smoke issue from within. This helpful man is the true prophet, who alone can enlighten the souls of men, so that they may see with their own eyes the way of eternal salvation.'[1]

Even Judaism must be compared with a house filled with smoke. From time to time it had become necessary to raise up a really great prophet among the chosen people. But even the last of them, Moses, did not himself write down the law which he gave, but he transmitted it (verbally) to seventy wise men.[2] It was not till after his death that it was written down by men who were not prophets, and who if they had been such would have known that it would again be lost, so that they would not have written it at all. For it has been lost several times, and under Nebuchadnezzar it was destroyed by fire. Yet it was always written afresh. Of course it was not preserved in its original form, but falsified, the doctrines being intermixed with many statements which are contrary to God,[3] and the rights distorted by commandments which God has not given.[4] Among the falsified parts in the Pentateuch are those in which ignorance, lying, injustice, jealousy, repentance, are attributed to God; where it is stated that God is pleased with sacrifices;[5] where Adam's fall is referred to, or anything sinful is state

[1] Hom. i. 18. [2] Hom. iii 47. [3] Hom. iii. 47; xi. 38.
[4] See Hom. iii. 26, 56, where the sacrifices are especially designated not pleasing to God. [5] Hom. ii. 43–45.

about the other impersonifications (or incarnations) of the true prophet, the Divine Word.[1]

The truth in Scripture.

However uncertain Scripture has become by the mixture of the true with the false, yet already in the first book of the written law there is a passage[2] which shows what is true and what false in Scripture. It is enough to believe that Christ is the one who should come from Juda, and that he has taught how Scripture is to be understood. He himself is supposed to say that the true is mixed up with the false in Scripture, when He reproves the Sadducees, saying: 'Therefore ye err, because *ye know not the true things of the Scriptures*, and for this reason ye do not perceive the power of God.'[3] The same thing is assumed to be implied by the Lord's saying: 'Ye are professional (or appointed) money-changers.' And that he taught the necessity of reading the Scriptures discriminately, with the understanding, is proved by his having said: 'Therefore ye do not know what is according to reason in the Scriptures.'[4] Again, since, notwithstanding the existence of Scripture, he refers to the scribes and teachers[5] and to those who sit in the seat or pulpit of Moses, he thereby pointed to a hidden key of knowledge. Again, if Christ said: 'I am not come to destroy the law,' yet as he evidently did destroy parts of it, he proved thereby that what he destroyed did not belong to the original law, to 'the true things of Scripture.' If he said: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but a letter or stroke of the law shall not pass away,' we are to learn from this, that that which did pass away before heaven and earth cannot have belonged to the pure law of God. Therefore Christ said: 'Every plant which the Heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up.'[6] The writer points out that Christ himself, the true prophet, said: 'I am the door of life, who enters by Me will enter into life,'[7]

[1] Hom. ii. 52; iii. 43. [2] Gen. xlix. 19. [3] Mat. xxii. 29.
[4] These two here recorded sayings of the Lord cannot be traced back to him. [5] Mat. xxiii. f. [6] Mat. xv. 13. [7] Comp. John x. 9.

CHAP. VIII.

because there is no other saving doctrine. Again, the writer shows that the words 'Come unto me ye heavy laden,'[1] mean, ye who seek the truth without finding it. He refers to the words of Christ: 'My sheep hear my voice;'[2] 'Seek and ye shall find;'[3] and also from these passages he concludes that the truth does not lie openly and infallibly before us. Again, the writer points out that although the prophets longed after all truth, Jesus said that they died without knowing her.[4] Also he called himself *the One* of whom Moses prophecied.[5] As he knew the *true* things in the law, he replied to the question of the Sadducees why Moses had permitted the marriage with seven, by saying: 'Moses has only suffered it because of the hardness of your heart, for from the beginning it was not so. He who from the beginning created man created him as man and wife.'[6] To them who believe that, as the Scripture says, God swears, Jesus said: 'Let your speech be yea, yea; nay, nay; what is beyond this is from the evil;'[7] to them who say that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are dead, Jesus said: 'God is not a God of the dead, but of the living;'[8] to them who believe what the Scripture says, that God tempts, Jesus said: 'The *evil* one is the tempter;' to them who think that God knows nothing before the time: 'your Heavenly Father knows that ye have need of all these things before ye ask Him;'[9] to those who, according to Scripture, believe that he does not see everything: 'pray in secret, and your Father who sees also in secret will give what ye ask,' . .[10] &c.

The secret doctrine of Christ.

Even before Christ it was possible to distinguish the true from the false in Scripture.[11] Therefore, Christ said: 'On the seat of Moses sit Scribes and Pharisees, in all what they tell you give ear to them.'[12] It is shown that

[1] Mat. xi. 28. [2] John x. 27. [3] Mat. vii. 7.
[4] Mat. xiii. 17. [5] John v. 46. [6] Mat. xxii. 23; xix. 8, 11.
[7] Mat. v. 37. [8] Mat. xxii. 32. [9] Mat. vi. 8, 32.
[10] Hom. iii. 48–59. [11] Hom. iii. 18. [12] Mat. xxiii. 3.

he said this of them as of those to whom the key of the kingdom, that is of knowledge, was confided, which alone can open the door of life, through which every man can enter into life eternal. But, it is added, though they possess the key, yet they will not give the same to those who wish to enter. 'Therefore, I say, He himself arose from the seat, as a father for his children, *making known what from the beginning was secretly transmitted to those who were worthy*;[1] He extended His compassion also to the heathen, had compassion on the souls of all, and did not mind His own blood.'[2]

It is easy to understand this remarkable passage, if it be borne in mind that the Spirit of God is the revealing and restoring medium; that it was in measure in all men of all ages according to their obedience, and that in the fulness of time this eternal Spirit, Wisdom or Word, became flesh, became identified with the Man Jesus, who revealed to all the doctrine which had been till then kept secret by the few to whom it was known, not sparing His own blood in the fulfilment of His redeeming mission. The doctrine of all the seven great prophets was the same, since they were the specially perfected organs of the Holy Ghost. Thus the covenant with Moses was originally and essentially the same as the earlier covenant made with Abraham; however the latter had been rendered of none effect by the Pharisees, not only by the withholding of the key of knowledge, and by their bad example, but by their false traditions or interpretations of the written law, which had crept even into the most sacred of the written records. To harmonise the covenant of Moses with that of Abraham was, therefore, to restore the former to its original purity; for both were the special instruments of the universally indwelling Spirit of God. Gentiles as well as Jews are by nature participators of the only begotten Son of God, of the Divine Spirit or Wisdom, which though dwelling in man was from the beginning inseparably

[1] Comp. Mat. xiii. 35; Rom. xvi. 25. [2] Hom. iii. 19.

CHAP. VIII.

connected with its 'head,' that is with Almighty God. 'It is One Being who says to His Wisdom, "let us make man," of which Wisdom He (God) ever rejoiced as of His own spirit; the same (Wisdom) is like the soul connected with God, but is stretched forth by Him as the world-creating hand. Therefore, also, only *one* man was created, and it was from him that the female proceeded. And although here there is a unity, yet the same is according to the sex a dualism (or twofoldedness). For by extension and contraction the one may be taken as two. I do therefore what is right if I show every honour to one God as to my parents.'[1] This is stated to be the answer of Peter to the contrary assertion of Simon Magus. And it is confirmed by the fundamental doctrine of the recognitions as well as, more or less, of the homilies, of which doctrine the following dialogue is the fullest exponent.

Peter. 'Our Lord has neither proclaimed Gods but (or by the side of) the creator of all things, nor (has he) pronounced himself as God, but (he has) called him blessed who has called him the Son of God.'

Simon. 'Now, does it not appear to you that he who is from God is God?'

Peter. 'How is this possible. To the Father (it) belongs (to be) unbegotten, to the Son to be begotten; but the begotten has nothing in common with the unbegotten, or even with the self-begotten.'

Simon. 'Is it not the same as to origin?'

Peter. 'Whoever is not in every respect the same with another cannot share with him entirely the same denominations. Why do you not consider, that if the one is begotten by himself, or even unbegotten, but the other begotten, the two cannot possibly be called the same, not even if he that is begotten has the same being (or essence) as he who begets? Thus the human souls have immortal bodies, covered over by the breath of God, and because

[1] Hom. xvi. 12.

they have issued forth from God they are of one essence with Him, but still they are not gods. Yet supposing they be gods, then also the souls of all men must be it, of the dead, the living and the future. If then out of contentiousness you will declare also them as gods, how far is it still anything great for Christ, that he is called God? In this case what appertains to him (is) the same (which appertains) to all others.' [1]

We have already pointed out what will be fully confirmed by our gospel-investigations, that Christ taught a secret doctrine to his disciples, whilst speaking not otherwise than in parables to the multitude; that thus he uttered things which had been 'kept secret from the foundation of the world,' [2] or in the words of Paul, that he revealed 'the mystery which was kept secret since the world began.' [3] According to this secret doctrine Christ identified himself with the Divine Wisdom which in the beginning was with God and was God. Simon was therefore perfectly in the right if he spoke in the sense in which he is here reported to have spoken. Peter knew very well that this was so, but he was, as we have seen, solemnly pledged not to publish abroad in the outset what their Lord had secretly confided to them. He was consequently obliged to oppose, even in this point, the doctrine of 'the hostile man,' who by preaching the entire abrogation of the law threatened to undermine the only ground on which the Apostles were permitted by the rulers of the Jewish church to take their stand.

Personality of God.

In the so-called Clementine writings which we are now considering, the mysterious personality of God is insisted upon as the source from which the Divine Spirit proceeds. 'The one true God therefore presides in an incomparable form in the centre of the world; He is doubly (at the same time) the heart of the upper as of the lower things. From Him the power of life pours forth as from a centre. . . From Him all souls have life, because of the participation

[1] Hom. xvi. 15, 16. [2] Mat. xiii. 35. [3] Rom. xvi. 25.

CHAP. VIII.

in the spirit, which in all directions is unlimited; and when they long after Him, they are after their separation from the body carried into His bosom, as in winter the mist of the mountains is attracted by the rays of the sun. What love can we therefore bear towards Him, if in the spirit we behold His beauty. Otherwise it is impossible, because beauty without form is impossible, and because if he has no form, no one can by love be attracted to Him, nor can he even believe to see Him.'[1] 'Some who stand far from the truth, and war for iniquity, under the pretext of the greater honour of God, insist on His entire want of shape, so that without form or shape He should not be seen by anyone, nor desired by anyone. For the spirit which does not see a shape of God is empty of him. Yea, how is it even possible for anyone to pray, if he has nobody to whom he can flee for refuge, on whom he can depend? For (such a man) by not having anything to get hold of stumbles in the vacant space.'[2]

God is not the universe, but is absolutely supermundane. He Himself has a 'fleshless shape, which cannot become visible to human eyes, because they are blinded by the excessiveness of the light; and therefore it is not (as Simon Magus supposed) a jealousy of God, but his considerateness, which causes Him not to appear to men who have been transformed into fleshy existence. For the sight of God kills unless it be that through God's unspeakable might the flesh is transformed to a nature of light, and thus can bear the sight of the light, or that the substance of light is transformed into flesh in order to be visible to the flesh. For to see the Father without being transformed is the sole privilege of the Son, in which the just cannot participate until their bodies at the resurrection of the dead shall have become light and as the angels. Till then even the angels which are to appear unto men must first enter this temporary transmutation, because an entirely fleshless power cannot become visible. If

[1] Hom. xvii. 9, 10.

[2] Hom. xvii. 11.

therefore anyone receives a vision, let him understand that the same comes from an evil spirit.'[1] This view is indirectly confirmed by the remarkable passage in which Peter is recorded to have said at the conclusion of one of his addresses: 'Do you wish to become a temple of the Holy Ghost, then strive above all to drive out from you that unclean spirit.'[2]

It is then shown, that according to Scripture even such godless men like Abimelech, Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar, were warned by God through a dream. To receive visions is therefore not a proof of being especially called. For from 'the pious,' from him who is called and chosen, the truth breaks forth out of his inborn pure mind. Man is therefore called by an inward and not by an outward act. Peter having referred to the manner in which the Son was revealed to him by the Father, now proceeds, in a passage we have already considered, to reply to Simon Magus, who had asserted that Christ had appeared to him in visions.[3]

The Virgin-Born.

One very marked difference between the recognitions and the homilies must be more prominently noted than we have done. Whilst according to the latter the seven true prophets were, like Jesus, perfect organs of the Holy Ghost, and as such sinless, the former clearly state that Christ is 'alone' the true prophet. Yet in neither of these scriptures is there the slightest allusion, direct or indirect, of Christ's supernatural birth in the flesh. This doctrine is utterly excluded even in the recognitions, where we might have expected to find it supported. It was on the occasion of his water baptism that Jesus was called the Son of God;[4] for it was then that the Spirit of God, which had become imperfectly incarnate in all ages, and therefore had been 'running' through the times, in His fulness rested and remained on him who thereby became the Christ.[5] And baptism is defined as the cause

[1] Hom. xvii. 16.
[2] Hom. viii. 1–24; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 5.
[3] Hom. xvii. 19.
[4] Rec. i. 48.
[5] Hom. iii. 17–20.

CHAP. VIII.

of the new or spiritual birth,[1] which when perfectly accomplished makes of the son of man the Son of God, notwithstanding that imperfection which cleaves to the natural birth.[2] To the 'natural' is added the 'spiritual' birth.[3]

And this view of Christ's natural and spiritual birth harmonises perfectly with the pre-Christian and apocryphal doctrine of the incarnations of the Spirit or Wisdom of God, which we have fully considered. If then the non-personal power of God in the beginning issued forth from God, and in the end is to return to him;[4] if it is the object of its mission, by its incarnations to realise in the flesh the aboriginally conceived divine type of humanity, and thus to establish a kingdom of God among men, where God shall be all in all; then it is impossible to deny that the passages in the homilies in which the Divine Wisdom, 'the Son,' is referred to as the ruler of the eternal kingdom,[5] express but the logical consequence of the above assertions. This non-personal eternal and only-begotten Son of God, His right hand, the Divine image whose perfect incarnation was Jesus Christ, this Ruler of the Eternal Kingdom will be manifested again, no more in the humble form of a servant, but in glory. After the apparition of Antichrist, the spirit of false prophecy, the glorious second advent of Christ's spirit will usher in the end of (prophetic) time. When this 'eternal light' appears, all 'darkness' shall vanish.[6] The just become like the angels, that is, Spirits who see God;[7] the unjust are condemned to a fiery punishment, the object of which is stated in a very contradictory manner.[8]

These are the leading principles, according to the

[1] Hom. iv. 32; vi. 8. [2] Rec. vi. 9.

[3] The mixture of the infinite with the finite, of the spiritual with the material, constitutes that universal law of contrast, which is so fully developed in the homilies. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 46. [4] Hom. xiv. 12.

[5] Hom. xx. 2, &c. [6] Hom. ii. 17. [7] Rec. iii. 30.

[8] The same remark applies to what is said about the devil and his angels Hom. ix. 9–13; xi. 10–11; iii. 6, 59; vii. 7; xvi. 10; xv. 1; viii. 19.

recognitions and the homilies, with regard to the relations of the Divine Spirit with God and with man. They are clearly a development of the pre-Christian and Christian apocryphal doctrines. And so are those which refer to angels and spirits, to the universality of God's saving love, to righteousness as by the grace of God, and to atonement by righteousness.

Gospel-quotations.

Before concluding our epitome of the results of the leading investigations with regard to the recognitions and homilies, we must briefly refer to the gospel-quotations which they contain. Since the concluding part of the homilies has been published, the acquaintance of the writers with our four gospels is established beyond the power of contradiction. Little importance can however be attached to this, as we do not know when the text was finally revised. We meet with twenty-nine citations from Matthew, with nine clear and with two less evident references to the same gospel; there are six citations from Luke; one from Mark, being a literal reproduction of a passage only recorded by this Evangelist,[1] and also two clear references to this gospel; finally there are four, more or less probable citations from John's gospel, and three references to the same. Beyond these we meet with eight gospel-quotations which have no parallels in any of our gospels. One of the former, containing one of Christ's sayings, is likewise quoted by Clement of Alexandria. He writes:—'For not enviously said he (Barnabas), *the Lord did announce in a certain gospel*: My mystery (belongs) unto Me and unto the Sons of My House.'[2] It is evidently the same passage to which the homilies refer, when they record Peter's having said as follows: 'We recollect how our Lord and Master commissioned us with the (following) words: Preserve the Mysteries unto Me and unto the sons of My House.'[3]

Mysteries of Christ.

[1] Mark iv. 34. [2] Strom. v. 10; Potter's ed. p. 684; Sylburg's ed. p. 578.
[3] Hom. xix. 20; comp. Mark iv. 11, 22; Wisd. ii. 22; vi. 22; viii. 4; Eccl. iii. 19.

CHAP. VIII.

How Clement of Alexandria could confirm the authenticity of a gospel-quotation containing words of Christ which have nothing approaching to a parallel in our gospels is a question not easily answered. Perhaps our apocryphal point of view may lead us to a new suggestion. We have seen that to the twelve Apostles was confided the safe keeping and the eventual proclamation of the Lord's secret or apocryphal doctrine; that under then existing circumstances they must have agreed at first not to refer at all to those sayings of the Lord in which He had explained to them the mysteries of His doctrine; that nevertheless these apocryphal sayings of Christ were faithfully recorded, not only in the memory of the Apostles, but also in apocryphal or hidden writings; and that the latter were by the Apostle John, or at least with his direct sanction, worked up in that gospel which is the fourth in our canon. This apocryphal gospel continued to be kept secret till about the middle of the second century, when the direct and all-undermining attack of the leaders of Docetic, Simonian, or Alexandrian gnosticism against historical Christianity seems to have caused its publication. Until that time those teachers to whom the secret tradition had been confided after due probation, and under restricting obligations, would in their doctrinal addresses be guided by the secret and supplementary exponent of the Lord's doctrine; and they would yet do this without departing from their obligations. What these were Peter is recorded in the recognitions to have stated himself.

Simon Magus having referred to the contradictions contained in the sayings of Christ, whom therefore he refused to regard as a prophet, Peter thus replies: 'Our Lord, when he sent forth us the Apostles for the proclaiming of the gospel, has commanded us that we should teach *all people that which was committed to us. We can, for this reason, not pronounce these words* (the Lord's secret sayings) *as they were spoken by himself, inasmuch as w have it not in* (our) *commission to say this*, but to tea and to show therefrom (that is, from the Lord's sayir

as we announce them) how every one of the same is based upon truth. Nor is it allowed to us to say something of our own. If, however, (an Apostle) carries out that which was commanded him, and brings out their (the Lord's sayings) clear assertions, then it will appear that he fulfils the work of an Apostle, which I now try to accomplish, not pleasing you. Do not, therefore, blame that I bring out the words of him who sent me; but if there be anything therein which is not rightly said, which, however, can by no means be the case, then you may excuse me.'[1]

Here it is clearly stated that the Apostles were not commissioned to promulgate the sayings of Christ, at least *not all* of them *as they were spoken by himself*. Evidently for this reason, in the letter from Peter to James the former is recorded to have said, at all events he is made to say, that what he has verbally announced and written down must not be confided to anyone, Jew or Gentile, previous to probation. For the Apostles did not publish *all* the sayings of the Lord as they were spoken, though the above passage implies that *they might have done* this had they been commanded and enabled so to do. Instead of this they were commissioned to watch over, to guard and protect the 'mysteries' which their Lord had confided to them only. This is strongly confirmed by a very remarkable passage in the homilies, in which Peter, in reply to one of the expositions of Simon, is recorded to have declared that Christ had instructed them not to publish at all the true gospel (inclusive of his secrets or mysteries), till after the destruction of Jerusalem, before which time the false gospel would be preached by a false teacher: even after this event the true gospel is to be but secretly promulgated. 'As the true prophet has told us, the false gospel must first come from a certain misleader, and thus afterwards (and) *after the destruction of the holy place, the true gospel* (must) *be secretly transmitted for the rectifying of the future heresies.*'[2] And in another passage,

[1] Rec. ii. 33. [2] Hom. ii. 17.

CHAP. VIII.

the first false teacher is shown to be Simon, for Peter declares that the false apostles, false teachers, and heresies of which the Lord said that they would come, 'begin with Simon, the blasphemer of God.'[1] Whilst, therefore, the homilies support the statements of Eusebius and others as to Simon having been the father of all heresies, and whilst, by their combating the doctrine which we know as that of Marcion, they indirectly confirm the connection we have tried to establish between him and Simon, yet by their very scarce allusions to John's gospel, parts of these writings would seem to have been composed before the publication of the latter, inasmuch as every direct reference to the same might well have been added towards the middle of the second century, when the Gospel after John was no longer 'secretly transmitted.'

Mystery of Scripture.

We have here to consider other passages in the homilies, which refer to 'the mystery of the Scriptures;'[2] an expression intimately connected with the above passage in the recognitions. It is shown in the homilies that Christ has fully revealed and applied to himself, as the true prophet, the secret doctrine of the past, which was an epitome of the original revelation of God to man through the Divine Spirit, and that this secret tradition has been from time to time corrected by the seven principal prophets, of whom Moses was the last. This mysterious tradition has always been the secret rule or hidden canon for the interpretation of Scripture, which latter, therefore, was not and could not be rightly understood by all till Christ published 'the key of knowledge.' We have seen that Christ is spoken of in the homilies as having taught that which 'from the beginning had been secretly communicated to those who were "worthy."'[3] In another passage it is recorded that Peter and his fellow Apostles considered and designated themselves as stewards of the 'mysteries of Christ.' Since, then, so many religions have passed away, we are here as good

[1] Hom. xvi. 21. [2] Hom. ii. 40; iii. 4. [3] Hom. iii. 19.

stewards of the religion transmitted to us, and watched over by those who have preceded us; inasmuch as we bring the same unto you, *as if* we showed *the seed of the germs*, and placed (the same) under your judgment and power.'[1] Every man has by nature 'the germ' of all truth in himself, which is more or less developed in him by the Divine Spirit. 'The seed of the germs' is therefore the Spirit of God himself, whose perfect incarnation in Christ was effected for the purpose of fully revealing and demonstrating by his person the secret doctrine from the beginning, which was imperfectly revealed in all ages to the few, and was to become the property of all. Christ was to remove the veil of Moses, yet during his days in the flesh Christ did not speak to the people otherwise than in parables. And the reason for this mysterious form of His teaching is thus described by the Apostle Matthew: 'That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: I will open my mouth in parables; *I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.*'[2] The prophecy here referred to by the apostolic Evangelist is that contained in the 78th Psalm: 'I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter *dark sayings of old which we have heard and known, and our fathers* have told us. We will not hide them from their children . . . For the Lord established a testimony in Jacob and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers that they should make them known to their children . . .'[3]

If we recollect that Christ communicated to his disciples 'in secret and in darkness' what they were to 'proclaim in light;' that he did not speak the Word to the people except in parables, and that 'when they were *alone* he expounded all things to his disciples,'[4] to whom only it was given to know 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;' that he wept over Jerusalem because the

[1] Hom. ix. 8.
[2] Mat. xiii. 35.
[3] Ps. lxxviii. 2–8.
[4] Mark iv. 34.

CHAP. VIII.

things belonging to her peace had been hidden before her; that the Jewish rulers were charged with having *taken away* 'the key of knowledge,'[1] and that 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven' were promised to Peter[2] by Him who, in the Apocalypse, is represented as holding 'the key of David,'[3] it will then become evident that the mysteries of Christ consisted in utterances of things which had been 'kept secret from the foundation of the world.' As the perfect incarnation of the Divine Wisdom, Christ was like the latter, 'privy to the mysteries of the knowledge (or gnosis) of God.'[4] That same 'Hidden Wisdom' which 'Christ the Wisdom of God' had communicated in secret to a few, Paul openly proclaimed to the world with a zeal which could not be checked by the less enlightened and more restricted Apostles at Jerusalem. Therefore Paul wrote to the Romans that *his* gospel '*and* the preaching of Jesus Christ' was '*according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began.*'[5]

The revelation of this mystery by the twelve Apostles was a gradual one, and therefore their teaching was necessarily less comprehensive and clear. If, then, the preachings of any one of them, particularly those of Peter, were published in writing they would naturally be misconstrued. And this, according to the same document which we considered above, was the case even during the lifetime of Peter. Annotations of the apostolic preachings would therefore not be encouraged by the Apostles, although they could not prevent them.

It is a very striking coincidence that the same Clement of Alexandria, who quotes from 'a certain gospel' one of the Lord's sayings, as the same according to 'the preaching of Peter' has been communicated by this very Apostle and eye-witness, in another place states that Mark, the interpreter of Peter, wrote a 'gospel' during

[1] Luke xi. 52. [2] Mat. xvi. 19. [3] Rev. iii. 7.
[4] Wis. viii. 4. [5] Rom. xvi. 25.

this Apostle's lifetime, in which he noted down from memory what he recollected of Peter's public preachings, the promulgation of which gospel the Apostle 'directly *neither hindered nor encouraged.*'[1] It may therefore not be too bold to assert that the above saying of Christ, which refers to his secret or apocryphal doctrine, *was actually pronounced by Peter at Rome, and recorded during his lifetime by Mark his interpreter.*[2] His writings may well have been kept hidden for a time in some places; a circumstance whereby the doubts as to its authenticity may be sufficiently explained.

Simon Magus.

We have already referred to Simon the Samaritan and his docetic doctrine. Here we have only to consider what is said about him in the recognitions and homilies. In the first place we have shown, what others have done before, that he is not a fiction, but an historical individual; in the second place, we hope to have established the intimate connection between his doctrinal system and that of Marcion and his predecessors. It is the docetic development of the pre-Christian apocryphal tradition, the germs of which development we can trace to Alexandria, not only by the writings of Philo, but also by the Epistle to the Hebrews and that attributed to Barnabas. Not fully recognising this connection, the Simon of the recognitions and homilies has been, with very great ingenuity, and with almost universal consent,[3] regarded as the representative of all the teachers of 'gnostic' doctrines from Paul to Marcion. We hope to

[1] Eus. H. E. vi. 14.

[2] Not only are the preachings of Peter referred to in the letter of this Apostle to James, but also in that of Clement to the latter: 'I have not hesitated to compose for you an epitome of his (Peter's) addresses, which have been described and sent to you before by Peter, entitled: Epitome of Peter's Preachings.' Again, it is stated in the homilies that James had commissioned Peter to send him a regular account of his doctrinal addresses and his doings (Hom. i. 20). Thus the opinion gains ground that at least parts of the original Gospel of Mark have been worked up in the recognitions and homilies.

[3] See Baur, Hilgenfeld, Schliemann, Ritschl, Uhlhorn, &c.

CHAP. VIII.

have fully established our assertion that all the passages which are supposed to refer also to Paul refer to Simon only; and that at the time when Mark's original of Peter's preaching was written, Paul had probably not yet entered upon his apostleship.

It is Simon himself and his disciples and followers, the Simonians, who were also known to Hegesippus,[1] whom the recognitions and homilies represent as the teachers of false doctrines; whilst Irenæus, who lived when these so-called Clementine writings had been long known, calls Simon 'the father of all heresies'[2] It is written of Simon: 'He intends to be held as the highest power, and even above the Creator of the world; sometimes darkly pointing to Christ, he calls the same: Him who has been called into existence (or him who stands). Of this denomination he makes use, as if indeed He would always exist, and (as if he) had no cause (or germ) of corruption.'[3] This passage can now be explained from the extract which Hippolytus has transmitted from 'the great announcement' containing the doctrines of the Simonians. 'The highest power' is the invisible and incomprehensible essence, which he calls 'the great power,' and 'the mind of the universe directing all things,' being the heavenly offshoot from the one eternal root, which is the 'silence' of the beginning. From this is locally distinguished the earthly offshoot from that common root, the sucker which 'appears below the great thought.' Both form a pair, 'the Father' being in the air, supporting all things, and nourishing that which has a beginning and end; 'He is he who stands, who has stood and will stand,' or in other words, he who is, was and is to be. Simon therefore regarded Christ as essentially One with the Father, but as locally and therefore individually distinguished from the same. Yet he regarded himself as more than Christ, that is, not only as the incarnation of the earthly, but of the heavenly off-

[1] H. E. iv. 22. [2] Haer. i. 23; ii. 27; iv. 11. [3] Hom. ii. 22, f.

shoot or Divine emanation. Dark as these passages are, they clearly contain the germs of the docetic doctrine, which is a logical consequence of an erroneous conception of the relations between spirit and matter.

In the homilies Simon is accused to have denied the (carnal) resurrection of the dead, and not really to have believed in a future judgment; again, to have intended to give to Garizim the place and importance of Jerusalem, and to have explained the law in a figurative sense. It is said, that originally he was the leading disciple of John the Baptist. In the recognitions[1] it is stated that Simon had considered himself as 'the Standing One (that is, as God's representative, as Christ), and the highest virtue of the highest God, who is above the Creator of the World.' Accordingly he set himself up as an anti-Jewish Messiah.

If the Apostles were bound, at least for a time, not to divulge the secret sayings of the Lord; if, on the other hand, they were commissioned 'to teach all people that which was committed' to them; again, if in the beginning the merely verbal teaching of the Apostles led to grave misunderstandings and false annotations of the apostolic doctrine, then we need not be surprised to be told by Clement of Alexandria, that when Peter was at Rome, that is during his first visit to that city, his interpreter did commit to writing what he recollected of Peter's sermons. That Peter should neither directly hinder nor encourage such an undertaking is just what we should be compelled to assume, if Clement had not informed us of the fact, which is not contradicted by any earlier or later authority. Thus scriptures would be composed which, though not all at any time recognised as authoritative, might still be, and no doubt in many cases were, based on the doctrinal addresses of one or more of the Apostles. These would be called, as indeed they were, apocryphal scriptures, not only because they referred, or

[1] i. 72.

CHAP. VIII.

were supposed to refer to the apocryphal or hidden doctrine of the Lord, but because similar writings were at first entirely, and in measure during later periods, kept secret. Even some of the Lord's sayings, originally more or less paraphrased by the Apostles or Evangelists, might easily be recorded in an apocryphal scripture, although in neither of the directly apostolic records of the Lord's sayings such words were attributed to him.

We have seen that the Judaising government of the Christian Church was, some time after the destruction of Jerusalem, transferred from Jerusalem to Rome. In the beginning of the second century the rulers of the Church at Rome, that is the Roman bishops and presbyters, seem not to have pursued a tendency essentially different from that of those 'chiefs of the Jews' who prevented Paul's liberation, and probably also the free promulgation of his doctrine. For some time everything which referred to the pre-Christian apocryphal doctrine, whether confirmed by Christ or not, was as rigidly excluded as uncanonical, as this had been done in the Church of Palestine. But gradually, and through the verbal teaching of the Apostles, the secret and hidden or apocryphal doctrine of Christ was revealed, whilst at the same time Paul, by word of mouth and by his writings, proclaimed that same secret doctrine much more openly and comprehensively, not being under that yoke of bondage which the Jewish and Judaising rulers had imposed on the Apostles and their fellow labourers. This led, as we shall see, first to the apocryphal principles being by Luke grafted on the anti-apocryphal first gospel record of Matthew, then to the more complete harmonising of the same in the Gospel after Mark, and finally to the publication of the complete apocryphal doctrine as taught by Christ himself. This gospel, containing the hidden or apocryphal sayings of Christ, seems not to have been published before the latter half of the second century, and it is not improbable that, nearly up to this time, 'the preaching of Peter,' in a more original form, was kept

secret, inasmuch as Peter's discussions with Simon Magus referred to some of the most important questions which had received their solution by the secret doctrine of the Lord. Such an apocryphal scripture might have been acknowledged as canonical in the fourth century, since Clement regarded it as such in the second. But at that time, and long before, the interests of the projected universal Church required it, that all reference to the secret doctrine of Christ having been for so long a period purposely and necessarily kept hidden from the people, should be avoided. Above all, a scripture would be excluded from the canon, to which was prefixed an Epistle of Peter to James, referring to this very subject.

From the time of the publication of the Gospel after John, that is probably from the latter part of the second century, the word 'apocryphal' received a more restricted meaning. If till then every direct recognition of such doctrines as had been excluded from the Palestinian canon had been avoided, now after the open recognition of the apocryphal doctrine as taught by Christ, only those doctrines or statements were considered as apocryphal which were not contained in the four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, or in those epistles which the Church had then inserted in the New Testament canon. And yet so strong was still in Origen's time the belief that apocryphal writings existed which contained necessary and original expositions of the truth, that many turned to them as to an authority.[1] This tradition could never be quite eradicated. Some held[2] that the Apocrypha ought to be read by those who were perfected, but not by all; others referred to Christ's saying that he had said nothing in secret,[3] and defined the apocryphal writings no longer as 'secret,' but as 'absconded' writings. Augustin states in one place that they were called apocryphal

[1] Com. in Mat. xxii. 29, iv. p. 826.
[2] See Credner: 'Geschichte des N. T. Canon,' 1860, p. 111 f. and 279 f.
[3] John xviii. 20.

CHAP. VIII.

because their origin was unknown, and in another, that they were called so because the ecclesiastical canon rejected them. And still in the middle of the fifth century Bishop Turribius of Asturia wrote to the Pope Leo the Great, that some even greatly preferred the apocryphal to the canonical writings, the former being however exclusively within reach of a few adepts.

Ebionites.

The doctrines contained in the recognitions and homilies are unquestionably developed from, if not identical with those of the Ebionites, whose close connexion with the Essenes is more or less admitted on all sides. We have seen that these were the most faithful guardians of secret or apocryphal tradition, and as such necessarily that class of people in the Israelitic community with whom our Lord must have sympathised more than with any other. Originally the Nazareans seem to have been only another name or a branch of the Essenes, and therefore of the Ebionites, whose doctrine they may have slightly modified. It cannot be proved that the Nazareans and Ebionites were a separate sect in the first two centuries; since Epiphanius and Jerome are the first who note this distinction. Epiphanius states that at first all Christians were called Nazareans, the former name being given them first at Antioch by the Gentiles;[1] that they were distinguished from the unbelieving Jews merely by their faith in Christ; that they were at his time living in Coelesyria, in the Decapolis, near Pella, in Kokabe in Basanitis; and that they were the remnants of the church at Jerusalem which fled to Pella before the destruction of the city.[2] In the Acts[3] it seems to be implied that the name Nazarenes was the original name of the Christians.

The name 'Ebionites' or 'the poor' may originally have been the designation of all those whom the Gentiles first called Christians. '*The believing poor*'[4] were called blessed by the Lord; for whilst He declared it difficult for

[1] Naer. xxix. 1.
[2] Naer. xxix. 7.
[3] Acts xxiv. 5.
[4] Hom. xv. 10.

the rich to enter into the kingdom of heaven; and whilst faith was by Him insisted upon as the essential key to the same, 'the believing poor' possessed the two most essential qualifications.[1] To the 'poor' therefore was the gospel preached, in order that they might possess 'the key of knowledge.' But the instruction of the ignorant multitude could only be a gradual one at first. We have seen that the Lord taught the hidden or apocryphal doctrine secretly to his disciples, and only in parables to the people; and that the twelve Apostles carefully watched over the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven which their Divine Master had confided to them. To Peter alone 'the key of knowledge,' that is 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' were promised. In its general sense Ebionism therefore seems to have been the originally proclaimed apostolical doctrine, which excluded every direct reference to the Lord's secret doctrine. Originally the Ebionites, if the above definition be right, did not possess the key of knowledge; but they were taught by the Apostles as 'the multitude,' that is all but his disciples, had been taught by the Lord himself. It was not given them at once to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, that is the hidden mysteries as revealed by Christ. From this it would naturally follow that as the apocryphal doctrine was gradually promulgated, partly by the twelve Apostles, and more fully and uncompromisingly by Paul, the Ebionites, or at least some among them, would enlarge their doctrinal sphere, thus forming separate communities within their own sect.

And in accordance with this view we find that at the end of the second century the Ebionites, properly so called, recognised and used *only* 'the Gospel after Matthew,'[2] or according to Jerome,[3] 'the Gospel of the

[1] As we have already suggested, the meaning of 'the poor in spirit,' supposing these to be the exact words of the Lord, seems to be the poor who are *in the spirit* and therefore believe.

[2] Ir. 3, 11, 7. [3] Com. Mat. xii.; Eus. H. E. iii. 27.

Hebrews,' which Epiphanius defines as one closely connected with the Gospel after Matthew.[1] If the apocryphal sayings of the Lord had been carefully excluded from the first apostolic gospel; if Luke and Mark harmonised the former with the latter, and if in John's gospel was published the entire apocryphal doctrine of Christ; the exclusion of the three last gospels by the Ebionites is best explained by the assumption that they did not recognise the secret doctrine of the Lord, which neither he himself, nor at first his chosen apostles, had taught to the people. In course of time the Ebionites would however cease to acknowledge one and the same gospel, and would alter the same with a view to harmonising it with their more enlightened principles of doctrine. And this is what Epiphanius says of them: 'They wrote books, having composed them after the names of the apostles, at a distance from the presence of James and Matthew and of other disciples.'[2]

In the time of Epiphanius the Ebionites held essentially the same doctrines than those which have been transmitted to us in the recognitions and homilies. For he writes[3] about the former generally, and especially about those who had received their doctrine through the prophet Elkesai or Elxai, that Christ was the first created Adam, who through the breath of God had received a living soul Some of them said that He was from above, created before all things, that He is a spirit, being above the ange the ruler of all, that He is called Christ, that His kingdc is in the world above; that from thence He comes often as He wills it, *as He came in Adam*, and as appeared to the patriarchs. As He came to Abraha Isaac and Jacob, so also he came, in the latter time, in covering of Adam's body; he *appeared* to them, crucified, arose and returned. They said also, that *Spirit, which is Christ*, has attracted him who was Jesus. The Divine in Christ was therefore the Sp

[1] Haer. xxx. 13. [2] Haer. xxx. 23. [3] Haer. xxx

God, and the human was conceived not as a reality, but as an apparition in the veil of the flesh.[1] These Ebionites were evidently docetics, and as such opposed to the gnosticism of Cerinthus, whose party likewise used exclusively the gospel of the Ebionites, and who regarded the humanity of Jesus as a reality, the Divine essence being added to the same at some time or other. Of these docetic Ebionites, Epiphanius writes that they had cut away the genealogies in the Gospel after Matthew, so that the latter began with the words: 'In the days of Herod, the King of Judea, it happened.'[2] It is evident that they did this because the genealogies were opposed to their docetic views, inasmuch as they show Jesus to have been the son of Joseph, and *as such* the son of David.

Now, according to Epiphanius, this deduction from the genealogies was erroneous. And it is important to observe that he does not support his opinion by referring to the account of the birth of Jesus, as modifying if not as being contrary to, the genealogical descent. If in the time of Epiphanius, at the end of the fourth century, the gospel of the Ebionites, of whom he says that they (like the Nazareans) possessed 'the Gospel after Matthew in its greatest completeness,'[3] commenced with the second chapter, and if the first chapter of Matthew's gospel contained the account of the birth of Jesus in addition to the genealogies, he could hardly have omitted to refer to the former as to an apostolic account of the absolutely supernatural birth of the child Jesus. For Epiphanius is bent upon showing how wrong it was of Cerinthus and Carpocrates, who used the Ebionitic gospel only, to try 'to prove from the beginning of the Gospel after Matthew, through the genealogies, that Christ was from the seed of Joseph and Mary.'[4] This was, as we have seen, the doctrine of Paul. According to the flesh Christ was made of the seed of David. Nor did the Apostle even take notice of a

[1] See Baur, 'Christl. Lehre der Dreieinigkeit,' i. p. 158. [2] Mat. ii. 1.
[3] Haer. xxix. 9. [4] Haer. xxix. 9.

CHAP. VIII.

contrary opinion. If then we bear in mind that the two most ancient gospel manuscripts we possess date from the fourth century, that is from about the time when Epiphanius wrote the above, we are led to assume that the account about the birth of Jesus, to which not even Justin refers, cannot have formed part of Matthew's original gospel.

Collection of Holy Scriptures.

Before we can consider what the historian Eusebius has written about the Ebionites, we must briefly review the circumstances under which he was empowered by the Emperor Constantine to form a collection of Holy Scriptures.[1] Already about the year 170 Bishop Melito, of Sardes, had pointed out to the Emperor Antoninus that the Christian religion was the best support of the monarchical principle. 'The philosophy which we profess first indeed flourished among the barbarians, but afterwards, when it grew up also among the nations under your government, under the glorious reign of Augustus your ancestor, it became especially to your reign an auspicious blessing. For since that time the Roman power has grown in greatness and splendour. Whose desired successor you have become, and will be, together with your son, if you preserve that philosophy which has been nurtured with the empire, which commenced its existence with Augustus, and which also your ancestors did honour, with other religions.'[2] Now, in the year 311 Constantine declared the Christian religion to be permitted within the entire confines of the Roman Empire. This measure led to an open declaration of the liberty of conscience; for it was followed in 313 by an imperial edict declaring in the name of Constantine and Licinius the liberty of all forms of worship in the Roman empire.[3] Thus were caused openly declared divisions among the people, and even among the bishops, so that Constantine limited the application of the

[1] See Credner, N. T. Kanon, p. 205 f. [2] H. E. iv. 26.

[3] 'Now that each one of the Christians may freely and without molestation pursue and follow that course and worship which he has proposed to himself, . . . which it is obvious is consistent with the peace, and tranquillity of our times,' &c.

ordinance to the Christians of 'the Holy Catholic Church,' in which 'no room for schism or division' was to be left.[1] The relations of 'the Catholic church of the Christians' to the empire were in the year 325, at the Council of Nice, determined by an understanding between Church and State. Nothing was fixed on the important subject, which of the Scriptures were to be regarded as holy or inspired, and which not. This was decided by usage alone, which was different in the various churches. Confidence was expressed that the bishops would be led to a right decision.

In order to remove the inconveniences arising to the Church from such uncertainties, Constantine himself took the initiative, and in the year 331 or 332 issued an order to the Bishop Eusebius of Cesarea to undertake, *according to his own judgment*, the setting up of an authoritative collection of the Holy Scriptures of the Christians. This imperial task was accomplished by the bishop a few years before the death of Constantine (337), which was soon followed by his own (340).

It was probably 'some years after the Council of Nice,' when 318 bishops (or 'something more than 250') assembled and 'suppressed all the devices of the heretics,'[2] that Eusebius completed his ecclesiastical history, which consequently formed the groundwork for the setting up of the imperial canon, a task exclusively entrusted to himself. Whatever doctrines had therefore directly or indirectly been declared as heretical by the council which Constantine summoned at Nice in Bithynia, these were necessarily described in the 'History' of the Church as the opinions of the wicked. Accordingly Eusebius writes as follows about the Ebionites: 'The spirit of wickedness,.. being unable to shake some in their love of Christ, and yet finding them susceptible of his impressions in other respects, brought them over to his purposes. These are properly called Ebionites by the ancients, as those who cherished low and mean (or poor) opinions of Christ.

[1] H. E. x. 5.

[2] Valerius believes this passage to have been interpolated by Jerome, who also 'inserted many passages of his own,' in 'Eusebius's Chronicle.'

CHAP. VIII.

For they considered him a plain and common man, and justified only by his advances in virtue, and that he was born of the Virgin Mary by natural generation. With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary, as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ and a corresponding life. Others, however, besides these, but of the same name, indeed avoided the absurdity of the opinions maintained by the former, not denying that the Lord was born of the Virgin by the Holy Ghost, and yet in like manner not acknowledging his pre-existence, though he was God, the Word and Wisdom, they turned aside into the same irreligion, as with the former they evinced great zeal to observe the ritual service of the law. These indeed thought on the one hand that all the epistles of (Paul) the apostle ought to be rejected, calling him an apostate from the law; but on the other only using the gospel according to the Hebrews, they esteem the others of but little value. They also observe the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews, just like them; but on the other hand they also celebrate the Lord's days very much like us, in commemoration of His resurrection. Whence, in consequence of such a course, they have also received their epithet, the name of Ebionites, exhibiting the poverty of their intellect. For it is thus that the Hebrews call a poor man.'[1]

Common and gnostic Ebionites.

From this definition, which is not unlike that of Epiphanius, the junior contemporary of Eusebius, it follows that there were common Ebionites and gnostic Ebionites, the former rejecting all the apocryphal doctrines of the Lord, which neither he nor at first any of the twelve Apostles publicly taught; the latter accepting these secret doctrines of Jesus Christ, but rejecting Paul because of the abrogation of the law which he preached. If then the doctrines developed in the so-called Clementines were at first and in the main taught by Peter, the doctrine of this apostle was similar then to that of which the gnostic Ebio-

[1] H. E. iii. 27, comp. vi. 17.

nites in the fourth century were the only representatives. Whilst therefore those Jews who merely believed in Christ as the promised Messiah, but not in his secret doctrine, may be called common Ebionites, those who accepted his apocryphal doctrine, like the Essenes, may be distinguished as gnostic Ebionites. But by the side of these and opposed to them were the docetic Ebionites, mentioned by Epiphanius. These Origen distinguishes, like Eusebius, from other Ebionites, by saying that they acknowledge the supernatural birth of Jesus of the Virgin, *although both classes of Ebionites rejected Paul.*[1] In course of time the Nazarenes and Ebionites seem to have accepted the complete apocryphal doctrine of Christ as a supplement to the primitive apostolic doctrine, and though some of them may have been drawn away from the truth by anti-Christian doceticism, yet as a body they are more likely to have merged into the Christian church.

Conclusion.

The contents of the so-called Clementine recognitions and homilies justify the hypothesis that the original records of the preaching of Peter have been inserted and partly worked up in the above Scriptures. In the second century they were regarded by Clement of Alexandria as the authentic record of Peter's preaching; and according to his testimony, which remained unopposed until the fourth century, an epitome of Peter's preaching was written by Mark, his interpreter. Now, either Clement or his contemporary Irenæus of Lyons, is correct as to the time when Mark wrote down the substance of the preaching of Peter in Rome, where the Apostle had successfully combated Simon of Samaria. We hope to have adduced a strong argument in favour of Clement's testimony, according to which Mark wrote during the Apostle's lifetime, what he recollected about Peter's preaching. For, in the first place, we have tried to assign a reason for Peter's neither encouraging nor discouraging his interpreter's undertaking; and, in the

[1] Orig. C. Cels. vi. 61.

CHAP. VIII.

second place, we have tried to show that the absence of every direct allusion to Paul or to his writings is best explained by the assumption that this record of the Apostle's disputations with Simon was written before the time when Paul came forward as an Apostle of Jesus Christ. We supported this view by proving that every supposed indirect allusion to Paul may be, and in our opinion must be, explained as referring to Simon, who evidently is the 'hostile man' mentioned in the Epistle of Peter to James, and 'the adversary' repeatedly spoken of by Peter in the homilies.

We therefore venture now to assert that the testimony of Clement must in this respect be preferred to that of Irenæus; that accordingly Mark wrote his record of Peter's preaching at Rome, particularly of his disputations with Simon of Samaria during the Apostle's lifetime, and most probably in that earliest apostolic period when Paul, though converted, had not yet been recognised as an apostle by the Apostles at Jerusalem, even if he had already at that time entered upon his apostolic mission.

It is not so easy to show that the preaching of Peter, as transmitted to us by these Scriptures, if taken as a whole, is essentially identical with Mark's original record of the same. Thus much, however, is certain, that Clement of Alexandria knew in the second century a scripture called 'the preaching,' and which he regarded as an authentic record of the substance of the Apostle's addresses in Rome, since he introduces quotations from the same by the words, 'Peter saith,' or 'Peter in the preaching saith.' Inasmuch as these quotations of Clement from the preaching of Peter are essentially identical with the version contained of these passages in the homilies, or preaching of Peter, which we possess, no reasonable doubt can exist on the essential identity of the so-called Clementine homilies, referring to Peter's preaching, and of that version of the same which Clement of Alexandria regarded as authentic and authoritative. And this con-

clusion is confirmed by the memorable fact that Clement has recorded a statement made by Barnabas, according to which Peter quoted a saying of the Lord, which was, according to Barnabas, contained 'in a certain Gospel,' and which has been transmitted to us only by the homilies.[1] It is, then, not unreasonable to conclude that Barnabas, as well as Clement, testify to the existence of a written document referring to the preaching of Peter, and that this document of the apostolic period is at least partly contained in the preaching of Peter as recorded in the homilies. We shall later consider whether we have sufficient reasons for assuming that the disputations between Peter and Simon, as recorded in the homilies, formed the one part, and the record of the principal incidents of Christ's life, as contained in the Gospel 'after' Mark, the remaining part, of the original Gospel of Mark which he wrote during the lifetime of Peter.

The record in the recognitions and homilies about Peter's preaching in Rome, though not complete, must be regarded as essentially historical, even if we had no reasons for assuming the general identity of the above with the record of Peter's preaching to which Barnabas and Clement of Alexandria refer. For since the record we possess was in the second century supposed to have been written by Clement of Rome, the disciple and successor of Peter, and purports to contain a correspondence between Peter and James, and the disputations between Peter and Simon, the facts herein recorded were, if not historical, at least intended to be believed as such by the contemporaries of the Roman bishop, who was, like Mark, the contemporary and the disciple of Peter.

[1] The testimony of Barnabas is all the more important, because we know that, according to Clement of Alexandria (Str. 2, p. 176 Sylb.) and Eusebius (H. E. i. 12), he was early a disciple of Christ, and one of the seventy; and that according to the homilies he preached in Rome and Alexandria, converting the Roman Clement; whilst according to the recognitions he preached in Rome even during the lifetime of Christ.

CHAP. VIII.

Nobody supposes Clement to have written these writings which have been later attributed to him. But were he the writer, the testimony would be as directly apostolical than if it could be positively proved that Mark had written the same. The recognitions and homilies contain in part that which in the second century was believed to be genuine and authoritative tradition about the preaching of Peter in Rome. The difference between the same and the preaching of Paul originated in the keeping back by the one, and in the proclaiming by the other, of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ. The time came when both apostles preached the same doctrine, and a record of Peter's early preaching would naturally not be received into the canon in the fourth century, when the same was finally settled. Moreover, though Clement of Alexandria quotes it as an apostolic record, it may possibly already at that time not have been recognised as such in the Roman church, where a record showing a discrepancy between the early preaching of Peter and that of Paul would not be regarded as favouring Catholicity. It is to be regretted that the first lines of the Muratorian list, which refer to Matthew's and Mark's Gospels, have been lost. Did the writer refer to Mark's record of the preaching of Peter? If so, the hardly casual disappearance of these few lines would be easily accounted for. If not, a probably Roman document of the second century, which does not mention either of the Epistles of Peter, or the Epistle of James, must be acknowledged to be written with a tendency of obliterating that difference between the early apostolic preaching, of which the above Epistles and that to the Galatians are the indelible memorials.

If we but regard the record of Peter's preaching in Rome as genuine in essence, though not in form, the same throws much light on the state of the Christian church previous to Paul's proclamation of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ. The preaching of Peter refers, then, to the time

preceding the apostolic conference, which may have taken place as early as the year 50 A.C., even if we reckon seventeen years to have elapsed between the same and his conversion, which Eusebius places in the year 33. Not one of the apostolic epistles refers to so early a period, that is, to a time when no other than Matthew's gospel, and some of the records contained in the Acts, could have been written. By the help of this ancient record we may draw the following outlines of a picture of those early times.

Peter meets Simon in Rome, and confronts him in public disputations. No reference is made to Simon as a magician, or as a Gentile. It is by fair argumentation only that the rock-Apostle tries to persuade the Samaritan, that instead of opposing the Apostles, he ought to learn from them and become their fellow-worker, before he preaches in the name of Christ and with the credentials of truth. Simon refers to contradictions contained in the promulgated words of Christ; and Peter, in reply, asserts that the Apostles are not commissioned to promulgate the sayings of Christ 'as they were spoken by himself,' and that it was left to their teaching to show *how* every one of them is based upon truth. Peter argues from this that if the words of Christ as promulgated by them did contain contradictions, which in his opinion they cannot do, then Simon ought to excuse him. Thereby Peter seems to imply that he and his fellow-apostles were not commissioned to promulgate at once all the sayings of Christ, and that the apparent contradictions contained in those which were promulgated, originate in the necessary imperfect, that is, as we must explain, incomplete promulgation of Christ's sayings. The Lord had commissioned the Apostles, to whom alone he confided his mysteries, to preserve the same (in secret) till after the destruction of Jerusalem, and even then to transmit them 'secretly.' For Christ has made known 'what from the beginning was secretly transmitted (only) to those who were worthy.'

Simon is called the first heretic by Peter, and this is

CHAP. VIII.

what the early fathers of the Church unanimously confirm. There can be no doubt that the preaching of Simon was adverse to that of the Apostles. For he insisted on the abrogation of the law, and derived his authority as a Christian teacher from visions through which Christ had instructed him. Thus he dispensed with asking James for credentials as a teacher, and this was contrary to apostolic rule. But his heresy consisted chiefly in the docetic doctrine, the origin of which we have tried to trace to Alexandria, according to which a perfect incarnation of the Divine Word is impossible. Simon was not satisfied with Peter's declaration that Christ revealed the Hidden Wisdom from the beginning. The great Samaritan denies the humanity of Christ, and regards Him as the Divine Wisdom from the beginning, which has appeared in the veil of the flesh, and to which, since it was in the beginning with God, honour and adoration was due as to a second God. Against this Peter protests. Christ has not proclaimed one or more gods by the side of the one only God, the Creator of all things; consequently He could not and did not proclaim Himself as God; on the contrary, He called that disciple blessed who called Him the Son of God. Even Peter did not fully know that Christ is in the Father, and the Father in Him; that the Son and the Father are one; to him, though not to Simon, it seemed impossible that 'He who is from God is God;' that the one should in all respects be entirely the same with the other. No more are the souls one with God, although their immortal bodies are covered over by the breath of God. In this sense Simon might, in his contentiousness, declare all the souls to be gods. But if so, how far can it still be 'anything great for Christ that He is called God? In this case, what appertains to Him... appertains to all others.' Thus argued Peter.

If we succeed in showing that the secret doctrine of Christ was a forbidden doctrine at Jerusalem; and that the Apostles were exempted from the persecutions to

which all the Christians were exposed, on the tacit or express condition that they would not divulge the mysteries of their Master, which one of their number had probably betrayed to the rulers of the Jewish church; then nothing is more natural, and more confirmatory of the genuineness of Peter's Epistle to James, than that the former should urge upon the latter the necessity of taking extreme precautions, in order to prevent the promulgation of their Master's secret doctrine. But it may well be doubted whether, in the face of Simon's teaching, which as regards the doctrine of the Divine sonship was not far different from the secret doctrine of Christ, whether even the most rigid restrictions and precautions would avail in keeping back, for any lengthened time, the full light of Christ's gospel. It may be said that by the open disputation between Peter and Simon, the entire hiding of Christ's mysteries had become impossible. The sensation created among the hearers was very great, as we are told, and as we may well conceive. Many of his words, as transmitted to us, might easily be differently construed by different people. Peter complains that this was the case during his stay in Rome, and he foresees more serious controversies which might arise after his death. Mark was urged by those who heard Peter, to record the substance of his preaching, that is principally of his disputations with Simon. He does so, whilst Peter neither encourages or discourages him. For whilst wishing for a correct record, in order to put an end to dangerous misconstructions, the Apostle could not openly sanction the promulgation of doctrines touching more or less directly upon the secret doctrine of Christ, which he and his brother apostles were bound to hide from the people.

Peter had thus been led indirectly to divulge the secret, that Christ had also taught a secret doctrine. In the eyes of James and others among the Apostles, this course must have been considered highly dangerous, and was excluding the possibility of continuing to hide the Lord's

CHAP. VIII.

mysteries from the people in Palestine. Peter's recommendation to James shows, that the former was quite alive to the danger to which his preaching in Rome had exposed the Palestinian church; and the manner in which James carried out Peter's proposal proves that this was considered by him as a question of life and death. Again, Peter's preaching had created so great a sensation in Rome, that records of the same could not be prevented, and that he did not consider himself called upon to discourage Mark from writing an authoritative account of the same. In fact Peter had become the forerunner of Paul.[1] Not only did he preach to Jews and Gentiles, but his gospel was to a certain extent another gospel than that which the Apostles at Jerusalem had agreed to promulgate in the outset, or whilst the darkness continued. Peter was no longer in the same boat with James and the apostolic body.

The fishers of men.

We find a strong confirmation of this view, if we interpret in a figurative sense the record contained in the four gospels about conversations between Christ and some of his disciples on and near the Sea of Galilee, which in the fourth gospel is called after the town of Tiberias, built by Herod Antipas on its shores.[2] According to Matthew, Jesus walking by the Sea of Galilee saw Simon Peter and Andrew his brother, who were fishers, casting a net into the sea, and he said to them, 'Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men; and they straightway left their nets and followed him.'[3] The same is recorded about James and John, the sons of Zebedee. According to Luke, Christ said to Simon, on this or on a similar occasion: 'Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a

[1] In the Muratorian list, John is called 'the predecessor of the apostle Paul.' So he was; at all events, as the guardian and recorder of the Lord's secret saying, which Paul first promulgated, whilst Peter had paved the way for him.

[2] In ancient times this lake was called after the town of Chinnereth (Num. xxxiv. 11; Deut. iii. 7), or Chinneroth (Jos. xii. 3). Later it was called Gennesar (1 Mak. xi. 67) or Gennesaret (Luke v. 1).

[3] Mat. iv. 18-20.

draught.'[1] Luke probably refers to the same occasion, when Christ told Simon and his brother that he would make them, or as Mark has it, make them 'to become' fishers of men.[2] Even if we assume that Luke refers to a different occasion, he must have known these words to have been on an earlier occasion addressed to the disciples. He does not yet record them, perhaps because in the opinion of the Paulinic Evangelist these apostles had not at once become fishers of men. To become such they must boldly launch out into the deep. Simon acknowledges that they 'have toiled all the night and have taken nothing.' They had not yet reaped what the Lord had sown;[3] they had 'toiled' under the restrictions, obligations and heavy loads of the law; the night had not yet passed; the morning was come and yet there was night.[4] Darkness still covered the earth and the chosen people especially; the time had not yet come when the mysteries which Christ had confided only to them in secret and in 'darkness,' could be proclaimed in the 'light' of that gospel wherewith Christ has made his people free. No wonder then, that those whom the Lord would *make* fishers of men, had 'taken nothing.' Yet they had faith enough in the 'word' of Christ to let down the net in the deep, for a draught of men. 'And when they had this done, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes, and their net brake. And they beckoned unto their partners which were in the *other* ship, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both ships, so that they begun to sink.' Their net and their ships were not sufficiently prepared for such a launch in the deep mysteries of Christ. They now caught a multitude of fish of every kind, and none were rejected. Some of the twelve, like Peter, may have been already preaching among the Gentiles, even in Samaria, whilst others, like James, preached the gospel to the Jews only. But now the partners of Simon Peter, who were in the *other* ship,

[1] Luke v. 4. [2] Mark i. 17. [3] John iv. 37. [4] Is. xxi. 11 f.

CHAP. VIII.

that is the sons of Zebedee, come and help, and both ships are filled, so that they begin to sink. 'When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord! For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken. And so was also James, and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said *unto Simon*, Fear not; *from henceforth thou shalt* catch men. And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all, and followed him.'[1]

Not until Peter had launched out into the deep could he catch men; till then he could catch nothing. For he understood not fully the depths of Christ's mysteries, that is, 'the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God,'[2] nor 'the mystery among the Gentiles;[3] the fellow heirs of the promise. Seeing his success, his partners, the sons of Zebedee, join him, *forsake all* and follow Christ. The draught was too weighty for their boats. They were ready to sink, and thus to lose their contents, like the old bottles containing the new wine. But now that the time of the gathering had come, the Lord of the harvest sent more labourers into the field. Many servants had gone forth to invite to the marriage of the king's son, and the first among the invited guests were not worthy, so that the room had to be filled with bad and good, yet with the restriction, that to belong among the few chosen ones, to be covered by the wedding-garment of the law, was necessary for admission.[4] Then that one servant (Paul) was sent out, who having bid many who would not go in, invited all he could find to come to the marriage, *all of them* being not only called but chosen, and this *without* the wedding-garment of the law; so that the Lord's house was filled, whilst the first called were excluded.[5]

Now, if we turn to the account contained in the fourth

[1] Luke v. 8–11. [2] Rom. xi. 33. [3] Col. i. 27; Eph. iii. 6.
[4] Mat. xxii. 1–14. [5] Luke xiv. 16–24.

gospel about *the risen* Christ's conversations with some of his disciples at the sea of Tiberias;[1] and if we likewise interpret the same in a figurative sense, without prejudice to its historical value, we shall find that this chapter refers to that time when Peter launched out into the deep, and having separated himself to a certain extent from the apostolic body, begun to meet with success in his mission.

The companions of Simon Peter are no longer the sons of Zebedee, and Andrew Peter's brother; but instead of the latter, Thomas called Didymus and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee and 'other disciples' declare themselves willing to go with Peter a-fishing. They enter into *one* ship, but '*that night* they caught nothing.' *With the morning*, Jesus stood on the shore, but they knew him not as such. Hearing that they had no meat,[2] that they had no knowledge of the meat of Christ, he told them to 'cast the net on the *right side* of the ship.' Having done this, they found according to promise, and were not able to draw the net 'for the multitude of fishes,' whilst notwithstanding these the net 'was *not* broken.' Because of this marvellous success, 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' said to Peter, 'it is the Lord.' Hereupon Peter (like Adam in Paradise) is ashamed of his nakedness, girts himself with his fisher's coat, and throws himself into the sea, whilst the other disciples, who had kept close to the land, dragged the net, which, when Peter drew it to land, was found to contain 153 fishes.

Thus the account contained in the Gospel after John may, like that in Luke, be explained in a figurative sense, and shown to refer to the relations between Peter and the other Apostles, and to a time when the difficulties resulting from the restrictive gospel propagation had been partly removed, to which 'the preaching of Peter' indirectly refers. The partners of Peter, including the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who had recorded the very

[1] John xxi. [2] Comp. John iv. 34.

CHAP. VIII.

words in which Christ had taught his secret doctrine, are no longer in different ships. They launch out together into the deep, and though it is John who first recognises the Lord's presence, yet Peter is at once converted and confesses himself to be a sinful man, an unprofitable servant, who had hidden some of the Lord's money, some of the treasure confided to his stewardship.[1] The Lord drew Peter after him. Having been caught in the net of Christ, the rock-Apostle had now become a true fisher of men. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the fact that the 153 fishes can be so explained as to contain a hidden reference to Simon Jonas, by which name Christ exclusively addresses the distinguished disciple in this part of John's gospel. For according to the numerical value of the Hebrew letters, the name Simon Jona gives the sum 153.[2] Peter's epistles are a proof that he preached to Jews *and Gentiles* Christ within them,[3] 'the unsearchable riches of Christ,'[4] that is 'the mystery which was kept secret since the world begun.'[5] He followed his Master's call and fed the lambs of the good shepherd, of the Lamb of God, and when he was old he followed his Lord into death, suffering the death of the Cross,[6] whilst John tarried till after the destruction of Jerusalem, when Christ was expected to come.

The tempest.

The narrative about Christ stilling the tempest may likewise admit of an allegorical interpretation by the side

[1] The hidden money wherewith Jesus paid tribute may here be referred to. Peter, the fisher of men, is ordered to hook 'the fish that *first* cometh up,' and to open his mouth, when he would find the hidden treasure safely lodged in the same (Mat. xvii. 24–27). It is as if Jesus had intended to remind Peter that, as of old so now, the Word of God is not hidden to any man, but to be found within him.

[2]

ש	=	ש	=	21	י	=	10
מ	=	ם	=	13	ו	=	6
ו	=	י	=	70	נ	=	14
נ	=	נ	=	14	א	=	5
				118	+		35 = 153.

For this calculation see Egli, in Theol. J. B., 1854, p. 134.

[3] Col. i. 27.

[4] Eph. iii. 8.

[5] Rom. xvi. 25; see Mat. xiii. 35.

[6] John xxi. 18; 2 Pet. i. 14.

of the purely historical incident, and thus may be explained as referring to the relations between Christ and his disciples.[1]

Already the fathers of the Church have interpreted the ship tossed about by the waves as a symbol of the Church and the dangers to which she is exposed; and it has been shown that already the Psalmist makes use of the same symbol. The Lord 'spake and raised a stormy wind which lifted up the waves of the sea: . . . Then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and he brought them out of their distresses. He made the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof were still, and they were glad to rest; and he brought them unto their desired haven.'[2] This means, that 'the redeemed of the Lord,' whom he gathered 'out of the lands from the east and from the west, and from the north and from the south,' will be brought back to Zion, the typical place of that rest which remaineth for the people of God.[3] It is the same symbol which we find used in the description of Daniel's vision referring to the four beasts, or to the kings of the Gentiles among whom the Israelites are scattered. Daniel saw how 'the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea.'[4] And Zechariah, having first seen in a vision that as long as 'all the earth sitteth still and is at rest' the Lord will not 'have mercy on Jerusalem,'[5] was shown in another vision how four chariots, that is, 'the four Spirits of the heaven,' went forth to carry the wrath of God into the lands of the Gentiles.[6]

Now, if we turn to the two narratives of the storm on the Sea of Galilee, we find that on the first occasion[7] it was Jesus who 'entered into a ship' whilst 'his disciples followed him.' A great tempest arose, and Jesus was asleep; the disciples having awoke him he reprimanded

[1] For some of the particulars in the following, refer to Strauss Leben Jesu, 1864, p. 490, f; also Hengstenberg on the Psalms.

[2] Ps. cvii. 25, 28–30. [3] Ps. cvii. 2. [4] Dan. vii. 2.

[5] Zech. i. 11, 12. [6] Zech. vi. 1–5.

[7] Mat. viii. 23–27; Mark iv. 36–40; Luke viii. 22–25.

CHAP. VIII.

them because of their want of faith, and by rebuking the winds and the sea he caused 'a great calm.' If allegorically explained, this historical event may also refer to the storm which the followers of Jesus had to encounter, and which filled the former with fear, whilst the latter closed his eyes to it, and knew how to create a calm. According to Matthew's, Mark's and John's gospels, the disciples on another occasion went into a ship *without* Jesus, and in the evening encountered a storm, caused by a contrary or hostile wind. For some time the storm raged in the darkness of the night, and Jesus did not come to them. Having toiled and rowed about twenty-five or thirty furlongs they saw Jesus 'walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the ship, and they were afraid; but he saith unto them: It is I, be not afraid; then they willingly received him into the ship, and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went.'[1] On this occasion Jesus was not with his disciples when the evening had come, and when the hostile wind which blew up to a storm arose; nor did they at once see him draw nigh to the ship; but when towards morning they recognised Him who, though He had left them, had promised to be with them to the end of the world,[2] then they received the Master into their ship. He had come to them as 'the Lord which maketh a way into the sea, and a path in the mighty waters.'[3] It was not Peter who first recognised him,[4] for he said: 'Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water to go to Jesus.' Being afraid of the boisterous wind, and having cried, 'Lord, save me,' Jesus stretched forth his hand *and caught him*, and said unto him, 'O, thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt. And when they were come into the ship the wind ceased. Then they that were in

[1] John vi. 16–21; Mat. xiv. 22–33; Mark vi. 45–52. [2] Mat. xxviii. 20.
[3] Jes. xliii. 16; comp. Ps. lxxvii. 20; Job. ix. 8.
[4] Comp. John xxi. 7.

the ship came and worshipped him, saying: Of a truth thou art the Son of God.'[1]

It is not difficult to point out the allegorical meaning of this historical incident. Christ had risen, and soon after this event had more fully revealed himself to Paul as the Son of God. By this new Apostle, as before him by Simon of Samaria, 'the hostile man,' a storm was occasioned, which for some time raged through the darkness of the night, and which prevented the original disciples, in their want of faith, until the approach of the morning to see the approach of Christ, who is ever present with his church. Peter asks for a sign to assure him of the Lord's presence, and whilst beginning to sink in the deep waters, the Apostle was caught by his Master. It is to this circumstance that the narrative recorded in the 21st chapter of John seems to refer in its allegorical meaning; for we have seen that Peter cast himself into the sea and was caught in the net of Christ. This Apostle had boldly launched out into the deep, whilst 'the other disciples' had remained 'in a little ship,' and were dragging the net with such fishes as were to be caught in the shallower parts near the land of Palestine. They seem to have forgotten or misunderstood the doctrine which lay hidden in Christ's parable, in which he likened the kingdom of heaven 'unto a net that was cast into the sea and gathered of *every* kind, which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away.'[2] They had not yet preached the gospel of the kingdom to all nations, they had not launched out into the sea, the symbol of the Gentile world, but had restricted their apostolic mission to the Holy Land and the districts adjoining them. Not so Peter, who had been the earliest to approach Paul, and who with Barnabas would have done so already at Antioch, had he not thought it best to yield to the representations of his colleagues at Jerusalem. He went to

Net for every kind.

[1] Mat. xiv. 28-33.

[2] Mat. xiii. 47, 48.

CHAP. VIII.

Rome, and did not shrink from an open disputation with Simon Magus, whilst he was, in the latter years of his life, a zealous fellow-worker of Paul, with whom together he suffered martyrdom. It was owing to Paul's bold proclamation of the Lord's secret doctrine that the apostolic net and their little ship or church had to be enlarged and strengthened. That net of theirs was at first not capable of gathering men of every kind; therefore the net 'brake,'[1] and the apostolic mission was carried on in two different ships, one of them keeping close to the land. This separation between the Palestinian apostles and Paul had arisen from a difference of opinion about the time of publishing abroad the secret doctrine of Jesus. But the time came when all the Apostles worked harmoniously together; when they cast on the 'right' side of the ship and caught a multitude of fishes, and when 'for all there were so many, yet was the net not broken.' In that net of Christ, which 'gathered of every kind,' Simon Jonas was caught the first, after that Paul had first cast it into the sea.

These narratives of historical incidents on the Sea of Galilee, if interpreted in a figurative sense, confirm therefore the result of our investigations on 'the preaching of Peter.' By indirectly divulging the secret doctrine of Christ in his disputations with Simon Magus, Peter had begun to be a fellow-worker, if not forerunner of Paul, and was 'caught' in the net of Christ. He as well as his fellow apostles, were gradually led to understand the mysteries of the Divine sonship.[2]

EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

Introduction.

When Marcion was a young man, says Tertullian, he wrote a letter which the Catholics approved, and the Marcionites (later) recognised as containing the germ of his doctrine.[3] This letter, to which Eusebius does not

[1] Luke v. 6. [2] Comp. John xiv. 20.

[3] For this and the following extracts see 'Christianity and Mankind,' i. 170, f.

refer, was supposed to be lost, but it has been rendered extremely probable, if not absolutely certain, that the Epistle to Diognetus, of which we possess a considerable part, is the letter in question.[1] Whether it be written in the year 135 or about the year 140,[2] in either case Marcion may have written and addressed it to the young man who later was the great and virtuous friend of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, that is to Diognetus, who in 139 was only eighteen years old, when Fronto was appointed as tutor. It is hardly an objection to the later date, that between 136 and 138 Marcion separated from the Church of Rome, and set up a school and congregation of his own. For Tertullian leads us to assume that when Marcion wrote his epistle the 'Marcionites,' may have already seceded from 'the Catholic church.' At that time young Marcion may well not have been a docetic, whilst the principles enunciated in the epistle are such as could easily be developed into doceticism.

We give the following extracts from Marcion's epistle:

Extracts.

'Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind, either by their country or by their language, or by their habits; for they do not dwell in cities of their own; they do not speak any strange dialect; they do not live in any peculiar manner; nor indeed hath this their doctrine been arrived at through the imagination and forethought of meddlesome men; nor do they put forward any mere human opinion as some do; but living in Greek or barbarian cities, as hath fallen to the lot of each, and following the habits of the country in dress and food, and the other modes of life, they present a marvellous and strange condition of their own polity. They dwell in their own fatherlands, but as strangers. They take part

[1] Justin Martyr could not have written that God sent Christ 'not as an angel;' for he expressly states, that Christ the Word 'sometimes appeared, in the image of incorporeal beings' (Ap. 83), and that Christ taught respecting 'the host of the *other* good angels, who follow him, and are made like unto him' (Ap. 6).

[2] Volkmar in 'Credner's N. T. Canon,' p. 59.

CHAP. VIII.

in everything as citizens, and they have to bear everything as if they were foreigners. Every foreign country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is a foreign country to them. Like all the rest they marry and they beget children, but they do not cast off their children; they make their table common to all, but not their bed; they are in the flesh, but they do not live after the flesh; they pass their time on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven; they obey the established laws, and by their own lives gain a victory over the laws; they love all, and yet are persecuted by all; they are taken notice of, and they are condemned; they are put to death and they come to life again; they are poor themselves, and yet make many rich; they lack everything, and yet they abound in all things; they are put to shame, and yet they glory in their shame; they are evil spoken of, and yet they are justified; they are reviled, and they bless; they are insulted, and they show honour; they do good, and yet they are punished as evil doers; they rejoice in punishment, as being thereby quickened; the Jews make war upon them as upon foreigners, and the Greeks persecute them; and yet they that hate them can give no reason for their enmity.'

'In short, what the soul is to the body, Christians are in the world. The soul is spread through all the members of the body, and so are Christians through all the cities of the world. Now the soul liveth in the body; yet is she not of the body; and so do Christians live in the world, yet are not of the world. The invisible soul is preserved in a visible body; and so Christians are known to be in the world, yet are not of the world. The invisible soul is preserved in an invisible body; and so Christians are known to be in the world, but their religion remaineth unseen. The flesh hateth the soul, and warreth against her without receiving any injury; for the soul preventeth her from indulging in pleasures; so the world hateth Christians, yet is no way injured; for they

are opposed to pleasures. The soul loveth the flesh and its members that hate her; and so do Christians love those who hate them. The soul is shut in by the body, yet she upholdeth her body; and so are Christians kept, as it were, in prison by the world, yet they uphold the world; the undying soul dwelleth in a mortal tabernacle; and so do Christians dwell by the side of that which is perishable, while they wait for immortality in heaven. The soul is made better the more she is maltreated by the withholding of food and drink; and Christians the more they suffer punishment, the more do they from day to day increase in number. Such is the place which God hath assigned to them, and woe to them if they fly from it.'

'For as I said before, theirs is no earthly invention handed down to them, nor is that a mortal doctrine, which they hold worthy of being so diligently preserved; nor is it a dispensation of human mysteries, which is entrusted to them; but God, the ruler and creator of all things, the Invisible, hath himself from heaven planted *in men* the truth and the holy incomprehensible Word, and hath established Him in their hearts. He sent Him not (as one might suppose) as a servant, or as an angel, or as a ruler, or as one engaged in earthly affairs, or as one entrusted with the care of things in heaven; but God sent the very artificer and creator of the universe; Him by whom He made the heavens, by whom He enclosed the sea within its due bounds; Him whose mysterious laws are faithfully kept by all the starry signs; Him by whom the sun hath received the measures of his daily course, duly to keep them; Him at whose command the moon shineth in the night; Him whom the stars obey, as they follow the moon in their course; Him by whom all things have been set in order, and defined, and placed in subjection: the heavens and the things that are in the heavens, the earth and the things that are in the earth, the sea and everything that is in the sea, fire, air, deep, things above, things below, things between. This is He

CHAP. VIII.

whom God sent unto them. Was it, as some one among men might suppose, to tyrannise over and to terrify mankind? No, indeed; but in mercy and gentleness, as a king would send his son, so He sent Him as a king. He sent Him as God, He sent Him as man to man; He sent Him to save; to persuade, not to force them: for violence is no attribute of God; He sent Him as wishing to call, not to persecute; He sent Him in love, not for judgment; for He will send Him to judge, and who will then be able to stand in the day of His coming?'

'. . . . What man did not disbelieve in God until He came? . . . . No man ever saw or knew God; He revealed Himself, and through faith He revealed Himself, by which alone it is possible to see God. . . . He alone is good. . . . Now, when He had by Himself, together with His Son, set everything in order, He left us during the time past, to be carried about as we willed, by our unruly impulses, led away as we were by pleasures and desires; not in any way as if He took delight in our sins, but as one who bore with them; nor as One who approved of that season of unrighteousness; but as One who was fashioning the time of righteousness; so that having by our own works in former times proved ourselves unworthy of life, we might now, through the goodness of God, be made worthy of it; and as we had shown our inability to enter into the kingdom of God by our own strength, we might be enabled so to do by the power of God. But when the measure of our own unrighteousness was filled up, and it had been fully shown that punishment and death awaited it as its reward, and the time came which God had fore-ordained to show forth His own goodness and power (Oh! the exceeding love of God for man!) He did not hate us, or cast us off, or remember the evil against us, but He bore long with us and suffered us, and out of pity took our offences upon Him; He Himself gave up His Son as a ransom for us, the Holy for transgressors; Him that was without

CHAP. VIII.

evil for sinners; the Just for the unjust; the Imperishable for perishable men; the Immortal for mortals. For what else but His righteousness could have been a covering for our sins? In whom else could we the sinners and the ungodly have been justified but in the Son of God above. Oh! the sweet change! Oh! the unsearchable dispensation! Oh! the unlooked-for benefits! to cover the transgressions of many through one righteous man, and by the righteousness of One to justify many sinners! Having then proved to us in former times how impossible it was for our nature to attain unto life, and having now in the present time shown forth the Saviour as able to save even that which seemed impossible, He desires us, from both these considerations, to trust in His goodness, to look upon Him as our guardian, our father, our teacher, our counsellor, our physician, our understanding, our light, our honour, our glory, our strength, our life, and not to take thought for raiment and food.'

'Mayest thou desire this faith, and first acquire the knowledge of the Father; for God loved men, and for their sake He created the world; to them He made all things subject that are therein; to them He gave reason and understanding; to them alone He gave permission to look up to Him; them He formed after His own image; to them He sent His only-begotten Son; to them He hath promised the kingdom in heaven, which He will also give to those who love Him. And when thou hast acquired this knowledge, with what joy shalt thou be filled! or how wilt thou love Him, who hath first so greatly loved thee! But when thou lovest Him, thou wilt become a follower of His goodness. And marvel not at this, that a man may become a follower of God. He can if he will. For happiness consisteth not in lording it over our neighbours, or in desiring to have more than the weaker brethren; or in being rich and oppressing the poor; nor can man in so doing be a follower of God, for they are entirely foreign to His Majesty. But whosoever beareth

CHAP. VIII.

the burden of his neighbour, whosoever is ready to do good with that wherein he aboundeth, to another who is in want; whosoever by distributing to the needy the things which he hath received from God, becometh a God to those who receive them: this man is a follower of God. Then shalt thou behold, though thou be living on earth, that God reigneth in heaven; then shalt thou begin to speak the mysteries of God; then shalt thou both love and admire those who are suffering punishment because they will not deny God; then shalt thou condemn the impostures and errors of the world, when thou hast known how to live truly in heaven; when thou canst despise that which appeareth to be death here; when thou dreadest that which really is death, a death which is kept in store for those who will be condemned to that eternal fire, which will torment them whom it receiveth unto the end. Then shalt thou admire those who can bear patiently the (torments of) earthly fire, and bless them, when thou thyself hast tasted that fire.'[1]

'I do not announce strange things, nor do I advance contrary to reason, but after having become disciple of the Apostles, I become teacher of the Gentiles, and I present that which has been delivered unto me, in a correspondingly worthy manner to those who are about to become disciples of the truth. For who that is rightly taught and has become befriended with the Word (Logos), does not try plainly to know, what through the Word has been lucidly expounded to those disciples, to whom the Word during his appearance has plainly made it known? By speaking without reserve, *not being understood by the unbelievers, and by explaining it to the disciples, those who were by Him deemed as believing, knew the mysteries of the Father*, who has for this reason sent the Word, that He should make Himself known to the world, Him who was shamefully entreated by the Jewish people, was proclaimed by the Apostles, and faith-

[1] For the following see Credner, N. T. Canon, p. 59 f.

fully accepted by the Gentile people. That is *He from the beginning, He who appeared as a new One, and was found to be the old One, and He who continues to form himself anew in the hearts of the holy ones.* That is He who is for ever, He who this day was declared as the Son, through whom the Church is richly furthered, and the grace which is unfolded in the holy ones is perfected, *that grace* which gives the right understanding, *which reveals the mysteries*, which causes the courses of the world to be known, which takes pleasure in the believer, which to those who seek her is imparted as a gift, to those by whom neither the precepts of the faith are injured, nor the precepts of the fathers trespassed against. In consequence of this the fear of the law is being praised, and the grace of the prophets explained (that is the grace which operates in the prophets), and the *credibility of the gospels* firmly established, *and the tradition of the Apostles permitted*, and the grace which operates in the Church rejoices. And if thou dost not grieve this grace, thou shallst know what the Word bringeth forth, by whom He will, when He will. For what we (the dependents of the Word), were driven to say at the command of the commanding Word, out of love to that which has been revealed to us, of that we strive to make you participate.' CHAP. VIII.

'If ye take heed to this, and listen with zeal, then ye shall know what God proffers to those who love Him in the right way, who have become a paradise of delight, an abundantly fruit-bearing tree, who are ornamented with manifold fruits, when they have brought up *within themselves* that tree to the full blossom. For *in this place the tree of knowledge and the tree of life was planted;* but not that which destroys knowledge, but which destroys disobedience. For not without meaning is that which is written, how God originally has planted the tree of knowledge and the tree of life in the midst of paradise, pointing to this, that *through knowledge* cometh life. Since the first men have not made a pure use of the

CHAP. VIII.

same, they were, by the temptation of the serpent, divested (of the life). For there is no life without knowledge, and no certain knowledge without true life, for which reason both were planted by the side of each other. In consequence of the discernment of this meaning, *the* Apostle saith, whilst blaming that knowledge which is without a firm relation to life: knowledge puffeth up, charity edifieth. For he who thinketh that he knoweth something without true knowledge certified by the life, he hath not attained to any knowledge, and is seduced by the serpent, because he did not love the life. Who, however, with fear followeth after knowledge, and has his eyes fixed upon the life, he plants upon hope and expects fruit. Let, therefore, thine heart be set upon knowledge, and thy life upon gaining the true Word. If thou bearest wood (a tree) of this sort, and gatherest its fruit, thou shallst continually reap that which is well-pleasing to God, which is not approached by any serpent, and which is neither touched by delusion, nor spoilt as Eve was, but is firmly found as a virgin. And salvation manifesteth itself, the Apostles are being understood, the Passover of the Lord steppeth onward, the courses of the world dovetail into each other, and that which refers to the world beyond is equalised, and the Word which continually teacheth the holy ones is of joyous courage, whereby the Father is glorified, He to whom eternal glory is due. Amen.'

Results.

It has been justly observed that in this truly evangelical Epistle there is not a word which Marcion, when a young man, could not have written. When he begun to be a leader of a separate sect of his own in the Church, he recognised all the Apostles, though especially *the* Apostle Paul. And although not a word is said which might not be interpreted from the docetic point of view, yet the expressions are so carefully balanced that the believer in the reality of Christ's humanity could not possibly object to them, although not a word is said about Christ in the flesh. Marcion seems to mark the end of that period when the

secret doctrine of the Lord was regarded as a Hidden or Apocryphal Wisdom, and the commencement of that new era, when the key of knowledge was about to be restored to the people by the publication of the Gospel after John. It is by the apocryphal doctrine of the Divine Word as revealed by Jesus, and as contained in that gospel, that the old can be connected with the new, that the Apostles can be understood, and the faith of the gospels established. This was not possible so long as the 'tradition of the Apostles' was not 'permitted,' but hidden before the eyes of the people. The secret doctrine of Christ having for about a century been hidden from the people, it seems to have been about the year 150, or not long after, that the apostolical record of the same was published. For, as it has been rightly observed, the writer would hardly have expressed himself as he has if the doctrine of the Divine Word, which constituted the Lord's secret doctrine, had been long known and acknowledged. Nor is it at all certain that at the time when this Epistle was written, the Gospel after John was publicly known. Had it been published even during the time when Marcion fully developed his docetic doctrine, and mutilated the only gospel which he recognised, that is the one after Luke, he must have necessarily referred to the fourth gospel as containing the tradition of the Apostles, which the few that knew it had kept to themselves. But as a preliminary step towards the publication of John's gospel, the secret tradition of the Apostles was probably no longer forbidden to be taught in the Roman church, at least verbally, at the time when the Epistle to Diognetus was written.

What is said in this valuable document about the doctrine of the Divine Word is a strong confirmation of what we have tried to point out as to its origin and development. The Word of God is connected with the account about the tree of knowledge and the tree of life in the Garden of Eden; it is the 'grace' and the 'truth' which God has 'himself from heaven planted in

CHAP. VIII.

man,' and established in the hearts of men, in order that by bringing up the same within themselves to the full blossom, they might 'become a paradise of delight' (a spiritual Eden), 'an abundantly fruit-bearing tree' of knowledge and thus of life. The account about Eden is therefore in a figurative sense explained to refer to God's planting in the heart of man the tree of knowledge and the tree of life, that is the Divine grace which imparts the former and leads to the latter. It is the heart of man which is intended to be the temple of the spirit, the paradise of God. But in the beginning man made an impure use of this incomprehensible Word which God himself had planted. Consequently man was lost unless he was saved. For this reason the Divine Word ('the Saviour of all') was sent 'as man to man;' and yet as God, in order 'to save,' by the revelation of 'the mysteries of God,' and of the unknown and unseen God himself, who alone is good. These mysteries were plainly explained to his disciples by the Word, and 'during his appearance.' Then it was that the Word spoke 'without reserve;' whilst he was not understood by the unbelieving Jews, 'those who were by him deemed as believing knew the mysteries of the Father.' In all ages the Divine Word has lived in the hearts of men, as a Divine grace which, if it be not grieved, causes man to know and to do the will of God, to 'reap that which is well pleasing to God, and which is not approached by the serpent, nor deluded and spoilt as Eve was.' Thus the everlasting teacher of the holy ones causes the Father to be glorified.

The Epistle to Diognetus may be regarded as an introduction to the Gospel after John, which hardly can then have been publicly known. Before it could be understood and accepted, it was necessary to teach the doctrine of the Divine Word, which, although it was contained in the Apocrypha of the Septuagint, had never been recognised or even permitted by the Jewish, or the Jewish-Christian church. The spell was now broken,

and permission was given to preach the verbal tradition of the Jews and of the Apostles. It may have been the danger arising from the docetic heresy which caused the Catholic church to give this permission towards the middle of the second century, and to publish the apostolic apocryphal record probably not many years later. For already between the years 160 and 180, a harmony of the 'four' gospels was published by Tatian, the docetic disciple of Justin Martyr, under the name of the *Diatessaron*. The gospel-harmony which Justin seems to have used may not and probably did not include John's gospel; for the only quotation from the same is a saying of Christ which might well be known to him and others through verbal tradition, and he merely introduces these words of Christ (to Nicodemus) by the words, 'Christ said,' without referring to the written apostolic record. But Tatian, who 'apostatised from the Church,' in the spirit of the gnostic or docetic Ebionites struck out the genealogies, that prove the human descent. The same was, according to Theodorete, bishop of Cyprus on the Euphrates about 420, excluded altogether from Tatian's harmony, for which reason Theodorete suppressed this dangerous gospel, of which he says, that by its cunning and calculated amalgamation it spread a dangerous poison.[1] The senior contemporary of Theodorete, Epiphanius (died 402), identifies Tatian's harmony with the gnostic-Ebionitic gospel of the Hebrews, perhaps because the gospel of the docetic Ebionites did not contain the genealogies.[2] But he never could have intended thereby to deny what his predecessor Eusebius of Cæsarea (314–340) had established, about its having been a harmony of the four gospels. Indeed, Victor of Capua says it was a compendium of five gospels, being called *Diapente*, perhaps because Tatian made use of Marcion's gospel in addition to the four. Like the later harmony of Ammonius of Alexandria (about 230), that of Tatian

[1] Haer. fab. i. 20. [2] I. xlvi. 1.

CHAP. VIII.

may have begun with the first verse of the Gospel after John.[1]

In the epistle of Marcion to Diognetus, we find nothing which is opposed to, or goes beyond the Christian gnosticism which Paul had been the first to proclaim as the Hidden Wisdom of Christ; and yet the humanity of Christ, though not assailed, is not directly recognised. What is anti-apostolic in this Epistle is the unsupported assumption that the doctrine of the sonship, that is, of the Divine Word as the Saviour in the hearts of the men of all ages, was altogether an unrevealed mystery before the days of Christ. We have seen that this doctrine was in its principal points fully developed during the last pre-Christian centuries in the apocryphal Scriptures, which were the earliest records of the originally verbal tradition of the Jews, the origin of which may perhaps be traced through the Chaldæans to Zoroaster, the messenger of the Divine Spirit among the Aryans of Central Asia, at a time which in the biblical records is referred to as the time of Adam.

Conclusion.

We have seen in this chapter that those doctrines of Christ which he communicated secretly to his disciples only, and the promulgation of which had been forbidden in Palestine, because of their connection with the secret tradition of the Pharisees, do not seem to have been recognised in the Roman church at the time when the chiefs of the Jews in that city prevented Paul's liberation by the Romans. We then pointed out that the Epistle of Clement was written under the peace-engendering influence of Paul's martyrdom, and on an occasion when the Roman writer to the Corinthians required all the authority which could be derived from a real or assumed concurrence with Paul's doctrines. Anyhow, shortly after Clement's death the influential, if not the most numerous party, in the

[1] See Credner's N. T. Canon, p. 50.

Church of Rome, evidently did not recognise the secret doctrine of Christ, of which that about the Divine sonship formed the centre. The Shepherd of Hermas we then explained to be a cautious attempt to engraft this doctrine of the sonship on the recognised public sayings of the Lord. Meanwhile in other churches the secret doctrines of Christ had been promulgated, principally through the instrumentality of Paul. Thus Christian gnosticism was promulgated as the necessary supplement to the elementary doctrine contained in the first gospel, where only the public sayings of the Lord had been recorded. But to this complete compendium of the Lord's teaching was opposed anti-Christian doceticism, or the non-recognition of Christ's humanity. The earliest known writings which contain the germs of this anti-Christian doctrine, the writings of Philo and the so-called Barnabas, both of Alexandrian origin, were most probably for this reason never recognised by the Roman Church. And the intimate connection between the gnostic and docetic parties on all other points, the negation of Christ's humanity excepted, may have been one of the causes why Christian gnosticism, that is, the secret teaching of the Lord, the verbal tradition of the Apostles, was not fully recognised in the Roman church up to the beginning of the second century.

Ignatius of Antioch was a believer and teacher of Christian gnosticism, and the determined and zealous opposer of anti-Christian doceticism. In his Epistle to the Romans he commends them that they are 'entirely cleansed' from the stain of heretical doctrines. The teaching of Simon Magus of Samaria, had left no traces in Rome, where his teaching had been opposed by the Apostles themselves. Having established the essential connexion between the docetic teaching of Simon Magus and the fully-developed doctrines of Marcion of Sinope, we showed that Polycarp opposed the latter in Rome as 'the first-born of Satan.' Justin Martyr's doctrine

CHAP. VIII.

formed the basis to doceticism, which, however, he does not acknowledge, although in the interpretation which he vainly attempts to establish of the prophecy about the virgin-born, he clearly outsteps the apostolical limits, and therefore the domain of Christian gnosticism. Marcion's fully developed doctrine of his latter years is unmixed doceticism, and consequently denies all and every connection between Christianity and either Judaism or heathenism. Christianity is something essentially new.

The gradual transition from Jewish Christianity, first to Paulinic or gnostic Christianity, and then to docetic Christianity, can be traced in the so-called recognitions and homilies, which may be based on one or more authentic Scriptures of the first century. Even if they could be regarded as altogether a fiction, they were certainly written for the purpose of being accepted as a record of the preaching of Peter. As such they were generally promulgated, if not recognised, in the second century. Had not at that time the tradition obtained general credence, that the twelve Apostles were the guardians of a secret tradition, and this at a period when Jerusalem was still the mother church, such tradition could not possibly have been recorded in a work which in the later form transmitted to us was attributed to the Roman Clement, the direct disciple of the Apostles. Notwithstanding its later interpolations and transformations, this remarkable document is an invaluable record of the relations between jewish, gnostic, and docetic Christianity. First it was Simon Magus whom the twelve Apostles regarded as 'the hostile man.' By his anti-Christian docetic doctrine he threatened to undermine all historical Christianity. He is pointed out as the real enemy, who opposes the preaching of Peter, and this at a time and place when and where neither friends nor foes ventured to name Paul or his writings. For up to Justin's time neither were fully recognised in Rome, and it was Marcion who first brought about in the universal

city the entire acknowledgment of the great Apostle and of his writings. If the recognitions and homilies, taken as a whole, had been written as late as even the middle of the second century, Paul and his writings would have been directly alluded to. The preaching of Peter is therefore in its principal parts a work, the final composition of the principal parts of which seems to have taken place before the time of Marcion. For we have tried to show that we are by no means compelled to accept the almost generally admitted assumption that it is Marcion who in the homilies is represented by Simon Magus, since the latter can now be proved to have taught the same doceticism as the former. But we have tried to show that the mysterious omission of every reference to Paul in the recognitions and homilies is best explained by the assumption that the original scriptures, which were later worked up in the above form, were composed during that possibly long interval when Paul was preparing for his mission, that is during the greater part or the whole of the seventeen and more years which preceded the recognition of Paul by the twelve Apostles. When the original of the preaching of Peter was written, it was Simon, and not Paul, who caused uneasiness to the apostolic body at Jerusalem. The time had not come, though it was near, when the Apostle of uncircumcision publicly preached the abolishing of the law, and the promulgation of Christ's secret doctrine.

Ebionism is then by us explained as having probably been, in its general sense, the originally proclaimed apostolical doctrine, which excluded the Lord's secret doctrine as apocryphal. Contemporary with the general promulgation of Christian gnosticism, we can trace a gnostic development and therefore a split among the Ebionites, which led to their no longer all recognising the Gospel of Matthew as the only evangelical record. Thus the original Ebionism was developed into gnostic, and also into docetic Ebionism, at a time when in some Christian

CHAP. VIII.

Churches Paul's writings were rejected, as was done by all Ebionites.

Finally, the Epistle to Diognetus is pointed out to have been probably written by Marcion in his early years, and before he had developed his doctrine into unmixed doceticism. In this most valuable document we possess a clear and full definition of the doctrine of the Divine sonship, which Christ had secretly taught, and which Paul had fully proclaimed, though still 'in a mystery.' It is probably the first complete announcement of this doctrine in the Roman church, and may be regarded as paving the way to a more general acceptation of the same, which was brought about by the publication of the hidden apostolic document, the Gospel of John. This important event seems to have taken place not long after the middle of the second century, at the time when Irenæus was already born, who is the first who names the four gospels of our canon. The later doctrinal development in the Roman church we have not here to consider. But if we have in some degree succeeded in proving that Christ taught a secret doctrine, the principles of which were first publicly revealed by Paul, whilst the apostolic record of the same, containing the secret sayings of Christ, continued to be kept secret till after the middle of the second century, then it must be possible to show the relation between the fourth and the three first gospels, as also to explain the development traceable in the latter. Thus we may hope to offer a solution for the great gospel-problem, by showing for what reason the first three Evangelists must have agreed not to publish any of those sayings of Christ which are only recorded in the Gospel after John.

CHAPTER IX.

THE GOSPEL AFTER MATTHEW.

'*Why speakest Thou unto them in parables? . . . Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.*'—Mat. xiii. 10, 11.

CHAP. IX.

Testimonies.

THE first apostolical Scripture was written by Matthew in the Hebrew language, or rather in the Syro-Chaldæan dialect, spoken by the Israelites ever since the Babylonian captivity. This is fully established as a fact by an unbroken chain of witnesses from the earliest times. The most ancient direct testimony is that of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in Asia Minor, which testimony, perhaps, reaches to the end of the first, but certainly to the commencement of the second century. Eusebius states in his History of the Church,[1] that Papias was known in the days of Polycarp 'as a man well versed in all sciences, and well acquainted with the Scriptures.'[2] This statement is confirmed by Irenæus, who writes that Papias was the disciple or 'hearer of John, and the associate of Polycarp.'[3] And Papias, 'in the preface to his discourses,' as Eusebius informs us, wrote as follows:—

'But I shall not regret to subjoin to my interpretations (of the discourses of the Lord) also, for your benefit, whatsoever I have at any time accurately ascertained and

[1] We generally quote from Mr. Crusé's translation of the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, in Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library.

[2] H.E. iii. 36. [3] H.E. iii. 39.

CHAP. IX.

treasured up in my memory, as I have received it from the elders, and have recorded it, in order to give additional confirmation to the truth by my testimony. For I have never, like many, delighted to hear those that tell many things, but those that teach the truth; neither those that teach foreign precepts, but those that are given from the Lord to our faith, and which came from the truth itself. But if I met with any one who had been a follower of the elders anywhere, I made it a point to inquire what were the declarations of the elders; what was said by Andrew, Peter, or Philip; what by Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord; what was said by Aristion and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord. For I do not think that I derived so much benefit from books as from the living voice of those that are still surviving.'[1]

In this same chapter, Eusebius informs us that Papias has expressed himself as follows about Matthew:— 'Matthew composed his discourses (logia) in the Hebrew dialect, and everybody translated them as well as he could.' Irenæus tells us that Papias 'has written a work in five books;' and Eusebius states that these five books of Papias, which were 'said' to exist in his time, in the fourth century, bore the title, 'Interpretations of our Lord's Discourses.'[2] According to Eusebius, Matthew 'having first proclaimed the gospel in Hebrew when on the point of going also to other nations, committed it to writing in his native tongue, and thus supplied the want of his presence to them by his writings.'[3] And the same writer informs us that according to Irenæus, 'Matthew produced his gospel, written among the Hebrews in their own dialect, whilst Peter and Paul proclaimed the gospel and founded the Church at Rome.'[4]

From these statements it follows that of the first apostolic record of the sayings of Christ by Matthew, which were interpreted by Papias, no universally received

[1] H.E. iii. 39. [2] H.E. iii. 39. [3] H.E. iii. 24. [4] H.E. v. 8.

translation existed up to the beginning of the second century. Had there been any authorised translation which, for some reason or other, was rejected by some, Papias could not have omitted to mention a fact which would so materially affect his above statement. This important testimony confirms the fact which has been so fully established,[1] that up to the middle of the second century no authorised or generally acknowledged canon of the New Testament existed, such as was later set up by the Roman Catholic church.

Title.

The earliest and apostolic record of the primitive doctrine of Christ was in the early centuries entitled, 'The Gospel *of* Matthew the Called One' (*d'mfarsho*), as is proved by the most ancient Syrian manuscript we possess, which has been shown to be in all probability, and in the main, a translation from the Hebrew original,[2] of which we shall see that it was in the hands of Jerome in the fourth century. Although the above appellation may be regarded as one generally applied to the disciples whom the Lord had called,[3] yet this word '*d'mfarsho*' which has been preserved in ancient Arabic and Ethiopian manuscripts, is nowhere appended as a title to the name of any other Apostle, so that it may refer to the time when Matthew was the only Apostolic Evangelist.

References.

The earliest known reference to this apostolic record of the Lord's sayings, that is, to the first written gospel, is contained in the Epistle attributed to Barnabas, and which has most probably been written in the first century. Here one of Christ's sayings, which has been transmitted to us only through the Gospel after Matthew,[4] is introduced by the words, 'as it is written,' thus showing that the words of the Lord recorded by Matthew were regarded as authoritative in the first century, at a time when no universally received Greek translation of them existed. This early testimony is all the more valuable,

[1] Credner, Gesch. des N. T. lichen Kanon, 1860, pp. 3–21.
[2] See Cureton's Syriac Gospels. [3] Rom. i. 1. [4] xxii. 14.

CHAP. IX.

since the above passage herein quoted is not the only one which, but for Matthew, we should not know, whilst the writer quotes nothing from the gospels which is not found in Matthew, if anywhere. Still more ancient, though less direct, is the reference in the Epistle to the Hebrews to Christ's agony in the garden as recorded in our gospels.[1] A more direct, but probably later reference to the account of the transfiguration, as recorded in Matthew, is to be found in the second Epistle of Peter.[2]

Justin the Martyr, whose latest writings contain the date 150, alludes constantly to a collection of scriptures to which we shall more minutely refer, which was then known as the Memoirs of the Apostles, and as a collection at once complete and universally received by the Christian churches. Nearly seventy different sayings of the Lord are here recorded, all of which, excepting one passage in Luke,[3] which may have been interpolated from the original gospel, are to be found in the Gospel after Matthew. They are recorded in a slightly different form, if we except four passages which literally coincide with our version. These discrepancies may be partly explained by assuming that Justin quoted from memory, or that he copied incorrectly. But it is very remarkable that some quotations of Christ's sayings by Justin, which do not entirely coincide with the parallel passages in any of our gospels, do literally coincide with the quotations of these passages as contained in other and partly earlier Scriptures; and there are some gospel-texts which Justin in different writings of his quotes in the same form, and yet with the same deviations from the gospel text transmitted to us. Among these is the following passage from the Sermon on the Mount:[4] 'Therefore become ye merciful, as your Father in heaven is merciful.' He quotes it twice in this form: 'Become ye kind and gracious (merciful), as your Father in heaven is kind and gracious.' Writers such as Justin, and as the authors of 'the Preaching of Peter,'

[1] Heb. v. 7. [2] 2 Pet. i. 17 f. [3] Luke xxiii. 46. [4] Luke vi. 36.

must have known either the Hebrew original or a uniform translation of the same, or one of those gospel-harmonies of which we know that they existed in the time of Justin's pupil, Tatian. Justin is the first who refers to evangelical writings under the name of 'gospels.'

Clement of Alexandria seems to refer to Matthew's gospel when he writes about 'the Gospel after the Hebrews.' Origen (185-253) directly alludes to the Hebrew work of Matthew. Irenæus (+ 202) is the first writer who mentions the four gospels of our canon by name. He states that 'Matthew indeed produced his gospel, written among the Hebrews in their own dialect, whilst Peter and Paul proclaimed the gospel and founded the Church at Rome,'[1] therefore about the year 66 or 67 A.C. Epiphanius has clearly in view the record of Matthew when he writes about the sect of the Nazarenes that they possessed 'the Gospel after Matthew in its greatest completeness in Hebrew; for in fact the latter is with them preserved *as it was originally written with Hebrew letters.*'[2] He also calls it 'the Hebrew product after Matthew,' and states that Matthew, whose gospel was also used by the party of Cerinthus, was the only one who in Hebrew letters 'composed the explanation and the preaching of the Gospel.'[3] If we connect this statement with that of Papias, according to which Matthew wrote down 'the sayings of the Lord,' the supposition gains ground that the Apostle did not write much or anything referring to the history of the life of Christ. Jerome mentions Matthew's gospel as 'the Gospel after the Hebrews,' and he adds that it was by some called 'the Gospel after the Apostles,' and by others the Gospel 'after Matthew,' but that it was called 'by most, the authentic (Gospel) *of* Matthew,' and that although Origen had 'often' used it, some were pleased not to regard it as authoritative.[4]

This statement seems clearly to indicate a gradual de-

[1] H.E. v. 8.
[2] Haer. xxix. 9.
[3] Haer. xxx. 3.
[4] Catal. c. 2.

CHAP. IX.

velopment of the contents of what originally was called 'the Gospel.' It was 'of' Matthew, for he had recorded those sayings of the Lord which are therein contained; it was called 'after' the Apostles, because the twelve Apostles had sanctioned it as the standard of Jewish-Christian orthodoxy; and since it was written by those whom even Paul calls 'Jews,' and for the Hebrews, it was in later times, when the Paulinic Gospel of Luke had been written, naturally called by the distinguishing name of the Gospel of or after the Hebrews. This original gospel may have contained from the outset the principal incidents of the life of Jesus; indeed some of his sayings could hardly have been recorded independently of every reference to his life. Yet it seems probable that no more than a few casual references of an historical nature were here and there interspersed in the primitive apostolic collection of the Lord's sayings. A very remarkable feature, which is wanting in all the gospels except in that after Matthew, somewhat confirms this view. We meet in this gospel a sentence which is uniformly repeated five times, and which in each case serves to connect some of the sayings of the Lord with the subsequent historical part: 'When Jesus had ended' these sayings, commandments, or parables, and at the end: 'all these sayings.'[1] This would lead us to suppose that in the Greek translation of Matthew's gospel transmitted to us, and of which even Jerome knew neither the author nor the time of its composition, the collection of the Lord's sayings was originally divided in five parts, for the purpose of inserting, probably from Mark's gospel, a record of the life of Jesus. And if this was done, we need not be surprised to find that, as we shall see, still greater liberties were taken with this gospel and other gospels previously to the fourth century, from which time our most ancient gospel manuscripts date.

We have already referred in general terms to our

[1] Mat. vii. 28; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1.

peculiar view with regard to the contents of this gospel when compared to the Gospel after John. We tried to prove that the secret, hidden, or apocryphal tradition among the Jews was first openly promulgated, and to a certain extent may even have originated during the Babylonian captivity; that this esoteric tradition was written down in the apocrypha of the Alexandrian church, which formed part of its canon, and that no record of the same was ever admitted in the Palestinian canon, so that what was orthodoxy in Egypt was heterodoxy in Palestine. The rigid exclusion of the apocryphal element in the Palestinian church was such as to prevent Jesus from preaching otherwise than by parables and in secret his sublime doctrine. The same was closely allied to the apocryphal tradition of the Israelites, and was not only a development of the same, but an application to his own person of its cardinal doctrine about the Divine sonship, as the result of the combined effect of free grace and free obedience. In all ages the Divine Spirit or Word had been poured upon all flesh, and notwithstanding man's imperfect obedience, this indwelling 'still small voice' had made sons of God among sons of men. In the fulness of time 'the' son of man was to be made 'the' son of God. But the chosen nation in the Holy Land, as a whole, knew nothing about the relations between the creature and the Creator, as being similar to those existing between a son and his father. Since, then, neither the people nor even those to whom it was given to know 'the mysteries of the kingdom of God' could as a body fully understand the hidden wisdom of Christ, the disciples were commanded to do what their Divine Master had been prevented from doing, owing to the blindness and selfishness of the rulers of the Jewish church. They were to proclaim in light and from the housetops what He had taught them in secret and in darkness. Even if the twelve Apostles as a body, and especially James, their leader, had been much more fully enlightened than it is

CHAP. IX.

probable they were, it would have been very difficult for them to evade the rigid supervision of the Pharisees and Sadducees, for the fear of whom nobody had dared to speak openly of Jesus, even before his ignominious death on the cross.[1] The most enlightened among the Apostles would see, that in Palestine the open and full declaration of what Jesus was, and what he taught, could only be a gradual one. They therefore only recorded his parables, and those doctrines which he had taught in public. These were generally known, and could not be objected to by the Pharisees, whilst the Apostles deemed them a necessary introduction to his doctrine about the Divine sonship, which for a time they were obliged to hide.

Already in the middle of the second century, not only the sayings of Christ recorded by Matthew, but also the principal incidents of the Lord's life, were referred to in a different form than that which has been transmitted to us by the four evangelists. Thus Justin writes:[2] 'Abraham was the father of those who have been enumerated (in the genealogy) from whom Mary deducts her descent.' Therefore the genealogy to which Justin refers reached only up to Abraham, like Matthew's, and thus Justin tries to show that Mary descended from Abraham, which is not done in any of our gospels. Again he states that 'the angel of God,' whom he calls Gabriel, had been 'also' sent unto the virgin;[3] that Jesus was born of the virgin by 'the power of God;' and that we must 'not understand under spirit and power of God anything else than the Word, who also is the first-born of God, as the afore-named prophet Moses points out;'[4] that the birth took place in a 'cave,' in accordance with Isaiah's prophecy;[5] that 'all' the children in Bethlehem were killed by Herod's order, as Jeremiah had foretold;[6] that the child Jesus having grown

[1] John vii. 13.
[2] The quotations are from Otto's edition of Justin's works. Dial.c. 327.
[3] Apol. I. xxxiii. 75; Dial. c. 327. [4] Ap. I. xxxiii. 75.
[5] Is. xxxiii. 19. [6] Jer. xxxi. 15; Dial. lxxviii. & ciii.

CHAP. IX.

in stature 'according to the common law of all other men,' at first hid himself before other men,[1] and was 'thirty or more years old' when John the Baptist 'went forth.'[2] Like Elijah (and David), John was an incarnation of 'the Spirit of God,' of 'the herald' who 'preceded the first advent' of Christ,[3] whom Justin calls God's 'incarnate word,' spirit or power,[4] and in another passage 'the Son and Apostle of the Father, and Lord of all things.'[5] Justin states that Jesus, when he came to the river Jordan, 'put an end to John's prophecying and baptising;' that he (Jesus) 'also began to preach the gospel, saying: the kingdom of heaven is near;'[6] that when Jesus descended into the river (nothing is said of John's hesitation to baptise him) 'a fire flamed up in Jordan,' and when he rose from the same 'the Holy Ghost flew upon him as a dove, . . . for the sake of men;' because men required such a sign, inasmuch as they believed that John was the Christ. For this reason he declared: 'I am not the Christ, but a voice of one who cries; for one will come who is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear.'[7] He adds that 'at the same time a voice came from heaven, which had likewise been pronounced by David, who, *as in the person of the same* does say what to him (Jesus) was to be said by the Father: "My son thou art, I have begotten thee this day."'[8]

According to Justin, it was 'immediately on his rising from Jordan,' and after that the voice had thus spoken, that 'as it is written in the memorials of the Apostles, the devil, that is, that power which is also called serpent and Satan, approached and tempted him up to the point of

[1] Ap. I. xxxv. 75. [2] Dial. lxxxviii. 315. [3] Dial. xlix. 268.
[4] Dial. cii. 328. [5] Ap. I. xii. 60. [6] Dial. li. 270 f.
[7] Dial. lxxxviii. 315.
[8] Dial. lxxxviii. 315. These same words are also recorded to have been pronounced on this occasion in the Cod. D., and by St. Augustine, Clement of Alexandria, Methodius, Hilarius, Lactantius, and Juvencus. The Epistle to the Hebrews seems likewise to imply that these words were pronounced on this occasion (Heb. i. 5; iv. 5). The gnostics maintained that during baptism a fire is manifested above the water, and represents the Holy Ghost.

CHAP. IX.

saying to him, "worship me."' Hereupon Christ answered him: 'Get thee behind me, Satan; the Lord thy God shalt thou worship, and him only shalt thou serve;' thus conquering the devil 'by proving to him that he was wicked, because he desired, contrary to scripture, to be worshipped like God, and (thus) has become an apostate from the will of God.'[1] Again, Justin says of Jesus, that 'his sayings were short and terse, for he was no sophist, but his speech was a power of God;'[2] that by his miracles he led 'the people of his time to recognise him,' and that these miracles, including the raising of the dead,[3] were recorded in the Acts of Pontius Pilate, to which Justin refers his hearers.[4]

He writes that 'when one of his disciples, who formerly was called Simon, recognised him as the son of God, (as) Christ, through the revelation of his (Christ's) father, he called him Peter;'[5] that he said, 'What callest thou me good? One is good, my father who is in heaven.'[6] 'In what (state) I find you, therein will I also judge' (you); 'there will be schisms and heresies.'[7] Justin repeatedly affirms, that after the crucifixion all the disciples of Jesus fell away (fled) from him, and that it was not until after his resurrection that they repented.[8] Again, and with special reference to the memoirs of the Apostles, he records the Lord's words on the cross which are transmitted to us by Luke only, 'Father, in thy hands I commend my spirit,'[9] These and many other sayings of the Lord does he quote from 'the Memorials composed by the Apostles, and by those who have followed them.'[10] These scriptures, 'which are called gospels,'[11] he calls 'our own scriptures,'[12] and he states that they contained 'all' which refers to Jesus Christ,[13] so that he entirely excludes all verbal tradition. He writes about sayings of

[1] Dial. ciii. 331; cxxv. 354.
[2] Ap. I xiv. 61.
[3] In the plural, thus referring also to Lazarus.
[4] Ap. I. xlviii. 84.
[5] Dial. c. 327.
[6] Ap. I. xix. 66.
[7] Dial. xlvii. 35.
[8] Dial. liii. 273; cvi., &c.
[9] Dial. cv. 333.
[10] Dial. ciii. 331.
[11] Ap. I. lxvi. 98.
[12] Ap. I. xxviii. 71.
[13] Ap. I. xxxiii. 75.

Christ which have been 'announced by the Apostles,'[1] and he knew several gospels composed by '*disciples* of the Apostles.'[2] These gospels of direct or indirect apostolic origin were regarded of equal authority with the writings of Moses and the prophets, and, like them, were in regular order read every Sunday in the Christian congregations.[3]

From these few extracts it follows that Justin must have known, in addition to Matthew's original gospel, that of Luke, probably that of Mark, and possibly that of John, since the record of the baptist's confession that he was not the Christ is only contained in the latter gospel, and since Justin quotes a passage which, in a somewhat modified form, is to be found in the Gospel after John. It is the following: 'Christ said: Except ye be born again ye may not enter (come) into the kingdom of heaven.'[4] The same passage is similarly quoted in 'the preaching of Peter:' 'Except ye be born again with living water in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, ye may not enter (come) into the kingdom of heaven.'[5] Instead of 'born from above,' as John has it if literally translated, the above two writers have 'born again;' instead of 'kingdom of God,' 'kingdom of heaven;' instead of 'if one,' 'if ye;' instead of 'can enter,' 'ye may or will enter.'[6] This single saying of Christ, which is not recorded in the first three gospels, may have been known to Justin and to others from verbal tradition, or through some of those apocryphal writings which, for one reason or other, as we have seen, were hidden from the public, as the Gospel after John seems to have been kept hidden till after the time when Justin wrote. Or the fourth gospel was known to him, but he refrained from referring to it, inasmuch as the secret doctrine of Christ therein recorded stood in direct connection with the apocryphal pre-Christian doctrine, which was excluded

[1] Dial. vii. [2] Dial. ciii. [3] Ap. I. xlvii. 98.
[4] Ap. I. lxi. [5] Hom. xi. 25. [6] Comp. Mat. xviii. 3.

CHAP. IX.

from the Hebrew canon. We are, therefore, not compelled to assume that Justin's gospel quotations were taken from a gospel harmony which contained extracts from the fourth gospel.

It likewise follows from the above, that in his dialogue with the Jew Trypho, Justin only referred to that *one* gospel which the former had read. For Trypho says to Justin, 'But even your written rules *in the so-called gospel* are, as I know, so wonderful and great, that one is led to the supposition that no one can keep them, for I made a point of reading them.'[1] And since it was one of Justin's principal objects to prove to the Jew the orthodoxy of the doctrine about the Divine Power, Spirit, or Word, he would, of course, not have abstained from referring to the Gospel after John, if the latter had been recognised as authoritative by Trypho. It is easy to conceive how Justin, whilst avoiding every reference to any document containing the forbidden apocryphal doctrine, would try to prove to the Jew not only the perfect harmony between the law and the prophets on one side, and the sayings of Christ on the other, but also the fulfilment of the former by the latter. Having done so, the eye of the understanding would be opened for the Israelite to understand the great doctrine of the sonship, as developed by Christ, and as by himself applied to his own person. This was the great difficulty, inasmuch as among the sayings of the Lord which Matthew recorded, and which were all that were publicly recognised by the twelve Apostles, so few could be directly referred to for this purpose. Therefore Justin repeats three times the passage only recorded in Matthew, from which the doctrine of Jesus as the Son of God could be easiest developed. Justin writes, in his dialogue with Trypho, 'And in *the Gospel* it is written: All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father, neither (knoweth) any man the Father than the

[1] Dial. x. 227.

Son, and he to whomsoever the Son reveals it.'[1] And in his apology he explains: 'And *as the Jews did not perceive* what (was meant by) Father and what (by) Son, *Jesus Christ himself convinced them* in similar manner (or in manner following): "No man *knew* the Father than the Son, nor the Son than the Father, and he to whomsoever the Son reveals it."' Again, in another passage he has it: 'And he to whomsoever the Son *hath* revealed it.'[2]

Whether Justin and other writers of his own and of earlier times knew and quoted from the Hebrew original of Matthew, or, as is far more probable, from a uniform Greek translation of the same, which may have formed part of a harmony of at least two, probably three, and possibly all the four gospels of our canon, this much is certain, that even in the middle of the second century the sayings of Christ, and more so the principal incidents of his life, were referred to by the staunchest supporters of the Church-doctrine in a form different from the one transmitted to us.

But about this time a new danger arose to the gospel-records and thus to the Church. We have seen that Marcion, the head of the docetic party, came to Rome, and called upon the bishop and presbyters of this Church to consider the full bearing of the Lord's declaration, that new wine requires new bottles or skins. We shall see that this had been fully pointed out in Luke's gospel, the only one which Marcion recognised, being the Gospel of Paul, who in the eyes of the great reformer from Sinope was the only Apostle of Jesus Christ. Luke had already made an attempt, as we shall point out, to put the new wine into new skins. He accepted, as a basis, the primitive Palestinian record of the sayings of Christ, and modified them in accordance with the Lord's secret tradition, which Paul had been the first openly to proclaim. In Marcion's opinion, as formerly in Paul's, this was a step in the right direction. But the attempt had not perfectly

[1] Dial. c. 326; Mat. xi. 27. [2] Ap. I. lxiii. 95, 96.

CHAP. IX.

succeeded, inasmuch as the new wine had in due time begun to ferment and to burst the skins, so that there was danger of soon seeing it spilt altogether. New skins had, therefore, become absolutely necessary, as he thought. Away, then, Marcion would say, whilst referring to the Epistle to the Hebrews, away with the primitive gospel-record, 'let us leave behind the elementary doctrine of Christ, and press towards the more perfect.'[1] It is as if, in addressing the Roman presbytery, Marcion had intended to explain allegorically Christ's miracle in Cana, when he turned into wine the water contained in the Jewish earthen vessels on the occasion of a marriage.[2] The true marriage of Christ, the bridegroom, with his people could only take place after a full knowledge and recognition of his entire doctrine, after a complete performance of his commandment, to publish abroad, what he himself had been prevented by the Jewish authorities from promulgating openly for the benefit of all.

Would Marcion have insisted on the necessity of pouring the new wine into new bottles, if the Gospel after John had at that time already been read in the churches? This may well be doubted. We have tried to render probable the assumption that John's gospel, or as we may call it, the hidden or apocryphal gospel, continued for a time after the beloved Apostle's death to be hidden as the secret tradition, which the twelve Apostles had considered themselves compelled to keep back. Marcion had an especial object in view when he proposed a re-formation of the gospel text. Like Paul, Luke had fully acknowledged the humanity of Christ. Marcion openly denied it; and we have seen that his gospel was a docetic transformation of Luke's record. Thus the primitive apostolic record of Christ's sayings was first, if we may say so, Paulinified by Luke, and then it was Marcionized to the point of rank doceticism, or as Paul seems to have defined it, 'the science falsely so called.'[3]

[1] Heb. vi. 1. [2] See 'the Gospel after John.' [3] 1 Tim. vi. 20.

CHAP. IX.

In the preface to his ecclesiastical history, Eusebius promises among other things, 'to describe the character, times, and number of those who, stimulated by the desire of innovation, and advancing to the greatest errors, announced themselves leaders in the propagation of false opinions; like grievous wolves unmercifully assaulting the flock of Christ.' Faithful to his promise, Eusebius has preserved to us a few extracts from the writings of the earliest Church-historian, Hegesippus, and of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, both of the second century. These extracts suffice to prove the fact, confirmed by later Fathers of the Church, that in that time the gospel-text was mutilated by 'false teachers,' who opposed 'the preaching of the truth by the preaching of the science falsely so called.'[1] We have already considered the highly important statement of Hegesippus, whom Eusebius designates as the defender of 'the sound doctrine of the preaching of the gospel.' The communication of Dionysius, who was bishop about 178 A.C., and who claims to have been 'planted at Corinth' by Peter and Paul,[2] is not less important, as it throws some light on the manner in which ancient scriptures were preserved, and new ones accepted, in the second century. He mentions a Greek gospel-text, but he leaves it to his junior contemporary, Irenæus, bishop of Lyons from 171, to distinguish four gospels, and to transmit the names of their authors, that is the Gospels after Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

Dionysius speaks in the following terms about the falsifications of the most revered Scriptures in his own day, 'Whereas the brethren urged us to write Epistles; I wrote the same, and these the Apostles of the devil have filled with weeds, *by changing some things and adding others*, for whom a woe is reserved. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at, if some have even put their hands *to falsify the writings of the* (*sayings of the*) *Lord*, as they

[1] H. E. iv. 22. [2] H. E. ii. 25.

CHAP. IX.

have attacked Scriptures not of this sort.'[1] There can be no reasonable doubt but that Dionysius refers to the falsification of 'holy Scriptures,' a term which we do not find in earlier writings. Whereas Papias shows that at the beginning of the second century there was no uniform and generally acknowledged translation of Matthew's Hebrew gospel, Dionysius complains that the process of changing some things and adding others had been applied to the falsification of the Lord's writings, an expression which clearly refers to the records of the Lord's sayings. We conclude from these statements, that between the beginning and the end of the second century, and not before the year 150, when Justin wrote his apology, efforts may have been made by the Roman church to set aside the gospel-harmonies till then extensively used, and to sanction the promulgation of the text of the four gospels in a separate and authorised form, as referred to by Irenæus. Even at this time, however, there cannot have been a universally acknowledged Church-authority; for had such an one existed, Dionysius could not have complained of the Scripture-falsification by some 'apostles of the devil,' evidently Marcion and his party, who could not be, and at all events were not prevented from carrying out their nefarious practices, and for whom, as the bishop writes, a woe is reserved, thereby, probably, referring to 'the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels.'[2]

Now, if we bear in mind, that Hegesippus, the senior contemporary of Marcion, attributed to 'false teachers' the preaching of a false science in opposition to the truth of the gospel; that by the same expression Paul defines the gnostic opposition to 'the good deposit' of 'the wholesome (or sound) sayings' of the Lord; that the perverters of the faith at Corinth, whom the Roman Clement mentions, were most probably false teachers; that Ignatius characterises the nature of their heresy as

[1] He probably refers to such Scriptures as his own Epistles. H. E. iv. 23.
[2] Mat. xxv. 41.

doceticism; that Polycarp, when he met Marcion in Rome, called him 'the first-born of Satan;' that, according to the Muratorian list, Paul warned the Corinthians against the schism of heresy; that Dionysius complains of 'apostles of the devil' who falsified the Scriptures, from the most ancient ones to the most modern; that Irenæus and others accuse Marcion to have falsified the Scriptures; we are led to assume that these Scripture-forgeries in the second century were effected by the docetic gnostics, and especially by Marcion. And this supposition is raised to the dignity of a fact, not only by a comparison of Luke's gospel with that of Marcion, but by the striking circumstance that in the Gospel after Mark, as transmitted to us, and which is of Roman origin, there are, as we shall see, some slight traces of a docetic influence, such as Marcion is known to have exercised at Rome about the middle of the second century.

From the third century we have the confirming testimony of Origen respecting the *wilful* falsifications of Scripture. He writes that the difference of the (Greek) text in the various copies was caused 'either by the carelessness of copyists, or by *the malicious boldness* of the correcting writers, or of *those who have added or taken away*.'[1] If Origen had written this about Luke's gospel, he might possibly be supposed to refer to Marcion's counterfeit of the same. As it is, Origen admits that different versions of Matthew's gospel were even in the third century in circulation, and that they originated partly in the activity of malicious gospel-forgers. In the end of the fourth century, Jerome (born 342, died 420) writes the same thing in other words about the Latin translation, and he adds, 'there are as many texts as manuscripts.' He also states that it is 'not sufficiently certain' who translated the Hebrew Matthew into Greek, and that he himself had translated the Hebrew gospel which he found in Cæsarea, and among the Nazarenes of

[1] Com. in Mat.

CHAP. IX.

Berœa, where he copied it, into Latin, as also into Greek; showing thereby that even at that time the still-existing Hebrew original of Matthew had either not been correctly translated, or that such translations had been falsified. Again, in the fifth century, Epiphanius writes that the Hebrew Gospel after Matthew, which was used by the Nazarenes and by the Ebionites as well as by the disciples of Cerinthus, was in his time 'not complete, but falsified.'[1]

It is not possible, in the face of such evidence, to stifle inquiry by the mere assumption that the early fathers of the Church may have one and all erred in this respect. Granted that the writings of the fathers cannot all be implicitly relied upon; but so grave a charge as that which the above assumption implies must be substantiated before it can have any weight with the truth-searching inquirer. It would, indeed, be a difficult task to prove, or even to render probable, that the earliest bishops whose writings we possess, in denouncing the wilful falsification of holy writ, were instigated by a party-spirit, and that by such erroneous statements they could have furthered the interests of the Catholic church. In the face of the Catholicising efforts of the Roman church, ever since the end of the second century, the above unanimous testimonies form a very valuable contribution to the history of the early Church.

But it may be objected that, even though such falsifications of holy writ may have taken place at one time or other, yet that a purification of the sacred text must have been effected by the Roman church. At first sight this seems to be a somewhat plausible objection; for if substantiated it would explain the otherwise rather mysterious fact that the two most ancient gospel manuscripts we possess, the sinaitic and the vatican one, date from the end of the fourth century, when Jerome could still testify to the existence of as many different gospel-

[1] Haer. xxx. 13.

texts as there were manuscripts. But in order to be able to assume that even at that very late period, when Eusebius wrote his history of the Church, the Roman church carried out effectually, and with strict regard to truth, such a purifying process of gospel reformation, it would be necessary at least to produce the Hebrew original of Matthew, or such a copy of the same as Jerome found in the library of Cæsarea, and to compare the same with the Gospel after Matthew transmitted to us. Inasmuch as it is not easy to account for the sudden disappearance of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, or of that part of the Muratorian list which refers to it; and unless more ancient records should come to light, and prove the contrary, the suspicion must remain, that the gospel-falsifiers did not leave the most ancient Gospel of Matthew as they found it. Yet we hope to succeed in pointing out, in the course of our gospel-investigations, that by not recognising, but condemning as far as possible, the heretical innovations of Marcion and other teachers of doceticism, the Roman Catholic church has rendered a very great service to the Church of Christ. And if the four gospels of our canon, each of them taken as a whole, have been transmitted to us more or less in the form in which each of them must have existed ever since the first century, this is principally due to the Church of Rome.

We have repeatedly referred to what we consider the cardinal point of our gospel-investigations, that is to the apparent fact, that owing to the restrictions imposed by the rulers of the Jewish church, Christ spoke to the people in parables only, without giving them to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and that even to His disciples He communicated His doctrine in secret and in darkness. We have tried to show that the Apostles at Jerusalem were at first not able to publish a complete record of the sayings of their Lord and Master, and that consequently they agreed to record only such of His sayings which they considered to be in perfect harmony

CHAP. IX.

with the law and the prophets, leaving out all those which in any way confirmed, developed, and applied the apocryphal doctrine or Hidden Wisdom, the promulgation of which was in Palestine strictly forbidden, and this, probably, at no time more rigidly than during the beginning of the Christian era. It will be no slight confirmation of the above view, if it is possible, by a minute comparison of the Gospel after Matthew and that after Luke, to point out that the omissions, alterations, and additions in the parallel passages of the latter arose from the desire to harmonise the incomplete primitive apostolic gospel-record, with its necessary complement, that is with the principles of the Hidden Wisdom, which the Lord had secretly communicated to his disciples only, and which Paul had been the first to proclaim 'in light' and from 'the housetops.'

These alterations of the first gospel-record must be carefully distinguished from those falsifications of Scripture by false teachers, that is, by the docetic gnostics of the second century. Nor is it necessary to point out that to these falsifications alone the anathematising protests of the ancient fathers refer. The writings of these docetic gnostics contained, as we have seen, heretical doctrine, and such as, in the opinion of the probably Roman writer of the so-called Muratorian list, written in the second century, could not be received by the Church, since 'it is not seemly to mix gall with honey.' We repeat it, the glory of the Roman church is, that by its anti-docetic opposition, it strove with a truly apostolical zeal to prevent this mixture of gall and honey, of docetic gnosticism and pure Christianity. Notwithstanding its efforts, no uniform record of the four gospels could be introduced in all the churches during the first four centuries. And though during this time such a scripture as the Epistle to the Hebrews was by the Latin church excluded from its canon, probably, as we have seen, because of its docetic interpretation, yet, when in the fourth century the Emperor

Constantine commanded Eusebius to form a collection of sacred writings, with a view to the establishment of a universal Church, that epistle was acknowledged as canonical, though not as the work of Paul.

This compromise can in no sense be regretted, for without it the desired uniformity of the canon would perhaps never have been accomplished, and 'the good deposit' of 'the wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ' might not have been transmitted to us in the form we possess it. But truly lamentable is the fact that the tradition of the Roman church has not made known to the world, under what circumstances the first and incomplete evangelical record of Matthew was written, and why it had to be followed, first by the Paulinic Gospel after Luke, then by the more compromising Gospel after Mark, and finally by the uncompromising Gospel after John. The Roman church need not have dreaded the consequences of making known to the world that the gradual revelation of pure Christianity was a work of almost a century. But such was her determination to establish the infallibility of the Church as having uninterruptedly existed ever since the commencement of the apostolic age, that in the spirit of the Acts of the Apostles it preferred to eliminate, as far as possible, every trace of the original disagreement between Paul and the twelve Apostles, and of the docetic schism which the latter as well as the former had to combat, and which, nevertheless, triumphed to such an extent in the second century as to lead to falsifications of the gospels.

We hope to have proved that there was sufficient ground, and even absolute necessity, for the apostolic disagreement, of which the Epistle to the Galatians is the indestructible memorial. But in order the more fully to establish the nature and extent of the same, and to point out the different phases of gospel reconstruction, we shall minutely compare the third gospel of our canon with the first, then the second with the first and third, and thus we

CHAP. IX.

shall have paved the way to the consideration of the all-important Gospel after John.

With regard to the Gospel after Matthew, all that can be said with certainty is, that it is at once the earliest and the latest written gospel of our canon. Taking it as a whole, and without considering later additions, it contains those sayings of Christ which, under existing circumstances, were alone permitted to be recorded by the Apostle Matthew, with the consent of his fellow Apostles, and for the use of the Hebrews in Palestine. The record herein contained of the principal incidents of the life of Christ, so far as these were not directly connected with his sayings, dates probably, at least in part, from a later period altogether. The Gospel after Matthew may not have received its present form till after the first century of the Christian era. But since we do not possess even those earlier gospel-manuscripts which were at that time in existence, it is impossible either to assert or to deny that the Gospel after Matthew may have received its final revision as late as in the second, if not partly in the third and fourth centuries.

CHAPTER X.

THE GOSPEL AFTER LUKE.

INTRODUCTION—MAN'S INABILITY TO PERFORM GOOD WORKS, AND THE CONSEQUENT INSUFFICIENCY OF MERIT BASED UPON THEM — TO THE BELIEVING SINNER THE MERCIFUL GRACE OF GOD IS OFFERED AS THE SOLE BUT ALL-SUFFICIENT MEANS OF SALVATION — OMISSION OF ALL THE PASSAGES IN MATTHEW WHICH REFER TO THE CONTINUED VALIDITY OF THE MOSAIC LAW, AND ADDITION OF PASSAGES WHICH PROVE THE CONTRARY—ADOPTION OF PAUL'S PECULIAR DOCTRINE WITH REGARD TO THE PERSON AND OFFICE OF JESUS—INSTEAD OF MATTHEW'S LIMITED AND TERRESTRIAL KINGDOM, THE SPIRITUAL AND UNIVERSAL KINGDOM OF THE ETERNAL MESSIAH WHO IS FROM HEAVEN—THE HARDNESS OF HEART, BLINDNESS, AND REJECTION OF THE JEWS FAVOURABLY CONTRASTED BY THE GREATER WILLINGNESS OF THE GENTILES TO ENTER IN—THE JEWISH NATION IS NOT EXCLUSIVELY CALLED TO FORM THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM, BUT ON THE CONTRARY JESUS HAD A MARKED PREDILECTION FOR THE GENTILES — TENDENCY OF THE WRITER TO DIMINISH THE AUTHORITY OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES—PAUL THE FIRST OF CHRIST'S APOSTLES—CONCLUSION.

'*Ye have taken away the key of knowledge.*'—Luke xi. 52.

Introduction.

Differing from the other gospel-narratives, the Gospel after Luke furnishes us with a statement about its origin. Many having undertaken to relate, or rather to compile a narrative of the things which had passed among them (the Christians), as transmitted by those who 'from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word,' the composer of this gospel has resolved to write these things down in regular order, having himself carefully followed up everything from the beginning. The immediate

CHAP. X.

object of his doing so is, that Theophilus may know 'the certainty' of those things about which he had received instruction. From this it seems to follow, that in the opinion of the writer the then existing evangelical writings were not of such a nature as to convey to all 'the certainty' of the Christian doctrine in its original purity and completeness. If, without exception, all the sayings of the Lord had been recorded, or if in the original apostolic record no important sayings of his had been omitted, such uncertainties as those to which the writer alludes could not have existed.

We therefore find in the very beginning of this gospel an indirect confirmation of the fact we are trying to establish, that in the original apostolic gospel-record some of the sayings of Christ had been excluded, and we are led to surmise that they were those which he had communicated in secret to the chosen few. This supposition is supported by the fact that the full light of Christ's glorious gospel was first revealed publicly by Paul, who thus amended and completed the original apostolic gospel by 'another gospel,' which for being a new one was yet essentially the record of the principles of secret doctrine, such as communicated by the Lord in secret, and to be proclaimed in light in 'the gospel afterwards to be revealed.' It will become evident, by a minute comparison of the Gospel after Luke with the Gospel after Matthew, that the writer of the former had the special purpose in view, to harmonise the incomplete archives of original apostolic Christianity with the leading principles of the supplementary gospel revealed to and through Paul, that is with 'the Hidden Wisdom,' which he preached in a mystery in public, as Christ had done in secret.

We shall now proceed to point out the connection between the principal doctrines contained in Paul's Epistles, which we have found to be the exponents of Christ's hidden wisdom, and those parts of the Gospel after Luke, in which passages from the Gospel after Matthew have

been either inserted in a strikingly modified form, or have been entirely left out, or have made room for others.[1]

Among the leading principles of Paul's hidden wisdom, that is of Christ's secret doctrine, we here mention in the first place:

1. *Man's inability to perform good works, and the consequent insufficiency of merit based upon them.*

This doctrine the Apostle has nowhere stated more clearly and comprehensively than in the following passages. 'Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God'[2] 'For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.'[3] Among the passages in Luke which appear to have been altered from the original in Matthew, in accordance with the above Paulinic doctrine, the following are the most remarkable: 'Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful,'[4] instead of: 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.'[5] Again, in all the three parables reported in the fifteenth chapter of Luke, that is in the parable of the lost sheep, of the piece of silver, and of the prodigal son, the leading idea is, that notwithstanding the murmurings of the Pharisees and Scribes, merit based on good works is of no avail, and that God receives even 'all' publicans and sinners, whether among the Jews or among the Gentiles.[6] These may all rejoice and participate in the kingdom of God, although by their works they have no more merited it than the younger son in the last of the above-named parables. But like the murmuring Jews, the elder son in this parable is 'angry,' and will not 'go in,' although the Father entreats him to do so. He considers it an injustice that he who has been his Father's faithful servant, and who never transgressed his commandment, that the

[1] We shall here follow as closely as our above new point of view will permit of it: 'die Evangelien, ihre Verfasser und ihr Verhältniss zu einander,' by the so-called Saxon Anonymus. Second Edition, Leipzig, 1852.

[2] 2 Cor. iii. 5. [3] Rom. iii. 23. [4] Luke vi. 36.

[5] Mat. v. 48. [6] Comp. Rom. iii. 29.

CHAP. X.

elder son, clothed as he was with the wedding garment of the law, should be even less honoured than the younger son. Notwithstanding his open sin, this riotous man had been received with open arms, and although he had been feeding with the swine, a fatted-calf-reception awaited him on his return to his Father's house.

The same lesson is taught by the history of the penitent publican, who was justified before the self-satisfied Pharisee, which latter gloried in his meritorious observance of the law.[1] Again, the contrast between righteousness by means of the works ordained by the law, and repentance through faith, is vividly brought out in the version contained in Luke, about the healing of the Centurion's servant.[2] A Centurion, who as it is clearly implied was a Gentile, had a servant who was dear to him, but sick and ready to die. He sent 'the elders of the Jews' from Capernaum to Jesus, beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant. The Jews begin their request by a statement of the Centurion's merits, in order to prove to the Lord that 'he was worthy for whom he should do this; for he loveth our nation, and he has built us a synagogue.' Although not an Israelite, he has done much for the preservation and promulgation of the Mosaic law. But Jesus, though listening to their words whilst going along with them, answered nothing, as if their confidence in the justification by law had not moved his compassion. When, however, he approached the house, and heard the message which the Gentile Centurion sent him through his friends, who possibly were Gentiles also, He marvelled at the faith which it expressed, and which Jesus had not found even in Israel.

Also in another part of the Gospel after Luke,[3] the Pharisees are shown to rest satisfied with the gospel of the law,[4] and not to need the new gospel of faith. By their not being baptised they rejected the counsel of God,

[1] Luke xviii. 9–14. [2] Luke vii. 1–10; comp. Mat. viii. 5–13.
[3] Luke vii. 29–30; comp. xvi. 15. [4] Comp. Rom. ii. 16–19.

whilst 'all the people' that heard John the Baptist, and the publicans 'justified God,' that is to say, acknowledged His justice, being baptised with the baptism of repentance.[1] It is also a self-righteous Pharisee, who has to be told by Jesus, that the penitent woman, whose sins were many, was preferred before him.[2]

2. *The Paulinic origin of the principal differences in the parallel passages in Luke and Matthew is further shown by such passages in the third gospel, the purport of which it is to offer to the believing sinner the merciful grace of God, as the sole but all-sufficient means of salvation which does not depend on any observance of the written law.*

In addition to the parables of the prodigal son, of the penitent woman, and of the publican, which we have already considered, we have first to refer, among the passages in Luke which bear upon this point, to those in which the humility and faith of Mary, 'the handmaid of the Lord,' is contrasted with Zacharias, who notwithstanding his blameless keeping of the commandments and ordinances, was lacking in faith.[3] We have then to point out the passages which show, that zealous Martha was 'cumbered about much serving,' whilst faithful Mary, sitting at Jesus' feet, had chosen 'that good part,' the 'one thing . . . needful.'[4] Another passage to which reference must here be made is that which contains the Lord's specific declaration, that faith was the necessary condition of his restoring to life the daughter of Jairus.[5]

Also in the parable of the sower,[6] the alterations in Luke tend to show the relative importance of faith above works. The most striking of these are the addition of the words: 'lest they might believe and be saved.' Again, 'which for a while believe, . . . and bring no fruit to perfection.'[7] And finally, 'and bring forth fruit with patience.'[8]

[1] Comp. Mat. xxi. 32. [2] Luke vii. 36–50. [3] Luke i.
[4] Luke xx. 38–42. [5] Comp. Luke viii. 50 f. with Mat. ix. 18 f.
[6] Luke viii. 5-15; Mat. xiii.
[7] Comp. Eph. iv. 15; Col. i. 28; ii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 9–12.
[8] Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 12; vi. 4.

CHAP. X.

Another passage, apparently introduced for the same purpose, is the prayer of the twelve: 'increase our faith,'[1] or more literally; 'give us (add to us) faith also;' and the answer of the Lord, beginning with the words: 'if ye had faith like a grain of mustard seed,' and ending, 'when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants.' By this statement it seems clearly to be implied that even the twelve Apostles have no faith at all, and that the Lord reproves them for their trust in the works of the law.

The doctrine of faith, as the only but sure means of salvation, is nowhere more clearly exemplified than in the history of the penitent thief on the cross. For 'no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost.'[2] As the penitent thief had, in faith, called Him so, and this even on the cross, he was by the Spirit of God born again to the kingdom of God. Accordingly the disciples of the law, which trust in themselves that they are righteous, whilst despising others, are not God's 'own elect;' they are not those of the inhabitants of the earth, among whom the Lord when he comes again will 'find faith;' the 'elect of God' are the disciples of faith '*without*' the deeds of the law, who will be 'justified rather than the other.'[3] Here we must also refer to the pointed difference in the record of the 'two blind men,' near Jericho.[4] According to the first account, two blind men, believing in the healing power of Jesus the promised 'Son of David,' received their sight by His touching their eyes. But in the second account we hear but of one blind man, who having acknowledged Jesus of Nazareth, as Son of David, and implored his mercy, was at the command of Jesus 'brought unto him, and when he was come near,' Jesus asked him, what he should do unto him. The man stricken with blindness, asks that he may receive his sight, and Jesus, without touching his eyes, 'said unto

[1] Luke xvii. 5 f. [2] 1 Cor. xii. 3. [3] Luke xviii. 8 f.
[4] Mat. xx. 30 f; Luke xviii. 35 f.

him, receive thy sight, *thy faith* hath saved thee; and immediately he received his sight, and followed Him, glorifying God; and all the people when they saw it, gave praise unto God.' May not the Paulinic Evangelist, the companion and fellow-labourer of Paul, have had in his mind, whilst writing this account, the history of the great Apostle's conversion? He was likewise stricken with blindness; he was afar off and had to be, as it were, brought to Jesus by his command, and thus having come near, was enabled to see that salvation is by faith and not by any deeds, the necessity of which was insisted upon by the 'blind' rulers of the 'blind' Jews.

Apparently for this same reason, the parable of the labourers in the vineyard[1] is omitted in the Gospel after Luke; for it tends to show, that man *is* able by his works to earn his reward. The author of this gospel, therefore, opposes to this anti-Paulinic doctrine a parable which sets forth the insufficiency of good works without faith,[2] and which ends, as we have pointed out, with the injunction, 'when ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants.'[3]

3. *Further traces of a reformation of the original gospel-narrative in accordance with Paulinic principles are the omission in the Gospel after Luke of all those passages in the Gospel after Matthew which refer to the continued validity of the Mosaic law, and the addition of passages which prove the contrary.*

Here we have first to mention the omission of the passage about Christ's not destroying, but fulfilling the law, of which every jot or tittle shall be fulfilled.[4] Again, an omission here to be considered is the injunction of Christ, that His disciples and followers are to 'observe and do' whatsoever they are bid to do by the Scribes and Pharisees, who 'sit in Moses' seat.'[5] But the strongest confirmation of the above assertion is to be found by a

[1] Mat. xx. [2] Luke xvii. 7-10. [3] Comp. Luke xix. 10.
[4] Mat. v. 17-19. [5] Mat. xxiii. 2, 3.

CHAP. X.

comparison of the sermon on the mount as reported in the Gospels after Matthew and after Luke. In the sermon on the mount,[1] the disciples of Jesus, that is, as it would seem, only Peter, Andrew, and the two sons of Zebedee,[2] are addressed as 'the salt of the earth,' and 'the light of the world.' They are called blessed if, notwithstanding their poverty, they are rich in the Spirit, if they be 'poor' who are 'in the Spirit,' if they are spiritually-minded poor, whose heart is their sanctuary, and who for this reason *already* possess the kingdom of heaven. If they mourn, they shall be comforted; if they are meek, they shall inherit the earth; if they hunger and thirst after righteousness, they shall be filled; if they are merciful, they shall obtain mercy; if they are pure in heart, they shall see God; if they are peacemakers (or rather 'peaceful'), they shall be called the children of God; if they are persecuted for righteousness sake, then the kingdom of heaven is theirs; blessed are they, if they are reviled, persecuted and spoken against without cause, and for the sake of their Master. They may rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is their reward in heaven, for so were the prophets persecuted before them.

The sermon on the mount has lately been beautifully interpreted as a consecration-sermon addressed to the representatives of the new Israel, chosen from among the misled and purposely blinded people forming the Israelitic theocracy. Jesus himself is the founder, the head, the representative and the defender of this new Israel. We have already pointed out how He contrasted the new to the old, *His* law to 'their law,' the new garment to the old garment. We have seen in what sense He alone can have referred to the validity of the letter of the law. The law is to be fulfilled in spirit and in truth; that is, with due regard to 'the weightier matters of the law, judgment (right), mercy and faith' (faithfulness?), which can only be spiritually discerned by the verifying faculty in man,

[1] Mat. v. f. [2] Comp. Mat. iv. 18–21.

by 'the power of God.' In the sermon on the mount Jesus openly contrasts his sayings with the recorded sayings of old. Having pronounced his blessings upon his disciples, he proceeded to proclaim his woes unto those who are not.[1] The rich have received their consolation; those who are full shall hunger; those that laugh shall mourn and weep; those of whom all men shall speak well are like the false prophets of whom their forefathers spoke well. Riches, sumptuousness, self-satisfaction and want of sympathy, good reputation and respectability, all tend to harden the heart, and to close it for the kingdom of heaven. The law of the heart proclaims woe to such who are not condemned by the letter of the written law.

True righteousness is the fruit of inward holiness, and not the result of a cold performance of the works prescribed by the law. Therefore the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees can 'in no case' lead to the kingdom of heaven. And because the righteousness proclaimed by Jesus has the kingdom of heaven for its reward, the followers of Jesus are persecuted as opposers of official orthodoxy. It is not enough to satisfy the injunctions of the old law, and not to 'kill.' The new law forbids man to be 'angry with his brother without a cause, or even to call him 'raca' (blockhead) or fool. Reconciliation is urged. The commandment of the old law: 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,' is already broken 'in his heart' by him who is guilty of unchaste thoughts or looks, or of an unlawful putting away of his wife. Again, the old law permits of oaths, and only condemns the man who forswears himself. 'Swear not at all,' says the new law. By truthfulness in the heart and by the simple word, the disciples of the new law are to be known. Wrong shall not be combated by resistance or by retaliation. For wrath becomes the source of ever-renewed mutual mortifications, and of differences which it may be difficult

[1] In the Palestinian record this passage (Luke vi. 24–26) has been left out, probably because the Jewish rulers did not sanction its insertion.

CHAP. X.

to settle. But by a meek and yielding temper, by engendering a better spirit through genuine kindness, the root and nurture of evil is removed. And finally the highest test of love is not such a love which is based upon selfishness and self-interest, as for instance the love of relatives, and of those who return our love. True love is spontaneous, and is its own reward. It destroys all hatred and uncharitableness, and if this work of regeneration be so far accomplished that we love even our enemies, then we are perfected in our innermost parts.

In the following part of the sermon on the mount[1] it is shown how our best actions, such as alms-giving, forgiving the brethren, praying and fasting, become hypocritical, lose their genuineness and their good effect when they are not performed out of love to God, but with an eye to the reward of this world. In the concluding part[2] Christ points to those who judge others, who see the mote in the brother's eye, but not the beam in their own eye; to those who cast holy things to dogs, and pearls to swine, and who therefore ought to pray to God in full reliance that their heavenly Father will give them the good things they are still wanting. To do to men what we wish them to do to us, this is the law and the prophets as interpreted by the new law; this is the gate which leads from the broad to the narrow path. The Lord warns his disciples against the false prophets, who can say: 'Lord, Lord,' but who instead of bringing forth the fruits of good works, and instead of following the will of their heavenly Father concerning them, act contrary to the letter and spirit of the law, and have therefore built their house upon the sand.

'Jesus regarded the law of the Old Testament as based upon the selfish natural soil of the human heart, upon the principle of self-preservation which is never free of selfishness. But in the new Israel selfishness is to be overcome by the holy and sanctifying power of beneficent love;

[1] Mat. vi. [2] Mat. vii.

for the extent of this love there is no other limitation than the merciful and immeasurable love of God. No frailty had been more developed by the hierarchical theologians and their followers than the frailty of judging men's consciences, and the propensity to condemn. The source of this lies in the fancy, that only one's own form for individual thought, faith and life has a right to exist. From this fancy springs up that fanaticism which forms one of the most revolting features of hierarchical judaism. Therefore Jesus says to his disciples in the third part of his consecration-sermon: judge not, condemn not. The judging and condemning of the religious convictions and views of others is all the more to be avoided, inasmuch as it renders blind against one's own religious shortcomings, and as he who accustoms himself to lord it over others according to his own religious prejudices, will never leave them off. If then, moreover, a zealot of this kind fills the place of a teacher, then his pupils will become likewise proud, sharp, intolerant, and therefore will remain religiously ignorant. Again, want of toleration and the desire to condemn lead unavoidably to hypocrisy; the more the intolerant be wanting in humility and self-negation, the more he seeks to cover his own sins and deficiencies with the cloak of an outward and official righteousness. Mildness of judgment in all matters of conscience, toleration towards the religious views of others, a friendly deportment towards the neighbour's holiest convictions, this is one of the signs by which a disciple of Jesus in the kingdom of God may be known.'

'Outward obedience to the theocratic rules, subjection to the authority of tradition and of usage, zeal in the performance of prescribed works, these were demanded by the leaders of the hierarchical and clerical party as imperative conditions of true piety. Thus piety and virtue were outwardly inculcated, yet the same were not developed as free and living from the inner emotions and the moral self-determination of individuals embued with

CHAP. X.

a character of their own. But Christ said that the heart of man is either a 'good treasure' or an 'evil treasure,'[1] out of which he brings forth 'that which is good' or 'that which is evil,' according to his free will, for which he is responsible.[1] How dangerous then is it, if in the place of deeds empty words are haughtily uttered, or when forms of prayer audibly expressed, or long-breathed assurances are to take the place of a sincere devotion of one's life to God. And yet so it was with the adherents of the hierarchical-clerical party. Their Messianic expectations, their plans about the future, were high-flying dreams. Thus they were not led to any real results, nor did they intend to bring willing sacrifices, least of all were they inclined to suffer for their cause. What was wanting was love, unselfish surrender and humility. Already Jesus had observed among his followers a few traces of a similar state of mind. Some joined themselves to his person with apparent submissiveness, and with a kind of devotion they called him their Lord and Master. But this did not lead to a moral decision within, nor without to a determined separation from the old mode of life. They had not found a firm foundation on the new soil. Jesus pointedly compares them with the man who builds his house on the loose foundation of rolling sand. Words without a corresponding state of mind, promises without the power of fulfilling them, are like houses without foundation. Unconditional sacrifice and active devotion to the kingdom of God, this is another mark by which it may be known whether a man is a disciple of Jesus in his heavenly kingdom.'[2]

Now, if we consider the version of the sermon on the mount as contained in the Gospel after Luke, we are first of all struck with the strange fact, that even the outward circumstances of the occasion are here differently related. Instead of going 'up into a mountain,' Jesus is here described as coming 'down' the mountain; and he is

[1] This sentence has been somewhat enlarged in the translation.
[2] Schenkel, das Charakterbild Jesu; p. 100–102.

accompanied by the twelve disciples and not by four of them only. Instead of sitting down he 'stood in the plain,' when delivering the sermon to the twelve Apostles, as well as to 'the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people.' This is very different from Matthew's record, who leaves it at least doubtful whether the multitudes met and followed the Lord before his descent from the mountain, so that we are not sure whether any other than the four Apostles heard the Lord's address.[1] The most striking alteration in this version of the sermon is the omission of those passages which refer to the Apostles as 'the salt of the earth,' and 'the light of the world.' We shall have occasion to consider in another place the probable causes of so portentous an omission. Again, from so declared an enemy of the law as the writer is, we could hardly expect that he would fail to omit that long passage in Matthew,[2] which refers to the fulfilment of righteousness in the invariable sense of the first gospel that is in righteousness not 'without' but *by* the deeds of the law.[3] Again, the passage in which the meek are declared blessed, could hardly find a place in the writings of so zealous a disciple of Paul, who could not forget that his Master said of himself that he 'burned,'[4] and who advised his followers to be 'not slothful in business, fervent in spirit,' or more literally translated: 'in zeal undaunted, glowing (or burning) in spirit.'[5]

Again, the declaration of blessedness addressed to the peaceful is omitted by the Evangelist who, in the account of the Lord's passion, thought it necessary to leave out the injunction: '*put up* again thy sword into its place,'[6] as not being quite in harmony with the Lord's command to buy swords, which is reported in the third gospel only.[7] The writer shows himself to be the companion and disciple of that Apostle, the principal element of whose life was strife, and whose emphatical admonitions were such as:

[1] Mat. v. 1; viii. 1. [2] Mat. v. 21–43. [3] Rom. iii. 28.
[4] 2 Cor. xi. 29. [5] Rom. xii. 11. [6] Mat. xxvi. 52, 53.
[7] Luke xxii. 36–38; comp. xii. 49.

CHAP. X.

'Quit you like men, be strong,'[1] and 'Stand fast.'[2] And the above noted omission is quite in accordance with the modified version in the Gospel after Luke about settling disputes with an adversary. Instead of *agreeing* with our adversary, while we are in the way with him, we are here told that when a man is with his adversary on the way to the magistrate, he is to 'give diligence,' that he may be '*delivered from him.*' For if he is a transgressor against, or debtor to the law, he will not be forgiven and, unlike the so-called unjust steward, the stern judge of the law will condemn him to pay 'the very last mite.'[3]

The Evangelist upholds the doctrine, that in man 'dwelleth no good thing.'[4] Accordingly it is impossible for him to admit, that there can be any who are 'pure in heart.' Again, to 'hunger and thirst after righteousness' is an expression which must be omitted, since it might possibly undermine the doctrine of righteousness by faith *without* the deeds of the law.[5] Least of all is it convenient to insert the Lord's words about 'the poor (who are) in spirit;' since the 'newness of spirit' is opposed to 'the oldness of the letter,'[6] and since the words 'poor in spirit' might be misunderstood so as to mean *wanting* in grace, whilst contrariwise it is good to be '*filled* with the spirit.'[7] Spiritual poverty is a bar to knowledge.

We have now to point out a peculiar circumstance, which can hardly be regarded as a mere chance-coincidence. All the condemnatory passages in the sermon on the plain, as recorded in Luke, may be taken to refer to the twelve Apostles chosen by Christ; whilst the laudatory passages are clearly addressed to 'the multitude of his disciples.' These are mentioned apart from the twelve, whilst 'the great multitude of people . . . which came to hear him'[8] is addressed separately. Thus, on this occa-

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 13.
[2] Rom. v. 1; comp. Eph. vi. 13 f; 1 Thes. iii. 8; 2 Thes. ii. 15; Phil. iv. 1.
[3] Luke xii. 58–59; comp. Mat. v. 25.
[4] Rom. vii. 18.
[5] Comp. Phil. iii. 6–9.
[6] Rom. vii. 6.
[7] Eph. v. 18.
[8] Luke vi. 17.

sion, the 'company of his disciples' are first addressed,[1] from among which it seems implied the seventy were chosen. Here, as in similar passages in this gospel, such as in the parables of Lazarus and of the prodigal son, the poor, the hungry, they that *now* weep, who are *now* thrust out, all these may be understood to represent the Gentiles, who vainly hunger after salvation, and who are, as it were, lying at the door of the rich Jews and of the Jewish disciples.[2] This view is almost in literal accordance with Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. Paul, as steward of 'the mysteries of God,'[3] and as father of the Corinthian church, has 'in Christ Jesus begotten' them, 'through the gospel.'[4] And he now asks them: '*Already* have ye become full, *already* become rich, *without us* have ye gained dominion? And would to God ye might have gained dominion, that we also might reign with you.' This dominion in their divided Church, if dominion it be, the Corinthians owe to Paul, who yet is 'judged' of these very members of his flock. But he tells them that his mission to reveal the mysteries of God is not accomplished so long as the Lord has not come himself, and brought 'to light the hidden things of darkness.' As yet, the true disciples of Christ, such as Paul himself, are 'set forth as the least;' they are, in the eyes of the world, 'fools for Christ's sake.' Yet the contrary ought to be the case, and there are some who acknowledge this. Those are 'wise in Christ' who have received from Paul that which makes them to 'differ' from others. The heathen Corinthians, being *hungry* and *poor*, have become *full* and *rich* by the preaching of that 'other gospel,' which makes them to 'differ' from those who have not received it. These Corinthians whom Paul addresses, and likewise the Gentiles generally, are in this gospel described 'as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, yet having all things.'[5]

[1] vi. 20–23. [2] Comp. i. 51–53. [3] Comp. Col. i. 27; Eph. iii. 1–6.
[4] 1 Cor. iv. 15. [5] 2 Cor. vi. 10.

CHAP. X.

Accordingly, in the version of the sermon on the mount, as reported in Luke's gospel, among those who are blessed by the Lord are 'the poor,' those that hunger and weep, and those that are 'separated' from the company of others. They are like poor Lazarus and the poor Gentile Corinthians, who were afterwards made rich and to rejoice by and according to the gospel of the Gentiles. All these commendatory passages[1] seem, therefore, in the narrative of this gospel, to be by Christ addressed to the chosen Gentiles, or, as they are here called, to the 'company of his disciples.' These are clearly distinguished from the chosen twelve Apostles,[2] in the same manner in which, as we shall see, the seventy disciples were distinguished from and contrasted to them. Now, if the above words of Christ may be taken to refer to the company of his Gentile disciples, it would seem to follow that the following verses,[3] expressing the woes unto the full, unto them that laugh, unto those of whom all men speak well, are addressed to the Judaisers, with whom even the twelve original disciples were somewhat connected by Paul and his disciples. For although these 'Jews,' from whom Paul learnt nothing, had only proclaimed the original gospel of circumcision, and had been, like the rest, 'shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be (by Paul) revealed,' yet they were 'held in reputation,' all men spoke well of them, and they '*seemed* to be pillars.' But with the days of the law their mission has come to an end. They are like 'the false prophets,' of whom '*their* fathers,' that is the Jews, spoke well.

Having first addressed the chosen band of his disciples among the Gentiles, and having contrasted to them his disciples among the Jews, Christ is here reported now to have addressed those 'which hear,'[4] that is, those among 'the great multitude of people . . . which came to hear him.' This great multitude we may conceive to have been of a mixed character, that is, not to have belonged exclu-

[1] vi. 20–23. [2] vi. 17. [3] vi. 24–26. [4] vi. 27.

sively either to the Gentile or to the Jewish community. Yet, from the locality where the scene took place, we should be led to expect that the great majority of this great multitude, assembled in Palestine, consisted of Jews. And indeed, the interpretation of the following verses which suggests itself from the point of view we have taken, strongly confirms this assumption. They are enjoined to love their enemies,[1] that is, as it seems to be implied, if they be Jews they are to love the Gentiles. The true disciples of Christ are to give without exception to the Gentiles, if they ask it, whatsoever the Jews have hitherto exclusively possessed; they are commanded to lend to those of whom they cannot hope to receive anything. By so doing, they will be merciful to the Gentiles, as their Father has been merciful to themselves. For this they shall be greatly rewarded, and become 'the children of the Highest,' who 'is kind unto the unthankful, and to the evil.' If the Jews and their teachers, the twelve Apostles, keep back, judge, and condemn, instead of giving and forgiving, they shall be measured by the same narrow measure that they mete with.

It would appear as if the Evangelist had not hesitated to carry out this injunction to the full. Instead of speaking of the Apostles as 'the light of the world,' they are probably indirectly referred to in the following parable[2] as being like the Pharisees, the 'blind' leaders of 'the blind.' For there cannot be any doubt but that the Paulinic Evangelist, in speaking of the blind, refers to the Jewish people, whose minds are '*blinded*' by the 'veil' which is spread over the Old Testament, which veil 'is done away in Christ.'[3] The Jews 'please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.'[4] But if 'the blind' are the Jews, who can be

[1] Comp. Luke i. 71.
[2] Luke vi. 39 f.
[3] 2 Cor. iii. 14; comp. Rom. xi. 25.
[4] 1 Thess. ii. 15–16.

CHAP. X.

meant by the leaders or guides of the blind? Are we permitted to think that the Apostles at Jerusalem, as well as the Sadducees and Pharisees, may have been thus designated, or shall we assume that the latter only were meant? Although we shall separately and fully consider all the bearings of this important question, yet we cannot omit to refer to it in a cursory manner in this place.

If we succeed in showing that dogmatical differences were in the outset the cause of a want of harmonious union and cooperation between Paul and the other Apostles; if the latter had purposely published a garbled record of the Lord's sayings, and this because they feared the rulers of the Jews; if the latter were among those who even indirectly sanctioned another gospel and another Jesus than the one preached by Paul, then they would be naturally included in his anathema.[1] And, indeed, Paul nowhere speaks of the twelve Apostles as having ceased to be Jews, but he clearly calls even Peter a Jew,[2] although he and those who came from James ought to know and did know better, and ought not to dissemble, that is to appear stricter Jews than they really were. Paul writes to the Romans: 'Behold (*if*) thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest His will, and, taught by the law, knowest how to prove what things are right and wrong, and art confident that thou thyself art *a guide of the blind*, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish (or ignorant), a teacher of babes, having in the law the aggregate of knowledge and of truth; thou therefore which teachest others, teachest thou not thyself?[3] Not unconnected with, but rather dependent from, the Judaisers, who consider themselves as guides of the blind, are those 'Jews' who were 'held in reputation' and who were Apostles of Christ before all others. These Apostles of the Jewish Christians were under the authority of the Pharisees, and such leaders of the blind cannot be 'the

[1] Gal. i. 8. [2] Gal. ii. 13. [3] Rom. ii. 17–21.

light of the world,' since they refuse 'the light of the glorious gospel of Christ,' being 'blinded' by 'the God of this world.'[1] According to the light of Christ's gospel, the Gentiles should be 'fellow-heirs and of one body.' This 'hidden wisdom,' although secretly communicated to the Apostles, was proclaimed first by Paul, and the Apostles at Jerusalem did not reveal it, though they suffered Paul to do so among the Gentiles. They and their followers therefore refused the full 'light of the glorious gospel of Christ,' and, in fact, preached 'another Jesus' and 'another gospel.' They are like the Scribes and Pharisees, the '*blind guides* which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.'[2] Satan, the god of this world, has blinded them, and therefore they and their followers are like Satan himself, who 'is transformed into an angel of light.'[3]

Even Paul has therefore not directly or indirectly separated the twelve Apostles from the rulers of the Jewish Church, against whom he raised such grave charges. He calls them 'Jews,'[4] and this because they were under the dominion of the Pharisees. They knew better than the latter, but they 'dissembled,' affecting to agree with those who, in fact, were preventing them from revealing the doctrine which even their Master had by them been forced to communicate only in secret and to a few. It is, therefore, but in harmony with what he writes to the Galatians about the twelve Apostles, when he writes to the Corinthians about '*false Apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ.*' Being blinded by Satan, they are 'his ministers,' and they also have been 'transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works,'[5] or in the words of the parable, the blind leaders as well as the blind whom they lead, shall 'fall into the ditch.'[6]

The remaining part of this parable seems to admit of

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 4. [2] Mat. xxiii. 24. [3] 2 Cor. xi. 14.
[4] Gal. ii. [5] 2 Cor. xi. 15. [6] Luke vi. 39.

CHAP. X.

the same interpretation, that is, it may be taken as partly referring, in a hidden manner, to the twelve Apostles. At all events it is easy to show that the alterations here made from the original passage contained in the Gospel after Matthew have been made in a Paulinic sense. Having spoken about the blind and the leaders of the blind, the Evangelist has shown that the blind guides, or leaders of the Jews, cannot escape the judgment which has fallen upon Israel. They must both fall into the ditch. He now proceeds to show that 'the disciple is not above his Master,' leaving out the concluding part of this sentence, 'nor the servant above his Lord.' In the Gospel after Matthew this passage, referring to the relations between the disciple and servant with his Lord, is preceded by the Lord's instruction to the twelve, who were by Him sent 'as sheep in the midst of wolves.' The Lord cautions them to be wise and harmless, and to beware of men, by whom they will be persecuted. They shall take comfort in the assurance that the Spirit of their Father, which speaks in them, shall teach them at all times what they are to speak. Persecution, hatred, death, are not to hinder them from enduring to the end. To persecution, hatred, and death, even their Lord and Master has been, and will be exposed, and his disciple, his servant, cannot be exempted from a similar dispensation, for 'the disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord.'

The Paulinic Evangelist may have felt, and not without cause, that instead of going out to preach fearlessly the Hidden Wisdom of Christ, as sheep among wolves, his first chosen disciple had 'given place by subjection' to those who had authority over them, to the rulers of the Jewish church, who forbad them to do what their Lord had commanded them. Had they boldly proclaimed from the housetops the secret doctrine of their Master, they would have been persecuted as he was. But as if they were above their Master, they had preferred that peace which the world can give, to the sword which Christ had brought

into the world, to the fire he wished even then to kindle. Thus the first disciples of the Master had forfeited the honourable name of servants of the Lord. Such considerations would suffice to make the Evangelist leave out the words, 'nor the servant above his Lord.'

The disciple of the greatest among the Apostles of Jesus Christ may have thought, that by leaving out these words, those that precede them, 'the disciple is not above his Master,' would gain in clearness and force. Jesus had told his first four chosen disciples in the very outset what lot awaited them if they ventured to follow him. They could not serve two masters. If they loved the one who possessed the key of knowledge, they must hate the other who had taken away that key, and who zealously strove to hide from the eyes of the people those things which belong to its peace. Having by means of secret instruction, through Jesus, received access to the tree of knowledge, and thus to the tree of life, they must boldly oppose light to darkness, the revelation of light to the hiding of the same. As 'the light of the world,' they were like 'a city that is set on an hill,' and which 'cannot be hid.' A lighted candle is not put under a bushel, but on a candlestick, 'and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.' The true disciples of Jesus must let their light so shine before men that these may see their good works, and glorify their Father which is in heaven.[1] Their good works must be a manifestation of their inner light.[2] Let them do the works of the written law, and yet not leave undone 'the weightier matters of the law,' which are not written in and yet suggested by the law. Let them be righteous not only in the sense of the Pharisees, but in the sense of their Master, seeking 'first the kingdom of God and his righteousness,'[3] and thus letting their righteousness exceed that of the Pharisees, by which 'in no case' any man can enter into the kingdom of heaven.[4] Those who 'offend' and 'do iniquity,' must

[1] Mat. v. 13–16. [2] Mat. vi. 22, 33. [3] Mat. vi. 33. [4] Mat. v. 20.

CHAP. X.

be distinguished from those who are 'righteous.'[1] But the test to be applied to all must be a higher standard than the written law, taken by itself. It is not enough to eschew evil, it must be accompanied by doing good. Let men strive to abstain from trespassing the written 'commandment of God,'[2] and from working 'iniquity;'[3] let them do the things commanded in the written law, and let them not leave undone 'the weighter matters'[4] of the hidden law of the heart; of that law of wisdom 'which God ordained before the world unto our glory.'[5] The disciples of Jesus must strive after 'truth in the inward parts,' and believe that 'in the hidden part' God will make them 'to know wisdom.'[6] Thus they will be taught to know the commandment of God, which is 'very nigh' unto them,[7] written 'not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart,' and 'with the Spirit of the living God.'[8] Having been called to 'the fellowship of the mystery,'[9] the disciples of Jesus must pray with all 'supplication in the spirit,' that 'utterance may be given' unto them, that they may open their mouth 'boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel.'[10]

Although Paul preached 'the Hidden Wisdom in a mystery,' yet it was plain enough to all who knew something about it, that this doctrine was the secret doctrine of Christ, and that it must necessarily be subversive of the established Pharisaical rule. Whilst closely watching the Apostles, and restricting their operations, the Pharisees carefully excluded from the original record of the preaching of Jesus every direct allusion to His secret doctrine. Paul, however, had a mysterious meeting at Jerusalem with Peter and James, that is with two of the three Apostles who were regarded as pillars of the Church, and to whom the mysteries were believed to have been especially revealed.[11]

[1] Mat. xiii. 41–43.
[2] Mat. xv. 3.
[3] Mat. vii. 23.
[4] Mat. xxiii. 23.
[5] 1 Cor. ii. 7.
[6] Ps. li. 6.
[7] Deut. xxx. 14.
[8] 2 Cor. iii. 3.
[9] Eph. iii. 9.
[10] Eph. vi. 18, 19.
[11] H. E. ii. 1.

CHAP. X.

He then prepared himself for the ministry of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ, and boldly asserted the entire abolition of the law. Whilst James ingrafted faith on the due observance of the works of the law,[1] Paul declared that righteousness is by faith only, and 'without' the works of the law. Neither the Pharisees nor the Apostles could agree to this radical innovation, which had not been sanctioned by the Lord whilst on earth. They and their followers would therefore be led to apply to Paul any passages in the original gospel-record of Matthew which refer to those nominal followers of Christ who acknowledge him as Lord, whilst trespassing against the commandments of God, and thus doing iniquity. It is apparently for this reason that the Paulinic Evangelist has in one remarkable instance so altered the meaning of one of Christ's sayings, as recorded in the Palestinian gospel, as to remove every possible reference to Paul, and to make it point against the Jews and Jewish-Christians. In the sermon on the mount, as recorded in Matthew, Christ warns in general terms those who, without doing the will of God, say unto His Son, 'Lord, Lord,' and boast to have done many things in His name. He knows not them that work iniquity; that is who entirely disregard the works of the law.[2] But Luke gives a totally different colouring to this passage.[3] Christ is here recorded as addressing 'his adversaries,'[4] that is the Jews, and as showing that but few will be saved after the resurrection of the Master, when the door will be shut and many shall stand without vainly crying, Lord, Lord. 'Then shall *ye* begin to say: We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in *our streets*; but He shall say: I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me all ye workers of iniquity.' The outward righteousness of the old Israel by the deeds of the law will be of no avail to the children of the new Israel.[5] If perfection is only possible through

[1] James ii. 14 f. [2] Mat. vii. 20–23. [3] Luke xiii. 24 f.
[4] Luke xiii. 17. [5] See for this Hilgenfeld, 'die Evangelien,' p. 194.

CHAP. X.

righteousness, *without* the deeds of the law, that is through the new gospel of Paul, it follows as a matter of course, that 'everyone that is perfect' (or perfected) must be 'as his master,' that is, that the true and faithful servant, or steward, must make the right use of the talent which his master entrusted to him; that he must not hide the same, but fearlessly proclaim in light and from the housetops what he confided to him in secret and in darkness. How then can the blind, in whose eye is the beam of darkness, remove the mote that is in their brother's eye? How can a Jewish disciple say to Paul, or to one of his followers, 'Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye?' They ought rather to look to their own infirmities, and remove the beggarly elements which stand in the way of the glorious gospel of Christ. Not that tree is a good one which brings forth corrupt fruit, nor is that tree a corrupt one which brings forth good fruit. 'For every tree is known by its own fruit;' every steward judged by the use he made of his talents.[1]

Thus we see that in the sermon on the mount, as contained in the gospel after Luke, instead of the continued validity of the law and its ordinances, their abolition is declared, if they stand in the way of the principles of true righteousness according to the Hidden Wisdom of Christ.

Among the further alterations in the third gospel, of passages from the first which recognise the continued validity of the law, we point out the following.

In the 20th chapter of the Gospel after Luke we find, with few exceptions and alterations, the same subjects treated as in the parallel part of the Gospel after Matthew.[2] The omission of the word 'householder' in the parable as contained in Luke may be regarded as intentional,

[1] According to the first gospel the Lord's prayer was taught on the mount; but according to the third gospel it was not taught the disciples until Jesus had gone into Judea. (Luke xi. 1 f.) The latter statement may be correct, inasmuch as the original record of Christ's sayings seems not to have been connected with the historical record.

[2] Mat. xxi. 23–46; xxii. 15–46.

inasmuch as we meet with this same expression in another part of this gospel.[1] Perhaps we may assume that the writer was by this word 'householder,' reminded of those 'of the house of Israel;' and that having, above all, the universality of the gospel in view, he preferred to introduce into his narrative the more general expression of 'a certain man.' Again, the description of the care bestowed upon the vineyard, which in Matthew resembles very much the similar passage in Isaiah,[2] points too clearly to the house of Israel and its law, to allow of its insertion by the composer of the universal gospel. As opposer of the works of the law, he leaves out the householder's thrice repeated demand for 'fruits.'[3] And as if to show his apprehension lest 'fruits' should be understood to mean 'works,' the possessor of the vineyard is here reported to have sent 'his servant,' instead of 'his servants,' to demand from the husbandmen 'of the fruit of the vineyard.' Now, Paul clearly defines the true meaning of this to be 'the fruit of the spirit,'[4] which is 'in all goodness and righteousness and truth,'[5] the fruit of 'the Spirit of God's Son,' which he has sent into our hearts, crying Abba, Father.[6] He who possesses this 'fruit of the Spirit' is not 'under the law,'[7] and has nothing to do with 'the fruits' of the law to which the parable in Matthew's version refers. This childlike spirit of justification by faith *without* the deeds of the law, is not to be found in Israel; and therefore all favourable allusions to the first-born among the nations must be omitted, and the parable be recast in accordance with the doctrine of the 'other' gospel, revealed to and preached by Paul.

We may also mention the passage about the 'children of the resurrection,'[8] who as 'the children of God,' that is as those who are justified without the works of the law, are not able to 'die any more;' but 'are equal unto the

[1] Luke xiv. 21.
[2] Isaiah v.
[3] Comp. Mat. xxi. 34, 41, 43; Luke xx. 10, 16.
[4] Gal. v. 22.
[5] Eph. v. 9.
[6] Gal. iv. 6.
[7] Gal. v. 18.
[8] Luke xx. 33–38.

CHAP. X.

angels,' may perhaps be assumed to contain an exposition of Paul's peculiar doctrine about the world to come.[1] In conclusion, we refer to the omission of the passage in Matthew which relates to the Apostles being accused by the Scribes and Pharisees of transgressing 'the traditions of the elders,' by not washing their hands before they ate bread.[2] Again, to the omission of the prayer against flight on a Sabbath.[3] Finally, the injunction, 'if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,' somewhat loses of its force by the less direct and more implied injunction as contained in Luke's narrative, in which the highly characteristic and suggestive words 'if thou wilt be perfect,' have been omitted.[4]

We have now to consider the Lord's words spoken during his last supper.[5] It is generally admitted that the versions of them contained in Luke and in Matthew are in perfect harmony with, and form, intentionally or otherwise, a parallel to, the version contained in Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians.[6] Yet the version in the Gospel after Luke is essentially different from the account contained in the Gospel after Matthew. Luke's version refers in the first place to the legal feast of the passover, which Jesus kept for the last time with his disciples.[7] But in the second place the Evangelist gives an account of the Lord's having instituted a new rite,[8] which in future was to be observed by his disciples, instead of the Jewish passover; the latter being regarded as a type which the death of Christ had fulfilled. '*This* passover,' which at the appointed time and in the appointed manner the Lord and his disciples observed, as did likewise all the Jews, Jesus will 'not any more eat, . . . until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.' And it is clearly implied in the preceding verse,[9] that this fulfilment of the legal type is identical

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 23–26, 54; Gal. iii. 26; iv.; comp. 2 Thess. i. 11, 5.
[2] Mat. xv. 1–6. [3] Mat. xxiv. 20; Luke xxi. 23 f.
[4] Mat. xix. 16 f.; Luke xviii. 18 f.
[5] Mat. xxvi. 26–29; Luke xxii. 14–20. [6] 1 Cor. xi. 23–34.
[7] Luke xxii. 14–18. [8] Luke xxii. 19, 20. [9] xv.

with His suffering, now so near at hand. Therefore, in the celebration of '*this* passover,' the distinguishing elements of the new passover are introduced in strict accordance with Paul's teachings. The cup is to be divided among all the disciples; for 'the cup of blessing' is 'the communion of the blood of Christ,' and they all receive the bread, this being 'the communion of the body of Christ.'[1] Like as their fathers, who were 'under the cloud, and all passed through the sea,' all drank 'the same spiritual drink,' that is Christ the rock, 'that followed them;[2] so the true disciples of Christ *all* drink the life-blood of the same spiritual Christ, of the Holy Spirit which at length has become incarnate. And as if to show that the last observance of the legal passover was followed by the institution of a new rite, the first cup is here reported to have been given to the disciples by the Lord, with the paschal thanksgiving which was usual on these occasions; whilst '*after* supper' a second cup is by Him distributed as the New Testament in His blood which was shed for them. Thus the cup of thanksgiving is distinguished from the cup of the New Testament, and the distribution of the former or passover-cup is made to precede the distribution of the bread, just as Paul mentions the cup of blessing before the breaking of the bread.[3]

The distribution of the bread is in Luke preceded as well as followed by the distribution of a cup, as if to point out the primary importance of the blood of Christ.[4] And this is quite in harmony with the Levitical law, according to which 'the life of the flesh (or soul) is in the blood,' and God has given it to Israel upon the altar 'to make an atonement for the soul.'[5] Again, at the time when the passover was instituted in Egypt, the blood was to be 'a token' to Israel as well as to the Lord, who seeing it would cause his judgment to pass over.[6] And for this reason the 14th Nisan was to be a

[1] 1 Cor. x. 16. [2] 1 Cor. x. 1–4. [3] 1 Cor. x. 16.
[4] Comp. Rom. iii. 25; Eph. i. 7. [5] Lev. xvii. 11. [6] Ex. xii. 13.

CHAP. X.

memorial 'throughout all generations.' Now, as Christ has said: 'This do in remembrance of me,'[1] the meaning of this command must have been, that the legal passover should be celebrated by his disciples, not any more in remembrance of Egypt, and of the Exodus from thence on the 15th Nisan, but that they should keep the passover in future in remembrance of Him, who on the following day would be lifted up as 'a sign of salvation,' and who would thus publicly give the culminating proof of His obedience unto death, by patiently suffering the bloody death on the cross. We have already pointed out that Christ has identified himself with the Wisdom of God. There can be, therefore, no doubt that he did institute among his Jewish disciples a new passover rite, in which, instead of the lamb, the bread and the wine were to be used as elements typifying the 'bread' and the 'wine' which in all ages Divine 'wisdom' has 'mingled.'[2]

In the shorter account contained in Matthew we do not find the words recorded: 'This do in remembrance of me.' But this is what we should expect in an incomplete first-gospel record, written in and for Palestine by one of the twelve Apostles, who were dependent on the Pharisees and Sadducees for what they published about their Lord and Master. We find these words quoted by Justin Martyr in his apology, and not in his dialogue with the Jew Trypho, who would only recognise 'the one' gospel which the Jews were permitted to read, and which he acknowledges to have read. Justin refers especially to the memorials of the Apostles, that is, as we have seen, probably to a harmony of the four gospels, when quoting the following remarkable passage: 'This food is called with us the Eucharist (or Thanksgiving). Nobody is permitted to partake of it except he who accepts as true that which is taught by us, and who has received the bath of baptism for the remission of sins and for the new birth, and who lives after the rule of Christ. For we do not

[1] Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24. [2] Prov. ix. 5.

receive this as common bread and as common drink. But even as our Saviour Jesus Christ, through the Word of God, has become flesh, and has had as well flesh as also blood for our salvation; even so we are instructed that the food which is blessed by the prayer of the Word which came from him, by the conversion of which (into our bodily substance) our blood and flesh are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the Apostles have transmitted to us in the memorials composed by them, called gospels, that Jesus commanded them thus; that having taken bread, and given thanks, he said: "This do in remembrance of me; this is my body;" and that likewise having taken the cup and given thanks, he said: "That is my blood," and that he distributed them to these alone.'[1]

This leads us to consider the more important question, why Justin does not refer to Christ as 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world;' and to his blood as being, as Matthew has it, the 'blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,' or as recorded in Luke, 'which is shed for you,' in the same way as the body was given for those to whom the Lord gave the bread. Unless we are prepared to assert that Paul had no authority whatever for stating that the Lord on this occasion actually spoke the words which the former records as having received of the Lord, we must accept the fact that Christ did, on this solemn occasion, as also on previous ones, speak words in the sense of those recorded by Paul. Hereby Christ has especially referred to what was to take place on the following day, that is, to his being lifted up, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, as 'a sign of salvation.'[2] And the Lord has further implied that the established paschal rite should in future not be any more connected with the blood, that is, with the life of the paschal lamb, which had hitherto been appointed by the law to make 'an atonement for

[1] After Chev. Ap. 86. [2] See 'The Gospel after John.' Wisd. xvi.

CHAP. X.

the soul,' nor as a sign or token of the salvation which it was originally intended to commemorate; but that the passover henceforth be made to refer to the blood, that is, the life or soul of Himself, who, as the incarnate 'Saviour of all,' had by His life of obedience shown the insufficiency of all other modes of atonement.

Now, we have seen that according to Paul's doctrine the paschal rite is to be entirely abolished, together with all other ordinances of the law. Such a view, however much in harmony with the Lord's secret instructions to His disciples, could not be promulgated in Palestine, where the rulers of the Jewish church, in the full exercise of their authority, insisted on the general recognition of the continued validity of the entire law. Accordingly, we miss in the first gospel, the distinct record of the Lord's having, after the celebration of the Jewish passover, instituted a new rite, which was to take the place of the paschal rite commanded by the law. Matthew seems to have combined the new rite with the old, and thus to have merely reformed the latter. And in the second century a regard for the views of the Jewish-Christian church generally, and especially for the Church of Rome, where, as we have shown, Judaising influences prevailed in the beginning of the second century, may have been the cause of Justin Martyr's not directly referring to the atonement, and of his regarding the Lord's passion as a cup, for the passing away of which Christ prayed, being a man capable of suffering. This omission is all the more remarkable, since Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho,[1] states, and this contrary to all other testimonies we possess, that a second spit was fixed transversely through the shoulders of the paschal lamb, thus forming, together with the pomegranate spit which was fixed lengthwise, the figure of a cross. It is clear that Justin regarded Christ as the crucified Lamb of God, but that, like Paul, he had a cogent reason for not applying this title to him; and that moreover Justin felt himself compelled, while at Rome,

[1] c. 40.

neither to mention Paul's name, nor to allude in any way to the doctrine of atonement which the Apostle had so fully developed, not without referring to the Lord's own sayings.

4. *The author of the Gospel after Luke shows himself to have been a true disciple of Paul, by the adoption of the latter's peculiar doctrine with regard to the person and office of Jesus.*

Jesus Christ, the second Adam and the Son of God, is 'from heaven,'[1] although 'according to the flesh, he is made of the seed of David.' The implied identity of the Spirit of Christ and of the Spirit of God further implies an eternal pre-existence of the spiritual nature of the Man Jesus. This all-important doctrine, which Christ had only privately communicated to his disciples, and which the latter evidently did not understand, had been first fully and publicly developed by Paul, who identifies Christ with the Spirit or the Wisdom of God. To the same Church to which the Apostle wrote that the Lord is the Spirit,[2] he writes, as we have seen, about Christ the spiritual rock,[3] and he further states that God 'was *in* Christ,'[4] that he dwelt in him in his 'fulness,'[5] and that Christ thus was 'the image of God.'[6] We have already pointed out, and shall more fully do so in another place, that the doctrine about the identity of Christ and the Spirit or Wisdom of God is by the author of the Gospel after Luke introduced into his evangelical record.[7] It is not contained in the Gospel after Matthew, because it was a stumbling-block to the Jews, for whom the gospel was written in accordance with the restricting regulations of the Pharisees.

This cardinal doctrine of Paul about the identity of Christ and the Spirit, Wisdom or Word, of God, was, as we have pointed out, also the doctrine which the Lord himself had taught whilst on earth. The one passage which, if unexplained, seems to contradict this identity,

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 47. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 17. [3] 1 Cor. x. 4. [4] 2 Cor. v. 19.
[5] Col. ii. 9. [6] 2 Cor. iv. 4. [7] Luke xi. 49.

CHAP. X.

forms its strongest proof; we mean the passage about the sin against the Holy Ghost, to which the first three Evangelists refer.[1] But it is only in Matthew and in Luke that the sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is distinguished from speaking 'a word against the Son of Man.' The meaning seems to be this: the sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost can never be forgiven, or, as Mark has it, may lead to eternal damnation; for that sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is nothing less than the continued wilful opposition to 'the Saviour of all,' the healer of all ages, the Divine Wisdom which saved the first Adam out of his fall,[2] and whose mission it is, man permitting, to save every man that comes into the world, by giving him power to become a son of God. This power and Wisdom of God is Christ; He is *the* Son of Man, who by being identical with the Divine Spirit, is the perfect incarnation of the same, and thus *the* Son of God. But this doctrine of the sonship through the Messianic Spirit of all ages was purposely hidden by the Pharisees from the body of the people. Even Peter had to be specially inspired in order to recognise in the Son of Man the Son of the living God. It was not a doctrine which was taught by flesh and blood. Therefore the ignorant and misled people might speak against the Son of Man without sinning against the Holy Ghost; but whoever persisted in not believing in the redeeming power of God's Spirit was cut off from all communication with the Creator, from the supernatural action of God's grace on the soul, and thus excluded from the Divine sonship. The sin against the Holy Ghost is the absolute denial of the most essential article of faith, that 'with God all things are possible,'[3] that the Holy Ghost can preserve flesh and blood even from all sin, and present our bodies blameless before the throne of God.

In the Gospel after Luke it is said of Christ, that after

[1] Mat. xii. 31; Luke xii. 10; Mark iii. 29. [2] Wisd. xvi. 7, 12; x. 1.
[3] Mat. xix. 26.

his resurrection he was raised to 'the right hand of the power of God.'[1] The expression 'power of God,' which Paul so frequently makes use of, occurs but once in the sayings of Christ as reported by Matthew.[2] In the third gospel the above expression is probably intended to imply that God is a Spirit, and in this sense it is invariably used by Paul. He declares Christ to be 'the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God;'[3] he states that Christ, 'though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God,' and he adds, that 'we shall live with him by the power of God.'[4] This identity of Christ and the Spirit or Wisdom, or Power, of God, leads the writer of the Paulinic gospel still further to follow Paul's example, and to apply to Christ the name of 'the Lord.' Now, it is a remarkable fact that, in the Gospel after Matthew, this expression is but in one single passage made to refer to Christ, and moreover, to the risen Christ.[5] As the words 'the Lord,' applied to Christ, can be proved in one instance to have been interpolated at a later period,[6] we may assume that in the Hebrew original of Matthew's gospel this name was not given to Christ at all. This assumption receives a strong confirmation by the other fact, that in the Gospel after Matthew God is never called 'the Lord.' But, as if to show their identity, this name is in the Gospel after Luke made to refer both to God and to Christ in numerous passages.

The identity of God and Christ in the unity of the Spirit is further pointed out in the third gospel, where the prophecy of Malachi is quoted. Paul renders a prophecy referring to Christ in such a manner as to make it refer to God himself;[7] and so also does the Paulinic Evangelist in such a manner alter the wording of Malachi's prophecy as to identify Christ with God.[8] He writes: 'Behold I

[1] Luke xxii. 69; comp. ix. 43.
[2] Mat. xxii. 29; Mark xii. 24.
[3] 1 Cor. i. 24.
[4] 2 Cor. xiii. 4.
[5] Mat. xxviii. 6.
[6] 1 Cor. xv. 47.
[7] Rom. xiv. 10, 11; Is. xlv. 23.
[8] Luke vii. 27; comp. the interpolations, Mat. xi. 10; Mark i. 2.

CHAP. X.

send my messenger before *thy* face, which shall prepare *thy* way before *thee.*' For this same reason, as it would seem, the words of Christ on the cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' are not reproduced by Luke. Again, the Evangelist who has pointed out that through the spirit Christ is at *one* with the Father is the only Evangelist who records Christ's words: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'[1] The object of the writer of the third gospel, the establishment of the identity of God and Christ, enables us to explain his remarkable omission of the Lord's words about the rebuilding of the temple in three days. According to the narrative of the first gospel, '*false* witnesses' declared that Jesus had said: 'I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.' It is clear, therefore, that the first Evangelist did not think it possible that Jesus should have made such a statement. But to a Paulinic disciple it might well appear unseemly that words so much in accordance with Paul's views about the spiritual nature of the person of Christ, and of his kingdom, should be received as the testimony of false witnesses. And as if the writer were impressed with the sense of the passage by him omitted, and as if he wished indirectly to refer to the parallel passage in Matthew about the false witnesses, he makes the chief priests and Scribes say: 'What need we any further witness?'[2]

Thus the relation in which Jesus stood to God, the unity in the Spirit of the Father and the Son, has been in the Gospel after Luke developed in harmony with Paul's writings. This is not the Jesus whom those dared to preach, who had gone 'in and out' with the Lord in the days of his flesh. It is the Jesus, who was revealed by Paul's 'other gospel,' which God had 'ordained before the world,' and which yet, as 'the hidden wisdom, . . was kept secret since the world began.'[3] It is the Lord's secret doctrine, which should 'afterwards be revealed' to the world, not at first by the Apostles at Jerusalem, but by Paul.

[1] Comp. Acts vii. 59. [2] Luke xxii. 71. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 7; Rom. xvi. 25.

CHAP. X.

5. *It is another proof of the Paulinic tendency of the third Evangelist, that the Messianic kingdom, which in the Gospel after Matthew is a limited and terrestrial one, is declared to be a spiritual and universal kingdom of the eternal Messiah who is from heaven.*

In the Gospel after Matthew Jesus is represented as nothing more nor less than the Messiah such as he was expected by the Jews, that is, as a Son of Abraham and David, and as born in Bethlehem, the home of his parents. The Messianic King of the Jews is not sent 'but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.'[1] With the Gentiles he has nothing to do. 'The children of the kingdom'[2] are the Jews, and it would not be 'meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs.'[3] Therefore the disciples are by no means to go 'into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans,'[4] but rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. In every city or town they are to 'enquire who in it is worthy;' and this they are to do before they enter the house, and before they preach the gospel to any one.[5] They shall not cast their pearls before swine, nor give to dogs that which is holy.[6] On the other hand it is recorded in the first gospel, that 'the children of the kingdom' shall be cast out,[7] and that the kingdom shall be taken from them, and 'given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.'[8] It may perhaps be doubted whether the latter saying of Christ was contained in the original record of Matthew, since the Pharisees might not have permitted the promulgation of a doctrine which must undermine their authority and position. Yet similar sayings of the Lord had been openly proclaimed, and, being known, may have been originally recorded. Be this as it may, we have here to consider two distinct elements in the recorded words of Christ. According to the one, the children of the kingdom are alone worthy, and to them only is the

[1] Mat. xv. 24. [2] Mat. viii. 12. [3] Mat. xv. 26.
[4] Mat. x. 5. [5] Mat. x. 11–14. [6] Mat. vii. 6; comp. xv. 26.
[7] Mat. viii. 12. [8] Mat. xxi. 43.

CHAP. X.

gospel of the kingdom to be preached; according to the other, the Gentiles alone are worthy, and shall receive the kingdom. If Christ has forbidden His disciples to go to the Gentiles, and if He has at the same time told them that the Gentiles would inherit the kingdom, He must have meant by this warning that, unless the children of the kingdom repented, the Gentiles would 'go into the kingdom of God *before*' them.[1] The Apostles were therefore to proclaim the entire doctrine of Christ, and to persuade the Jews to 'bring forth fruits meet for (worthy of) repentance.'[2] The disciples of the Lord were to do their best to 'make the tree good and the fruit good;' they were to have patience with the barren fruit tree, and to let it be known that, if after a time it did not bring forth fruit, it would be hewn down. The Jews were to be first invited to the wedding, and only after their refusal, after having slain the Lord of the vineyard's own Son, then the messengers of Christ are to 'gather together all, both the bad and the good,' the so-called worthy and the so-called unworthy,[3] provided they were clothed in the wedding garment[4] of grace, without which no man can partake of that holiness which is the necessary condition of being admitted into the Lord's presence, of following the bridegroom to the wedding, to the union of God and man through the Divine Spirit.

The coming in of the Gentiles does not therefore in any way change the Messianic character of Jesus, who, as king of the Jews, is likewise king of the Gentiles. Through the 'one' seed of Abraham '*all nations*' shall be blessed, and 'all nations shall flow' to 'the mountain of the Lord's house.'[5] For this reason the 'wise men' from the east worship at Bethlehem the king of the Jews, whose star the heathen Balaam had foretold, and the Gentile magi had discovered. The Gentiles must be

[1] Mat. xxi. 31.
[2] Mat. iii. 8.
[3] Mat. xxii. 5–15; xxi. 39–41.
[4] Mat. xxii. 11, 12.
[5] Is. ii. 2; comp. Ps. xlvii., lxvii., lxxxvii., xcvi., xcviii.

grafted on the Jewish olive tree, for to Jacob belongs 'the obedience' of all nations. And accordingly, when Christ shall return in His glory, not only as the Messianic king of the Jews, but as the universal Messiah, surrounded by all the holy angels,[1] he will 'restore again the kingdom to Israel.'[2] At this time of Israel's restoration, those who followed Christ in the 'regeneration' will 'sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel,' whilst *everyone* who believes in Christ's 'name,' or spirit, or power, 'shall inherit everlasting life.'[3] Yet '*all the tribes of the earth*' shall mourn on that day, which is the day of gathering.[4] At this time of the Son of Man's expected coming, the mission of the twelve Apostles *among Israel* will not have been accomplished. He will come *before* they 'have gone over the cities of Israel,'[5] that is, either the cities of the Holy Land exclusively, or in addition to them, those inhabited by scattered Israelites. In the pursuance of this their Jewish mission, they were to be 'brought before governors and kings,' who as Gentiles had authority over the Jews. They would be *forced* to appear before them, and thus to go out of their usual way. But this exceptional mission among the Gentiles would not lead to the saving of the latter, and of their princes, but would be 'a testimony against them.'[6] For ever since 'the days of John the Baptist . . . the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.'[7] The Lord's injunction, recorded in Matthew, to teach and baptise 'all nations,'[8] is therefore totally unsupported even by one single passage of the Gospel after Matthew; whilst Paul's description of the scene at Antioch,[9] which is omitted in the Acts, and the total omission in Luke of any sanction given to baptism by Christ, strongly supports the supposition that this isolated passage may be a later interpolation, or that the baptism in the 'name' or spirit 'of the Father and of

[1] Mat. xxv. 31. [2] Acts i. 6. [3] Mat. xix. 28, 29; comp. Rev. xxi.
[4] Mat. xxiv. 30. [5] Mat. x. 23. [6] Mat. x. 18.
[7] Mat. xi. 12. [8] Mat. xxviii. 19. [9] Gal. ii.

CHAP. X.

the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' referred to that which was typified by water-baptism, that is, to the spiritual baptism, the effect of spiritual teaching. To be baptised in 'the name' or spirit of Christ, is to be endued with His Spirit. And this view is confirmed by the fact, that in the Gospel after John the baptism of Jesus is implied to have been a spiritual baptism, and that in the Acts we hear only of the Apostles baptising in the name of Jesus, and not in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Not that this later form, rightly interpreted, militates against, or even materially modifies the earlier one; for the love of God, the grace of Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, were already by Paul regarded as synonymous terms.[1]

The above investigation seems to establish the fact that according to the first gospel the Messianic kingdom is both limited and terrestrial. Jesus is the foretold king of the Jews, the terrestrial Messiah, in whom 'all nations' shall be blessed; He is the sceptre of Judah, whom all people shall obey. Jesus is 'the great king,' His twelve disciples will sit on thrones, and all who belong to His earthly kingdom will sit at the marriage feast in a wedding garment, and together with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[2] This day of jubilee for the Jews is the day of judgment for the Gentiles. 'All the tribes of the earth' shall see their judge, the Son of Man, 'coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory.'[3] They shall mourn, but Israel shall rejoice. This was the never-failing hope of the Judaisers among the disciples of Jesus. But His not coming at the predicted time of the destruction of Jerusalem seriously disturbed this hope; whilst some of His disciples had so little understood their Master's explanation of the Danielic prophecy about the Son of Man, as to expect that He would, whilst on earth, set up the terrestrial kingdom announced by the prophets. Again,

[1] Comp. 'the Gospel after John,' at the end.

[2] Mat. viii. 11; xxii. 2 f.; xxv. 10.

[3] xxiv. 30; xxv. 31.

either Christ had not identified himself with the righteous servant of God foretold by the unknown prophet of the captivity, and he had understood this passage to refer to the chosen people of God; or if He had applied this prophecy to Himself, His disciples, or some of them, had not believed in this interpretation. The unexpected death of their Lord, before the Messianic restoration of Israel's kingdom, therefore, filled their hearts with doubts and fears. His death became a dark point, and His cross an offence, because He seemed forsaken by His God. Yet this stumbling block to their faith was soon removed. The disciples of the crucified Messiah became convinced, perhaps by the revelations made to Paul, that Christ was the servant of God, whom the prophet had foreseen. As such, their Lord and Master had been made 'an offering for sin,' and He lives, though He died. God will 'prolong His days,' and through Him, the 'righteous servant,' many will be justified. Even His death was therefore a necessary fulfilment of prophecy;[1] and so likewise was the resurrection of Him who should sit on the right hand of God, and whom David in the Spirit called 'Lord.' They consequently expected His return as terrestrial Messiah, before the generation of His contemporaries should have passed away,[2] before even they themselves should have 'gone over the cities of Israel.'[3]

We have seen that neither Paul nor the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to a terrestrial Messiah as the head of the theocracy in the Holy Land which the prophets had promised in the name of God. Although believing in the Messianic future of an Israel in the flesh, yet Paul did not conceive that a king should be at the head of a visible church, and that the same should be called, as Cyrus was called by the prophet, an Anointed, a Christ, or Messiah of God. The Apostle did not wish to forestall what God has reserved to His power. With future gene-

[1] Comp. xxvi. 54.
[2] xvi. 28; xxiv. 34.
[3] x. 23; comp. xxiv. 27–31; xxv. 31 f; xxvi. 64 f.

CHAP. X.

rations which would live to see the Messianic days, Paul had nothing to do. But to the then living generation he said: 'Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation.'[1] To the spiritual kingdom of heaven everyone belongs who believes in the saving, sanctifying, anointing power of God's Holy Spirit freely given and freely received. That anointing or Messianic power, 'the spiritual rock,' has been the willing Saviour of all in every age, the eternal and heavenly Messiah. That Power, or Wisdom, or Word of God, through which He has not left Himself 'without witness' at any time, and which has in all ages testified to our spirit, that we are the children of God; that great Power from the beginning, the brightness of the everlasting light, that is of His glory, and the express image of His person, has become flesh, that is has become at one or identical with the spirit of a freely obedient human individual. Thus the finite spirit, which received the testimony of the Infinite Spirit, was absorbed by the latter, and in the face of the thus anointed Man Jesus, of Jesus Christ, did shine 'the glory of God.' It shone no longer through a veil, but 'full of grace and truth,' so that those could 'with open face' behold that glory, that 'dayspring from on high,' who had been led to know that through the selfsame glory which was 'in the beginning with God, and was God,' the Almighty Father, the Creator of all, did shine in their hearts, and had shone in the hearts of all mankind according to His gift, that is to the desire of sinful man according to his obedience to the 'still small voice' within him, which the Apostle of the living Christ was commissioned to proclaim as Christ in Jesus, as 'Christ' within man.

The indwelling Messiah of all ages, the anointing Spirit, or the blood of the everlasting covenant, with which the spirit and the blood of Jesus have been assimilated, is now both in heaven and on earth. As the 'spiritual body' of Jesus it sits at the right hand of God, and as

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 2.

the spirit of adoption, it dwells in the hearts of those who believe in God's anointing power. Being led by the same, these children of God are enabled to avoid the wilful and fatal sin against the Holy Ghost, against the indwelling Son of God, the Saviour of all ages, in the unity of which the Son of God in the flesh is at one with the Father in heaven. The indwelling Messiah having become flesh, and having been raised to a heavenly life by the power of God, Paul calls upon his generation not to believe any longer in a Messiah in the flesh, in a human advocate of the Messianic spirit. He did not know all those mysteries of the kingdom which Jesus had secretly revealed to his disciples, and which were recorded in a hidden or apocryphal document by the disciple whom Jesus loved. Paul did not know that Christ, who as long as He was on earth was the light of the world, would pray the Father that he would send to the world 'another' comforter, or advocate, of the selfsame Spirit of Truth which shone in the face of Jesus Christ, and spoke through him.

These Paulinic views about the Messiah and his kingdom, the writer of the Gospel after Luke has invariably adopted. Christ is not born as 'the King of the Jews;' nor does he enter Jerusalem as 'the Son of David;' nor is he mockingly styled 'the King of Israel.' But as 'the Son of God,' as 'Christ the Lord,' he is announced by the angel; as 'the King that cometh in the name of the Lord,' he is welcomed at Jerusalem by 'the whole multitude of His disciples;' and as 'the Christ, the chosen of God,' he is derided on the cross. For the universal Messiah has made 'peace on earth' and 'peace in heaven.'[1] The Paulinic Evangelist has therefore remodelled the saying of Christ as reported in Matthew[2] about the kingdom of heaven suffering violence by violent men, an expression which might be so explained as to point to Paul, at least by those who regarded the Baptist as Paul's forerunner.[3]

[1] Comp. Luke ii. 14; xix. 38.
[2] Mat. xi. 12.
[3] See 'the Gospel after John.'

CHAP. X.

It is only since the law and the prophets ceased to be explained more according to the literal than according to the spiritual meaning, that 'the kingdom of God is preached' in such a manner as to press 'every man' into it.[1] For, according to the record of the Paulinic Evangelist, Christ's kingdom is a spiritual kingdom, and not one which comes with observation, as the Pharisees expected that the kingdom of God should come. 'Neither shall they say, lo here! or lo there! for behold *the kingdom of God is within you.*'[2] We have seen that an outward, a terrestrial kingdom, which was to come with observation, was announced by the earlier prophets; but that later prophets also proclaimed a spiritual kingdom; and we have seen that Jesus was the Messiah of the latter. Following Paul's example, the Evangelist never has made use of the expression, 'the kingdom of heaven,' although in the Gospel after Matthew Christ is reported to have used it himself upwards of thirty times, for the designation of the kingdom, the approach of which he announced, whilst confirming the expectation of the future terrestrial kingdom.[3] In all the parallel passages in Luke this expression, 'kingdom of heaven,' or more literally, 'of the heavens,' is changed into 'kingdom of God.' It is difficult to account for so systematic a change, and this all the more as the word 'heavens' (*shemaja*), in the Aramaic dialect, was at the time of our Lord often used as a designation of God and of His government. If in Palestine it was considered that *shemaja* could not be better translated than by 'heavens;' and if accordingly this word was so translated in the Greek Gospel after Matthew, why were the parallel passages in other gospels altered in harmony with the writings of Paul? It might be assumed that this expression was changed into the more general 'kingdom of God,' because 'kingdom of heaven' can be understood to denote the Danielic 'kingdom under the whole heaven,' which was to be given to

[1] Luke xvi. 16; comp. xiv. 23. [2] Luke xvii. 21. [3] Acts i. 6, 7.

'the people of the saints of the Most High.'[1] And it is certainly remarkable that the expression, 'the Son of Man,' which may point to this Danielic prophecy, has likewise never been adopted by Paul. But although it is not unlikely that the reference to the above designation of the Messianic kingdom to a prophecy referring to a terrestrial kingdom '*under* the whole heaven,' may have been the principal cause of this change, yet the latter may also somewhat owe its origin to a different idea connected with the word 'heaven.' CHAP. X.

In the books of the Old Testament, and in all the sayings of Christ as reported in the Gospel after Matthew, 'heaven' denotes the locally circumscribed throne of God, of the Father 'which is in heaven,' and at the right hand of whom is the throne of the Son of Man. God's throne above and God's kingdom below are ideas which exclude, or at least do not quite coincide with, the Paulinic ideas of God, in whom 'we live, move and have our being,' and of God's spiritual kingdom, which 'cometh not with observation,' and will not be confined 'here' or 'there,' but which is 'within' us.[2] This explanation of the systematic change of 'kingdom of heaven' into 'kingdom of God,' derives some confirmation from the very remarkable fact that, as in Paul's writings so also in the Gospel after Luke, the expressions 'the Father which is in heaven,' and 'heavenly Father,' do not occur, although we meet the former thirteen times and the latter seven times in the Gospel after Matthew. All these expressions refer to the personality of God, as the expression 'the evil one,' which we likewise find only in Matthew, refers to the personality of Satan. He who preached 'Christ within' proclaimed the Father, not as in heaven, but as 'with us.' We have already shown that, in his Epistles, Paul distinguishes between 'the Creator' as the final cause of all things, and between the Creator as he is intended to be manifested by the creature according to His eternal

[1] Dan. vii. 13, 14. [2] Comp. Rom. xiv. 17; John xiv. 18, 23.

CHAP. X.

purpose. But, like Paul, Luke may have had reasons for insisting more upon the effect than upon the cause.

6. *The author of the Gospel after Luke reveals the object at which he is aiming, by describing with increased force and bitterness the hardness, hypocrisy and selfishness of the Jewish rulers, and the consequent blindness of the Jews, whilst he favours the Gentiles.*

We trace this tendency already in the first address of Christ at Nazareth,[1] and even in the rejecting word of John the Baptist, which, according to this narrative, is addressed to the whole people, and not, as in Matthew, to the Pharisees.[2] But more especially we meet with this tendency in the parable of the talents.[3] In the outset we have to observe that in Matthew's record [4] the Lord's servants, to whom it was given 'to know the mysteries of the kingdom,' which were 'not given' to know to the people,[5] received in the aggregate the largest possible amount of 'the Lord's money,' that is, according to their individual abilities, from one to five 'talents,' this being the largest measure for gold or other metal. Not so in Luke, where every one of the servants receives but one 'pound.'

The talents.

The principal addition in Luke is, that 'a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return.' In Matthew's record, if rightly translated, nothing is said of a certain man's going into a far country, but it is merely stated that he left them on a journey, or rather that he went, as it were, 'across the country.' In Luke, however, the distance of the country to which he went is dwelt upon, and apparently for the purpose of pointing out that the kingdom which the nobleman was to receive for himself before his return is not a terrestrial but a heavenly one. This distinction is all the more remarkable, since the Jews, and likewise the twelve Apostles, as we have seen, believed that the Messiah's

[1] Luke iv. 16 f. [2] Luke iii. 7 f. [3] Luke xix. 12–27.
[4] Mat. xxv. 14 f. [5] Mat. xiii. 11.

kingdom was a terrestrial one, which, contrary to his disciples' expectation, the Lord had not set up, and which would be established on his return, when the twelve Apostles would sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Among these we cannot include Judas, who seems to be pointed out as the one who came to the wedding without the wedding-garment of righteousness and holiness, and who seems clearly pointed out in this parable as 'the unprofitable servant.' We must therefore include Judas in the number of the Lord's servants, of whom, according to the parable in Luke, there were but ten. Perhaps the Paulinic Evangelist may have intended thereby to exclude first James, of whom we know that his antagonism against Paul was so great, as even to prevent Peter from following at once in the footsteps of Paul, by proclaiming openly the Lord's 'hidden wisdom.' We shall also point out the possibility that James may have been one of the two disciples of Emmaus, who had not profited by the Lord's sayings so that they understood him not. Jude, 'the brother of James,' may have been the other of the twelve Apostles (Judas Lebbeus or Thaddeus, by Luke called 'Judas, the brother of James'[1]), whom Paul's disciple would hardly recognise as one of the Lord's true servants. The words 'enter thou into the joy of thy Lord' are here left out, as if such a recompense were too great for the Jews, among whom even the Apostles had never been promised more than that they should sit upon thrones, judging the tribes of Israel, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory as terrestrial Messiah.[2] Accordingly, the best among them are recompensed by the conferring of *terrestrial* dignity and power, being set over ten and five cities; whilst he who had not made any use of the talent entrusted to him, but had hidden the same, was simply deprived of the pound, which was given to him who had made the best use of his own. From him was taken

[1] Luke vi. 16. [2] Mat. xix. 28.

CHAP. X.

even that which he had;[1] the indwelling Saviour, the bridegroom, the kingdom of heaven was taken from him.[2]

This important feature, about the hiding of the Lord's treasure, has been preserved in both accounts. In the first, the Lord had given 'to every man according to his several ability,' and the one servant who had received the least amount, and therefore was the least of them, 'hid his Lord's money in the earth;' in the second record no distinction is made of the servants' abilities, but a limited amount of money, ten pounds, to every servant but one pound, was delivered to them by the Lord, with the command that they were to 'occupy' until his return. This occupation became impossible because of the hatred of the citizens, who would not have this man to reign over them. Yet on his return the Lord inquired from his servants, 'how much every man had gained by trading?' It follows from this, that, in the writer's opinion, the unwillingness of the citizens to recognise the kingship was not a sufficient excuse for the servants not trading with the pound confided to them. There were other nations who might have been made acquainted with this treasure; others might have entered in and seen the light; others would have accepted the wedding garment. Accordingly the Lord is only displeased with that one of his servants who returned to him his pound, which he had 'kept laid up in a napkin.' Both accounts seem to imply that the Lord had made to his disciples, as 'stewards of the mysteries of God,'[3] certain communications, which they were openly to proclaim; but that one of them had hidden altogether from the people what the Lord had wished them to know. By this trait the reference to the Apostles as the servants of the Lord becomes almost certain; for we have shown that he had communicated to them certain things 'in secret,' which they were to proclaim openly. To Judas the traitor, as the unprofitable servant, we have referred. And the excuse here recorded of the unprofitable servant, that his

[1] Mark iv. 25. [2] Mat. ix. 15; xxi. 43. [3] 1 Cor. iv. 1.

Lord at his second coming took up what *he had not laid down*, and reaped *that he did not sow*, seems to imply that the Lord had not generally laid down, nor sown broadcast, 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,' and that in the opinion of some he was acting as an 'austere man,' in demanding that his servant should do what he himself had not done whilst on earth.[1]

According to Luke's account the unprofitable servant is not cast 'into outer darkness,' as if to show with greater force that the nobleman's citizens were the most to blame, who refused to have him as their king. These citizens, in the eye of the Paulinic Evangelist, seem to represent the Jewish nation, and as if the same had been fully made acquainted with the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and had rejected them, the citizens of the parable, the real enemies of the Lord, were slain in the face of him whom they rejected.

Destruction of the Temple.

Again, the hardness of the Jewish rulers and the willingness of the Gentiles to come to Christ seem to be indirectly referred to in the passage about the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem.[2] In the Gospel after Matthew[3] it is clearly stated that 'his disciples,' that is the twelve, 'came unto him *privately*,' as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, to ask him about the time and signs of his coming. But in the third gospel even this reference to the chosen disciples among the Jews is omitted, and it is generally stated that 'some' spoke to him on these subjects; a general definition, which at least does not exclude some Gentile disciples. This might be regarded as a casual omission, if alterations of this nature were not so frequent. And here the alteration in question is all the more striking, because it harmonises with a passage at the end of this chapter, which contains the addition of a very important feature in this narrative. Here the Lord is made to say that the destruction of Jerusalem by the enemy's army would take place in 'the days of vengeance,'

[1] Comp. John iv. 35–38. [2] Luke xxi. [3] Mat. xxiv.

CHAP. X.

as a sign of God's 'wrath upon this people,'[1] and that 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.'[2]

Christ's Passion.

This same tendency of bringing into relief the Jews' stern rejection of Jesus is very transparent in the account of the Lord's passion, as we find it in the Gospel after Luke. The principal difference between the two accounts is marked by the leading part which, according to the third gospel, the high priests and elders of the Jews take in the conspiracy against Christ. In the Gospel after Matthew it is 'a great multitude . . . *from* the chief priests and elders of the people,'[3] which came to the Mount of Olives with swords and staves. But in Luke 'the chief priests and captains of the temple and the elders' themselves came out to him 'as against a thief.'[4] And instead of being taken by an armed rabble 'to Caiaphas, where the Scribes and the elders were assembled,' and where possibly a preliminary examination was to take place, the highest authorities of the Jews take him 'into the high priest's house.' It is also clearly implied in this narrative,[5] that the latter themselves 'held Jesus' and 'mocked him and smote him, and when *they* had blindfolded him *they* struck him on the face and asked him, saying: Prophesy, who is it that smote thee?'

Lament over Jerusalem.

Again, the reproof of Christ, that Jerusalem's children 'would not' be gathered together 'as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings,'[6] is heightened by the Evangelist's having previously identified Christ with 'the Wisdom of God,'[7] which had ever since 'the foundation of the world,' inspired and sent 'prophets and apostles' to the chosen people. It is Jerusalem, that is, as we may imply from the latter passage, the rulers of the people,

[1] Luke xxi. 20-23. [2] Comp. Rom. xi. 25. [3] Mat. xxvi. 47.
[4] Luke xxii. 52 f. [5] Comp. 52, 54, and 63 f.
[6] It is probable that our Lord chose this parabolic form, because the parable circulated as a proverb; for we find it written in the Apocrypha: 'I gathered you together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings' (2 Esd. i. 30). Luke xiii. 34. [7] xi. 49.

the Pharisees and lawyers, which kill the prophets and stone them that are sent unto Israel. For to the Pharisees and lawyers Christ said, that they bore 'witness' to the 'deeds' of their fathers, and he added: 'for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres.'[1] Christ, therefore, identified himself with the Divine Wisdom and Word, when he wept over Jerusalem; and the sin of Jerusalem's responsible rulers is all the greater, for it is a sin against the Holy Ghost, a sin committed, not by the ignorant, but by those who might have known and did know the doctrine of the Divine sonship, though they *hid* it from the people. This is why the Lord, when he was come near and beheld the city, wept over it, saying: 'If thou *hadst known*, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now *they are hid from thine eyes*.'[2] Her rulers had hidden these things from the people, and had prevented Christ from revealing to Jerusalem the things which belonged to her peace. They knew nothing about the saving love of God, besides whom there is no other Saviour.[3] They did not believe in the saving power of God, in the Divine Wisdom, through the medium of which in all ages God gathers his own, 'as a shepherd his flock,' reproving, nurturing, teaching, and bringing them again[4] ever since the foundation of the world, by sending unto them inspired messengers, prophets, and teachers, that is 'wise men' or 'men of wisdom,'[5] to declare the good news of the kingdom of heaven, the things belonging to their peace. The responsible rulers of Israel had hidden the gospel-news, that the Wisdom or Word of God gives power to those who receive the same, to become sons of God. Like the unprofitable servant in the parable of the talents, instead of trading with the treasure intrusted to them, they had hidden it in the earth; they 'shut up the kingdom of heaven against men,' for they neither went in themselves nor even

[1] xi. 48. [2] Luke xix. 41, 42. [3] Is. xlv. 21; Eccl. xxiv. 24.
[4] Eccl. xviii. 13. [5] Mat. xxiii. 34.

CHAP. X.

suffered they them that were 'entering, to go in.'[1] And if the people did not know the doctrine of the Divine sonship, how could they recognise in Jesus the Christ, the Son of God, the incarnate Word?[2]

Pilate.

Again, it may be explained by the writer's antipathy against the Jews, and his prejudice in favour of the Gentiles, that Pilate in the third gospel is represented as a far superior man to the Pilate in the Gospel after Matthew. In the latter narrative the character of Pilate is hardly brought out at all, and although his washing his hands and the dream of his wife sufficiently suggest that in the opinion of the first Evangelist Pilate was innocent, yet it is implied that he acted against his better knowledge, as a weak man who took no interest in Jesus, and only tried to get rid of him without danger to himself. But in the Gospel after Luke, which was probably destined in the first place for the Romans, Pilate the hea then Roman is described as a man who acts with great impartiality and decision.[3] By sending Jesus to Herod he showed his willingness to release him; three times he declared that Jesus had done no evil, and he could not avoid giving sentence, forced as he was to do so by the will of the fierce chief priests of the Jews, and by the unanimous clamour of the Jewish people, who on a previous occasion had attempted to kill him.[4] It seems to be for this reason that the Evangelist wrote of Pilate, how 'of *necessity* he must release one unto them at the feast.'

Thus Luke regards the Jewish people as equally guilty with their rulers of the death of Christ. Of such an accusation there is no trace in the first gospel, where the

[1] Mat. xxiii. 13.

[2] Mat. xi. 19; Luke vii. 35; xi. 49; 1 Cor. i. 24; Col. ii. 3. These and other passages strongly confirm what we try to establish as a fact, that our Lord was by the Jewish rulers compelled to teach the good news of the kingdom in secret and by parables, and that the people of Israel, as a body, were blinded by the ignorance imposed upon them by their blind guides, so that Jerusalem did not know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and that the Pharisees were the cause of its ruin.

[3] Luke xxiii. 14–16.

[4] Luke iv. 29.

guilt centres in the rulers. For we cannot regard 'all the people' assembled before the judgment hall as genuine representatives of the people of Jerusalem. They were probably a mere rabble, brought together by the chiefs of the Jews, for the purpose of assisting them in their design of getting rid of a man who was the friend of the people and the enemy of its spiritual rulers. When, therefore, Pilate had declared himself 'innocent of the blood of this just person,' the excited and riotous mob cried: 'His blood be on us and on our children.'[1] CHAP. X.

The same well-grounded partiality in favour of the Gentiles seems to have caused the writer of the third gospel to omit the charge which is so clearly stated in the Gospel after Matthew, about the Gentiles having mocked, scourged, and evil entreated Jesus.[2] Not the Roman 'soldiers of the governor,' but Herod, the prince of the Jews, and '*his* men of war,' are here stated as those who 'set Him at nought and mocked Him, and arrayed Him in a gorgeous robe.'[3] Again, not the soldiers of Pilate, the Gentile, 'led Him away to crucify Him,' but 'the chief priests and the rulers of the people' did *themselves* lead Him away to Calvary. This account reminds us of the record contained in the Acts about the martyrdom of Stephen, who was 'cast out of the city' by those whom the same writer designates on the authority of Stephen, as 'stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears,' and as those who 'always resist the Holy Ghost,' as their fathers had likewise done before them.[4] And it is not a little remarkable, that the words which in the third gospel Christ is reported to have spoken before the Council are almost identical with those which, according to the same writer's account, were spoken by Stephen.[5] Again, not 'they that passed by,'[6] but 'the people . . and the rulers also with them, derided Him, saying: He saved Herod.

[1] Mat. xxvii. 25.
[2] Mat. xxvii. 27–31.
[3] Luke xxiii. 11.
[4] Acts vii. 51.
[5] Comp. Luke xxii. 69; xxiii. 34–46 with Acts vii. 56, 59, 60.
[6] Mat. xxvii. 39.

CHAP. X.

others, let Him save Himself if He be Christ, the chosen of God.'[1] Not even the usual stupefying mixture of vinegar and gall is offered to Him before the crucifixion,[2] but the soldiers of Herod, the Jew, 'mocked Him, coming to Him and offering Him vinegar, and saying: If thou be the king of the Jews, save thyself.'[3] Finally, Pilate's yielding to the Jews by ordering the sepulchre to be watched, as also the fright and flight of the soldiers, the opening of the graves, and the apparition of 'many bodies of the saints,' are likewise omitted, and possibly for a similar reason.

7. *The Paulinic origin of the third gospel is further shown by the omission or alteration of all those passages in Matthew which favour the idea that the Jewish nation is exclusively called to form the Messianic kingdom, and by those additions which express the marked predilection of Jesus for the Gentiles.*

Genealogies.

We shall begin by comparing the first chapters of the first gospel with the corresponding chapters of the third. As we have already pointed out, it is obviously the object of the author of the Gospel 'after' Matthew to show that Jesus is the Messianic king of the Jews, and that His lineage, and all the circumstances of His life, correspond to whatever the prophets have announced respecting 'the great king.' Accordingly it is pointed out from the beginning, that all the facts of His life were fulfilments of those passages in the law and the prophets which the Jews considered as referring to the future terrestrial Messiah. For this reason, as it would seem, 'the book of generation of Jesus Christ' shows Him to have been the son of David and the son of Abraham, and thus to have belonged to the royal line of God's chosen nation, to have been 'born king of the Jews.'[4] And as if it were the writer's special purpose to remove any doubt as to Christ's being indisputably the true king of promise, the genealogy is divided into three parts, and it is especially mentioned

[1] Luke xxiii. 35.
[2] Comp. Mat. xxvii. 34.
[3] Luke xxiii. 36, 37.
[4] Mat. ii. 2.

that each of these divisions contains twice seven, or fourteen generations. If fourteen generations have elapsed from Abraham to the first David, and again as many from David to the Babylonian captivity, it may be conjectured that, when after the rejection of Israel other fourteen generations shall have passed, God will again adopt His people, and restore the same under the second David. This conjecture is confirmed, first by the fact that Jesus was, or was supposed to be, the last direct descendant of the royal house of David, and next by the other fact, that from Salathiel to Jesus not fourteen, but only thirteen, generations had passed. For this circumstance points to the solution of the great mystery, that although Jesus had died without setting up the promised Messianic kingdom on earth, yet He will return as Christ or Messiah, that is, as a terrestrial king, and He will choose Jerusalem as His capital, so that it will be in truth 'the city of the great king.' The thirteenth generation is that of Jesus, the fourteenth that of Christ, who shall come again from heaven in the all-fulfilling greatness and glory of His kingdom. For this reason, as it would seem, nowhere else in Matthew, except in the genealogy, Jesus is called 'Jesus Christ.'[1] In all other passages He is called 'Jesus' or 'the Son of Man,' which latter name, as we pointed out, some might regard as Messianic.

So much about the genealogy and its imperfect division into three periods of fourteen generations. It is an established fact, confirmed as we have seen by the most ancient Syriac version which we possess, that 'the Gospel of the Hebrews' accounted for seventeen generations between Abraham and David. Yet this genealogy is the oldest which has been transmitted to us through our canon, and it clearly proves that, in the opinion of the writer, Jesus was the son of David *because* He was the son of Joseph, who is shown to have been the son of David. The genealogy in the first gospel is therefore

[1] Mat. i. 1–18.

CHAP. X.

founded on the belief that the Jewish nation is exclusively called to form the Messianic kingdom, and that Jesus, when He shall return as Messiah, will be 'the great king' of the restored theocracy.

The opposite tendency is easily traceable in the genealogy contained in the third gospel. Instead of beginning the same with Abraham, the Evangelist begins it with 'Adam which was the son of God.' He shows thereby that not only Abraham's children in the flesh, but all men, are sons of God, being the descendants of Adam. Therefore men and angels, without exception, are joint heirs of this Divine sonship, have a joint interest in the Redeemer, 'of whom *the whole family* in heaven and earth is named.'[1] For Jesus Christ, the Spirit, is 'from heaven;'[2] he is 'the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature;' and the Creator of all things in heaven and earth.[3] In accordance with this doctrine the writer of the third gospel informs us that Jesus was only '*supposed*' to be the son of Joseph by those who, being blinded, had no right judgment about the birth or death of Jesus. They were not able to discern that although Christ 'concerning the flesh' came from Israel, yet that he is 'over all' as the One who obtained the prize among men.[4]

Now, it is evident that if Jesus was not really the son of Joseph, then the genealogy breaks down at once; and it would in this case be better not to 'give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions (or bring about differences[5]) rather than godly edifying which is in faith,' or, rather than the dispensation of God in faith.[6] And indeed at first sight the genealogy appears to stand here to no purpose. For though Joseph is shown to be the son of David, yet David is like his great ancestor Abraham, and like every man ever born, but a

[1] Eph. iii. 15. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 47. [3] Col. i. 15–20.
[4] Rom. ix. 5; i. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 24; Luke iv. 18.
[5] Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 7. [6] Comp. 1 Tim i. 4.

son of God in consequence of the descent from Adam. It is not difficult, however, to point out the object of the writer in framing the genealogy as we find it in the third gospel. True to his general principles and main objects, he has deprived the genealogy of every Jewish element, and thus he has essentially modified the genealogy contained in the first gospel. The Jewish history is by this genealogy shown to have been not even a type of that history of mankind, of that universal dispensation, which began with Adam, 'the first man,' who being 'of the earth earthy,' was the first and real type of 'the second man,' Christ Jesus who is 'from heaven.' In order, as it would seem, to deprive the Jewish dispensation of that pre-eminence which its adherents claimed for the same, the especially Jewish division of fourteen generations 'from Abraham to David'[1] has been omitted in this genealogy. And instead of dividing the same into three periods of fourteen generations, he divides his genealogic version with great accuracy as to numbers into thrice seven, or twenty-one generations. For there are twenty-one generations between Jesus and Zorobabel, twenty-one from Salathiel to Nathan, and twenty-one from Thara up to God. Again, and apparently for the same purpose, in this genealogy of the universal Messiah, Joseph, the 'supposed' father of Jesus, is shown not to have been a descendant of the royal line of David and Solomon, but of Nathan, an obscure son of Israel's first king.[2] Thus, in the opinion of the writer of the third gospel, the Jewish dispensation has been by the universal genealogy reduced to its proper level.

Birth and Childhood.

If we now proceed to consider the history of the birth and childhood of Jesus, as contained in the first and in the third gospel, we shall find that the first Evangelist writes from a Jewish, and the third from an anti-Jewish and universal, point of view. The Gospel after Matthew shows that, in accordance with a prophecy in Isaiah,[3] the

[1] Mat. i. 17. [2] Comp. Luke iii. 31, with Mat. i. 6. [3] vii. 14.

CHAP. X.

birth of Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee took place in Bethlehem, the town of Judea where David was born, and to which the prophecy of Micah refers.[1] Again, magicians, that is Chaldæan astronomers, have been struck by the appearance of a peculiar and remarkable star, which they recognised to be the same of which the prophet Balaam had foretold, that it would appear in the time of Israel's most glorious history. Herod is stated to have been terror-struck by the simultaneous appearance of the star and of the new-born 'King of the Jews.' He sought to destroy this child, and in consequence of this the flight of Joseph and the young child, with Mary His mother, became necessary. Following the instructions received in a dream, they fled into Egypt till after Herod's death. God called His Son out of Egypt through an angel, in accordance with the prophecy of Hosea.[2] Meanwhile Herod slew all the young children in Bethlehem and the coasts thereof, thus fulfilling the prophecy of Jeremiah,[3] a passage which refers to Rachel weeping for her children. And on the return from Egypt, Joseph dwelt in Nazareth, thus unconsciously fulfilling the prophecy which has not been directly transmitted to us: 'He shall be called a Nazarene.' We see, therefore, that every part of this account points to a terrestrial king of the Jews; and the angel especially announces to Joseph that the child shall 'save *His* people from their sins.'

The corresponding account in Luke is totally different. Everything which in Matthew refers to the king of the Jews, as such, is passed over; hence the adoration of the Magi, the jealousy of Herod, and his cruel attempt to kill his rival, are omitted. For the same reason, apparently, Joseph is made gradually to withdraw from the scene, and to disappear entirely as soon as he has accompanied 'his espoused wife . . . unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem.' On the other hand, Mary is by the narrator brought much more into the foreground. It is to her that the angel

[1] v. 2. [2] Hos. xi. 1. [3] Jer. xxxi. 15.

appears who announces the birth and destiny of the child; to her Simeon addresses his prophecy, and it is Mary who is brought forward as the careful mother, in the narrative of the boy Jesus in the temple. Now, even in the Gospel after Matthew, it is neither stated nor assumed that Mary was of the lineage of David, nor indeed is it expressly stated that she was the descendant of Jewish parents. In the Gospel after Luke, the mere possibility that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was a Gentile by birth, may be regarded as having become a suggested probability. For here we are told, that when 'all,' that is Jews as well as Gentiles, went to be taxed, 'Joseph also went up *from Galilee* out of that city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; because *he* was of the house and lineage of David, to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife.' And as if it were the object of the writer, that the probability of a Gentile origin of Mary should be regarded as a positive fact, the city of Nazareth in the country of 'Galilee *of the Gentiles*' is here clearly pointed out as the house of Jesus, and of his parents. It is unto Nazareth that the angel was sent by God to Mary;[1] from this same city she is here reported to have been removed by Joseph to Bethlehem, in consequence of the Roman emperor's command. 'To their *own* city of Nazareth' they return,[2] and no reason is assigned why they should have left Bethlehem, had this city been their original home, which according to the first gospel's account it undoubtedly was. For here we are informed that Herod sent the wise men to Bethlehem, where they find Jesus in '*the* house,' where again the angel appears unto Joseph, and whence the flight into Egypt takes place. To Bethlehem Joseph would have returned with the mother and child, had Archelaus, the brother of Herod, not reigned in Judea. But instead of doing this, he dwelt in 'a city called Nazareth,' of which it is neither said nor implied in the Gospel after Matthew that it was his 'own

[1] Luke i. 26. [2] i. 39.

CHAP. X.

city.' On the contrary, he is reported to have settled there for the purpose of fulfilling a prophecy. It is, therefore, at least a suggested fact, according to the third gospel, that Nazareth in Galilee of the Gentiles was the original home of Joseph and Mary, and not merely the place where Jesus was 'brought up.'[1]

The writer of the universal gospel, who has in his genealogy of Jesus removed every exclusively Jewish element, has likewise removed Jesus from the centre of Judaism to a Gentile country. And although he has thought it necessary to reproduce the account about the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, yet this is merely reported as a chance event. We have already pointed out the reason for supposing that the first chapter of Matthew's gospel originally contained only the genealogies.[2] Could this be proved, the account of the birth in the Gospel 'after' Luke would likewise be a later interpolation. Since it would be rather hazardous to deny the possibility of any interpolations having been ever effected from one gospel into another, we may well assume that in the original Gospel after Luke this account about the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem may have been altogether omitted. Indeed the Gospel after John somewhat supports the supposition that Jesus of Nazareth was born in Nazareth, and that, at a time when every event of Christ's life was connected with the prophecies, the second David was assumed, and by some reported, to have been born in the city of David. Philip announced to Nathanael 'Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.' Nathanael, the Israelite, doubts this for the very reason that Jesus was of Nazareth, and not of Bethlehem; he says: 'Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth,' a city in 'Galilee of the Gentiles.' Again, in this same gospel[3] we are specially told that some said: 'Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town

[1] iv. 16. [2] See p. 57. [3] vii. 41, 24.

of Bethlehem, where David was?' It is obvious that if the writer of the fourth gospel had regarded the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem as an indisputable fact, he would hardly have omitted to refer to the same, nor would he have even indirectly implied that Jesus of Nazareth was born in the Gentile country; and he would not have positively stated that this circumstance prevented many from regarding him as the foretold Messiah, so that 'there was a division among the people because of him *on this very ground*. Again, we have here to observe that, according to this gospel, Christ said to those who came to seek for 'Jesus of Nazareth,' 'I am he.'[1] Also in the Gospel after Mark no mention or indirect allusion is made of Bethlehem as the birthplace of Jesus. The account begins by stating that 'Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee,' and that 'after that John was put into prison Jesus came (back) into Galilee.' Finally, in the Acts, Nazareth is regarded as his birthplace.[2]

The subsequent minute investigation of the first two chapters in Luke will show the entire harmony of style and ideas which exists between these chapters and the ninth and the two following chapters of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. In these Paulinic chapters, as well as in the beginning of the Paulinic gospel, the leading ideas refer to the Divine promises made to Abraham, and through him to '*all* families of the earth.'[3] It is true that the angel says: 'And he shall reign over *the house of Jacob* for ever;'[4] in like manner the Holy Ghost is reported to have spoken through Zacharias: 'Blessed be *the Lord God of Israel*, for he hath visited and redeemed *his people*;'[5] and Mary rejoices that God 'hath holpen His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy, as He spake to our fathers, to Abraham and to his seed for ever.'[6] These are undoubtedly expressions which fully recognise the

[1] xviii. 5, 7, 8.
[2] Acts ii. 22; iii. 6; iv. 10; vi. 14; xxii. 8; xxvi. 9.
[3] Gen. xii. 3.
[4] i. 33.
[5] i. 68–79.
[6] i. 54, 55.

CHAP. X.

peculiar privileges of the Jewish people. But at the same time the 'holy prophets' of God have been 'since the world began,' and therefore ever since Adam, the father of mankind. And the promise made to Abraham refers to 'all' families or nations of the earth. For this reason Paul teaches us that '*they* are not *all Israel* which are *of* Israel, neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they *all children*;'[1] but quite the contrary: for he adds, 'They which are the children of the flesh, these are *not* the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.' Thus the true Israel, and house of Jacob loved by God, and whose are the promises, are not those who belong to the Jewish dispensation. God's chosen people are formed by the members of 'the dispensation of the fulness of times,' those to whom Paul's 'other' gospel is preached, and who, having received it, belong to 'the dispensation of the grace of God,'[2] to the universal or Gentile dispensation. To this all those belong who through God's grace and mercy were chosen and predestinated from the beginning, and who strive after justification, not by 'the deeds of the law,' but by 'faith,' or, as Paul likewise expresses it, by 'the election of grace.'[3] The Gentiles, who were before not a people of God, are now the true people of God their Redeemer, and 'in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God.'[4]

Now, if it can be fairly established by a comparison of Luke's and Matthew's gospels, that in the former the Jewish elements of the latter have been systematically removed, and that they have been replaced by the chief elements of Paul's doctrine, then it may be deemed quite justifiable to interpret the above Jewish expressions in Luke, 'the house of Jacob,' and 'the Lord God of Israel,' and 'his servant Israel,' in the same manner as Paul has interpreted these and similar expressions in his Epistle to

[1] Rom. ix. 6, 7. [2] Eph. i. 10; iii. 2. [3] Rom. xi. 5. [4] Rom. ix. 25, 26.

the Romans. If we interpret them thus, these expressions in Luke do not favour the Jewish idea that Israel is exclusively, and at all events *first*, called to form the Messianic kingdom. For such expressions in the third gospel are then intended to refer to 'the vessels of mercy,' which God has afore prepared unto glory, . . . not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles.'[1] Nor must it be supposed that Israel, unless it conforms to the new gospel of faith without the deeds of the law, can participate in this glory. Therefore the Apostle writes: 'But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.. because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law.'[2] Therefore it is only 'a remnant' of Israel which shall be saved.[3] And the gospel must first be preached 'to the poor,' or what means the same in this gospel, to the Gentiles. These must first 'come in,'[4] like the younger brother in the parable of the prodigal son, whose elder brother would not 'go in,' though he was entreated by his father to do so. The Gentiles belong to the only availing circumcision, for they 'worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.'[5]

The Evangelist informs us that Simeon was a 'just and devout man,' living in Jerusalem, 'waiting for the consolation of Israel,' and who was endued with the Holy Ghost. He does not describe him as living like Zacharias and Elizabeth, 'in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.' For although Zacharias 'was filled with the Holy Ghost' in a favoured instance, and for a special purpose, the Paulinic disciple would hardly have conceived it possible that the Holy Ghost should rest upon such as 'followed after the law of righteousness,' and who have 'not attained to the law of righteousness,' seeking it 'by the works of the law.' Simeon appears, therefore, to be described as the forerunner of Paul; and,

[1] Rom. ix. 23, 24. [2] Rom. ix. 31, 32. [3] Rom. xi. 25.
[4] Rom. xi. 25; 2 Cor. iii. 16. [5] Phil. iii. 4; comp. Gal. iii. 7, 14–29.

CHAP. X.

in the spirit of the revelation made to Paul, he declares that the salvation which the child Jesus brought has been prepared by God for '*all* people.' And in literal accordance with the doctrine laid down by Paul, the enlightenment of the Gentiles is here mentioned *before* the glory of Israel. The star which, in the Gospel after Matthew, is related to have appeared, is 'a light to lighten the Gentiles.' It is 'the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God,' and who 'should shine unto them.' For 'in the face of Jesus Christ . . . God . . . hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God.'[1] Therefore Christ, 'the light of the world,' has revealed 'the mystery which hath been hid from eternity and ever of old,'[2] namely, 'that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs and of the same body, and partakers of God's promise in Christ by the gospel.'[3]

This revelation Paul tells us he has not received 'of man,' neither was he 'taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.'[4] And though Simeon is here shown to have had at a favoured moment, when under the influence of the Holy Ghost, a glimpse of this light, just as John the Baptist had a glimpse of Christ, yet it was left to Paul to be the first revealer of that mysterious light. God had prepared it 'before the face of all people;' it shone in darkness, but the darkness comprehended it not. Before the foundations of the earth were laid, this universal light 'which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,' was predestinated to shine unto '*all* people' in the fulness of time. But the faith in this light was not understood at first; it was a faith '*afterward* to be revealed,' and it was revealed, *after* the resurrection of Christ, by the Apostle who was appointed to call the Gentiles 'into the grace of Christ unto *another* gospel.' So new was this gospel, that Paul was 'by revelation' commanded to 'communicate' the same even to Christ's originally chosen Apostles at Jerusalem. It is therefore not even left us to

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 4–6. [2] Col. i. 26, 27. [3] Eph. iii. 2–6. [4] Gal. i. 12.

infer, but it is positively stated by Paul, that the pre-ordained 'fulness of time,' though it began during Christ's days upon earth, was not understood as such till Paul proclaimed what the risen Christ had revealed to him. And accordingly we find, that this new 'mystery among the Gentiles' is not foreseen by even the most blameless adherents of 'the commandments and ordinances' of the Jewish law. Not Zacharias, the Jewish priest 'of the course of Abia,' nor his wife which was 'of the daughters of Aaron,' preached of this new light, but a just and devout man, who, though he lived in Jerusalem, may have been a reformed Israelite, if not even a Gentile. The angel who appeared to Zachariah does not announce 'a light to lighten *the Gentiles*,' but one who shall turn 'many *of the children of Israel* to the Lord their God.' Even to Mary the angel does no more than announce the expected king of the Jews, 'the son of the Highest,' to whom the Lord shall give 'the throne of his father David.' And Zacharias refers in his thanksgiving only to the redemption of the house of David, to the performance of the oath sworn to Abraham, and in so far only as it referred to the Jewish nation. The redemption of the Gentiles, of the universal community forming 'the Israel of God'[1] was and remained a mystery, of which Simeon alone had any foreknowledge previous to the full revelation to and by Paul.

We thus see exemplified in the first chapters of Luke's gospel, and by the chief personages of this part of his narrative, on the one side the Paulinic doctrine of universal justification by faith, and on the other the Jewish doctrine of limited justification by the law. In Zacharias we see represented the righteousness by the deeds of the law,[2] and without faith.[3] Only in rare instances such a man, like the prophets of old, is filled with the Holy Ghost, and even then he does but see 'as through a glass

[1] Gal. vi. 16.
[2] Comp. Luke i. 6; Mat. xxviii. 20.
[3] Luke i. 20; comp. viii. 25.

CHAP. X.

dimly,' the heavenly treasure having been temporarily confided to an earthen vessel,[1] and 'the veil' of the law not being yet removed. But notwithstanding this impediment, and although even in inspired moments left in utter ignorance about 'the faith which should afterwards be revealed,' the hidden meaning of the Holy Ghost's teaching may be traced in the words of Zacharias. If read in the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, these words imply that God's true Israel, the true house of David, whose are the promises, consists in the first place of 'the fulness of the Gentiles,' and in the second place of 'a remnant' of Israel in the flesh. Zacharias therefore speaks unconsciously words of deep meaning, which reveal the hidden mystery among the Gentiles, when he says that John is 'to make ready a people prepared for the Lord,' by turning 'the hearts of the fathers,' that is of the Jews, 'to the children,' that is to the Gentiles;[2] and 'the disobedient,' who rejected Christ, 'to the wisdom of the just,' that is to the hidden wisdom of those who are justified by faith and not by slavish taskmasters.[3]

The Virgin Mary.

The true life of righteousness, as regulated by the light of faith,[4] is exemplified by the 'Virgin' Mary, who, in consequence of her faith, was 'highly favoured' by the Lord, and declared to be blessed among women, having 'believed' there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord by the angel.[5] It was not flesh and blood which had revealed to her that she was 'the handmaid of the Lord,' and which had caused her to say, 'Be it unto me according to Thy word.' But the Spirit of God which caused the Son of God and the Son of Man to say, 'Thy will be done,' worked mightily in the chosen 'vessel of grace,' and enabled her 'both to do and to will of His good pleasure.' Light was to shine out of darkness, 'the light to lighten the

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 7.
[2] Gal. iii. 29.
[3] Comp. Gal. iii. 24.
[4] Comp. John i. 4.
[5] Comp. Mat. i. 20–23; Is. vii. 14.

Gentiles' was to be made 'of the seed of David according to the flesh.'[1] Therefore God shined into Mary's heart 'to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' Thus possessing this heavenly treasure in an earthen vessel, and being the highly favoured vessel of grace, 'the excellency of the power' was truly of God, and not of her.[2] Like Paul, Mary received this revelation not 'of man,' but from a Divine source; and, like Mary the sister of Martha, she had 'chosen that good part which shall not be taken away from her.'[3] Accordingly, Elizabeth, the believing wife of the just but unbelieving Zacharias, being 'filled with the Holy Ghost,' called Mary, 'in the spirit,'[4] 'the mother' of her 'Lord.' For, unlike Abraham's unbelieving wife, Mary had believed that 'with God nothing is impossible.' She did not stagger at the promise of God through unbelief, but, 'strong in faith,' she also 'against hope believed in hope,' that she might become the mother of many nations, by bringing forth the light which was to shine out of darkness, the light to lighten the Gentiles, the bringer of that 'salvation' which God had 'prepared before the face of *all* people.'

We have seen that Luke, when he contrasts the Gentiles to the Jews, makes use of the symbolic expressions of 'the poor' and 'the rich;' and that Mary, according to this gospel, might be assumed to have been a Gentile. Living in Galilee of the Gentiles, and there, on heathen ground, receiving the Divine communication, Mary, the mother of the light of the Gentiles, rejoices in God, the Saviour of *all* mankind. She knows that God has done 'great things' to her, not regarding 'the low estate of His handmaiden.' She believes that 'the holy thing which shall be born' of her shall be called the Son of God, and that therefore *all* generations shall call her blessed. The limited covenant with Israel's children according to the flesh is at an end. Henceforth 'His

[1] Rom. i. 3. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 6, 7. [3] x. 42. [4] Comp. Mat. xxii. 43.

CHAP. X.

mercy is on (all) them that fear Him, from generation to generation,' and 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for . . . all are one in Christ Jesus.'[1] 'The proud' are scattered in the imagination of their hearts; 'the mighty' have been put down from their seats, though they sat on the seat of Moses; those of low degree, such as the Gentiles and the apostle of the Gentiles, have been exalted; 'the hungry,' those that hunger after the true righteousness, are filled with good things; 'the rich' have been sent empty away. This new revelation was through Mary communicated to the Jews. Leaving the land of the Gentiles, where the new light had been revealed to her, she went 'with haste into . . . Juda,' into the house of Zacharias, the blameless child of the old covenant, perfect in good works, but lacking in faith. In like manner did afterwards Paul communicate the new gospel to the persons 'of reputation,' or who were 'held in respect' at Jerusalem, that is, to them which were apostles before him.

Not in Jewry, but in Galilee, was God known to shine into every man's heart. God, 'who accepteth no man's person,' or more literally, 'before whom is no respect of persons,' has regarded the low estate of those who hitherto had been called 'not a people.' Therefore the mother of the Gentiles, as afterwards 'the apostle of the Gentiles,' reveals the new light which has first shone among the Gentiles, but which is destined to be not only 'a light to lighten the Gentiles,' but also 'the glory' of God's people 'Israel.' Although 'the fulness of the Gentiles,' typified by the younger son in the parable of the prodigal son, shall go into the new kingdom of God 'first,' yet the same new light is to shine also 'to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death.' But this light remained 'in the deserts till the day of His showing unto Israel.'[2] So likewise did Paul withdraw into the

[1] Gal. iii. 28.

[2] Luke i. 80.

deserts of Arabia, after that 'the light of the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ' had been revealed to him on his way to Damascus. Thus, according to the third gospel the deserts of 'Galilee of the Gentiles,' and according to the first gospel even Egypt, the land of Israel's bondage, were the highly favoured spots, where the early life of Him was spent, whose 'life was the light of men.' There came a day when this light was shown unto Israel, when the light shone in darkness, but 'the darkness comprehended it not.' All this proves that 'the kingdom must be taken away from Israel,' and given to 'a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof,'[1] before it can return, or be shown to Israel. Israel had been rich in comparison with the less favoured Gentiles, yet to these, 'to the poor,' the gospel was preached, whilst the rich were 'sent empty away,' for the true light has been comprehended among the Gentiles. Because of their hungering after the true righteousness by faith, the Gentiles are 'filled with good things.' Like the prophet of old, Christ Jesus had been sent 'for a light to the Gentiles.'[2]

According to the Gospel after Matthew, 'the house' in Bethlehem where Jesus was born may be taken to have been even the very same royal house where David saw the light of day. At all events there is no room for the supposition that Joseph and Mary were strangers and sojourners in the city of David, and that they took refuge in a stable because the inn could not receive the travellers. On the contrary, Bethlehem is, as we have seen, in the first gospel unmistakeably pointed out as the original home of Joseph and Mary. As such, in the third gospel, the city of Nazareth, in Galilee, is at least indirectly referred to. And as if the writer wished in a prominent manner to mark in his narrative, as a mere chance accident, the stay of Joseph and Mary in Juda and in Bethlehem at this time, he expressly states that they went '*from* Galilee out of the city of Nazareth, *into* Judea

[1] Mat. xxi. 43. [2] Is. xlix. 6.

CHAP. X.

unto the city of David,' for the sole purpose of being taxed in obedience to the Roman Emperor's decree. According to this account, it was owing to such casual circumstance only, that 'the light of the Gentiles' first shone in Judea. And as if to bring out still more forcibly the unusual and unexpected entry of Joseph and Mary into Bethlehem, he relates that Jesus was born in a stable, which account is but slightly modified by Justin the Martyr, who informs us that he was born in the darkness of a cave.

The universal Messiah.

It is in accordance with the writer's object, the description of Christ as the universal Saviour or Messiah, that in the third gospel the light to lighten the Gentiles is not identified with the star of Jacob foreseen by Balaam. Again, it is not the rich, but the poor, who are first attracted by this Divine light. Not the rich wise men of the East, though they were Gentiles, are here related to have been the first to have worshipped the expected newborn 'king of the Jews.'[1] The universal Messiah is announced to poor shepherds, who were occupied with 'keeping watch over their flock by night.' And this Divine revelation is confided to 'the angel of the Lord,' that is, to a celestial being, chosen for the special purpose of manifesting to the chosen vessels of mankind 'the glory of the Lord,'[2] which without the interposition of this celestial mediator no man can see and live, and which not even Moses was able to behold.[3] And as if to show that He who was 'in the form of God,' and 'equal with God,' would appear on earth 'in the form of a servant,' as the Messiah, Christ, or Saviour announced by the prophets of old, that is as the second David, the angel is reported to have announced the birth, in the city of David, of 'a Saviour which is Christ *the Lord*.'

'The dayspring from on high' was given to the world, not for the salvation of *one* people, but as the

[1] The account in the primitive gospel record about the wise men of the east has been interpreted as referring to Chaldean magi, who as priests of the Zoroastrian religion expected an especial instrument of Divine power.

[2] Comp. Is. xl. 5.

[3] Exod. xxxiii. 18–23.

salvation which God has prepared 'before the face of *all* people.' Therefore the angel announces that he brings good tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all people*.' But unlike the first man, in whom God breathed the breath of life, and who yet was 'of the earth, earthy,' this 'second man is (the Lord) from heaven,'[1] and even there he is adored by all.[2] It therefore corresponds well with this view, that in the gospel-narrative the apparition of the angel and glory of the Lord is followed by the apparition of the heavenly host. The Evangelist can hardly have written the above words without having in view the other Paulinic passage, where it is written: 'Having made peace through the blood of his cross . . . it pleased the Father . . . by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself . . . whether they be things in earth or things in heaven;'[3] by Him 'our Lord Christ Jesus, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.'[4]

This good news of the universal Messiah is announced by the multitude of the heavenly host in the following words: 'Glory to God in the Highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.' *To* the *glory* of *God* the Father, who dwells *in the highest*, all tongues in heaven and earth, and under the earth, the whole family of creation confess that Christ Jesus is Lord, that the glory of God became incarnate. In this heavenly Messiah 'shall the Gentiles trust.' His birth is for them the beginning of 'the accepted time,' and 'the day of salvation;'[5] they shall become 'the saints' who are to judge the world, yea, even angels.[6] And if they confess before men Christ the Lord to the glory of God the Father, then the Son of Man will confess them 'before the angels of God'[7] 'when He shall come in His own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels.'[8] 'For He is our peace, who hath made both (Jew as well as Gentile) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 47. [2] Phil. ii. 9–11. [3] Col. i. 20. [4] Eph. iii. 15.
[5] 2 Cor. vi. 2. [6] 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3. [7] Luke xii. 8. [8] Luke ix. 26.

CHAP. X.

abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace. And that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.'[1]

Christ's baptism.

A comparison of accounts which refer to Christ's baptism will likewise show that it was the object of the third Evangelist to remodel the earlier accounts, with a view to prove that the Jewish nation is not exclusively called to form the Messianic kingdom, and that, on the contrary, the Gentiles would be the first citizens of the new Israel's universal commonwealth. As it was in the darkness of Judea that the light of the Gentiles first saw the light of day, so the witness of that light received 'the Word of God' in the wilderness. And this was in perfect accordance with the prophecy in Isaiah, about 'the voice of him that crieth *in the wilderness*.'[2] In the Gospel after Matthew, John preached 'in the wilderness *of Judea*;' but, in the third gospel, John not only receives his revelation 'in the wilderness' generally; he remains 'in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel.'[3] By omitting the words 'of Judea,' which limit the wilderness to that of Judea alone, the Evangelist may have intended indirectly to suggest that the wilderness in question was in the Gentile country, and possibly in Galilee. If we bear in mind the predilection which the writer has shown for Galilee, the home of Jesus, and for the Gentiles generally, we shall naturally be led to assume that he would have considered Galilee as the most probable and the best qualified place, where the forerunner of Christ 'waxed strong in spirit.' The author of the third gospel having stated that the good news had been first communicated to Mary in Galilee, and by her to John's

[1] Eph. ii. 14–18. [2] Is. xl. 2. [3] Luke iii. 2; i. 80.

mother in Judea, has at least suggested that John passed his childhood and early manhood in this same country of Galilee, and that he there received his revelation. And, as if desirous of including Galilee within the immediate circle of the Baptist's preaching, the Evangelist states that John preached in '*all* the country about Jordan;' therefore also in Samaria and Galilee.

It is only thus that the events here narrated can be fully shown to have been the literal fulfilment of the Isaianic prophecy. For, as if the writer of the Gospel after Matthew had been anxious to quote and to refer to that part only of this prophecy which speaks of Jerusalem and the old Israel, his narrative of these events [1] does not take any cognisance of the words: 'And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and *all flesh shall see it together.*' [2] The 'glory of the Lord,' which had first appeared to the poor shepherds; 'the light to lighten the Gentiles,' which God had prepared 'before the face of *all* people;' was announced by the herald of his coming to *all*, to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles. Such is the account given by the Paulinic Evangelist.

Keeping in view the universality of Christ's kingdom, the writer of the Gospel after Luke avoids mentioning that John the Baptist preached about the nearness of 'the kingdom of heaven,' an expression which, as we have shown, might be understood to refer to the expected Jewish kingdom of the Jewish Messiah. John is reported to have preached to the multitude that came forth, about 'the salvation of God,' which *all* flesh should see.[3] He did baptise with water, but his was 'the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,' and as such it was totally different from the long-established Jewish water-baptism. John declares that his baptism was but a type of, and preparation for Christ's baptism 'with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' It seems to be for this reason that the Evangelist omits all mention of such an outward

[1] Mat. iii. 3. [2] Is. xl. 5. [3] Luke iii. 6.

CHAP. X.

act as water-baptism ever having been ordered or sanctioned by Christ. And, as if to show how completely water-baptism was only intended as a type of Christ's spiritual baptism, the writer renders in such a manner the account of the baptism of Jesus by John, as to give it a sense very different from the account of the first gospel. According to the Gospel after Matthew the object of the baptism of Jesus by John is, that he should thereby receive the anointing with the Holy Spirit, of which latter Isaiah had prophesied that it would 'rest' upon the promised Messiah.[1] Jesus is therefore baptised in Jordan like everyone else; but having fulfilled all righteousness, he upon his going 'up straightway out of the water . . . saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him,' and a voice from heaven was heard saying: 'This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased.' But the third Evangelist, in accordance with his view about the merely typical nature of water-baptism, has neither stated that John's baptism consisted in part in an immersion in the river Jordan, nor referred to the getting in and out of the water by Christ. This last omission seems to be best explained by the assumption that it was the object of the writer, in this instance, to remove the impression necessarily produced by the Jewish account, as if water-baptism had been for Jesus himself a necessary act. And indeed the account here rendered of Jesus's baptism may perhaps even be taken to suggest its having been not an outward, but an inward act, a spiritual, not a water baptism.

This view is strongly confirmed by another omission. In the Gospel after Matthew it is recorded that Jesus having come to be baptised by John, the latter 'forbade him, saying: I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him: Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him.' Of all

[1] Is. xi. 1–3.

this, not a word is to be found in the third gospel. It is evident, that, by the reproduction of this account, the fact would have been clearly established, that Jesus received baptism by water, and in exactly the same manner as the rest. Now, the account in the Gospel after Luke, if taken by itself, does imply that Jesus was baptised as all other people were, that is by water. But it must be admitted that Luke refers to this act in such manner as to imply that it was an outward act of humiliation, which, although not necessary for himself, was necessary for the people. Accordingly it is not Jesus alone who saw, as it is related in Matthew, that 'the heavens were opened unto Him,' and that the Spirit of God descended upon Him in the similitude of a dove. The third Evangelist tells us that 'the heaven was opened,' as it were in the face of all people, and 'for their sake,' as Justin has recorded this narrative; and adds that this visible manifestation of God's power took place whilst Jesus was praying;' thereby seeming to imply that it was vouchsafed as a visible proof of Christ's prayer having been heard. This whole account strongly reminds us of the raising of Lazarus as related in the fourth gospel, where it is expressly stated that the miracle was performed 'because of the people,' and in answer to Christ's prayer. As Lazarus was visibly in the face of all bystanders restored to life, so Jesus was baptised for the sake of those who were present, and he was by transcendent signs declared to be the promised 'One' seed of Abraham, 'to whom the promise was made,'[1] that is the fruit of David's body, whom God swore that he would set upon the throne;[2] and that he would be His Son according to the prophecy of Nathan.

Samaritans.

The writer of the Gospel after Luke has further shown his inclination to favour the Gentiles above the Jews, by the omission of Christ's declaration that he is 'not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,'[3] and by not

[1] Gal. iii. 16, 19. [2] Ps. cxxxii. 11. [3] Mat. xv. 24.

CHAP. X.

recording the Lord's command to His disciples, not to go 'into the way of the Gentiles' nor to enter 'into any city of the Samaritans.'[1] It is more especially the sixteenth chapter in the third gospel which shows the author's partiality for the Gentiles. In it is carried out the leading idea of the fifteenth chapter, which is there developed by the parables of the lost sheep, the piece of silver, and the prodigal son, which we have already considered. Here we have first the parables of the unjust steward, and of Lazarus, which, as well as the parables in the preceding chapter, popularise Christ's doctrine about the kingdom being taken away from the Jews, the first-born among the nations, and of its being given to the Gentiles. The old dispensation, with

Unjust Steward.

[1] Mat. x. 5. The enmity between the Samaritans and the Jews cannot in itself have been the only cause why the Lord would give such an order as the above to his disciples. The following facts seem to offer the best explanation:—'The law of Jehovah' was not known and practised in Samaria up to the time of Josiah's reformation; it was not till long after the Babylonian captivity, soon after the discovery of 'the book of the law' (Deuteronomy) in the days of Josiah, 624, that the Samaritans seem to have become intimately acquainted with the Pentateuch. The striking similarity between the Samaritan text and that of the Septuagint leads us to infer 'that the Samaritans obtained the copies of the Hebrew Pentateuch, from which *their* text was made, from the Alexandrian Jews of Egypt, from whom, indeed, they would be likely to obtain it more readily than from those of Jerusalem.' Already, before the death of Alexander, Samaritans had been transplanted into Egypt, and a multitude of them was transplanted to Lower Egypt and Alexandria by the predecessor of the Ptolemy in whose reign the Septuagint version was made (see Bishop Colenso's 'Pentateuch,' iv. 3–13). The Samaritans became therefore acquainted with the principles of Jewish reform soon after the Babylonian captivity; and if the apocryphal doctrine was the cause of the important discrepancies between the Hebrew and the Greek version, the similarity between the Samaritan and the Alexandrian text, and the difference between these and the Hebrew text, are best explained from this point of view. The prohibition not to visit Samaria is not recorded in any other gospel; but if Luke is right in implying, and John in insisting upon it, that the Lord did go into Samaria and did teach there, that prohibition addressed to the Jewish apostles, if it be a historical fact, which we believe it to be, may have been caused by the mutual animosity between the Jews and the Samaritans, to which the idolatrous practices of the latter, and also their public recognition of the apocryphal doctrine, may have given rise. If so, Christ would naturally warn his Jewish disciples against the influence of so impure a source. The doctrine of Simon the magician, of Samaria, throws much light on this prohibition (see 'Simon Magus,' in the chapter on the Roman Church).

its righteousness, is represented in the parable of the prodigal son by the elder brother, who was clothed with the wedding-garment of the law. To his nominal righteousness, which did not lead to repentance, is contrasted that of the penitent younger son, who having *wasted* what the father had intrusted to him, desired to be fed 'with the husks that the swine did eat.' The steward, in the parable we now consider, 'was accused . . . that he had *wasted* his goods.' Now Paul says of himself, that he '*wasted*' the Church of God. He evidently wasted the Church of God when he took a leading part in that persecution of the Christians of which Stephen's martyrdom had been the precursor. It was, however, not till after Paul's conversion, that in the eyes of the Pharisees, and to a certain extent in the eyes of the Apostles, he wasted the goods intrusted to him. We know that when he was separated from the Church in which he had been born, when he was no more 'exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the fathers,' he openly opposed these Pharisaical traditions, as contrary to the spirit of the new gospel which Christ had revealed to him. Accordingly he separated himself from the Apostles at Jerusalem, who insisted on the continued binding authority of the law, and who refused to admit the Gentiles, unless as proselytes they acknowledged the law. Without this wedding-garment they considered the Gentiles as not worthy of the 'holy things' and 'pearls,' which it would be *waste* to offer to 'dogs' or 'swine.'[1]

In the eyes of the Judaisers, Paul was guilty of this waste; the Apostle of the Gentiles was like the steward in the parable, who was accused of wasting his master's goods, that is his spiritual gifts, of wasting the ointment which he had received.[2] Even the Apostles as a body must have considered Paul to have done this in more than one sense. Not only would he be charged by them with

[1] Mat. vii. 6; comp. Luke xv. 15, 16; xvi. 21; Mat. xv. 26, 27.
[2] Comp. xxvi. 8.

CHAP. X.

having too suddenly laid aside the 'traditions' of the fathers, but also with having too suddenly proclaimed to the world the secret doctrine of the Lord, for which the twelve Apostles did not consider either the Jews or the Gentiles as sufficiently prepared. They were to proclaim 'in light' the mysteries which their Master had revealed to them in secret; and they felt that the time for this enlightenment had not yet come. If then Paul were prematurely to reveal this hidden wisdom, he would, in the opinion of the Apostles, act against the Lord's injunctions, and endanger the Church of God. Unless, then, we have failed to prove that the hidden wisdom which Paul preached in a mystery was essentially the secret doctrine which Christ had confided to the twelve Apostles only, we may fairly assume that Paul is here indirectly referred to as the unjust steward who had wasted his Master's goods. A minute consideration of this mysterious parable will confirm this view. We are told that the steward's master, having heard the accusation, desires him to 'give an account of his stewardship, implying that, if the accusation be well founded, he *may* no longer be his steward. The accusation was in fact *not* well founded, although Paul received the Gentiles into the Church of Christ without their acknowledging the supreme authority of the law, or their trespasses and debts against it. Unquestionably this was against the letter of the Master's recorded injunction respecting the continued validity of the whole law.[1] The other stewards, those who had been Apostles before Paul, held such conduct to be irreconcileable with those of the Lord's doctrines which they had publicly proclaimed, and the record of which the Pharisees had allowed. But Christ had also communicated to His disciples a secret doctrine, and the same had been revealed to Paul by the risen Lord. Those who accused Paul of waste, of casting pearls before swine, were those who had made no use, or but a limited use, of the talent intrusted to them; who had

[1] Mat. v. 18, 19.

hidden the light so that it could not be seen by those who entered in, and who had at first disobeyed the Lord's command to proclaim in light and from the housetops what he had only been able to tell them in secret and in darkness. Even the twelve Apostles, by not having understood 'the mystery of the Gentiles,' or the mystery of the sonship,[1] had totally misunderstood, as a body, 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,' which formed the essence of their Master's secret doctrine. In revealing these mysteries, that is, 'the hidden wisdom' of his Master, Paul had therefore *not* wasted his Master's goods, but had traded with them to the best of his abilities, wishing to return the Lord's own 'with usury.' Yet by so doing, by sowing broadcast the seed of the Word, Paul had wasted the talent intrusted to him, in the opinion of those who had more or less hidden their own.

The conduct of the Lord's steward was unjust according to the old law, but it was just in the eye of the new law. It was not contrary to the spirit of the Master's revealed will, but in perfect harmony with it. The fundamental principle of Christ's doctrine, the universality of God's redeeming love, had by the new gospel-revelation received an extended application. Accordingly, the true disciple and steward of Christ had to declare the righteousness, not of the law, but of God, and above all 'the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.'[2] Paul, therefore, in due time resolved to do openly what he had first done 'secretly before the Jews.' Instead of speaking in the ear in closets, he proclaimed upon the housetops the new gospel of righteousness by faith, *without* the deeds of the law;'[3] he zealously strove 'to give knowledge of salvation . . . *by the remission of their sins.*'[4] Accordingly, the true servant of his Lord does not look to the law, and does not condemn the transgressors against it, to pay the very last

[1] John xiv. 20.
[2] Rom. iii. 25.
[3] Rom. iii. 28; comp. Luke xii. 3.
[4] Luke i. 77.

CHAP. X.

mite, but he remits to the Lord's principal debtors a considerable part of their heavy debts.[1] He does this, not surreptitiously, but in open daylight. The good and faithful servant forgave, hoping to be forgiven for not having judged according to the condemning letter of the law, but rather according to 'the weightier matters of the law: judgment, mercy, and faith.'[2] He had faith in the spirit of righteousness, which is by faith only, and without the deeds of the law. And according to his faith so was it done unto him. For 'the Lord commended' the steward who had falsely been accused of being unjust. Not the old law, but the new law, is the standard by which stewards of the risen Master must be judged. According to the hidden rule of faith the Lord could but commend his steward. He had carried out the spirit, if not the letter, of his Master's instructions. Paul did not hide the Lord's money, the talent intrusted to his stewardship; but he distributed his Master's gifts unto men, he lent even where there was little or no hope of an immediate return. Thus debts were incurred. To a certain extent the Lord's goods were wasted, and, in some instances, the steward gave pearls as it were unto swine, to such as were unworthy. Yet it was better to risk, or even to waste, his Master's goods, than to dig them into the ground. On his return, the Lord might not in every case receive his own with usury, the seed of the Word having been sown broadcast on different soils, but he would find the leaven of faith at work, which would in due time pervade the whole lump. The steward would therefore not have acted in the spirit of his Master, if, instead of reducing the debt of the debtors, he had wiped the debts off altogether, though in the parable of the king and his servants[3] the Lord himself is shown to have forgiven his servant the whole debt.[4] The steward, to whom the parable seems to refer as a *child of this world*, is wiser

[1] Comp. Luke xii. 58, 59.
[2] Mat. xxiii. 23.
[3] Mat. xviii. 27–32.
[4] Comp. Col. ii. 14.

towards his generation, that is towards his disciples, than the Apostles at Jerusalem towards their followers. For these, who *seemed* to be pillars, consider themselves even now children of light,[1] though bent to 'entangle again with the yoke of bondage,[2] and to bring up in the 'fear' of the law,[3] even those committed to the charge of wiser men, who are the faithful stewards of the Master's mysteries.

This interpretation may lead us to a right appreciation of the Lord's injunction, to make 'friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.' It would seem as if the Master had said to the originally appointed stewards: Make to yourselves friends from among the Gentile world, which has no respect for the righteousness by the deeds of the law, and which in your eyes is so unrighteous; so that when ye fail in insisting on the continued validity of the law; when ye fail in building the tower on your foundations;[4] when ye fail to bring fruit to perfection; when ye, once so rich, have entirely lost the treasure of the kingdom of God; when your salt has lost his savour; then the 'unrighteous' Gentiles, who were once poor as Lazarus, and who hereafter will lie in Abraham's bosom, 'may receive you into everlasting habitations,' that is into the kingdom of God, which after having been taken from the Jews, will remain with the Gentiles. He that is faithful 'in that which is least,' that is, in the culture of 'the *least* of all seeds,' of the *grain of faith*, of the spiritual kingdom which is 'within,' of the paradise of the heart, he will 'be faithful also in much,' that is, in the gathering in of 'much' fruit from the fullgrown tree of life.[5] He, therefore, who is nominally 'unjust' in the approved sense of this parable is he who, like Paul, promulgates the gospel of forgiveness of sins, not only among those who are debtors 'to do the whole law,' but also to those whose faith in Christ has made free from the 'yoke of bondage.' And such of the Lord's debtors as have by his steward

[1] Comp. Mat. v. 14. [2] Gal. v. 1. [3] Rom. viii. 15.
[4] Luke xiv. 28. [5] Mat. xiii. 32; xvii. 20.

CHAP. X.

not been condemned as defaulters according to the rigour of the law, whose 'smoking flax' has not been quenched, whose lamps are burning; such as have tasted the goodness of the Lord will in future strive to sin no more, and, if they do sin again, they may be actuated by that godly sorrow which worketh repentance, and as penitent sinners they will be preferred before ninety-nine 'righteous' debtors, who having paid their debts according to the letter of the law, think they need no repentance; they will know that they 'have an advocate with the Father,' who is 'the propitiation . . . for the sins of the whole world,'[1] who, as 'the lamb slain from the foundation of the world,'[2] has in all ages by his anointing abode prepared, 'as a complete offering' unto God, the souls of those who strove to become 'partakers of His holiness.'[3]

In the same manner as Paul shows that to be wise is to be foolish, so also it is here shown that to be just is to be unjust, that righteousness by faith, without the deeds of the law, is falsely called unrighteousness by those who insist on the deeds of the law as a necessary means of salvation. The Apostle of the so-called unrighteous Gentiles and his followers, that is, those who preach the faith in Jesus without insisting on any commandments and ordinances of the law, possess 'the true riches,' that is, 'the fulness of Him who filleth all in all.' If therefore the other stewards or Apostles of Jesus, who insist on the full acknowledgment of the written law, have not been faithful to the so-called 'unrighteous,' to the Gentiles who though they have not the law yet by nature do the works of the law, then the true riches, the gift of the spirit, cannot be intrusted to them. Far from its being a reproof, it is an honour to be like these Gentiles who have individually received 'their own' guide and standard of the truth. Let them be called 'children of this world;' it is not a shame to be 'a child of the world,' if thereby is meant the freedom from the law, wherewith Christ

[1] 1 John ii. 1, 2. [2] Rev. xii. 8. [3] Wis. iii. 6; Heb. xii. 10.

has made us free from bondage. Let the riches of the so-called unrighteous Gentiles, or the 'mammon of unrighteousness' be ever so much despised, they are nevertheless 'the true riches' in Christ Jesus. For the Gentiles are not a barren, but a fruit-bringing tree. Therefore the more or less Judaising stewards and followers of Christ must make to themselves 'friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.' Not on the foundation of the law, but on the foundation of faith in Christ, the incarnate Word from the beginning, must 'the tower' of the true Church be built. Every man must be built up 'a spiritual house,' so that he may enter into the 'everlasting habitations.' Under existing circumstances it is only the faith *without* the deeds of the law, the Gentile faith, which can form the foundation of such a spiritual house, not made with hands. To the Gentiles and to those who, like them, *without* the law do the works of the law, belong 'the everlasting habitations.' Those only who are not 'under the law' can be under grace. The standard of the written law, if it be a stumbling-block, must therefore be abandoned, and the law written on the heart must be the sole guide to everlasting life.

It is impossible to insist on the necessity of the deeds of the law to be righteous or just in the Jewish sense, and at the same time to acknowledge that it is possible to be righteous or just without the law. But whilst all the Judaisers at Jerusalem insisted on the righteousness by works, and whilst they as a necessary consequence regarded Paul as an unjust steward, who had 'wasted' his Master's goods, Peter, a Jew, lived at Antioch 'after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews.'[1] He did eat with the Gentiles, a thing which the other Apostles at Jerusalem abhorred, and thus he made friends with the unrighteous, with the so-called 'mammon of unrighteousness.' For this reason Peter was blamed both by those who were sent to him from James, and also by Paul.

[1] Gal. ii. 14.

CHAP. X.

According to the one party, Peter had done too much; according to Paul he had done too little. And even this little he gave up for a time, withdrawing and separating himself, 'fearing them which were (like himself) of the circumcision.' Peter had been converted by the Lord, at least in so far as to agree with the main principles of Paul's doctrine. 'For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty' in Paul 'toward the Gentiles.'[1] Though Peter did not at once preach to the Gentiles, yet he mixed himself up with them, and it would seem that it was only in consequence of the representations made to him by the deputation from Jerusalem that he compelled the Gentiles 'to live as do the Jews,' though he himself had ceased to do so, having been caught in the net of Christ.

The twelve Apostles cannot preach their own gospel of justification by the deeds of the law, and at the same time recognise Paul's 'other gospel' of justification by faith without the deeds of the law. The so-called 'just' must be made openly 'to differ' and 'be separated' from the so-called 'unjust,' the nominally wise from the nominally foolish.[2] For 'no servant can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other.' Those who restrict the service of God to the keeping of the written law may continue to 'serve God' in this manner; but then let them not 'dissemble;' let them keep separate from the Gentiles, whom they choose to call the children of this world. If they think they possess themselves alone the 'true riches,' then let them not 'come in privily to spy out' the liberty which they who are free from the bondage of the written law have in Christ Jesus. What the Jews and Jewish Christians possess is a written testimony, what the Gentiles possess is an inward and hidden testimony, now brought out into the full light by the revelation made by Paul. It is difficult to serve at the same time the law of

[1] Gal. ii. 8. [2] Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 7; Rom. i. 1.

the Jews and the faith of the Gentiles who do not know the law. If the service of God is believed to consist in the fulfilment of the law, then let nobody who believes this have any fellowship with the Gentiles who do the works of the law without possessing the law. If these are believed to be engaged in the service of mammon, they must be avoided, for nobody can 'serve God and mammon.'

The Apostles at Jerusalem and their followers cannot receive what is their own, that is, the spiritual treasure in an earthen vessel, 'the true riches, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all;' they cannot derive the full benefit of their stewardship; they cannot trade as they ought with the talent intrusted to them, unless they are faithful to their Master's commands, and cease to hide more or less the full light of the gospel. And this implies that they must act in the spirit of their Master, and not according to the beggarly element of the letter that killeth. Herein lies 'the hidden wisdom' of the risen Christ's revealed doctrine, which is considered as foolishness even by those who regard themselves as 'the light of the world.' Those whom they regard as 'children of this world,' as excluded from the commonwealth of Israel, have become acquainted with this mysterious wisdom, through the Apostle who is referred to as 'a child of this world.' They are therefore 'wiser' than the so-called children of light, who are now struck with blindness. And that steward has 'done wisely' whose dealings were regulated by this now fully revealed hidden wisdom of the heart, by 'the weightier matters of the law,' and not merely by the letter, ordinances and grievous burdens of the same. The law of Moses cannot disannul the covenant made with Abraham; but contrariwise, the law is of none effect to them that believe, that 'if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.'[1]

The above interpretation of the parable about the

[1] Gal. ii. 21.

CHAP. X.

unjust steward is strongly confirmed by what follows this narrative. The money-loving Pharisees, who did not like to spend what they possessed, having heard all these things, are here reported to have derided Jesus. 'And he said unto them, ye are they which justify yourselves before men,' by the outward performance of the deeds of the law; 'but God knoweth your hearts,' which are devoid of faith. 'For that which is highly esteemed among men[1] is abomination in the sight of God.' This covetousness and avarice of the Pharisees and of all those who cling to the law ought not to prevent the preaching of the entire gospel to the Gentiles. For 'the law and the prophets were until John,' they were the sole standard of the faith; but 'since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and *every man* presseth into it.' That universal kingdom of God, which was revealed to Abraham, includes those who continue to know nothing about the written law, who are not 'under the law,' and who yet do the works of the law written in their hearts. These are 'the weightier matters of the law,' the requirements of the spiritual law, not contained in the 'handwriting of ordinances,' but written on the tables of the heart by the finger of God. The restrictions of 'the law and the prophets' belong to times past. Christ did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it; He has fulfilled also the weightier matters of the law; He has blotted out 'the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and *took it out of the way*, nailing it to His cross.'[2] Whoever therefore places himself again 'under the law,' crucifies his Lord afresh, and Christ lived and died for him in vain. The Pharisees have taken away the key of knowledge, but Christ has restored and applied the same. He has by His doctrine and by His life revealed what was hidden ever since the beginning, and what His Apostles continued to hide. The time has come when the Sinaitic law must be left behind, and when men must press towards that which

[1] Comp. Gal. ii. 6.

[2] Col. ii. 14.

is more perfect, towards the realisation of the Abrahamitic covenant. Jesus is the seed to whom the promise was made, and in His name, that is, in His spirit,[1] shall all nations be blessed. What is now required is faith in the unlimited and all powerful agency of the Divine Spirit in man. Notwithstanding the opposition which is made by the Jews and Jewish Christians against the universality and spirituality of Christ's religion, every Gentile can 'press' his entrance into the spiritual kingdom of God. With the Baptist, who came in the ways of the law, the law has come to an end; for He who was mightier than him has fulfilled the whole of it, so that not even 'one tittle of the law' has failed to be accomplished. Christ has redeemed all from the curse of the law, by His perfect obedience unto death, by obeying the promptings of the Holy Spirit which dwelled in Him without measure, and through which He was in perfect unity with God the Father. Now therefore 'the blessing of Abraham may come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ,' and all may receive 'the promise of the Spirit through faith.'[2]

It is not a slight confirmation of the above interpretation that the verse now following[3] about the divorce can be interpreted in a similar manner. The passage may easily be referred to Christ and his Church,[4] as also to the Apostles and their relation to the Church of Christ. It is an allegory similar to the one which Paul makes when speaking of Abraham's two sons, 'which are the two covenants.'[5] 'Whosoever putteth away his wife,' that is, Christ, the true bride,[6] or the new Church which is freed from the law, 'and marrieth another,' breaks his oath to Christ and his Church, and so does he who 'marrieth her who is put away by her husband,' that is, who remains in, or joins himself to, the Jewish dispensation, which now, in the fulness of time, has been put away by Christ, 'the

[1] See 'the Gospel after John.'
[2] Comp. Gal. iii. 8–29; iv. 4, 5; 2 Cor. iii. 13, 14.
[3] Luke xvi. 18.
[4] Eph. v. 31, 32.
[5] Gal. iv. 24.
[6] 2 Cor. xi. 2.

CHAP. X.

seed' which should come to fulfil the promise made to Abraham. This is what even the twelve Apostles at Jerusalem and their followers do, who keep up the distinction between Jews and Gentiles, although the new gospel communicated to them by Paul has abolished any such distinction or prerogative. For Paul has made known to the Gentiles 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,' the Hidden Wisdom of the indwelling Saviour of all ages, and thus has prepared the Gentile world, the virgin of Immanuel, for the Divine sonship.[1]

Lazarus.

The same lesson is taught to the Pharisees, and by implication to the Jewish apostles, by the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. The rich man with his brethren typifies the selfishness and unprofitableness of Judaism and of Jewish Christianity, which, like the former, insists on the continued validity of the law. In the house of their father Abraham, as children of Abraham according to the flesh, both the Pharisees, and in a certain sense the original Apostles, like the rich man, have received in their lifetime 'good things,' the 'glad tidings' of which they kept for themselves and their home-circle. They are clothed in the rich wedding garment of justification by the works of the law, and thus belong to those which justify themselves before men,[2] but whose hearts have not received the true riches of the spirit, the 'fulness of him that filleth all in all.' Meanwhile, the poor Gentiles, like Lazarus (which word means: 'may God have pity on him!'), full of sores, neglected and forsaken, have been lying at their gates, vainly desiring to satisfy their hunger with the crumbs which fell from their table. It was left to the dogs to have compassion on them; and in this forlorn state they die. But when the great harvest day comes, when the wheat shall be separated from the tares, then suddenly the scene will change. He who in this life had not received the 'good things' of this world will be

[1] Comp. our interpretation of the parable of the ten virgins, in 'the preaching of Jesus Christ.'

[2] Luke xvi. 15.

shown in the world to come to have been possessed of the 'true riches,' of the spirit of holiness which is to be shed on all flesh, and of that faith in the Almighty power of this heavenly guest in the soul of man, which is 'able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God.'[1] As a 'child of faith,'[2] as a disciple whom the Lord loves, such a man will be in the bosom of Abraham, to whom the promise was made that in him all nations shall be blessed. He will sit with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at the supper of the kingdom of heaven. But he who has been rich in this world, to whom much was given, and who in his narrow selfishness had nothing to give to others; he who believed that, notwithstanding his evil deeds, he could obtain righteousness by the deeds of the law; he who raised again the 'walls of partition,'[3] which had been broken down; he is now separated from the kingdom of heaven, he is not under grace, and is like the man who was cast into outer darkness because he had no approved wedding garment. From such a fate 'Moses and the prophets' might have preserved such a son of Abraham in the flesh, if he had but been willing to explain the Scriptures in the now fully revealed light of truth. But, even if one were to rise from the dead, such men as are struck with blindness could not be persuaded. Nor does it stand any better with the 'blind guides' who cannot lead the blind. If they say they see, their sin remaineth, and they have no cloak for it.[4]

Fire from Heaven.

Among other passages which prove that it was the object of the writer of the Gospel after Luke to show a marked preference for the Gentiles, we must refer to that part of this gospel where Christ is reported to have said that, like Elijah and Elisha, he was not sent among those who suffered by the famine or leprosy in Israel, but unto Gentiles.[5] Yet it is in this respect only that the Lord compares himself with Elias and Elijah; he does not, like

[1] Heb. vii. 25. [2] Gal. iii. 7. [3] Eph. ii. 14; comp. Col. ii. 14.
[4] John ix. 41; xv. 22. [5] Luke iv. 25–27.

CHAP. X.

them, persecute and destroy the Gentiles. For in another part the Evangelist informs us that, contrary to the Lord's positive injunction, as reported in the Gospel after Matthew,[1] Jesus did himself go into Samaria with his disciples, having sent messengers before 'to make ready for him' in a village of the Samaritans, whence, not having been received, they went 'to another village,' and therefore probably remained in Samaria, as we are told that Jesus before going to Jerusalem, *returned* to Galilee.[2] But when his disciples asked him, whether they might 'command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did,' they were severely rebuked by their Lord, who told them, 'Ye know not what *manner* of spirit ye are of;'[3] the spirit of Christ was not the spirit of Elijah. In the very same country Elijah had twice caused fire to descend from heaven, in order to devour those who had not honoured him whom God had sent.[4] It is true that in this gospel the Lord is reported to have said: 'I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I, if it be already kindled?'[5] But the whole tenor of this gospel, as also the writings of Paul, more than imply that this fiery strife, to cause which the Lord had come, was to benefit, and not to destroy, the Gentiles. It would seem, therefore, as if Jesus had taken his true disciples for this very reason to Samaria, in order that they might learn on this very spot that he was not a zealot of the law, and an enemy of the Gentiles, as Elijah the Thisbite. The dispensation of fire from heaven has been displaced by the dispensation of the sword of faith.

This narrative, as rendered by the writer of the third gospel, may also be understood as directed against the Apostles at Jerusalem. They wished to be similar zealots for the Jewish dispensation; for even Jesus himself was rejected by the Samaritans, because he was a Jew, and was on his way to Jerusalem. And his disciples regarded

[1] Mat. x. 5. [2] Luke iv. 14. [3] Luke ix. 55.
[4] Comp. 2 Kings i. 9 f. and 1 Kings xviii. 38. [5] Luke xii. 49.

him as a prophet, who in the power of Elijah should come 'to restore all things.'[1]

Entry into Jerusalem.

The writer's predilection for the Gentiles is perhaps no where more strongly marked than in the narrative of Christ's entry into Jerusalem. According to the Gospel after Matthew, 'Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth in Galilee,'[2] is welcomed as 'the son of David,' that is, as the long expected great king of the Jews, the Messiah who had been first foretold by Nathan to David.[3] Not so in the Gospel after Luke. There he is reported to have been on the same occasion greeted as 'the king that cometh in the name of the Lord.'[4] Not 'the multitudes,' which must have consisted principally of Jews, but 'the whole multitude of the disciples' rejoiced with a loud voice. And, as if to imply that the majority of his disciples were Gentiles, he states that there were among the multitude 'some . . Pharisees.' These require Jesus to rebuke his disciples, apparently because the Gentile majority among them had not proclaimed him as the Son of David. The Lord's reply entirely harmonises with the Evangelist's marked predilection for the Gentiles. The sense of Christ's answer is, that if this multitude of his true disciples, including therefore the seventy, 'should hold their peace;' if those from among whom God had raised up children unto Abraham, and who had become the true Israelites, not by birth but by election; if those were not to spread abroad the true gospel of the kingdom, then the prophecy of John the Baptist would have to be fulfilled by the very stones crying out in the very same manner as this 'multitude of his disciples' did now cry out, proclaiming Jesus as the universal Messiah.[5] The multitude of Christ's true disciples, of which, as we shall see, in the opinion of this Evangelist, the seventy formed the originally chosen band, represent therefore the Gentiles. These are hungry and thirsty, not after the letter that killeth, but after the Spirit

[1] Mat. xvii. 10, 11. [2] Mat. xxi. 11, 46. [3] Mat. xxi. 9.
[4] Luke xix. 38. [5] Comp. Luke iii. 8.

CHAP. X.

which giveth life; they desire the righteousness, not by works but by faith, which is the fruit of the Spirit. Unlike the Jews and Jewish Christians and their leaders, they have the saving knowledge of the things belonging to their peace; for, 'being justified *by faith*,' they have 'peace' with God through Jesus Christ.[1] They are made to 'differ'[2] from the Jews, who 'as concerning the gospel are enemies.' These things which have been revealed to babes are hid from the so-called 'wise and prudent (intelligent),' from the eyes of those over whose city the Lord wept, wishing that 'even' Jerusalem, or rather she '*also*,' and not only the cities of the Gentiles, might have this knowledge. But 'blindness in part is happened to Israel,' whilst the fulness of the Gentiles has begun to 'come in.'[3]

We have tried to establish the fact, that it is one of the leading objects of the writer of the Gospel after Luke to prove that the true light of Christ's doctrine has first shone among the Gentiles, whilst the blindness of the Jews shuts out this light. We shall now point out more fully that the Paulinic Evangelist centres his well-founded predilection for the Gentiles in the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and that he does this with a view, not unjustifiable under the circumstances, to diminish the authority of those who were Apostles before Paul, and who but *seemed* to be pillars, whilst hiding the full light of Christ's gospel, which they were to proclaim from the housetops.

8. *The author of the Gospel after Luke has betrayed his tendency to diminish the authority of the twelve Apostles, by the omission or alteration of all those recorded words of Christ, which establish his predilection for those Apostles whom he called during his days in the flesh.*

If the most important part of Christ's doctrine was kept hidden, then the disciple of the one Apostle who had proclaimed the Hidden Wisdom would be naturally led to diminish the authority of the Palestinian Apostles, and even by such means to pave the way for the general

[1] Rom. v. 1. [2] Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 7. [3] Rom. xi. 25.

recognition of the Hidden Wisdom and its Apostle. It was on the exclusion of this wisdom the rulers of the Jewish church insisted, and the Apostles had not the power to oppose them. They did not shrink from recording those public sayings of the Lord which condemned in the strongest manner the conduct of the Pharisees and the doctrine of the Sadducees, yet they could not at once do what their Master commanded them, and instead of publicly revealing the glorious Gospel of Christ, they were by circumstances at first obliged to prevent others from seeing this Hidden Wisdom. We have already pointed out the striking alteration of the passage in the sermon on the mount, where the words of Christ addressed to the twelve Apostles, 'Ye are the light of the world,' are, in the sermon on the plain, altered into the pointed parallel, 'Can the blind lead the blind?'[1] Again, the words, 'Ye are the salt of the earth,' are omitted, and only the latter part of this passage, 'but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned?' is inserted, and that in a different place.[2] The original meaning of this saying has thus been entirely changed, and every element of commendation eradicated.

Parable of the sower.

The tendency of the writer to depreciate the authority of the twelve Apostles may also be traced in that part of the third gospel where the parable of the sower is interpreted.[3] The parable itself, although somewhat differing in form from the version contained in the Gospel after Matthew, is so like the latter, as to render it, in the outset, extremely improbable that the Lord should have, on two distinct occasions, related the parable as it is recorded in the first and the third gospel. To support this assertion, we would point to the fact, that in the interpretation of this parable, as contained in the Gospel after Luke, the Paulinic tendency of the writer is obvious. This is sufficiently shown by the addition of the words: 'lest they should *believe* and be saved,'[4] 'bring no fruit *to*

[1] Luke vi. 39.
[2] Luke xiv. 34.
[3] Luke viii. 12-15.
[4] Comp. Eph. ii. 8.

CHAP. X.

perfection,'[1] 'reap it (the word) and bring forth fruit with patience.'[2] Faith in the innate power of God, in the Divine word, is necessary in order to keep it, and particularly to develop unto perfection the indwelling germ of Divine fruit. The conclusion of the interpretation seems to give to the parable a sense somewhat different from the original. Its purport may be thus expressed. 'I have now given you the interpretation of the parable, because to you is intrusted the mission, as lights of the world,[3] to spread abroad my truth among mankind. Now, 'no man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed, but setteth it on a candlestick, that they which enter in *may see the light. For nothing is secret which shall not be made manifest*,[4] *neither anything hid that shall not be known and come abroad.* Take heed therefore how ye hear' my words, and try to find their full and true meaning. 'For whosoever hath' this right judgment respecting the spirit of truth, 'to him shall be given' more abundantly such treasures of his heart, and he shall grow 'from faith to faith'[5] being 'strengthened with might' by the Spirit of God 'in the inner man.'[6] 'But whosoever hath not (the inner light), from him shall be taken even that which he *seemeth* to have.'[7]

In the parallel passages,[8] the Apostles seem to be even more clearly referred to as among those 'of his disciples' who are warned to beware *for themselves* 'of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy;' whilst, according to Matthew, he bade them beware of 'the doctrine' of the Pharisees and Sadducees.[9] Those who were, according to Matthew, called by the Lord 'the lights of the world,' are indirectly warned to take heed that the light which is in them 'be not darkness.'[10] And they are clearly in-

[1] Comp. Luke vi. 40; Eph. iv. 13; Col. i. 28.
[2] Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 12.
[3] Mat. v. 14.
[4] Comp. Col. i. 2-27; Gal. iii. 23.
[5] Rom. i. 17.
[6] Ephes. iii. 16.
[7] Luke viii. 16–18; comp. Gal. ii. 9. Mat. xvi. 12.
[8] Luke xi. 33–36; xii. 1–3.
[10] Luke xi. 35.

cluded among those to whom the Lord said: 'Whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness *shall be* heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken *in the ear in closets shall be* proclaimed upon the housetops.'[1] By comparing this important passage with the parallel one in Matthew,[2] it will become evident, that, in the opinion of the Paulinic writer, the Lord had *not* commanded his Apostles that *they* proclaim 'in light' what he had told them 'in the ear' and 'in darkness.' For *they* had *not* fully understood his sayings, some of which were 'hid from them, that they perceived it not.'[3] They had covered the hidden wisdom, and prevented those who entered in from seeing the light. Therefore, *others* shall proclaim upon the housetops what the twelve Apostles and their followers have heard spoken in darkness, and in the ear in closets. There can be no doubt but that Luke intended hereby to refer to Paul, who had first preached 'the hidden wisdom' and its application, the gospel which should '*afterwards*' be revealed, and which was *hidden* from the world at large ever since it was created.

Ten lepers.

Here we must also refer to the ten lepers,[4] of whom but one was led by the indwelling Spirit of God to discern that he had not been healed solely by showing himself 'unto the priests,' but by 'Christ, the power of God.' This one faithful servant, therefore, 'forgetting the things which are behind,' turned back from the ways of the law, pressed forward 'to the mark of our high calling, which is in Christ Jesus,' and in the enjoyment of 'the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free,'[5] being 'justified by faith, and having peace with God,'[6] he glorified God 'with a loud voice,' and 'fell down on his face' at the feet of Jesus, just as Paul did at his conversion. Although a heathen and 'a stranger,'[7] he gave thanks to the physician of the soul. Such faith was not found in Israel; for this people and

[1] xii. 3. [2] Mat. x. 27. [3] Luke ix. 45. [4] Luke xvii. 11–19.
[5] Gal. v. 1. [6] Rom. v. 1. [7] Comp. Acts i. 21.

CHAP. X.

their guides, like the nine lepers, consider it sufficient to keep the ordinances of the law, without believing in Him who is 'the power of God,' in whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,'[1] and who as the incarnate Word is able to save the soul.[2] Perhaps nowhere are the twelve Apostles more directly charged with acting contrary to the Lord's commands than in the parable of the talents, which we have already considered. For here one of Christ's servants is accused with having *hidden* the treasure intrusted to him, and in his excuse he accuses his Master of being an austere man, since (as the parable implies) he had likewise hidden the treasure, instead of laying it down and of sowing broadcast for the benefit of all what he had but secretly communicated to those few to whom it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God.

Parable of the talents.

Judas Iscariot

We cannot omit here to refer to that part of the history of our Lord's passion which contains the account of the last supper. In the first place we are struck with what appears to be an unmeaning alteration. According to the account in Matthew, the traitor is pointed out by the Lord *before* the institution of the supper,[3] and the supposition is admissible that he left the room before it took place. But in Luke it is expressly implied that Judas was present to the last; for it is not till after the words about this rite have been spoken that Christ is here reported to have said: 'The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.'[4] It is as if the writer had in his mind the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, where, in his account of the Lord's supper, the Apostle twice warns against unworthily partaking of the same.[5] Certain it is, that in Luke's account Judas is represented as a warning example of the truth of Paul's admonition, and that, as is here implied, he brought upon him his judgment, at least in part, by the unworthy participation of the rite instituted by his Divine Master.

[1] Col. ii. 9. [2] James i. 21. [3] xxvi. 25.
[4] Luke xxii. 21. [5] 1 Cor. xi. 27–29.

Not only is Judas shown to have been 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' although he was one of the original disciples, a fact which in Luke's narrative is twice affirmed, but Judas has also, by such unworthy participation of so sacred a rite, eaten and drunk damnation to himself. This damnation is unqualified and eternal, as may be inferred from the record in Luke, though not from that in Matthew. In the first gospel we are told that Judas 'repented himself,' that whilst returning to the chief priests and elders the thirty pieces of silver, he said: 'I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood,' and that he 'went and hanged himself.'[1] Judas is therefore here delineated as not utterly unworthy of pity; nor is he excluded from the 'many' for whose 'remission of sins' Christ's blood has been shed.[2] But in Luke this promise of atonement is omitted, as if the writer had intended to imply that in the presence of this treacherous Apostle such words could not have been spoken.[3] And while Matthew relates that the chief priests bought a potter's field with the money which Judas returned,[4] Luke implies that he kept the money; and we are told in the Acts that he 'purchased a field with the reward of iniquity.'[5] Again, in the third gospel and in the Acts we miss every trace of Judas's repentance and despair. God's avenging hand makes him to fall headlong, perhaps on his field of blood, so that 'he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.' Such is the 'damnation,' which Judas had drunk unto himself. Had he betrayed to the Pharisees the secret doctrine which the Lord had either whispered into the ear of his disciples, or communicated in the darkness of the night to such men as Nicodemus? We know not. But unless we accept this supposition, it is inexplicable how Judas could have been bribed by the Pharisees to 'betray' his Master, whose whereabouts and whose person were of course sufficiently

[1] Mat. xxvii. 3–10. [2] Mat. xxvi. 28. [3] Luke xxii. 20.
[4] xxvii. 7. [5] Acts i. 18.

CHAP. X.

known to the suspicious and persecuting rulers of the Jewish church. The sin of Judas was to have betrayed to the latter the fact that Christ taught a forbidden doctrine, and the nature of the same. This was sufficient to unite the different influential parties among the Jews, and to lead to Christ's summary condemnation, on the plea of his having declared himself to be the Son of God, the Messiah; a crime which the Pharisees had determined to punish with death. Judas had indeed betrayed innocent blood, and by so doing he had sinned against the Holy Ghost.

Dispute.

Again, whilst Matthew describes the disciples as having been 'exceeding sorrowful,'[1] in consequence of the announcement of the death and betrayal of their Lord, in Luke's account they are inquiring among themselves, as it were in cold blood, 'which of them it was that should do this thing.'[2] And as if such deed of treachery, committed by one out of their own circle, did not affect them as a body, they in their self-righteousness quarrel among themselves, 'which of them should be accounted the greatest.' This passage ought to be translated: 'which of them *seemed* to be the greatest;' for here the same word is used which Paul repeatedly uses when directly or indirectly referring to the twelve Apostles.[3] The same word occurs in another passage of this Epistle: 'if a man think himself (or seemeth) to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.'[4] And, indeed, the twelve Apostles, who consider themselves, or are by others considered, as transcendently great, and pillars of the Church, are in the Gospel after Luke, and in the narrative of one of the most solemn occasions, represented as being as bad as the Pharisees; they are denounced by the Lord as those who, though 'highly esteemed among men,' are yet 'abomination in the sight of God,' who 'knoweth their hearts.'[5]

Peter.

In the first place we have to observe that Luke omits to

[1] Mat. xxvi. 22. [2] Luke xxii. 23. [3] Gal. ii. 2, 6, 9.
[4] Gal. vi. 3; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11; x. 12. [5] Luke xvi. 15.

mention that Jesus declared Peter blessed, because the Father had revealed to him the true relation between the Father and the Son.[1] The same Evangelist implies that Peter cannot be one of Christ's true disciples, unless he is 'converted,'[2] which he is not then, and will not be, if he is wanting in faith, if he does not proclaim the glorious gospel of Christ about justification by faith, and without the works of the law. Again, Peter's denial of Christ is not only recorded here immediately after the promises about the thrones;[3] but his declaration that he is 'ready' to go with him 'both into prison and to death,' immediately precedes the Lord's announcement of his denial, thus showing how little he relied on the firmness of Peter. And, as if to render the weakness of this Apostle more apparent, he is, according to this Evangelist, addressed in the verse immediately following by the name of 'Peter,' that is 'rock,' although this appellation is not used by our Lord anywhere else in any part of the four gospels, if we except the one passage in which he said to Simon, the son of Jona, that in consequence of his confession he was 'Peter,'[4] and one other passage which refers to this.[5] It is as if the Lord had said unto him: 'Thou *rock*, three times shalt thou deny me before the cock crows once.' Such is the character of the Apostle of the rock-confession on which Christ promised to build his Church, and against which the gates of hell should not prevail; a declaration for which we vainly look in the third gospel.[6] Having thus, by implication, lowered the authority of this Apostle, we cannot be surprised to find that the same Evangelist has narrated Simon's confession of Christ in such a manner as somewhat to render it less clearly defined. For, instead of 'thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,'[7] we read in Luke, 'Thou art the Christ of God.'[8] The writer seems to be

[1] Luke ix. 20 f.; Mat. xvi. 17 f.
[2] Luke xxii. 32.
[3] Luke xxii. 30 f.; comp. Mat. xxvi. 30 f.
[4] Mat. xvi. 18.
[5] Luke vi 14.
[6] See Luke ix. 20 f.
[7] Mat. xvi. 16.
[8] Luke ix. 20.

CHAP. X.

guided by the same tendency, when he omits to state that Peter was intrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

The twelve.

Again, the Lord's injunction addressed to the twelve, that whoever will come after him must take up his cross and follow him, may be understood, according to Matthew's account, to refer to Peter's crucifixion; but in Luke this inference is rendered impossible by the addition of the word 'daily,'[1] which points rather to an allegorical explanation of the Lord's words.[2] Nor is it reported in the Gospel after Luke that, according to Christ's promise, 'where two or three are gathered' in his name, there he will be in the midst of them.[3] The reason for this omission may be, that the discourse of which the above passage forms a part was addressed to the twelve Apostles, and that consequently it might be presumed that the Lord wished to refer to two or three of the twelve. Also, the Lord is not reported, in the third gospel, to have stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, calling them brothers and sisters;[4] but it is here stated that he spoke quite generally of all who 'hear the Word of God and do it;' stating that these are his brethren.[5] Nor is it stated in this gospel, with reference to the twelve Apostles, that they understood the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;[6] but rather contrariwise, it is asserted that they were 'fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken,'[7] and that they understood not the necessity and importance of Christ's death.[8] According to Matthew's account, the disciples, during the tempest on the sea, say to their Master, 'Lord, *save us*, we perish;'[9] but in Luke this proof of their faith is omitted, and the frightened disciples are only reported to have exclaimed, 'Master, master, we perish.'[10] And whilst in the first account the

[1] ix. 23.
[2] Comp. John xxi. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 31; 2 Cor. iv. 10; Gal. vi. 17; ii. 20; Rom. i. 16.
[3] Mat. xviii. 20.
[4] Mat. xii. 19–50.
[5] Luke viii. 21.
[6] Mat. xiii. 11.
[7] Luke xxiv. 25.
[8] ix. 45; xviii. 34.
[9] Mat. viii. 25.
[10] Luke viii. 24.

Lord is represented as having reproved his disciples because 'of their *little faith*,'[1] in the other account he is reported to have said to them, '*Where is* your faith?'[2]

Transfiguration.

The variations in the two accounts of the transfiguration are likewise evidences of the same tendency.[3] According to the third gospel, instead of being 'transfigured' during his prayer, 'the fashion of his countenance was altered,' and Moses and Elias, instead of merely 'talking with him,' the one as the originator and the other as the defender of the Jewish law, appeared 'in glory,[4] and spake of his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.' Hereby it is probably implied[5] that whilst Moses 'put a veil over his face,' when proclaiming the beginning of the law, *this veil was now removed*, and he appeared 'in glory,' to announce that Christ's death would be 'the end of that which is abolished.' And as the minds of the children of Israel remained 'blinded,' so also the disciples witnessing this transcendent scene were blinded, being 'heavy with sleep,' and they did not at once awake to the beholding of Christ's glory, not being able to discern the Lord's body, because of their being enveloped by the mere 'shadow of things to come.'[6] And this could not have been otherwise, since 'the handwriting of ordinances' was in full force, and not 'abolished' till Christ nailed the same 'to his cross.'[7] Having thus described the death of Christ, now so near at hand, to be the end of the law (and therefore also of the passover rite), the Evangelist could not, of course, insert the passage recorded in the first gospel about Elias, who was expected to return, 'and restore all things.'[8] For how was it to be conceived possible that the law would first be abolished and then restored? Even the disciples 'understood not' the true meaning of this revelation, it being 'hid from them, that they perceived it not.' No wonder, then, that '*they kept it close*

[1] Mat. viii. 26. [2] Luke viii. 25. [3] Mat. xvii. 1–9; Luke ix. 28–36.
[4] Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 7 f. [5] Comp. 2 Cor. 3, 13 f.
[6] Col. ii. 17. [7] Col. ii. 14. [8] Mat. xvii. 11.

CHAP. X.

and told no man in those days *any of those things which they had seen.*'[1]

The friends of Christ.

Again, in the Gospel after Luke, it seems to be implied that, like the Pharisees, the twelve Apostles are hypocrites.[2] His true disciples are warned not to fear men, not to deny their Lord, which even the rock-Apostle did, and to beware of covetousness.[3] Christ here speaks 'first of all' to his disciples, although an 'innumerable multitude,' or myriads of people, were gathered together. He tells them, that is, the disciples, that, like the leaven of the Pharisees, hypocrisy may be hid for a time, but that it shall be brought to light and known. It is not well to 'dissemble,' like the hypocrites at Jerusalem,[4] for there shall be 'nothing hid that shall not be known; but contrariwise, whatsoever ye (my true disciples) have spoken in (the midst of) darkness shall be heard in the light.'[5] 'And that which ye have spoken in the ear in the closets[6] shall be proclaimed on the housetops,' when the hidden mystery of the gospel of Christ shall be revealed by his true disciples, who are the 'friends' of Christ. Ere long 'his servant'[7] will reveal him as the 'light to lighten the Gentiles,' and this true Apostle of Him who was shortly to die and rise again would be permitted to say of himself, 'We are not as many[8] *which corrupt the Word of God*, but as of sincerity, but as of God, *in the sight of God speak we in Christ.*'[9] And again: '*We have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty*, not walking in craftiness, *nor handling the Word of God deceitfully*, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.'[10] That Apostle is an example who 'fainted not,' and who 'neither feared nor gave place by subjection' to those 'which were of the circumcision,' . . . 'that the truth of the gospel might continue,'

[1] Comp. Mark xvi. 8.
[2] xii. 1.; comp. Gal. ii. 13.
[3] Luke xii.; comp. Mat. xvi.
[4] Comp. Gal. ii. 14.
[5] Comp. Mat. x. 27.
[6] Comp. Gal. ii. 2.
[7] Luke xiv. 17.
[8] Comp. Phil. iii. 18.
[9] 2 Cor. ii. 17.
[10] 2 Cor. iv. 2.

that is, the truth of Christ's Hidden Wisdom. Therefore, in the Paulinic gospel, Christ is reported to have said that his true disciples and true friends are not to fear and follow them who 'sit in Moses' seat,' nor those who live like the Pharisees and Sadducees. For these are such as, when the body is killed, 'have no more that they can do,' inasmuch as they are not 'rooted in faith.' But let Christ's enlightened disciples fear Satan, for he 'hath power to cast into hell,' and 'has desired to have' even one of those who 'seemed to be pillars,' yea, the very Apostle of the rock-confession, who yet denied his Master before men.

Peter and Paul.

The true disciples of Christ, having been warned against hypocrisy, are now told by the Lord in a parable to 'beware of covetousness.'[1] As in the former part of this chapter, so in the following, Peter seems to be indirectly alluded to as the representative of the Apostles. The rich man,[2] whose ground brought forth plentifully, may be taken to refer to Peter, who requests his Master that 'his brother' Paul may be made to 'divide the inheritance' with him. But the Lord in his answer implies that he cannot recognise this strife among his disciples, who ought not to be like members of two hostile parties requiring a mediator, but who ought to be as one in God their common head. This interpretation of the parable will be deemed admissible so long as the fact is not denied that ever since the days of Paul there have been two parties in the Church, the one based on the principle of justification by the works of the law, and the weightier matters of the law, the other on justification by faith without the works of the law.[3] The epistles of Paul establish this fact beyond all contradiction, and the comparison between the first and the third gospel fully confirms it. Paul complains especially of Peter, that he, 'being a Jew,' compelled 'the Gentiles to live as do the Jews.'[4] Again Paul says, that he, 'as a wise master builder,' has 'laid the foundation, and another buildeth

[1] Luke xii. 15; comp. 2 Cor. xii. 13–18.
[2] Comp. Luke xvi. 19.
[3] Comp. Rom. iii. 28; James ii. 14.
[4] Gal. ii. 14.

CHAP. X.

thereon.'[1] And he adds, that, whilst 'some' measure themselves 'by themselves,' God has distributed to him a measure to reach even unto the Gentiles, for that he does not stretch himself beyond his measure, having come as far as the Corinthians in preaching the Gospel of Christ. Without boasting 'of other men's labours,' he hopes, when true faith shall be increased among them, that he shall be still more enlarged in his measure, and be enabled to preach the gospel in the regions beyond them.[2] But whilst this was Paul's conduct, Peter's conduct resembles that of the rich man,[3] who not having within the narrow measure of his ministry any room where to bestow his fruits, instead of enlarging the field of his labour, enlarged his barns, and being covetous, bestowed all his fruits and his goods on his own nation, at least for a time. Now, if, after having '*much goods laid up* for many years,' Peter's Lord were to come and demand his soul, that is the account of his stewardship, when he in the least expects it, 'whose shall those things be' which he has provided or hoarded up? Shall the Lord find faith?

Unprofitable servant.

We have already pointed out that, according to the account contained in the third gospel, the Lord addressed the twelve Apostles as if they had no faith at all.[4] The Apostles having asked the Lord to 'increase' their faith, the latter is in Luke reported to have answered them in such a manner as to show that in his opinion they had not even so little faith 'as a grain of mustard seed.' They have still to learn, if they do not know it, that the true faith consists in justification *without* the deeds which are commanded by the law. In a parable the Lord tells his chosen servants that he will not thank them because they did 'the things that were commanded.' For although they may have done 'all those things' which the law commands, yet they are to know and confess themselves

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 10. [2] 2 Cor. x. 12–18; comp. xii. 16; Gal. i. 6, 7; Rom. xv. 20.
[3] Comp. Luke xvi. 19. [4] viii. 25; comp. Mat. viii. 26.

as '*unprofitable servants*,'[1] for they do not turn to profit the goods secretly intrusted to their stewardship.

The Seventy.

The twelve Apostles having no faith in the world-conquering power of the true gospel of Christ, and not having brought to light the hidden treasure, Jesus is in the third gospel reported to have chosen seventy other disciples,[2] who, as can be inferred from the fourth gospel, may possibly have been chosen even from among the Gentile Samaritans.[3] It is a circumstance difficult to be accounted for, that the highly important event here narrated is not recorded or indirectly alluded to in any other of the gospels or even in Paul's epistles. We cannot explain this by the fact that Philo and other Alexandrian writers refer to the notion entertained by many, that, at the time of the promulgation of the law on Sinai, the voice of God, through the instrumentality of the air, was at once communicated and interpreted to the *seventy* nations of the world. At all events we know that Moses chose seventy elders of Israel,[4] and that he expressed a wish 'that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them.'[5] It would seem as if the Evangelist considered these seventy disciples as the true labourers in the Lord's vineyard. For the writer of the Gospel after Luke applies to them the beautiful words with which Matthew introduces the election of the twelve Apostles: 'The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth labourers into his harvest.'[6] And in order that the true character of Christ's true gospel should be clearly understood, it is here shown that the time has come to an end when the law was to be the schoolmaster, or rather the slave leading to the school of Christ.[7] The seventy disciples of the universal religion

[1] Luke xvii. 5-10.
[2] Luke x. 1.
[3] Comp. John iv. 39-41; Mat. x. 5.
[4] Ex. xxiv. 1.
[5] Num. xi. 29.
[6] Mat. ix. 35-38.
[7] Comp. 'the Gospel revealed to Paul;' comp. Gal. iii. 23, 24.

CHAP. X.

are to eat and drink such things as may be set before them.[1] It is impossible to deny that this twice-repeated injunction may refer to Peter's blameable conduct at Antioch, where he 'did eat with the Gentiles,' till those came who had been sent by James, and to whose remonstrances Peter, so unlike Paul, 'gave place by subjection.'[2] But, as Paul writes, 'The kingdom of God is not meat and drink,'[3] and the disciples of the 'other gospel' have 'power to eat and to drink, the law notwithstanding.'[4]

Like Paul, the seventy disciples are to be separated from those who, like Peter, 'separated' themselves from the uncircumcision, 'fearing them which were of the circumcision.'[5] They are not to be 'yoked together with unbelievers,'[6] but, being sent forth 'as lambs among wolves,' they are to 'salute no man on the way.' Had not Paul received 'the hand of fellowship,' and possibly, 'the brotherly kiss' of salutation, from those who seemed to be pillars at Jerusalem? And yet, it was some time before the twelve Apostles assisted Paul in the open proclamation of the hidden wisdom of Christ. Those who do not receive these seventy messengers, who go before the Lord's face to prepare his way, are here expressly designated as doomed to perdition in the day of judgment. For so irresistible is the power they are furnished with, that even the devils are subject unto them; that even Satan himself is now fallen as lightning from heaven. How inferior was the power which was granted to the twelve Apostles, who could not cure even a lunatic![7] From those who 'commend themselves,'[8] from the 'wise and prudent,' from the self-confident guides of the blind,[9] these things are hid, and they are revealed unto the simple.[10] They constitute '*the mystery which hath been hid*

[1] Luke x. 7, 8. [2] Gal. ii. 12, 5. [3] Rom. xiv. 17.
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 4. [5] Gal. ii. 12. [6] 2 Cor. vi. 14–17.
[7] Mat. xvii. 16. [8] 2 Cor. x. 12. [9] Rom. ii. 17–19.
[10] Comp. 1 Cor. i. 18; ii. 16.

from eternity and ever of old, but now is made manifest' to the saints, that is 'the mystery among the Gentiles,'[1] 'that the Gentiles should be fellowheirs and of the same body, and partakers of God's promise in Christ by the gospel.'[2] Accordingly, it is implied that the seventy disciples, instead of the twelve,[3] were called blessed for seeing the things which they saw, *though they were hidden in times past, and hidden even by the Apostles of the circumcision*, who not unlike the rest were 'shut up unto the faith which should *afterwards* be revealed,' and which was first revealed by Paul.

Resurrection.

Again, in the account of the resurrection as contained in the Gospel after Luke, the same tendency of the writer is traceable, to lessen the importance of the relations between the Lord and his first-chosen Apostles, and to lower their authority. We consider, first, the corresponding account in the first gospel. It is evident that the purport of the words which in Matthew are reported to have been spoken by the angel,[4] or by the Lord himself, is to honour and glorify the eleven Apostles; for the expressions 'his disciples' and 'my brethren'[5] can only refer to 'the eleven disciples' who went into Galilee, there to meet him. These being repeatedly called his 'brethren,' we can readily conceive why, in Matthew, we hear nothing about a subsequent outpouring of the Spirit of God, through which they were to be endued, after Christ's resurrection, with 'power from on high.'[6] Christ's spirit, the Spirit of God, has already been given to them, and has enabled them to discern him as 'the Son of the living God.' They are, therefore, already 'moved by the Spirit of God,' and consequently 'children of God,' Christ's brethren, and 'joint heirs' with him. Accordingly, a visible ascension is not necessary for the strengthening of their faith. Jesus, the Messiah, who is to come again to judge the world,[7] has already been raised to the right

[1] Col. i. 26, 27. [2] Eph. iii. 1-6. [3] Luke x. 23. [4] Mat. xxviii. 5-7.
[5] Comp. xii. 49, 50. [6] Luke xxiv. 49. [7] Mat. xxv. 31-46.

CHAP. X.

hand of God; and the angel at the empty grave has called him 'the Lord.' Having invisibly ascended into heaven, the reappearing risen Saviour gives his final confirmatory instructions to the eleven Apostles, and full authority to make all nations his disciples, through water-baptism, that is, in the same manner in which the proselytes at the gate were transferred from the Gentile to the Jewish dispensation. As through this ancient Jewish rite the Gentiles had been admitted into the typical kingdom of God, and thus had been made to acknowledge the letter of the law; so now, baptised in the Divine Name or Spirit, they were to be admitted into Christ's kingdom, and taught to observe the commandments which the Apostles had received of Him. Thus instructed, they were to read between the lines of the engrafted word, to learn and observe 'the weightier matters of the law,' and thus to perform the deeds of the law in accordance with the dictates of a more enlightened conscience. These new commandments would by the Jewish Christians be thought to be all contained in the sermon on the mount, which the Lord addressed to his twelve disciples on that very same mountain, the new Sinai, where the faithful eleven assembled, as the Lord had appointed, and where they saw and worshipped Him. There they received the promise, that the Lord would be with them 'even unto the end of the world:' a promise which, without referring to a new communication from above, assured them of the all-sufficiency of the instructions and authority they had received already.[1]

Paulinic version.

If we now compare the last chapter in Luke with the last chapter in Matthew, to which we have now referred, we shall find that the preferential position assigned to the Apostles in the first gospel has, in the parallel account, been deprived of its principal elements. Thus the account of the resurrection is communicated not only to 'the eleven,' but also 'to all the rest' of his disciples,

[1] Mat. xxviii. 19, 20.

including therefore the seventy, who were, according to the third gospel, commanded to preach the gospel to all nations. And the 'two men . . . in shining garments,'[1] who remind us of Moses and Elias at the transfiguration,[2] do not commission the women at the grave to announce the resurrection to the disciples generally, and still less to the eleven exclusively. Nor is it here recorded that Jesus appeared to the Apostles, in order to confirm them in their mission, and refer to them as 'his brethren.' Such an apparition of the risen Jesus, and such a confirmation of the gospel which his chosen Apostles were commissioned to preach, may have been considered by the Paulinic Evangelist as circumstances calculated rather to diminish than to enhance the peculiar honour reserved to Paul, of receiving a new revelation from the risen Christ, and of being commanded to proclaim 'another' gospel, that is the Hidden Wisdom of Christ. Again, lest it should be thought that the risen Saviour had expressed a preference for Galilee, it is not stated in this account that the Lord would go before his disciples *into* Galilee; but the women are told to remember how he spoke unto them '*when he was yet in* Galilee.' It is also difficult not to see a tendency to lower the character and authority of the Apostles in the statement, that the words of the women about the resurrection 'seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.'

Power from on high.

Again, whilst, according to Matthew, any new revelation appears unnecessary for those with whom Christ would be 'alway, even unto the end of the world,' the risen Lord is reported in the third gospel to have referred, in the presence of his disciples, to the words which he spoke while he was yet with them, and in such a manner as to imply that his recorded sayings were not sufficient for their future guidance.[3] For even the words of his which referred to the Scriptures, the Apostles could not have fully understood, if the risen Saviour had not '*opened their understanding*;'

[1] Luke xxiv. 4, 23. [2] Luke ix. 29-31; comp. Acts i. 10. [3] xxiv. 44.

CHAP. X.

and ere long they shall be endued with 'power from on high.' They are therefore not to continue in their darkness, and prevent others from seeing even that imperfect light which was intrusted to them. It is as if the Evangelist had directly referred to the new or supplementary gospel of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ which Paul proclaimed by Divine command. He it was who was chosen as an instrument for enduing the Apostles with 'power from on high.' To Paul, therefore, refers the Lord's prophecy here recorded about the 'promise' of the Father, and which seems to be the promise first made to Abraham, that salvation is for 'all nations.' 'The day-spring from on high' which has 'visited' the earth, the perfect incarnation and organ of the Holy Ghost, announces a 'power from on high,' which shall lead the forlorn Apostles into all truth. It is not even implied in this Paulinic gospel, that the promised power from on high, the Divine Spirit, would be communicated to the Apostles and to the world, not through the direct instrumentality of the risen Christ, but through the instrumentality of another advocate hereafter to be called. But we shall show that, in the Gospel after John, this prophecy is again referred to, and that Paul may by some have been regarded as the 'other comforter' or advocate, who should convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.[1]

In the account about the resurrection, as also in other parts of Luke's gospel, which we have already considered, it would seem to have been the especial object of the disciple and companion of Paul to lower the authority of Peter, who had proved himself to have been of all the Apostles at Jerusalem the most dangerous rival of the Apostle to the Gentiles.[2] According to the Gospel after Luke, Peter runs to the grave, but finds only the linen clothes; so that, without seeing the Lord, he departs in wonder and amazement, not having found the 'living

[1] See 'the Gospel after John.'

[2] Gal. ii. 11–14.

among the dead' and 'wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.'[1] Following Paul's account[2] about the risen Lord's apparitions, which Luke must have borne in mind, the writer ought to have mentioned first the apparition to Peter. Instead of doing this, he first records the apparition to two disciples, who were met by the Lord on the road between Jerusalem and Emmaus, which is the shortest way they could have chosen to go into Galilee.[3] These disciples belonged to that corporation which was composed of 'the eleven and all the rest' of the disciples. One of them, Cleophas (Clopas, or Alphæus), may be identified with the husband of Mary, sister to the mother of Jesus,[4] and mother of James the Little, Joses, Jude, Simon, and their sisters. It is a mere assumption, that Cleophas may have died before Jesus, who would naturally be considered as the cousin or brother of James, whether or not the two sisters inhabited the same house. James might be called the little or the younger, in order to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee and the Apostle. Yet the difficulty which arises from the distinguishing of two individuals, one as the chosen Apostle, and the other, although not an original Apostle, as the chosen head of the Apostles at Jerusalem, is very great. James the son of Alphæus, and James the son of Zebedee, may therefore be identified. Paul seems to have done this, for he writes that during his first visit to Jerusalem he saw none other of the Apostles, save James the Lord's brother, and Peter. According to Eusebius, James was 'called the brother of the Lord, because he is also called the son of Joseph.'[5]

Since Paul distinctly states that the Lord appeared to James,[6] it is not unreasonable to suppose that Cleophas and his son James were the two disciples to whom he appeared on the way to Emmaus.[7] This supposition is

[1] Luke xxiv. 12.
[2] 1 Cor. xv.
[3] Comp. Mat. xxviii. 16; John iv. 3, 4.
[4] John xix. 25.
[5] H. E. ii. 1.
[6] 1 Cor. xv. 7.
[7] Comp. Mark xvi. 12.

CHAP. X.

confirmed by an account which Jerome has transmitted to us,[1] and which he found in 'the Gospel of the Hebrews.' He states that James solemnly engaged, after he had partaken of the last paschal meal with the Lord, that he would fast until he should see Him again after His resurrection. The risen Christ, having appeared to him, said: 'Now eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from the dead.' The intimate connection between the two accounts is evident. For we know from Hegesippus that James was a very strict Jew, and, as such, it was natural for him to expect that Jesus, as the promised terrestrial Messiah, would have 'redeemed Israel.' Both James and his father Cleophas must have been 'sad' that the Lord had died without accomplishing the Messianic destiny. Remembering his command to go to Galilee, where He would meet them on the third day, when His resurrection might be expected to take place, they both went the straightest way towards that country. Jesus met them on the road, but 'their eyes were holden, that they should not know him.' The Lord reproves them for their wrong kind of faith, which made them believe '*all* that the prophets have spoken,' and He expounds to them the true and spiritual meaning of the law and the prophets, according to which Christ must have 'suffered these things' and entered 'into His glory.' Yet the eyes of these strict observers of the law were not opened, until 'He took bread and blessed it, and brake and gave them.' This was the literal fulfilment of His promise, that He would after His resurrection 'eat anew' the passover with His disciples. It was therefore the Lord Himself, according to this account, who caused James to break his fast. Having now no object in going to Galilee, both he and his father returned to Jerusalem, where they found 'the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them.'

This latter passage, if taken literally, would render the

[1] De Vir. Ill. cap. 2.

supposition untenable, that James the Apostle was one of those two disciples who walked to Emmaus. For if on their return they found 'the eleven gathered together,' neither of the two disciples could have been one of the eleven. But we must bear in mind that the Evangelist could just as well speak of the eleven without James as Paul did of the twelve without Judas. On the whole it is therefore highly probable that James was the disciple who accompanied Cleophas to Emmaus. At all events it is sufficiently clear that the account of the apparitions is in Luke but a slightly modified reproduction of Paul's account, although he does not mention the apparition to Peter as having been the first,[1] and although he omits altogether the apparition to 'the twelve' alone, whom Paul here seems to distinguish from '*all* the Apostles.' For as in Paul's account the apparition to James is preceded, amongst others, by the one to Peter, and is followed by the apparition to 'all the Apostles;' so in Luke's account, the apparition to the disciples at Emmaus, or, as we may suppose, to Cleophas and James, is preceded by the one to Simon, and followed, though not directly, by the apparition to 'the eleven and them that were with them.'

No water-baptism.

Another circumstance which, highly significant as it is in other respects, betrays the Evangelist's tendency to lower the authority of the Apostles at Jerusalem, is the fact that in the Gospel after Luke there is not to be found the slightest mention of, or allusion to, baptism as practised or enjoined either by the Lord or his disciples. If, therefore, the Apostles insisted on water-baptism, they did so without the Lord's authority, according to what the third gospel seems to imply. This omission of baptism is all the more important, inasmuch as Paul boasts that Christ sent him, '*not to baptise, but to preach the gospel.*'[2]

[1] This incident may refer to the fact, that Peter was the first among the Apostles who was led to recognise Christ as the Son of the living God, the full light of which revelation did not shine on him or any of the twelve till after Christ's death, when Simon was caught in the net.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 17.

CHAP. X.

Again, the omission of the Lord's injunction, that the Apostles should continue to observe 'all things whatsoever' he commanded them, may have been regarded by the Paulinic Evangelist as little in accordance with the new revelation so soon afterwards made to Paul by the same risen Christ. Again, instead of meeting the eleven on a mountain in Galilee, Christ leads 'the eleven and them that were with them' from Jerusalem to Bethany, and, having blessed them, parted from them, *all* the disciples worshiping him; whilst some of the eleven are reported in Matthew to have 'doubted.'

The parallel passages which we have been just considering strongly confirm the fact conveyed by the epistles of Paul, that a party spirit at first prevailed between him and the Apostles at Jerusalem. Nor could this be otherwise, seeing that the latter, as a body, continued to misunderstand the secret doctrine of the Lord, and did not proclaim it to the world. Paul's gospel remained for some time what it had been in the beginning, 'another gospel,' and the 'Jesus' whom he preached continued to be 'another Jesus.' This sufficiently explains the painful fact, that, in trying to harmonise the original gospel-record with the principles of the Lord's secret doctrine as revealed by Paul, even such a person as Luke could not help, in the interest of truth, purposely, though indirectly, lowering the authority of the twelve Apostles.

9. *In the Gospel after Luke, Paul is indirectly, but clearly, alluded to as the first of Christ's Apostles.*

We may first observe, that the appointment of the seventy disciples to preach the gospel to the seventy nations of the earth, is an act which typifies and lays the foundation for the mission of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and prepares the way before him. Again, Christ is, in the Gospel after Luke, shown to have been born, to have lived, to have died, and to have been raised from the dead, in strict accordance with Paul's views about the universal Messiah. All the words of Christ, as reported by

Matthew the Apostle, which do not confirm or support Paul's doctrine, have been, as we have shown, either omitted or altered, or displaced by others more in harmony with his teaching. We have now first to consider the version contained in Luke of the parable about the marriage of the king's son.[1] Whilst, according to Matthew, 'a certain king which made a marriage for his son' sends out '*his servants*;' according to Luke, 'a certain man made a great supper . . . and sent *his servant*.' The parable, in the first account, would seem to imply that God the Father, 'the King of Kings,'[2] made a marriage for his Son Jesus, and sent out his servants, the twelve Apostles, 'to call them that were bidden,' that is, God's chosen people, 'to the wedding,' or to the spiritual kingdom. But the parable, as related in the other account, speaks of 'a certain man,' who is not defined as being a father, or as having a son, and who, therefore, may be considered as the risen Son of God, who is equal, that is, in the Spirit identical, with God.[3] This man sends out his one servant, Paul,[4] to communicate the invitation of the new gospel 'to them that were bidden,' that is, to the Jews first,[5] all things being '*now* ready.' But the Jews 'with one consent,' refused to come to the 'great supper of the universal Messiah; their 'King of the Jews' had been crucified, and he would come again to set up his kingdom in Israel, and to appoint his twelve chosen Apostles to sit on twelve thrones, and to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. They demanded that the Gentiles should 'live as do the Jews,'[6] that they should be clothed in the wedding garment of the law and its ordinances; therefore they could not come and join 'sinners of the Gentiles.'[7] Those who had been first bidden having rejected the invitation, the faithful servant now acts in the spirit of Christ's injunction, as reported by the third Evangelist in the same

The King's Son.

[1] Luke xiv. 16–24; comp. Mat. xxii. 1–14.
[2] 1 Tim. vi. 15. [3] Comp. Rom. xiv. 10, 11. [4] Rom. i. 1.
[5] Comp. Gal. ii. 2; Rom. i. 16. [6] Gal. ii. 14. [7] Gal. ii. 15.

CHAP. X.

chapter. Although born a Jew, 'and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers,'[1] Paul turned away from his 'flesh and blood,' from his 'friends, brethren, kinsmen, and rich neighbours,' and called 'the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind,'[2] to whom even the crumbs were refused which fell from the rich man's table. This done, and there being yet room, his master bid him go out into the 'highways and hedges,' and even 'compel' those he met there to come and fill the house. No test, no qualification, was to be required, except a willingness to answer to the call. And once admitted to the supper-room all are equally welcome, whether they have put on a wedding garment or not. But 'none' of those that were first bidden, and had refused to follow the Lord's servant who had communicated to them his Master's invitation, shall taste of his supper. He knows them not, and they must be thrust into outer darkness.

It is highly significant that, in his version of this parable, the third Evangelist has left out the 'wedding garment,' which, in the first account, forms an essential part of the parable. By so doing, the main features in the parable have been reversed. In the first version, *many* servants were sent out to convey the invitation, and but *one* man was thrust out; whilst in the Paulinic version, *one* servant is sent out, and *many* are excluded from the supper of the 'angry' master of the house. It is as if the Evangelist had wished to imply that the Master, that is, Christ, *dissatisfied* with the 'many' servants who had been more or less hiding the treasure intrusted to them, had sent out that 'one' servant, Paul, who proclaimed to the world the Hidden Wisdom. The disciple and fellow-labourer of Paul, knowing that the wedding garment was by the Jews and Judaising Christians regarded as an outward test of obedience to the law, seems purposely to discard this misunderstood expression, as one referring to a mere

[1] Acts xxii. 3. [2] Comp. Luke vii. 22.

beggarly element, not calculated to reform those who were Jews 'inwardly,' and whose heart was not circumcised.[1] The Gentile's inheritance was not 'of the law,' but 'of promise,' of that promise which preceded the law, and which was made to Abraham. Not the wedding garment of the law, but the putting on of 'the new man,'[2] is required at the great supper of the universal Messiah.

The first last, and the last first.

The disciple of the new gospel-dispensation has been taught 'to differ' from those who insisted on the constant and entire validity of the Mosaic law. The Gentile as well as the Jew is told that, to become the Lord's disciple, he must separate himself from his nearest relatives, if they obstruct the way which leads to everlasting life. He must even 'hate' his 'father, mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also,' or he cannot be his disciple. Man must be born from above, and his spiritual birth is not dependent on genealogical descent or carnal relations. To be carnally minded is death, and so is also the carnal fulfilment of the works commanded by the law. For all that, man can be an unprofitable servant. In this sense, it is not 'peace,' but 'the sword,' which the Lord has brought upon earth. No compromise is possible. Either man is the servant of the law, and therefore of sin, or he is the servant of faith, *with* or *without* the deeds of the law. No man can serve under both dispensations; he must 'hate' the one and love the other. The Jews and their Apostles may have 'laid the foundation,'[3] and they may have intended 'to build a tower;' but if they have not counted the cost, if they have not considered whether they had enough to finish it, if they cannot bring 'fruit to perfection,' then men mock at them. These 'transcendently great Apostles' are the salt which has '*lost its savour*,' and which, being now good for nothing, must be 'cast out.'

The hidden meaning of this parable is so important, and the writer is so anxious that his readers may under-

[1] Rom. ii. 29. [2] Eph. iv. 24. [3] Luke xiv. 29.

CHAP. X.

stand it, that the Lord's words addressed to the twelve about their being 'the salt of the earth,' and to which we have already referred, are here reproduced in such a manner as not to convey a commendation, but a reproof. Addressing his chosen Apostles, whom he also designated as 'the light of the world,' he called them 'blessed,' if men should revile and persecute them, and speak evil against them falsely for his sake. And he does so, because, as we may infer, these trials would prevent them, that is, those who were 'the salt of the earth,' from losing their powers, like salt which has lost its savour. But in the Gospel after Luke it seems to be implied that these very Apostles have not been able to build the tower of Christ's church; that they have made war without considering whether they were able to meet 'him' who would come against them; without considering that their original and incomplete gospel has been perfected by another, that their restricted mission is at an end, that their salt has lost its savour, that their light has become darkness; that those who were apostles before Paul, that is, 'the first,' have become 'last,' and 'the last,' that is, Paul, who was 'born out of due time,'[1] has become 'first.' This greatest of the Apostles was 'separated' unto the gospel of Christ,[2] for he dared not be of the number of those 'who were of reputation,' and who 'seemed to be pillars,' and who yet commended, measured, compared, and exalted themselves, not unlike the Pharisee in the temple.[3] These Apostles were, in the opinion of the Evangelist, like the lawyers and Pharisees who 'chose the chief rooms.' How different is the conduct of Paul! It is true that he did not consult flesh and blood, and that he did not give place to subjection even for a moment. But how could he do so, considering that the risen Christ had communicated to him 'another' gospel, which he was commanded to proclaim. For all this Paul was the lowly Apostle, who called himself 'the least of the Apostles,'[4] and who having thus

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 8. [2] Rom. i. 1. [3] Luke xviii. 9–14. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 9.

humbled himself was exalted by his Lord and Master. His 'sufficiency is of God;'[1] his grace is sufficient for him, for it has led him to become the child of God and thus the Apostle of Christ; therefore, though he be 'nothing,' he is in reality 'more' than those Hebrews who are ministers of Christ,[2] and 'in nothing' is he 'behind the very chiefest apostles.'[3]

Conclusion.

We have attempted to establish that the author of 'the Gospel after Luke' has adopted the leading Paulinic principle of man's inability to perform good works, and the principle of the consequent insufficiency of merit; that this Evangelist declares the grace of God, as offered to the believing sinner, to be the sole means of salvation; that the Mosaic law, with its justification by the works of the law, has been displaced by the law of justification through faith, and without the works of the law; that in a certain sense Paul's gospel is 'another' gospel than that curtailed gospel originally preached by the Palestinian Apostles under the domineering sway of the Pharisees; that instead of the Messianic terrestrial kingdom, which the law foreshadowed, the prophets foretold, and the expectation of which Christ confirmed, the kingdom of the eternal Messiah from heaven is announced to be a spiritual one unlimited by time or space; that enmity towards the rulers of the Jews, and especially towards the twelve Apostles, for having withheld their light from others, and a predilection for the Gentiles in general, and for the Apostle of the Gentiles in particular, are marked features in this Paulinic gospel. We now propose to consider more minutely the causes which led to such antagonism and opposition.

We have seen that the words of Christ recorded by Matthew and the epistles of Paul were both circulated among the Christian churches, and that yet uncertainty

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 5. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 23. [3] 2 Cor. xii. 11.

CHAP. X.

prevailed more or less as to the true doctrine.[1] Inasmuch as Paul did not allude to the original record of the words of Christ, and since the secret doctrine of the Lord was hidden, such uncertainties would naturally arise, and they would increase by a comparison of the first gospel-record with the doctrines of Paul as contained in his epistles. The grateful disciple and enthusiastic admirer of Paul would therefore consider himself in duty bound to make the attempt of harmonising the complete doctrine of the great Apostle with the necessarily incomplete one of Paul's predecessors in the apostleship. For under existing circstances Christ had not been able to speak to the people otherwise than in parables, nor to his chosen disciples otherwise than in secret and in darkness, although they enjoyed the privilege that they were given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. The twelve Apostles had not proclaimed what had been confided to them in secret, they had not let their light shine, they continued to hide the light, and thus prevented others from seeing it. The time had come to reveal to the world the full light of the glorious gospel of Christ. This Paul had done. His gospel of the Hidden Wisdom was, therefore, 'another gospel,' when compared with the original gospel-record; but it was 'not another,' inasmuch as it was essentially, if not exclusively, Christ's secret doctrine. Convinced of this, and yet not doubting that Matthew's record contained genuine sayings of the Lord, Paul preferred to leave the primitive garbled account of the Apostles unnoticed, and by so doing to make a union possible between the public and the private, the originally recorded, and the originally unrecorded, doctrine of his Divine Master, and thus between himself and the other Apostles.

Nor was this apostolic union difficult. For the principal doctrine of Paul's gospel, justification by faith, was based upon the principal doctrine of the original gospel, love to God and love to man; a commandment which in

[1] Luke i. 4.

its germ was already contained in the Mosaic law, and in the promise made to Abraham. The main difference with regard to justification was this: that, according to the original gospel, Christ insisted on the continued observance of every jot or tittle of the law, provided that the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith, were likewise observed. On the other hand, according to the gospel of Christ as fully revealed by Paul, justification by faith 'without' the deeds of the law was insisted upon. This might be considered, not as a difference in principle, but merely as one with reference to the means employed for carrying the same into effect. The most zealous disciple of Paul might therefore give the hand of fellowship to the most zealous disciple of James or Peter. Not even the unbounded zeal of Paul, which was not always tempered by moderation, stood in the way to such joint action. Yet, although the difference between the two doctrines of justification might be regarded as a mere technical one, even more weighty difficulties had arisen with regard to the passover and the relation of Christ's death to the same. Such difficulties would naturally retard the perfect union and cooperation of the twelve Apostles with Paul, without however rendering the same an impossibility. It was not till docetic gnosticism began to raise its head, that the common danger led to a union and cooperation which, since we may regard the first epistles of Peter and of Clement as genuine, was fully established before the martyrdom of Peter and of Paul at Rome.

Having pointed out that the peculiar features of the third gospel can be explained by the essential difference originally existing between the Palestinian and the Paulinic gospel, caused by the gradual ingrafting of the Hidden Wisdom on the original but incomplete gospel-record, we shall now, in conclusion, try to show that the reforming work of gospel harmony, indirectly commenced by Paul in his epistles, was continued in a more direct

CHAP. X.

manner by Luke, his companion and disciple, and this probably with the great Apostle's own sanction.

We shall lay no great stress on the fact that not only Paulinic ideas, but also Paulinic language and Paulinic idioms, have been introduced, more or less, in every chapter of the Gospel after Luke. But it is a subject worthy of inquiry, whether this entire harmony, in essence and form, does not favour the supposition that Paul's own mind had been actively engaged in this process of gospel reformation. Indeed parts of this gospel, such as chapters i. ii. iii. vii. ix. xi. xviii. xx. xxi. and xxiv., are so completely moulded in accordance with the principles and the language of Paul, that the above assumption is by no means unsupported by internal and external evidence. And this hypothesis is somewhat strengthened by the fact, that Paul in his epistles alludes to a gospel which he calls his own.[1] Although these allusions must be admitted to refer generally to the doctrine preached by himself, yet it is difficult to conceive that the principles of the newly revealed gospel should not have been, already during Paul's lifetime, harmonised with the principles of the original gospel, as contained in those sayings of Christ which one of the chosen Apostles had committed to writing, under circumstances little encouraging to the spreading of the truth as it is in Jesus. Paul himself declares that the distinguishing feature of his gospel was, that it contained 'the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began.'[2] About this 'hidden mystery,' or 'the mystery of the Gentiles,'[3] that is, 'Christ within,' even the Apostles at Jerusalem, as a body, said little or nothing, they being, like all the rest, more or less 'shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed,'[4] and even one of the most enlightened among them did not walk 'uprightly according to the truth of the gospel.'

[1] Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25.
[2] Rom. xvi. 25.
[3] Col. i. 26, 27.
[4] Gal. i. 6, 11; ii. 6.

Now, of Luke we know that Paul calls him 'the beloved,'[1] and one of his 'fellow-labourers;'[2] that he was with him when others had left him,[3] and that Paul seems to refer to him as 'the brother whose praise in the gospel,' or, more literally, 'in matters relating to the gospel, is in all the churches.'[4] Again, the written tradition of the earliest fathers of the church refers to Luke in such a manner as to show that they identified Paul with Luke's gospel, in essence if not in form. In the second century Irenæus writes that 'Luke, the follower of Paul, laid down in the book the gospel preached by the former.'[5] Tertullian, in writing against the gnostics, states that 'Luke's digest they are in the habit of attributing to Paul.'[6] Origen might be understood to assert that Paul knew and approved of Luke's gospel, when he writes about 'the third Gospel according to Luke, praised by Paul;' though it is probable that he refers to the writer only, and not to the gospel itself.[7] More clear and decided is Eusebius when he writes: 'They say that Paul used to mention his gospel when, as if the writer of a special gospel, he said: According to my gospel.'[8] And finally St. Jerome writes: 'Some suspect that whenever Paul says in his epistles, According to my gospel, he means to signify the book of Luke, and that Luke learnt the gospel not only from the Apostle Paul, who had not been with the Lord in the flesh, *but also from the other Apostles.*'[9]

We are therefore permitted to come to the conclusion, that as 'the Gospel after Luke,' in the form transmitted to us, is no doubt essentially identical with the gospel written by Luke,[10] this highly esteemed disciple of Paul

[1] Col. iv. 14.
[2] Philem. xxiv.
[3] 2 Tim. iv. 11.
[4] 2 Cor. viii. 18.
[5] Iren. iii. 1; comp. Eus. H. E. v. 8.
[6] Tert. adv. Marc. iv. 2, 5.
[7] Origen, Eus. H. E. vi. 25.
[8] Eus. H. E. iii. 4.
[9] Hier. de Vir. Illus. c. 7.
[10] The arguments in favour of a later composition of the entire gospel are principally based on some passages contained in the 21st chapter, where the time of the Gentiles is shown to have already set in for Jerusalem, and

CHAP. X.

has, with the latter's direct or indirect sanction, made the bold but necessary attempt of harmonising the first record of the sayings of Christ, as well as the principal events of his life, with the leading principles of that secret tradition which Christ had privately and darkly communicated to his disciples, and which had been fully revealed to Paul by the risen Lord.[1] The question now arises, whether the words of Christ as recorded in Matthew, or as recorded in Luke, form the nearest approach to the words actually spoken by the Lord. Assuming that the original record of Christ's sayings has been, on the whole, faithfully incorporated in the Gospel after Matthew, this gospel contains his public preaching, but it does not contain his secret sayings, which we find in the second and supplementary apostolic record of John, and which are as historical as the former. The first record must therefore be read by the light of the second; the public doctrine of Christ must be interpreted by his secret doctrine; the one is the lock, the other the key. In this sense Luke has written more in the spirit of Christ than Matthew was able to do; he opened a way for the publication of the Lord's esoteric doctrine, by ingrafting the principles of the same, which Paul had revealed, on the stock of Christ's public doctrine as recorded by Matthew.

All Christians would greatly prefer to be permitted to believe that at least the words of Christ were in the outset recorded in their original completeness and pristine purity; that in this one instance the full light was not hidden even for a moment, that the enemy has not sown any tares among the wheat. But does the Bible itself permit such an assumption and such a belief? Does it not impera-

where the immediate expectation of the Lord's return is not recorded (Luke xxi. 25). But why should not Luke, or another disciple of Paul, have written part of his gospel at a later time, say between the years 70 and 80? Anyhow, this question cannot affect the overpowering argument in favour of the supposition that Luke is the author of the third gospel of our canon.

[1] Luke i. 4.

tively demand that, without any exception, 'all' things shall be proved, and that *after* this sifting process, carried out in full dependence on the guiding power of God's Holy Spirit, 'the best' only shall be kept? We come then to the conclusion, that the parallel passages in the first three gospels entitle us to suggest, if not to assert, that great liberties have been taken, *even* with the words which the Lord has actually spoken in public and in private whilst on earth, and that the gospels mark the gradual emancipation of the church from the spiritual thraldom of the Jewish and Jewish-Christian authorities. Surely it is not more than a mere assumption to say that such 'wilfulness' on the part of any evangelist, such 'intention to contradict and alter, . . . seems quite irreconcilable with *any* view of inspiration.' Of course such wilfulness and such intention, if proved, would be contrary to the notion of the literal or plenary inspiration of the Bible. But such proved facts do not militate against that view of inspiration which alone is in entire harmony with Scripture, and according to which view the prayerful reader can sufficiently trace in the Bible a Divine and infallible, by the side of a more or less exclusively human and fallible, element. Not the letter, but the Spirit, gives life.

Again, it is not enough to say of the parallel passages in the gospels, that they have so much in common as to render it improbable that they are original and independent accounts, whilst they are sufficiently different to admit of the assumption that the respective writers may possibly refer to genuine words of Christ, spoken by Him on different occasions. Let the honest inquirer after 'the truth as it is in Jesus' compare the parallel passages with each other, and then let him consider whether the relations between the original Apostles and the Lord's publicly proclaimed doctrine on the one side, and between Paul and the Lord's secret doctrine as fully revealed to him on the other, do not offer the best clue to the origin of accounts so like and yet so different. If it can be

CHAP. X.

established that the twelve Apostles promulgated a gospel principally based upon the public sayings of their Master, and that Paul's 'other' gospel was essentially based upon the principles of the secret sayings of the Lord, then we must expect to find that the original gospel-records essentially differ from the later evangelical writings. Nor must it surprise us to find that efforts were made, even in the apostolic period, to harmonise the one with the other. For the fact was known by all direct disciples of Christ, that he had taught and explained his mysteries only in secret, and that circumstances did not permit of their being at once everywhere proclaimed. Thus the independence of evangelical writers can be proved not to militate in any essential point against the authenticity of their doctrine; and the differences occurring in parallel passages of the Gospels are shown to be proofs of their genuineness. Although method and design are traceable in each gospel, this circumstance does 'not compromise that claim which alone gives value to a plurality of witnesses.'[1]

We now consider in what relation 'the Gospel after Mark' stands to 'the Gospel after Matthew,' and to 'the Gospel after Luke.'

[1] See the Archbishop's of York's article on the Gospels in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible.'

CHAPTER XI.

THE GOSPEL AFTER MARK.

INTRODUCTION—GENERAL METHOD—CHAPTERS I. TO XVI.—TIME OF COMPOSITION—CONCLUSION.

'*Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.*'—Eph. iv. 3.

Introduction.

EUSEBIUS has transmitted to us a communication from Papias, which is as follows: 'And John the Presbyter also said this. Mark being the interpreter of Peter, whatsoever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not, however, in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord; for he neither heard nor followed our Lord, but, as before said, he was in company with Peter, who gave him such instruction as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Lord's discourses; wherefore Mark has not exposed himself to censure by writing some things *as he had remembered* them; for but one thing he had in view, not to pass by anything that he had heard, *and not to falsify* anything therein.'[1] To this earliest testimony Eusebius adds that of Clement of Alexandria. He writes that in the books that go under the title of Hypotyposes or Institutions, Clement also gives the tradition respecting the order of the gospels, as derived from the oldest presbyters (or one of them), as follows: He says that those which contain the genealogies were written first, but that the Gospel *of* Mark was occasioned in the following manner: 'When Peter had proclaimed the word publicly at Rome, and declared the gospel under the influence of the Spirit, as there was a great number present, they

[1] H. E. iii. 39.

CHAP. XI.

requested Mark, who had followed him from afar, and remembered well what he had said, to reduce these things to writing, and that after composing the gospel he gave it to those who requested it of him, which when Peter understood, he directly neither hindered nor encouraged it.'[1]

Referring to this statement of Clement, as also to that of Papias, Eusebius, in another part of his history of the Church, writes as follows about the gospel *according* to Mark: 'The Divine Word having been thus established among the Romans, the power of Simon (the magician) was soon extinguished and destroyed together with the man. So greatly, however, did the splendour of piety enlighten the minds of Peter's hearers, that it was not sufficient to hear but once, nor to receive the unwritten doctrine of the gospel of God; but they persevered in every variety of entreaties, to solicit Mark, as the companion of Peter, and whose gospel we have, that he should leave them in writing a monument of the doctrine thus orally communicated. Nor did they cease their solicitations until they had prevailed with the man, and thus become the means of that history which is called the Gospel *according* to Mark. They say also, that the Apostle (Peter), having by the revelation of the Spirit ascertained what was done, was delighted with the zealous ardour expressed by these men, and that the history obtained his authority, for the purpose of being read in the churches.'[2]

To these testimonies about Mark's gospel we must add that of Irenæus, equally transmitted by Eusebius: 'Matthew indeed produced his gospel written among the Hebrews in their own dialect, whilst Peter and Paul proclaimed the gospel and founded the Church at Rome. After the death of these, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also transmitted to us in writing what had been preached by Peter.'[3]

It has always been regarded as strange, that while Clement of Alexandria speaks of Mark's gospel as having

[1] H. E. vi. 14. [2] H. E. ii. 15. [3] H. E. v. 8.

been written during the lifetime of Peter,[1] Irenæus on the contrary dates the composition of this gospel from the time subsequent to the death of Peter and Paul under Nero, which probably took place in the year 64 or 65. Again, it is very strange that Clement should think it necessary to inform us that Mark 'remembered well' what Peter had said, since if Peter was alive we may suppose tha he would have revised the composition of his interpreter, instead of neither hindering nor encouraging it. And, indeed, this indifference attributed to Peter is not accounted for even by the assumption that Mark may possibly have taken notes of what Peter said, either during or after his interpretation. Had he done so, then Clement or Eusebius could hardly have omitted a fact so strongly corroborating their statements. Far from admitting such a possibility, the additional statements made by Eusebius exclude it. For he states, without mentioning any special authority, and in contradiction to the positive statement of Irenæus about Peter's death before the composition of this gospel, how Peter ascertained that Mark's gospel had been written 'by the revelation of the Spirit,' in consequence of which Peter, far from neither hindering nor encouraging his interpreter's composition, gave it the stamp of 'his authority, for the purpose of being read in the churches.' No wonder, therefore, that according to the testimony of Papias, as rendered by Eusebius, this inspired penman has done nothing deserving of censure. We have seen, however, that the testimony of Clement of Alexandria about Mark having written a gospel during Peter's lifetime, although without his either encouraging or hindering it, receives a strong confirmation by the following circumstance. The same Clement records how Barnabas referred to one of the Lord's sayings, which was recorded in a certain gospel. These words of Christ are not contained in any of our four gospels, but in the so-called Clementine homilies they are recorded as having

[1] Comp. 'The Epistle of Barnabas.'

CHAP. XI.

been verbally transmitted by Peter whilst in Rome. These homilies purpose to contain the public addresses of Peter in Rome, when he confronted Simon Magus; and whether they were partly written in the first century or not, they are written with the intention of being received as an historical document. They were certainly known in the second century, at the end of which Clement speaks of the same as an apostolic Scripture, inasmuch as he introduces several passages taken from this source, by the words: 'Peter says,' or 'Peter in the homilies says.'[1] If then the homilies were by Clement of Alexandria believed to contain sayings of Peter; if in the former, as we possess them, one of Christ's sayings, unknown to our canon, is recorded in an address of Peter's; if Clement states, that Mark's 'gospel' contained what Peter said, and if he quotes the above non-canonical saying of Christ, slightly modified, as being, on the authority of Barnabas, contained 'in a certain gospel;' then it may be fairly assumed that Mark the Evangelist and Peter's interpreter did during the lifetime of Peter write, without being encouraged or hindered by the apostle, an epitome of the apostle's addresses, which in the second century was by Clement called a gospel. We have seen that Peter had strong reasons for not encouraging the writing down of his addresses, and equally strong reasons for not hindering such a person as his interpreter from composing a trustworthy record of the apostolic preaching, which had by some been misconstrued or perverted. Clement evidently regarded the Gospel of Mark as essentially a gospel of Peter, and this would alone suffice to account for the vague reference to 'a certain gospel.' Also it is possible that, already at the time when Clement wrote, Mark's Petrinic gospel was not universally acknowledged as canonical. His contemporary, Irenæus, the first who mentions our four gospels by name, does however say nothing about Mark's gospel which is contrary to Cle-

[1] See 'Credner's Beiträge,' i. 351 f.

ment's testimony. On the contrary, he strongly confirms it by saying, that Mark transmitted to us 'what had been preached by Peter.'

Now, it must be admitted that the entire testimony about Mark's gospel, previous to the testimony of Eusebius, is in favour of the supposition that the so-called Clementine recognitions and homilies are a later and enlarged edition of Mark's gospel, which contained, and was originally or later entitled: 'The preaching of Peter.' For not only do the homilies, or 'the preachings,' contain one of the Lord's sayings as transmitted by Peter, which Clement quotes as such, and which is not in our canonical collection; but in 'the Gospel after Mark' we entirely miss any kind of addresses which Peter can have held in Rome. And we shall point out that the doctrinal parts of this gospel have been composed with a view of taking a middle course between the Gospel of Matthew and that of Luke. Moreover, even the testimony of Eusebius is in a most important part essentially corroborative of the above view. For he states that the addresses of Peter principally referred to and were called forth by Simon Magus and his doctrine. Neither of the one nor of the other is there the slightest trace in the Gospel after Mark. Unless, therefore, sufficiently strong reasons can be urged for the originality of the doctrinal parts of the second gospel of our canon it will be difficult to reject the above hypothesis as unfounded.

The non-canonical gospel-quotation recorded by Clement, perhaps enables us to assign a reason for the later rejection of the preaching of Peter as transmitted by Mark. Clement writes, as we have already pointed out: 'For not enviously, said he (that is Barnabas), the Lord did announce in a certain gospel: "my mystery (belongs) unto me and unto the sons of my house."'[1] And in the homilies this passage is thus recorded as having been referred to by Peter: 'We recollect how our Lord and

[1] Strom. v. 10.

CHAP. XI.

Master commissioned us with the following words: Preserve the mysteries unto me and unto the sons of my house.'[1] The mysteries of the kingdom of God, or 'the mystery' of the same as proclaimed by the secret preaching of Christ, were only given to know to the twelve Apostles and to his other disciples,[2] as stewards of his mysteries. They were to preserve and to proclaim them after their Lord's departure. They did not do so at once, and not till after Paul had proclaimed the Hidden Wisdom of Christ in a mystery. This was the cause of that independence, and want of immediate harmonious cooperation between the twelve Apostles and Paul, the existence of which the Epistle to the Galatians would suffice to prove. When, however, the common enemy to both, docetic gnosticism, had helped to bring about that perfect understanding between Paul and those who were apostles before him, to which the Epistles to Timothy and those of Peter refer, then any additional reference to the previous apostolic discord and to its cause would be avoided, for the sake of that peace which was then more than ever necessary to the Church. We have seen that Paul is either not mentioned at all in the homilies, or that he is referred to as 'a hostile man.' This would suffice to confirm in the most direct manner that difference between the Apostles, the authentic record of which might have been fatal to the establishment of a universal Church. Thus the homilies were worked over, attributed to Clement of Rome, and not received into the canon at the end of the second century, when the first attempt was made to form a universal canon.

The 'certain gospel' here referred to by Clement, on the authority of Barnabas, seems therefore to have been 'the preaching of Peter.' It is the only gospel-reference which we possess from the apostolic period. These words of Christ were proclaimed by Peter, recorded by Mark, and referred to by Barnabas. Unless therefore we are

[1] Hom. xix. 20. [2] Mark iv. 10, 11.

prepared to question whether Clement's information respecting Barnabas was correct, we must regard this testimony about the early existence of a written gospel as reaching back to the early apostolic period, and therefore as preceding by many years the first direct testimony about a written gospel, which is contained in the Epistle attributed to Barnabas. We have seen that Matthew's gospel contains now as originally, those sayings of Christ which do not refer to his secret doctrine. Now, the above passage about the preservation of the mysteries of Christ does not more directly refer to the latter than the one which is recorded in Matthew and the parallel passages in the other gospels, about Christ's having only to the disciples secretly confided His mysteries. At the same time, we must observe that if Peter did verbally transmit the above non-canonical saying of Christ in the form transmitted to us, he may have quoted the same from memory, as it is in the preaching of Peter recorded that he did. But though Peter quoted those words of Christ from recollection, Matthew may have at that time already recorded the same in his gospel. And whether he did so or not at any time, Mark, the Evangelist and the interpreter of Peter, would naturally remember and note down Peter's quotation of the Lord's words. These we find recorded not only by Clement, as in his time or in that of Barnabas contained 'in a certain gospel,' but also, as we have seen, in the preaching of Peter, from which Clement quotes some of Peter's sayings, and which Scripture he would naturally call 'a certain' gospel, if the preaching of Peter, originally written by Mark, was in Clement's time, by some, not regarded as canonical or directly apostolical. Further grounds are not wanting to confirm the supposed general identity of the so-called Clementine recognitions and homilies, and the Gospel 'of' Mark. When we consider how little effect Paul's Epistle to the Romans seems to have produced in that Church, that even the name of Paul is not mentioned by

CHAP. XI.

the writer of the Shepherd of Hermas, or even by Justin Martyr, and that, if we except the first Epistle of Clement, not a single writer of the Roman church up to the middle of the second century takes any notice of Paul or of his writings, then the supposition gains ground that Paul and his doctrine were not considered as orthodox at Rome, and that the sole authority of the twelve Apostles and their doctrine ruled paramount in this Church during the first century and the first part of the second. If this be admitted as possible, we should expect the Roman Gospel 'of' Mark to show a marked tendency of recognising as little as possible the supplementary principles of Paul's gospel, and to point out in how far Peter acknowleged them. Since this is the tendency of 'the preaching of Peter,' the probability is strengthened that the latter is a later version of Mark's original gospel.

Again, although Eusebius identifies the Gospel 'of' Mark with the Gospel 'after' Mark, without stating any reason or authority for doing so, yet as his object clearly is, by not taking any notice of the differences between Paul and the other Apostles, to lay a foundation for the doctrine of the universal Roman church, the above identification of what we may suppose to have been the Gospel 'of' Mark with the Gospel 'after' Mark can have little weight. It is a known and acknowledged fact that centuries before Eusebius wrote his history of the Church a system of harmonising the various gospels had been introduced, which must have led, and which can be proved to have led, to systematic alterations of the first three gospels, but especially of the first and second.

It was not the object of Mark to give 'a history of the Lord's discourses;' and therefore we should expect to find in the Gospel after Mark an epitome of Peter's addresses in Rome, of his disputations with Simon Magus, such as we do find them in the so-called Clementine homilies. Here and there, and indeed often, Peter would refer to the sayings of Christ, which would not be re-

corded in a chronological manner. Again, this is what we find in the preaching of Peter. To Paul neither Peter nor Simon would directly refer; Peter not, because Paul was not recognised by all Christians, nor yet perhaps by all Apostles; and Simon not, because his docetic doctrine was equally opposed by Paul and by Peter.

It is a strong confirmation of the view we are trying to establish about the origin of the gospels, that according to the unopposed testimony of Clement, when Mark wrote his gospel, those of Matthew and of Luke, which contain the genealogies, were already in existence. We are therefore in the outset led to expect, that even the Gospel 'after' Mark will contain some reference to, and be in a certain extent dependent from those two gospels which 'were written first.' A minute comparison of these three gospels will fully establish, not only this dependence, although merely in the doctrinal parts, but also the intermediate position and the harmonising tendency of the Gospel after Mark. The testimony of Irenæus does not oblige us to assume that what he mentions as Mark's gospel was the Gospel after Mark which forms part of our canon. For we have seen that Mark's gospel, which contained what Peter preached, is more likely to have been worked up in the so-called Clementine preaching of Peter.

We hope to have sufficiently pointed out that the dogmatical differences between Paul and the twelve Apostles were such as to make an early and complete compromise impossible. If Luke has systematically modified the sayings of Christ recorded by Matthew, the Church of Rome, in her efforts after Catholicity, must have early felt the need of harmonising these earliest gospel-accounts one with another. Again, if Peter had taken a kind of intermediate position between his colleagues at Jerusalem and Paul, whom he so nearly joined at Antioch, a gospel written or supposed to have been written by the interpreter of Peter must have supplied the wants of the Roman church. And Mark could be supposed all the more

CHAP. XI.

suitable for the task of writing a conciliatory gospel of peace, inasmuch as he was the interpreter of Peter,[1] and as Paul, who summoned him to Rome, whither he went,[2] regarded him as 'profitable for the ministry.'[3]

Although the Gospel 'of' Mark may have been, and its concluding part notoriously has been, different from the Gospel 'after' Mark transmitted to us, yet even in the latter we have the most ancient record of the historical parts of the gospel, which was evidently written for the Roman church, if not in Rome itself. This is established by the unanimous testimony of the early fathers,[4] and by the text of the gospel itself, many passages of which refer not only to a non-Palestinian but to a Roman origin.[5] We shall try to establish that at the time when the Gospel after Mark was written, docetic gnosticism may already have began to spread to Rome its baneful influences. For whilst in the Gospels after Matthew and after Luke there is no trace of an endeavour to spiritualise away the reality of Christ's humanity, we find in this gospel a few hidden traces of such a tendency, and an indirect reference to the spread of false doctrine.

General method.

A minute consideration of the contents of the Gospel after Mark will show that the Evangelist composed the same after a pre-conceived plan, which may be thus generally described.[6] In the first place, all those histories, parables and discourses which we have pointed out as having been interpolated or considerably modified by the author of the Gospel after Luke, and which must have been

[1] Comp. 2 Pet. i. 15–18. [2] Col. iv. 10. [3] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

[4] Comp. Euseb. with Epiph. Haer, li. p. 428.

[5] See xii. 42; vi. 27; xv. 39, 44, 45, &c. By mentioning Alexander and Rufus as the sons of Simon of Cyrene the writer refers to a Roman tradition. This Rufus is clearly identical with the Rufus whom Paul mentions (Rom. xvi. 13), and who in the 'Recognitions' (iii. 68) is called Rubilus the brother of Zaccheus, as whom the 'Homilies' likewise mention him (ii. 1). Alexander and Rufus are alluded to as the companions of Peter in the Clementines and in the Acts of Peter and Andrew.

[6] See 'Die Evangelien,' &c., 2nd edition, p. 329 f.

repulsive to all non-Paulinic Christians, have been either entirely omitted or at least the Paulinic additions have been removed. Thus we miss in the Gospel after Mark the following parts of Luke's gospel. The early history of John the Baptist and of Jesus,[1] the additions in the account of the baptism,[2] the genealogy,[3] the record about the first appearance of Jesus at Nazareth, containing the bitter words against the Jews,[4] and almost the whole of that important part which extends from the seventh to the nineteenth chapters of the Gospel after Luke, and which on the whole is peculiar to the latter. The principal contents of the Paulinic relation contained in these chapters and omitted by Mark are the following. The history of the centurion, of the widow of Nain, and of the woman which was a sinner;[5] the journey through Samaria, the false zeal of the children of Zebedee, the appointment of the seventy disciples, and the visit to Mary and Martha;[6] the parable of the good Samaritan;[7] the Lord's prayer and the parable of the friend who asks for three loaves;[8] the woes against the Scribes and Pharisees;[9] those parts of the twelfth and thirteenth chapters in which the Lord's warnings may be supposed to be directed against the twelve Apostles; the account about Jesus eating bread in the house of one of the chief Pharisees, and the discourses made on that occasion;[10] the parables about the prodigal son, about Lazarus, and about the unjust steward,[11] about the judge and the importunate widow;[12] the account about the ten lepers, of which only the Samaritan returned thanks;[13] of the Pharisee and the publican;[14] of Zaccheus and of the nobleman.[15] The only important account which Mark has extracted from chapters seven to nineteen in Luke is the parable of the sower, in the interpretation of which, however, the Paulinic additions have been eradicated.[16]

[1] Luke i. and ii. [2] iii. 10–15. [3] iii. 23 f. [4] iv. 14–30.
[5] vii. [6] ix. 51; x. 42. [7] x. 29 f. [8] xi. 1–13.
[9] xi. 37–54. [10] xiv. [11] xv. and xvi. [12] xviii.
[13] xvii. 11–19. [14] xviii. 9–14. [15] xix. 1–27.
[16] Comp. Luke viii. 11–15 with Mark iv. 14–20.

CHAP. XI.

Having thus removed all those passages in Luke which might give offence to the non-Paulinic or Jewish Christians, Mark in like manner excludes from his gospel narrative all those passages in Matthew's gospel which refer to the continued binding authority of the law, and to the exclusive calling of the Jews to the Messianic kingdom. Thus the following omissions from the Gospel after Matthew are explained. The Jewish-Messianic genealogy and early history of Jesus,[1] the sermon on the mount,[2] and the discourses of the Lord in the tenth chapter, which are so highly favourable to the twelve Apostles; then all those parables which, being peculiar to Matthew, Luke had either entirely omitted or essentially modified. Such are the parables about the enemy who sowed tares among the wheat;[3] about the servant who had no compassion on his fellow-servant;[4] about the royal marriage to which those that were first bidden would not come;[5] about the labourers who, although hired at different hours of the day, received the same recompense;[6] of the two sons sent into the vineyard;[7] of the merchant seeking pearls;[8] of the talents, and of the wise and the foolish virgins.[9]

The principal parts inserted from Matthew into Mark's gospel are such as Luke has likewise accepted, without essentially modifying them. Thus in Mark we find the parable of the sower in its simplest form,[10] as also the parable of the mustard seed,[11] and of the faithless husbandmen.[12] The parable about the seed which once cast into the ground springs and grows up in due time, without man's knowing how this comes to pass,[13] is a conciliatory modification of the parable about the tares among the wheat, which latter, owing to the passage referring to the discord-sowing enemy, was capable of being explained in an anti-Paulinic sense.

Again, the author of the Gospel after Mark has left out

[1] i. and ii. [2] v. to vii. [3] Mat. xiii. 24–30. [4] xviii. 23–35.
[5] xxii. 1–14. [6] xx. 1–16. [7] xxi. 28–31. [8] xiii. 44 f.
[9] xxv. [10] iv. 2–20. [11] iv. 30–32. [12] xii. 1–11. [13] iv. 26–29.

some passages which we find in Luke, as in Matthew, without any essential alteration. Here we have to refer principally to the Lord's saying: 'No man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.'[1] It is known that this saying of the Lord was more than any other quoted by the Docetic Gnostics in support of their assertion that the true God which Christ taught had been at all times unknown, even to such chosen men among the Jews as Adam, Enoch, Noah, the three patriarchs, and Moses. And it is probable that the accurate record of this important saying of the Lord has been lost, and originally ran thus: 'No man *hath* known the Son but the Father, neither *hath* any man known the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son *hath* revealed him.' For Justin Martyr[2] and all the most ancient authorities record it in this form,[3] with the single exception of Clement of Alexandria, who in an isolated passage[4] has transmitted it in the form of our gospels, which, however, is sufficiently explained by his applying those words especially to the Jews of his day.[5] The Clementine homilies, probably in part written in the first century, likewise record this passage in the above form.[6] Had the same already been altered in Matthew and Luke in the form transmitted to us, we may assume that the author of the Gospel after Mark would not have left it out, inasmuch as in this altered form it could not have been offensive to the non-Paulinic Christians.

Thus having laid aside all those parts of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke which were opposed to Mark's conciliatory tendency, this Evangelist could more easily combine the remaining materials of those two primitive gospels, and thus compose a third and essentially original

[1] Mat. xi. 27; Luke x. 22. [2] Ap. i. 63, 96.

[3] Credner, Beiträge, i. 248 f. Griesbach Symb. Crit. ii. 271, 273; Schwegler N. Z. i. 255 f.

[4] Str. vii. 766 B. [5] Comp. Str. i. 355 B.; v. 589 B.

[6] Hilgenfeld 'Die Clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien,' p. 128.

CHAP. XI.

gospel-narrative. In doing so, he alternately followed the record of the one or of the other of these two Evangelists, thereby making an effort for peace between those antagonistic parties, which respectively regarded the Gospel after Matthew or the Gospel after Luke as the standard of their faith, as the gospel after their own hearts. Having this praiseworthy object in view, Mark leaves out such words which were the basis and the pivot of those baneful differences in the Christian church. Thus the important word 'law' is entirely expelled from his gospel. That this cannot have been a casual omission is shown by a comparison of Mark ii. 26, 27 with Matthew xii. 5, where the passage about the priests profaning the temple on the Sabbath by their sacrifices seems to have been left out in consequence of the reference to the law. In similar passages, such as Mark xii. 28-31, this word of strife is expunged, although it is to be found in the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke.[1] It may also possibly be for this reason that the account about the deputation of the disciples to John the Baptist[2] has been omitted in the Gospel after Mark. And it is not unreasonable to suppose that, owing to his peaceable tendency, Mark has not made use either of the word 'justification' or 'to justify.' Thus Mark's account of the baptism of Jesus seems to be intentionally abridged after Matthew's account, for the purpose of evading the words attributed to the Lord in the first gospel: 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.'[3] Apparently for the same reason the passage in Matthew about John's having come 'in the way of righteousness'[4] is omitted in the parallel passage in Mark.[5] And the same may be said about the omission of the passages: 'Wisdom is justified of her children,' and 'by thy words thou shalt be justified.'[6]

Having thus pointed out which was the general method

[1] Mat. xxii. 40; Luke x. 26. [2] Mat. xi. 13; Luke xvi. 16.
[3] Mat. iii. 15; comp. Mark i. 9, 10. [4] xxi. 32. [5] xi. 27; xii. 1 f.
[6] Mat. xi. 19; xii. 37; comp. Mark iii. 13 f.

employed by the Evangelist in the composition of his gospel, we now proceed to a more minute consideration of the gospel itself.

Chapters I. to IV.

From the outset we meet with traces of an intentional combination of the previously existing gospel accounts after Matthew and after Luke. 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.' As we have already pointed out, Mark passes over the genealogies and the accounts about the early history of Jesus, and commences his narrative with the public appearance of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. It is as if he had intended to point out from the very first what is more clearly insisted upon in the fourth gospel, that nobody really knew where Christ came from or what was His origin. Like a supernatural person he suddenly dwells among men.[1] The Evangelist seems to have taken from Matthew's gospel[2] the words 'Jesus Christ,' and from Luke's gospel[3] the words, 'the Son of God.' Mark's words, 'as it is written in the prophet *Esaias*,' we find in Luke,[4] where also[5] we find the falsified quotation of Malachi's prophecy, which in the Gospel after Mark, as also in that after Matthew, is quoted in the same words. Then follows the quotation of the prophecy of Isaiah, which we also find in Matthew, about the way-preparing voice in the wilderness. Luke having stated that 'the Word of God came unto John . . in the wilderness,' and that he preached 'the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,'[6] Mark states that 'John did baptise in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.'[7] Matthew having said: 'Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptised of him in Jordan, confessing their sins,'[8] Mark states, 'And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptised of him *in the river of* Jordan, confessing their sins.'[9] The explanation, that

[1] Comp. 'Marcion.' [2] i. 1. [3] iii. 23, 38. [4] iii. 4; comp. Mat. iii. 1.
[5] Luke vii. 27. [6] iii. 2–4. [7] i. 4. [8] iii. 5, 6. [9] i. 5.

CHAP. XI.

Jordan was a river, is evidently given for the benefit of non-Palestinian readers. Likewise Mark's account about John's clothing and his food[1] is almost identical with that in Matthew.[2] The following verses,[3] whilst chiefly resembling Luke's version,[4] yet by the words, 'there cometh one mightier than I *after me*,' seem to take cognisance of Matthew's account.[5] Mark omits the strong condemnation addressed by John against the Pharisees and Sadducees according to Matthew's record, and against the whole multitude according to Luke: 'O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?' And in the same manner the injunction is left out, to 'bring forth fruits meet for repentance,' and not to trust in the carnal descent from Abraham, since God can raise up children unto Abraham of the very stones. Again the passages in Matthew[6] and Luke[7] about the axe which is laid at the root of the trees, about the fan to purge the floor, and the burning of the chaff with unquenchable fire, is left out by Mark, as if too bitter against the Jews.

Following the order of his predecessors, Mark now gives the account of the Lord's baptism,[8] which chiefly resembles Matt. iii. 13-17, though it seems also to point to Luke iii. 21,22. To Matthew's words: 'Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan,' Mark adds that Jesus came 'from Nazareth in Galilee:' an additional explanation which had been rendered necessary by the leaving out of the earlier history. The account of the temptation in the wilderness, which as in Matthew's and Luke's, so in Mark's gospel, follows upon the narrative of the baptism, is in the latter concentrated into two verses.[9] All that is said is that he was 'tempted of Satan,' whilst the significant addition that he 'was with the wild beasts,' seems to justify the supposition that the full account given by the other evangelists was by him evaded, not for the sake of

[1] i. 6 [2] iii. 4. [3] 7 and 8. [4] iii. 16. [5] iii. 11.
[6] iii. 10, 12. [7] iii. 17. [8] 9–11. [9] 12 and 13.

abbreviation, but in view of a higher motive. For the above addition leads us to assume that the Evangelist's object may have been to show that Jesus, as the second Adam, according to Paul, although like the first Adam he lived with beasts, and like him was tempted by the serpent, 'which is the devil,'[1] yet did not succumb to the temptation, but remained without sin. We may perhaps even go further, and conjecture that this account about the temptation was curtailed for the purpose of evading the debated question with reference to the personality or non-personality of Satan.

The following section[2] is principally and in part almost literally reproduced from Matthew.[3] The peculiarities of this composition seem to be best explained by the writer's leading idea of representing Jesus as the Son of God and not as the Son of Man. Without referring to the birth and childhood of Jesus, he is at once introduced as a grown-up man, who came from Nazareth to be baptised of John in Jordan. On this occasion he was publicly proclaimed as the Son of God, which, however, he was before and from all beginning as the incarnate Word. The Evangelist seems to imply, by his account, that an apparently human individual was suddenly observed going from Galilee to the River Jordan, where he was declared, in the presence of the people, to be the Son of God; that then he was *driven* by the Spirit[4] into the wilderness, where he lived with the wild beasts, and was tempted of Satan, just like the first Adam in Eden, with this difference, however, that he who was above the angels[5] was ministered unto by these Divine messengers. It is the second Adam who 'is from heaven'[6] who, when the time was fulfilled for the establishment of the kingdom of God, suddenly appears,[7] suddenly invites a few men to follow him, suddenly, on a Sabbath, entered

[1] Rev. xx. 2. [2] Mark i. 14–20. [3] iv. 12–17; 18–22.
[4] Comp. Rom. viii. 14, where 'driven' is more correct than 'led.'
[5] Heb. i. 5. [6] 1 Cor. xv. 47. [7] Comp. Mal. iii. 1.

CHAP. XI.

into the synagogue of Capernaum and taught repentance and faith in the gospel, that is, in a 'new doctrine,' and who suddenly and immediately causes his fame to 'spread abroad throughout all the region round about Galilee.'[1]

In the part we are now considering we have to remark one significant alteration, and an important addition. Jesus proclaims not the nearness of 'the kingdom of heaven,'[2] but of 'the kingdom of God,'[3] an alteration which seems to imply the substitution of the spirituality of God's kingdom for the promised outward organisation of the same. To the summons of the Lord to 'repent,' Mark adds, 'and believe the gospel.' Although these words might well have been uttered by Jesus, yet the strangeness of their not having been recorded by Matthew is heightened by the consideration that when this gospel was written, two gospel-accounts existed, which differed so much from one another that this gospel took a conciliatory position between them. Mark's desire, of course, must have been that his gospel of peace should be generally believed and accepted, and that the preceding gospels should be harmonised with each other. Nor would the above words be easier explained as words of Mark than as words of Christ. For though the belief in the good news of the kingdom of heaven was only in its application essentially new, yet the key of the Hidden Wisdom had been taken away in Palestine. Here therefore, though not in Egypt, the doctrine of Christ was indeed a 'new doctrine' in every sense of the word. After the death of our Lord the word 'gospel' was gradually understood to refer more especially to the records of the words and deeds of Christ. These records were necessarily so imperfect, if not contradictory, that Luke found himself com-

[1] We have seen that Marcion's gospel began with Christ's preaching in Capernaum, and that the above traced tendency to suggest the but apparent incarnation of the Divine Word was a leading feature of that gospel.

[2] Mat. iv. 17. [3] Mark i. 15.

pelled to write his own gospel, so as to inculcate thereby 'the certainty' of the evangelical doctrine. And Mark was compelled to harmonise this 'other' gospel with that original Gospel of Matthew, which contained only a certain class of the words of Christ. How could the Jews have believed in a 'new doctrine,' which, in essential parts, was hidden from their eyes?

The omission by Mark of the account of the healing of the centurion's servant is best explained by pointing to the concluding part of the narrative in Matthew and Luke, where faith is shown to have been the cause of the miracle,[1] and to that part of Matthew's record, where the Jews are threatened with being cast out.[2] Again the omission by Mark of the sermon on the mount is not to be wondered at, when we consider the essential alterations of the same in Luke's account, which it would be impossible to harmonise with Matthew's record. As a proof that the sermon on the mount may have been purposely omitted, it may be mentioned that, after the above extract from Matthew, Mark gives an extract from Luke[3] about Christ's visit to Capernaum, in which account Mark interlaces the very words with which Matthew ends his record of the sermon on the mount; 'And they were astonished at his doctrine, for he taught them as one that had authority, and not as the Scribes.'[4] This interpolation from Matthew is all the more remarkable since Luke's version of this passage, introduced on the occasion of his teaching at Capernaum, is as follows: 'And they were astonished at His doctrine, for His Word was with power.'[5] We may here observe that the omission by Mark of the parable about the prodigal son is easily explained by the same reason which may have caused its being left out in the first gospel, that is, that according to the same the unjust steward of his goods,

[1] Mat. viii. 13; Luke vii. 9. [2] Mat. viii. 12. [3] iv. 31–37.
[4] Mark i. 22; comp. Mat. vii. 28, 29.
[5] Luke iv. 32; comp. 'the power of God,' ix. 43; xxii. 69.

CHAP. XI.

the prodigal *younger* son, the representative of the Gentiles, was gladly received by the father to the great displeasure of the elder son, who boasted in his outward righteousness. The account about Peter's mother-in-law, about Jesus healing her and others who were sick of divers diseases; and about his departing into a solitary place,[1] is likewise taken from Luke,[2] excepting that a few expressions and statements have been borrowed from the parallel account in Matthew.[3] Thus Jesus taking Peter's wife's mother 'by the hand,' is a trait which we find recorded in Matthew, but not in Luke. That the house of Simon, according to Mark, belonged also to Andrew; that James and John were present, and that Peter is stated to have, as it were, headed the multitudes, as the spokesman of the public, whilst, according to Luke's account, the latter sought and spoke to Jesus by themselves; these little varieties in Mark's account, although quite immaterial in themselves, are in so far characteristic, as thereby Peter's position is slightly raised. The account of the leper[4] is almost identical with that contained in Luke's gospel.[5] Only few words are taken from Matthew, such as, 'and he was cleansed;' corresponding with 'his leprosy was cleansed,' and 'see thou say nothing to any man,' corresponding more with, 'see thou tell no man,' than Luke's 'tell no man.' Mark has left out the narrative of the draught of fishes; for the same, as a consequence of the launch into the deep mysteries of Christ, had not been referred to by Matthew.

Mark's narrative in the second chapter and up to the 19th verse of the third, has for its model the account in Luke contained in the fifth and in the first nineteen verses of the sixth chapter, although from the parallel passage in Matthew[6] he inserts a few details, whilst adding some original ones, and leaving out from Luke's version what does not serve his purpose. Thus, instead of 'Judas, the brother of James,'[7] Mark, like Matthew, inserts the name

[1] Mark i. 29–39. [2] iv. 38–43. [3] viii. 14 f. [4] i. 40–45.
[5] v. 12–16 [6] ix. 1 f. [7] Luke vi. 16.

of Thaddeus ;[1] he calls Levi 'the son of Alpheus,' which is an original statement of Mark, as also the notice that David went into the house of God 'in the days of Abiathar, the high priest.'[2] Having followed Luke up to part of the 38th verse of the fifth chapter: 'but new wine must be put into new bottles,' he leaves out the following words: '*and both are preserved*; no man also having drank old wine *straightway* desireth new, for he saith, *the old is better*.' This omission is highly characteristic of the writer's conciliatory tendency. The words, new wine in new bottles would be understood by many to refer to the more perfect doctrine of Christ, as contained in Paul's 'other' and new gospel, and as recorded in the Gospel of Luke, which harmonised with the former. It is as if the Evangelist had considered that it was better not to refer at all to the difference between the old and the new doctrine. Luke had done right in putting new wine into new bottles, for Mark admits that this was necessary. But he does not care to preserve the new bottles, the vessels which contain the new leaven. The form in which Luke has expressed the new doctrine has given offence; Mark therefore has moulded a new form, which is more conciliatory. For this reason no account is taken of the sudden transition from drinking straightway the new after the old wine, or of the fact alleged by Luke, that in the opinion of those who have been brought up in the elementary doctrine of Christ, the old doctrine is 'better' than the new. Now that the new wine has become old, all such distinctions and prejudices must be given up. The time has come when a fusion of the new and the old can be at least attempted; the new wine has been kept some time in new bottles, and the men who had drunk old wine and who did not *straightway* desire new, may now be invited to taste the new wine which had become old, and to give up the prejudice that the old was better. We have already pointed out that in the middle of the second century

[1] iii. 18. [2] ii. 26.

CHAP. XI.

Marcion, the leader of docetic gnosticism, who recognised no other apostle than Paul, and no other gospel than Luke's, based on this passage about the old and new bottles his argumentation addressed to the elders of the Roman church, showing that even at that time there was much need for the new wine being put into new bottles, and for the old bottles being made to perish, for that otherwise 'the new wine will burst the bottles and be spilled.'[1]

Mark having followed Luke's account up to the beginning of his version of the sermon on the mount,[2] passes over the same and continues his narrative[3] by again following the account in Matthew's gospel.[4] The first two verses have been left out by Mark, perhaps because of the dangerous question raised by the people: 'Is not this the son of David?' We have seen that, according to some, the idea that Christ was the son of David was an 'error of the wicked.'[5] In the following account it is remarkable that, although Mark records the charge of the Scribes, that Jesus did cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, yet he omits the significant reply of the Lord: 'And if I, by Beelzebub, cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out, therefore shall they be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.' Christ herein lays no claim to any act which other children of Israel were not able to perform, and he implies that he, as well as others, did cast out devils 'by the Spirit of God.' According to this statement, Christ is a human instrument of the Spirit of God, which some of his fellowmen likewise possess in a sufficient degree to perform the same miracle of casting out devils which are performed by Christ.[6] This view does not suit the Evangelist, who has left out, as we have seen, the account about the origin and early history of Jesus, apparently for the purpose of suggesting an absolutely

[1] Luke v. 37. [2] Luke vi. 20. [3] iii. 20.
[4] Mat. xii. 22. [5] Ep. of Barnabas. [6] Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10, 11.

supernatural origin of the Son of God, such as was insisted upon by Marcion, the docetic gospel-forger.

This declaration of Christ about the relation in which he stood to his brethren, and likewise to the Spirit of God, is not modified by the words that follow it: 'He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.'[1] The importance of these passages is heightened by the word 'wherefore,' which connects this verse with the following words of Christ about the sin against the Holy Ghost. The argument, in Matthew, seems to be the following: Jesus attributes the power of casting out devils to the Spirit of God; this is what the Pharisees denied. In not acknowledging this Divine agency, or the effects of the same, the Pharisees were against Christ, and instead of gathering with him they scattered abroad. *Therefore*, although 'all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men,... the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men, ... neither in this world nor in the world to come.' By the above-named omissions Mark's quotation of the latter text would greatly lose in force, even if Mark had not essentially modified the same. Having considerably abbreviated the above words of Christ, he in such a manner alters them at the end of the passage as to make the Lord say that the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost 'is *in danger* of eternal damnation.' This modification of Matthew's text may have been effected out of deference to the Jews and Jewish Christians, that is, to all who were not Paulinians. For Mark likewise omits the subsequent part of Matthew's gospel,[2] in which the Jews and Pharisees are rebuked for their want of faith. The Evangelist continues his narrative[3] by inserting, in a slightly modified form, Matthew's account about the meeting between Jesus and his mother and his brethren. Here we have to remark, that not wishing to imply, as Matthew seems to do, that his disciples alone

[1] Mat. xii. 30. [2] xii. 33–45. [3] iii. 31.

CHAP. XI.

were his mother and his brethren, and yet not wishing to state as generally as Luke does: 'My mother and my brethren are these which hear the Word of God and do it,'[1] Mark states that Jesus 'looked round about on them which sat about him (that is, on "the multitude,")[2] and said: 'Behold my mother and my brethren,' to which general remark he adds, in a limiting sense: 'Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister and mother.' It is as if this gospel had been written under the influence of those principles which Marcion had proclaimed in the Roman church with so much effect. If the law was to be separated from the gospel, the authority of those apostles must not be upheld who insisted on the continued validity of the law, and who, in the opinion of Marcion and his school, recognised the God of the Jews and not the God of the Christians. Still following Matthew's account, Mark now records the parable of the sower.[3] The abbreviations and alterations[4] clearly point to the writer's intention to spare the Jewish people in general, and yet to lower the authority of the twelve Apostles. Thus he follows Luke in omitting the Lord's words, which declare the twelve Apostles as blessed because of their eyes seeing and their ears hearing that which many prophets and righteous men have vainly desired to see and hear.[5] Instead of this he reports the Lord to have said to them: 'Know ye not this parable, and how then will ye know all parables?'[6] to which he adds that Jesus spoke the Word with many such parables unto them 'as they were able to hear it.'[7] At the same time Mark leaves out, as already observed, the Paulinic addition in the explanation of this parable as contained in Luke.[8]

Now follows[9] an extract from Luke[10] about the candle on a candlestick, the manifestation of every hidden thing,

[1] viii. 21. [2] Comp. v. 31. [3] iv. 1–20; comp. Mat. xiii. 1–23
[4] Comp. v. 11, 12. [5] Mat. xiii. 16, 17. [6] 13. [7] 33
[8] viii. 12 f. [9] iv. 21. [10] viii. 16 f.

and the admonition addressed to the disciples to take heed '*what*' they hear. This alteration of 'how' into 'what' receives an increased significance by Mark's subsequent addition of the words: 'With what measure ye meet, it shall be measured to you, and unto you that hear shall more be given.'[1] In Luke's version, the words, 'take heed therefore *how* ye hear, for whosoever hath, to him shall be given . . .,' clearly refer to the faithful hearing of the Word of God, to the seed that has fallen on the good ground, to those 'which *in an honest and good heart*, having heard the Word, keep it, and bring forth fruit *with patience*.'[2] But in Mark's version, this passage, modified as it has been, clearly refers to the proving of all things, including the gospel. The honest and good man is to take heed what he hears, he is to prove and hear that which is proclaimed as gospel-truth; he is to meet with an exact measure whatsoever he hears, knowing that to such an honestly-investigating and discriminating hearer it shall be measured accordingly, and that to him more shall be given. Far from its being enough to receive 'in an honest and good heart' any seed that may be cast upon it, and to bring forth fruit 'with patience,' the seed must be measured and winnowed, so as to prevent the tares from growing up among the wheat. If the seed is thus received 'with patience,' an honest and good heart may 'with patience' also wait for the time when the seed will grow up and bring fruit. And so it is with the kingdom of God. It is of primary importance that man should be careful 'what' seed is cast into his heart, for whatever kind of seed it may be, it is sure to 'spring and grow up, he knoweth not how,' even if he 'should sleep.' For important as the nurture of the ground of his heart be, the tares, if sown, will grow up by the side of the wheat, and remain there until the time of the harvest. Here, then, we find another reference to the spreading of false doctrine, that is, as we have seen, of that

[1] 24. [2] Luke viii. 15.

CHAP. XI.

docetic heresy which Marcion and his predecessors had openly preached ever since the beginning of the second century, whilst before that time the false teachers of that doctrine having been defeated, were skulking in dark retreats, and the Church was like a pure virgin.

The parable of the sower having caused Mark to return to the eighth chapter of Luke, he, from the 35th verse to the end of the fourth chapter, follows Luke in the composition of his narrative,[1] not, however, without inserting passages from Matthew, nor without putting aside some expressions in Luke's account. Here and there we meet with an independent rendering of the story. Thus, Matthew has it: 'O ye of little faith;' Luke: 'Where is your faith?' and Mark: 'How is it, that ye have *no* faith?' Again, Matthew states: 'The men marvelled;' Luke: 'And they being afraid, wondered;' and Mark: 'And they feared exceedingly.'

Chapters V. to VIII.

In the fifth chapter, Mark has related the story about the unclean spirit in the country of the Gadarenes, about the daughter of Jairus, and about the woman who was healed by touching the garment of Jesus. Here he follows almost entirely Luke's account. Unlike Matthew's narrative,[2] Mark and Luke[3] speak of but one demoniac, and the latter Evangelists show us the man who had been healed sitting by the side of Jesus, and being by him commanded to make known to his 'own house' (to his 'friends') the 'great things' which God (Mark has 'the Lord') had done unto him. This he did by publishing the news 'throughout the whole city,' according to Luke, and as Mark writes, 'in Decapolis,' the district of the ten cities, that is either the smaller district to the east and south-east of the Sea of Galilee, or a larger district extending on both sides of Jordan. It is difficult to suppose that these differences in the three accounts are casual. According to Matthew's gospel, on such occasions the command is invariably given not to tell any man, and this is repeat-

[1] Comp. Luke viii. 22 f. [2] viii. 28–34. [3] viii. 26–39.

edly recorded by Mark,[1] and also by Luke.[2] If here an exception is made by Luke and by Mark, we can hardly abstain from assuming that the intention of the writers was to show that Jesus having healed this Gentile, summoned him, as it were, as the first Apostle among the Gentiles, to publish abroad the mighty works of Jesus. Why should he be afraid of the Pharisees, though they were determined to punish any Messianic assumption?

The story about the daughter of Jairus is generally modelled by Mark after Luke; but the latter leaves out the request of the ruler of the synagogue, reported by Matthew and Mark, that Jesus would *lay his hand* upon her which was 'even now dead;' and this Evangelist shows that Jesus came to her who 'lay a-dying,' and had since been reported as dead, and having called upon Jairus to 'believe only,' he took the maid by the hand, saying: 'Maid, arise,' which words Mark repeats in the original language, and interprets to his non-Palestinian readers. The omission by Luke of the request that the Master would, by the laying on of his hand, restore the departed life of the maiden, clearly points to a want of faith on the part of the 'ruler of the synagogue.' This impression is strengthened by the addition of the words 'believe only, and she shall be made whole.' Mark, wishing to take, as we may assume, an intermediate position between the two accounts, copies from Matthew the request about the laying on of his hand, and at the same time copies from Luke the Lord's admonition addressed to Jairus, only to believe. Again, Luke's account admits of the supposition that 'all' were put out by the Lord, even Peter and James and John, and the father and the mother of the maiden, whilst Matthew expressly states that Jesus was accompanied to the ruler's house by his disciples, and that 'the people' only were put out. In order to remove the possibility of such an interpretation, which would deprive the Apostles of a certain distinction, Mark does not

[1] i. 44; v. 43. [2] v. 14.

CHAP. XI.

fail to mention, that 'when he had put them all out, he taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, *and them that were with him*, and entereth in where the damsel was lying.' Notwithstanding so evident an amalgamation of the two previously existing gospel-narratives, a few original traits or expressions are found in the Gospel after Mark, which may well be urged in favour of the supposition that its author had the benefit of other independent and more or less reliable sources. Such additions are: 'Talitha cumi,'[1] 'Corban,'[2] 'Ephatha,'[3] 'Rabbi,'[4] 'Bartimeus,'[5] 'Rabboni,'[6] 'Abba.'[7] Again, the record that the herd of swine consisted of about two thousand, and that the daughter of Jairus was 'of the age of twelve years.'[8]

Mark now lays aside Luke, and in the beginning of the sixth chapter,[9] takes up again Matthew's account,[10] exactly where he had left it,[11] in order there to insert Luke's narrative. Yet here an highly important alteration has been effected. In the Gospel after Matthew it is stated: 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' And even this version appears to be a modification of the original Hebrew text, as transmitted in the most ancient Syriac translation: 'Is not this the son of Joseph the carpenter?'[12] But Mark has it: 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?' This alteration is all the more important since in the genealogy of Matthew's gospel great stress is laid on Joseph's being a 'son of David,' as the angel of the Lord addressed him. Again, even in the Gospel after Luke, where these words are not recorded, the angel says unto Mary that the Lord shall give unto the child which she should bring forth 'the throne of *his father* David.' This can only mean, either that Jesus was a descendant from David, because Joseph was his father, or, that his Davidic descent was owing to the Virgin Mary's being the 'espoused wife' of Joseph, who was

[1] v. 41. [2] vii. 11. [3] vii. 34. [4] ix. 5; xi. 21; xiv. 45.
[5] x. 46. [6] x. 51. [7] xiv. 36. [8] v. 13, 42. [9] 1-6.
[10] Mat. xiii. 53–58. [11] Mark iv. 34. [12] See 'Cureton's Syriac Gospels.'

of the lineage of David. In either case it is through Joseph that Jesus was a descendant from David. Having been by Joseph taken into his house, Mary gave birth to Jesus, who thus was a son of David. Now, it is a significant fact that in the Gospel after Luke the expression 'son of David' does not even once occur in the account of the genealogy, and it is only recorded in the account of the *blind* man near Jericho.[1] Mark has only in two passages inserted this appellation, first, in the parallel passage about the blind man,[2] and secondly, when referring to 'the Scribes,' who said that Christ 'is the son of David,' a view which is refuted by the words attributed to our Lord in this and the parallel passages. It is also worthy of remark, that whilst Luke has recorded the words of the angel about 'the throne of his father David,' Mark states, that on the occasion of Christ's entry into Jerusalem the people exclaimed: 'Blessed be the kingdom of our father David,'[3] and this is the more strange, since he has followed Luke in omitting the exclamation of the multitude: 'Hosanna to the son of David.'[4] To this we must add, that neither in the Gospel after John nor in the Acts, nor in any of the Epistles of Paul, the expression 'the son of David' has been recorded. Paul says that Jesus 'was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;'[5] and this statement is contained in a more ambiguous form in the Gospel after John, where it is said that some referred to the scripture as showing that 'Christ cometh of the seed of David.'[6]

We find, therefore, that first Jesus was generally regarded as the son of Joseph, who was the son of David, or, which is identical, that concerning the flesh he came from the Jews, that he was of the seed of David according to the flesh; then that he was shown to be the son of Adam, 'which was the Son of God.'[7] Having laid aside this view about his Divine sonship *notwithstanding* the usual carnal descent, Jesus was regarded merely as the inheritor

[1] Luke xviii. 38, 39. [2] x. 47, 48. [3] Mark xi. 10. [4] Mat. xxi. 15.
[5] Rom. i. 3; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 8. [6] John vii. 42. [7] Luke iii. 38.

CHAP. XI.

of the *throne* of David, whilst only the Scribes and Pharisees and blind men continued to regard him as the *son* of David. Then Christ was shown to be the son of Mary, to whom, instead of to Joseph, the announcing angel had appeared. And, finally, 'there was a division among the people because of him,' as some did not believe that the Messiah could come 'out of Galilee,' and insisted that according to scripture he must come 'of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was born.' This passage unequivocally shows that, in the opinion of some, the direct refutation of which opinion is not recorded, Christ was born in Galilee and not in Bethlehem, and that he was not of the seed of David. The conception of Jesus as the son of Joseph, and David, and Abraham, and Adam, 'which was the Son of God,' was therefore gradually removed, and replaced by the conception of Jesus as the son of the Virgin Mary and likewise of God. It is evident that these and similar passages, which mark a dogmatic development, point to a docetic source, if not to a direct docetic influence.

Mark having in the first six verses of the sixth chapter followed Matthew's account, he now returns to Luke's narrative, by taking it up where he had last left it;[1] and he follows the same up to the sixteenth verse, when he again returns to Matthew.[2] The account of John the Baptist's death[3] having been framed and amplified[4] after Matthew,[5] Mark writes the three verses from the thirtieth to the thirty-third with an eye to Luke's narrative.[6] With the thirty-fourth verse he again returns to Matthew,[7] although the account of the five thousand being fed is more assimilated to Luke; but from the forty-fifth verse, Mark uninterruptedly follows Matthew's narrative. The account of Peter's walking on the sea is omitted, for it cannot have been a later interpolation in Matthew.[8] In the beginning of the seventh chapter Mark inserts from the fifteenth chapter of Matthew

[1] Luke ix. 1. [2] xiv. 1. [3] Mark vi. 29. [4] See verse 19 &c.
[5] xiv. 1-12. [6] ix. 10, 11. [7] xiv. 14. [8] xiv. 28–31.

the admonition addressed by Jesus to the Pharisees because of their transgressing the commandment of God by their tradition; an account which Luke has omitted, perhaps because of the indirect implication of the continued validity of the law therein contained. And a consideration for the Jews (or Jewish Christians of the Roman church) is further exemplified by Mark omitting[1] the most severe words of Jesus against the Jews, as recorded in Matthew, about the uprooting of every plant not planted by God, and about 'the blind leaders of the blind.'[2] At the same time the composer of the gospel of peace by compromise, has left out[3] those traits which might act as a discouragement to all non-Jewish Christians. Such is the passage: 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.'[4] Again, the hard-sounding refusal of the Lord to help the woman of Canaan is greatly mitigated by Mark's preceding statement, that Jesus having entered a house on the borders of Tyre and Sidon, the exclusively Gentile quarter, 'would have no man know it.' Whilst thus Matthew's account is harmonised with that of Luke, the latter's account about the universal mission of Jesus to Jews and Gentiles, and of his journeys even into Samaria, is somewhat harmonised with Matthew's account by Mark's statement, that Jesus did go, although secretly, at least as far as to the Gentile borders.

In the following account about the Pharisees and Sadducees who demand a sign from heaven,[5] Mark's mild disposition towards the Jews is again manifested. Instead of inserting the words 'O ye hypocrites,' and 'a wicked and adulterous generation,'[6] Jesus is by him reported to have 'sighed deeply in his spirit,' and simply to have said that 'there shall no sign be given to this generation.' Again in the following narrative, 'the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod' is not explicitly identified with the whole 'doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sad-

[1] vii. 16 f. [2] Mat. xv. 13, 14. [3] vii. 24–30.
[4] Mat. xv. 24. [5] Mark viii. 10–13. [6] Mat. xvi. 3, 4.

CHAP. XI.

ducees,' although this is done in the Gospel after Matthew. We may here also point out the significant omission of the Sadducees in all gospels except in that after Matthew. In his zeal against the Jews, Luke may have preferred to amalgamate the Jewish rulers in one party, without recording a distinction in favour of the Pharisees. And in his conciliatory tendency, Mark may have preferred not to tax any of the rulers of the Jews with unbelief in the resurrection. Moreover, it is probable that the Sadducees existed only in Palestine, and this would account for the Palestinian gospel being the only one which refers to them. Whilst Mark has by these omissions spared the Jews and Jewish Christians, he as it were supplies the missing parallel of these passages in Luke, by adding that Christ asked the Jews whether they had their 'heart yet hardened,'[1] having previously expressly declared that 'their heart *was* hardened.'[2] Likewise the words of Isaiah[3] about having eyes and ears and yet neither seeing nor hearing, are, according to Mark, addressed by the Lord to those 'that are without,' whilst in Matthew's account these are addressed to all but the Twelve. Although it was given to the Apostles and to those who were about Jesus 'with the Twelve,' to know 'the mystery' of the divine kingdom,[4] yet it is clearly implied in this Gospel, that even the few to whom, when they were alone, Christ expounded 'all things,'[5] did not understand, and were therefore ignorant of this mystery.[6]

It must be admitted, that by the above essential alterations, Mark does in fact diminish the discrepancy between the two first gospels. The same compromising tendency is exhibited in the account of Peter's confession,[7] by the omission of the passages in which Peter is by the Lord called blessed, for having uttered the confession about Christ the spiritual rock, and in which Peter is intrusted with the keys.[8] In a similar manner, and apparently

[1] Mark viii. 17. [2] Mark vi. 52. [3] vi. 10.
[4] Mark iv. 11. [5] Mark iv. 34; ix. 32. [6] Comp. Rom. xi. 25.
[7] Mark viii. 29, 30. [8] Mat. xvi. 15-19.

for the attainment of the same object, Mark has in his account about Christ's walking on the sea[1] left out that part which shows that Peter believed in his Master's power to make him likewise walk on the sea, and that his faith was changed into vision.[2] Yet Mark has followed Matthew in recording[3] Peter's being rebuked by the words 'get thee behind me Satan.' Again, whilst according to Matthew, Peter confessed Christ to be 'the Son of the living God,' and whilst Luke states[4] that Peter regarded his Master as 'the Christ of God,' Mark takes an intermediate position, and changes these words in 'thou art the Christ,'[5] whilst, like Luke, leaving out Christ's benediction to Peter.

The ninth chapter begins with a very characteristic alteration. According to Christ's words as here recorded, some of the cotemporaries of the Lord would see 'the kingdom of God come with power,' instead of 'the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.'[6] It is reasonable to suppose that the cause of this alteration lay in the circumstance that when the Gospel after Mark was finally revised in the form transmitted to us, all the cotemporaries of Christ had died without his visible return. In the account of the transfiguration,[7] Mark follows Matthew,[8] and avoids to state that Moses and Elias spoke to Jesus 'of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.'[9] Yet he accepts Luke's version that Peter spoke 'not knowing what he said,' although he adds to the words 'he wist not what to say,' the explanation 'for they were sore afraid.' When we consider that the above words in Luke seem to refer to the circumstance that Peter and they that were with him were 'heavy with sleep,' it will be allowed that Mark's explaining them by the fear which had overcome them, shows that the Evangelist regards that fear as the natural result of the supernatural transformation of the person of Christ. Apparently for this reason he has not

[1] vi. 48–51. [2] Mat. xiv. 28–31. [3] viii. 32, 33.
[4] ix. 20. [5] viii. 29. [6] Mat. xvi. 28; comp. Luke ix. 27.
[7] Mark ix. 2–8. [8] xvii. 1–8. [9] Luke ix. 31.

CHAP. XI.

recorded Matthew's statement that the Lord 'touched them,'[1] for this he could not have done as an incorporeal spirit. And it may be explained by Mark's consideration for the Jews, that he left out Matthew's statement about the Jews not having known Elias.

The remainder of this chapter[2] is principally borrowed from Luke, although here also the tendency of the mediator is easily traced. On the one side Mark records after Luke the charge addressed to the disciples, that they 'understood not' the words of Christ.[3] The Evangelist can hardly have had before him the account of the tribute money recorded in our version of Matthew's gospel,[4] which cuts in two verse thirty-three in Mark's ninth chapter. Likewise he accepts from Luke the Lord's command to his disciples there recorded, not to forbid even one who has not had fellowship with them from acting for their Master.[5] And Mark strengthens this declaration by adding: 'For there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me.' Both Luke and Mark seem to point by this passage to Paul, who had been through miracles accredited as the Apostle of the Gentiles, although he had not walked with Jesus, nor followed his disciples. In order to leave no doubt on this subject, that even the least act of the least person shall be rewarded, if done in the name of Christ, Mark inserts here from an earlier chapter in Matthew,[6] the slightly altered passage about 'a cup of water' offered in Christ's name to the disciples. On the other hand, Mark seems to have the Jewish Christians in view when he omits the Lord's charge of unbelief addressed to the disciples in the Gospel after Matthew.[7]

Mark has carefully weighed in this chapter the discordant elements contained in the gospel of the Jewish Christians, and in that of the Paulinic Christians, and he has yielded about as much to the one as to the other.

[1] Comp. John xx. 17. [2] Mark ix. 14–50. [3] Luke ix. 45; Mark ix. 32.
[4] xvii. 24–27. [5] Luke ix. 49, 50. [6] x. 42.
[7] xvii. 20; Mark ix. 29.

The Apostles have received the Lord's warning against vain disputes among themselves, about who should be the greatest, and they have been told that he who desireth 'to be first shall be last of all and servant of all.'[1] Then the Lord's declaration has been recorded, that whosoever shall offend any of 'the little ones' that believe in Christ, that is, of those who, though they did not follow the Apostles,[2] yet were not against but for Christ, it would be better for him, 'that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea;'[3] and finally the Lord's injunction has been inserted, to cut off every cause of offence. The above passage about 'the little ones' has been altered in such a manner from Matthew's text that it has received an entirely different sense. In Matthew the words, 'these little ones' refer to the little children surrounding the Lord, one of whom was called by him and set in the midst of his disciples, who were then debating among themselves about who should be greatest. But by leaving out the passages which refer to 'their angels,' and by inserting from Luke the account about the *one man* whom the Apostles had forbidden to cast out devils because he had not followed them, Mark has either changed the character of his narrative, which may be taken to refer to the existing differences between the twelve Apostles and Paul, or this part of the narrative refers to the one hostile man, the first adversary of the Apostles, to Simon Magus. Perhaps the former of these interpretations is to be preferred, for not only is Simon Magus no where mentioned in this gospel, but we have seen that in Luke's version of the parable about the marriage of the king's son,[4] the Lord sends out his *one* servant, and that '*none*' of those who were first bidden (including the twelve Apostles) were invited. In Matthew's version the Lord sends out 'his servants,' and only that *one man* is condemned, and not permitted to participate in the supper, who was not clothed in the

[1] Mark ix. 35. [2] The great ones; comp. Gal. ii. [3] Mark ix. 42. [4] xiv. 16–24.

CHAP. XI.

wedding garment of the law. We further pointed out that the twelve Apostles seem to be referred to in Luke's version as the salt which has lost 'his savour,' and which must be 'cast out;' that it is said of them, that they have laid the foundations, but failed to build the tower of Christ's church; that they have made war without consulting 'him' (that *one man*) who would come against them; that their gospel has been supplanted by 'another;' that those who seemed the first have become last, and that the last had become first. The last is Paul, who was 'born out of due time,' who acknowledged that the twelve had been Apostles before him; and who yet humbly calls himself 'the least of the Apostles,' although 'in nothing' was he 'behind the very chiefest of the Apostles.'

It is impossible to say whether the account about the one man was or was not intended by the Evangelist to refer to Paul; at all events this passage might be so explained by the Paulinic Christians, even if it originally referred to Simon Magus. But the most probable interpretation seems to be, that, anxious to pursue a middle course between Matthew's and Luke's gospels, Mark used the above vague term, whilst possibly referring to Paul's disciples when speaking about the 'little ones,' that is, about the disciples of the 'one' who, as the last, is the least.[1] These little ones do 'believe' in Christ, and must therefore not be cut off.[2] Having pointed out this, the Evangelist has no need to refer to the following part of Matthew's narrative,[3] which in the beginning again refers to those

[1] Unless we utterly fail in pointing out the visible traces of design and arrangement in this and the other Gospels, but especially in the one we are considering, such arguments as those which we bring forward cannot be affected by the assertion, however authoritatively pronounced, that 'facts give no warrant for the dream that the first Evangelist represents the Judaic type of Christianity, and the third the Pauline; and that Mark occupies an intermediate position, marking the transition from one to the other. In St. Mark we have the Gospel as it was preached to all the world, and it is so presented as to suit the wants of Gentiles. But there is no trace of the wish, conscious or unconscious, to assist in any change of Christian belief or modes of thinking.'—The Archbishop of York in Smith's Dictionary on the Gospel of Mark. [2] Mark ix. 43. [3] xviii. 10–35.

children of Christ who are called 'these little ones,' and who are not to be despised. The admonition for peace contained in the above part of Matthew, Mark sums up in one verse [1] which concludes this chapter, so remarkable for the evident traces of a compromising and peace-establishing tendency. 'Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another:' this is the Evangelist's concluding address to the divided parties of the Church.

In order to understand the meaning of these words, it is necessary to bear in mind that in the sermon on the mount, as recorded in Matthew's Gospel, the Lord had designated the twelve as 'the light of the world,' and 'the salt of the earth.' We have seen that this commendation of the first-called Apostles has been by Luke reported as a reproof. To take a conciliatory position between these antagonistic accounts was a matter of great importance, but of still greater difficulty. It was only possible to do so by omitting the sermon on the mount and by generalising the words about the salt. Thus, instead of calling the twelve blessed for being the salt of the earth, and for being by trials enabled to preserve the savour of their salt, and instead of implying that the twelve have lost the seasoning quality of their salt, Mark seems to say: 'Have (all of you) salt in yourselves,' and remember that if you will preserve your salt, which is the gift of the Spirit, you must 'have peace one with another.' With your disputes about the greatest and the least you give offence, and you poison the others, instead of influencing them for good by the salt which is within you, and which is intended to save from corruption.

It may now be possible to venture on an explanation of the dark and mysterious preceding passage: 'For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.' And first of all we must bear in mind that these words follow upon, and are by the word 'for' directly connected with, the passage about cutting off even

[1] Mark ix. 50.

CHAP. XI.

what we most value, if it be a cause of offence. That which man values even more than his hand or his foot, or his eye, is his life; and there are but few who are ready to sacrifice it for the cause of peace and truth. Now fire is in every part of Scripture referred to as the type of trial, persecution, and death. Apart from 'the fire which is not quenched,' fiery trials are by God sent to men in order that their salt should not lose its savour. But there have been occasions when men could not preserve the salt which is within them, when they could not keep their lamps burning, could not follow the dictates of their conscience, could not fulfil their mission, unless they underwent the fiery trial of martyrdom. And as the 'meat offerings' were seasoned with salt,[1] and as upon the bullock and ram 'without blemish,' to be offered before the Lord, the priests were commanded to 'cast salt,'[2] so the martyrs undergoing the fiery trial might be referred to as being 'salted with salt,' as a 'sacrifice,' or burnt offering. If so, this otherwise inexplicable passage may refer not only to the martyrs generally, but especially to Peter and Paul, whose death must have exercised a very conciliatory influence among the two great parties in the Church, of which these two Apostles were regarded as the leaders, at least in Rome, where Mark's gospel was written. If this interpretation be admitted, and the text does seem to suggest it, then the connexion between this mysterious passage and the preceding account is at once explained. For having unto the end faithfully served the truth, according to their several abilities, and according to the circumstances in which they were placed, Peter and Paul were 'cut off' from the scene of their labours, and they as it were cast away their lives, which had been the cause of so much dissension and offence. Peter did lay down his life for Christ's sake,[3] for when he was old he stretched forth his hand on the cross of martyrdom, and by his death glorified God.[4] And Paul, when he was 'ready to be

[1] Levit. ii. 13. [2] Ez. xliii. 24. [3] John xiii. 37. [4] John xxi. 18, 19.

offered' on 'the service' of Christ's faith,[1] was in all probability beheaded during the Neronic persecution at Rome, and in the same year when Peter was crucified in that city.[2] Both of these great Apostles, as well as their predecessors and successors, from Stephen to Ignatius, Justin, Polycarp, and others, were presented as a living sacrifice, as a well-pleasing burnt offering, to the God of peace towards the men of goodwill. They followed the bridegroom to the wedding, as joint heirs with Christ; and their lives were 'hid with Christ in God.'[3]

In his tenth chapter Mark follows the narrative contained in the nineteenth and twentieth chapters of Matthew, except that he, as usual, interlaces here and there a few traits from the parallel account.[4] No important alterations occur here: but in the account concerning the divorcement, which Luke has omitted probably because of the reference to the Mosaic law, the dark passage about the eunuchs[5] is left out by Mark;[6] and likewise the parable about labourers hired at the vineyard[7] has not been inserted by him, as we have already observed. Instead of two blind men near Jericho,[8] Mark follows Luke in mentioning only one, and his words, 'And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth,' seem likewise to point to Luke's account, where it is recorded that the blind man 'hearing the multitude pass by asked what it meant,' to which question, though Mark has not repeated it, the above passage in Mark contains the answer. Again, the name of Bartimeus, 'son of purity,' has the same meaning as Zaccheus, 'the purified one.' As in Luke's account, so it is here expressly stated that 'faith' is necessary to salvation. Possibly the new incident here recorded of the blind man, that, having been called by the Lord, he cast away his garment, may by the Evangelist be intended to refer to the necessity of casting away the garment of the

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 6; Phil. ii. 17.
[2] 64 or 65 A.C.
[3] Col. iii. 3.
[4] Luke xviii.
[5] Mat. xix. 12.
[6] x. 9 f.
[7] Mat. xx. 1 f.
[8] Mat. xx. 30.

CHAP. XI.

law, and of being clothed in the righteousness of Christ, which is by faith only.

In the eleventh chapter of Mark, which corresponds with the twenty-first of Matthew, we must first observe that Mark has made of the two continuous narratives contained in Matthew four separate ones, the chronological order of which has been altered; whether in Matthew's or in Mark's gospel cannot be determined. The disconnected passages in Mark xi. 1–11 and 15–19 belong to the first of Matthew's stories,[1] and Mark xi. 12–14 and 20–24 to the other.[2] Here we have to consider in detail only that part of the narrative which refers to the fig-tree.[3] Mark's version seems to point to a more original source than that of Matthew. Jesus 'was hungry, and, seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came if haply he might find anything thereon; and when he came to it he found nothing but leaves, for the time of figs was not yet.' The first question is, Was it what we now call a fig-tree? It seems clearly to have been a 'fig-mulberry' or sycomore tree, which up to the present time is in Palestine 'a tree of great importance and very extensive use, . . *always verdant*, and bears fruit several times in the year, *without being confined to fixed seasons*.'[4] The fruit is eatable[5] and exactly like a fig, and, as the time of mulberry-figs is uncertain, Jesus might expect to find fruit on the tree whilst at a distance, and would not know till he came near that 'the time of figs was not yet.' Thus every difficulty of historically interpreting this narrative vanishes, whilst its allegorical interpretation receives additional point and beauty. For like the fig-mulberry, Israel might by Jesus be expected to bear fruit at any time.

Mark's additional statement in the following narrative, 'and sought how they might destroy him,' seems to be

[1] Mat. xxi. 1–17. [2] Mat. xxi. 18–22. [3] Mark xi. 12–14; Mat. xxi. 18–22.
[4] See Mr. Stowe's article on the 'Sycomore' in 'Smith's Dictionary.'
[5] Amos was 'a gatherer of sycomore fruit.' (Am. vii. 14.)

inserted from Luke,[1] who states that 'the chief priests and the scribes and the chief of the people sought to destroy him.' The passage about the mountain-removing faith, and about the believing prayer, coupled with the admonition to forgive men's trespasses,[2] may have been modelled after Luke's account.[3] But the most important alteration from Matthew's account is Mark's changing the words: 'My house shall be called the house of prayer' into 'my house shall be called *of all nations* the house of prayer.'[4] The parable about the two sons[5] may be omitted by the Evangelist because of its implying that the Jews did not repent of having refused the first call to work in the vineyard.

The same tendency to spare the Jewish people is traceable in the twelfth chapter of Mark, where, at the end of the parable about the faithless husbandmen,[6] Mark has left out the declaration of Jesus contained in Matthew,[7] that the kingdom of God shall be taken from the Jews and be given to others, and that whosoever shall fall against this stone shall perish. Again, in his account about the Scribe who inquired which was the first commandment,[8] the latter is recorded to have spoken so very much in the spirit of Christ as to have declared that the true love to the one and only God, and to one's neighbour, 'is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.' Therefore Christ is here reported to have said to him: 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' In a similar manner Mark has previously stated[9] that Jesus had looked with a loving eye upon the man who asked him what he should do in order to inherit eternal life. At the same time Mark has inserted in the twelfth chapter[10] Luke's account of the widow's mites,[11] although the poor widow might by the Paulinic reader be regarded as the representative of the Gentiles, and as opposed to the Jews. For we have seen in the

[1] xix. 47. [2] Mark xi. 23-26. [3] xvii. 3–5. [4] xi. 17.
[5] Mat. xxi. 28–32. [6] v. 11. [7] xxi. 43 f. [8] Mark xii. 28–34.
[9] x. 21 f. [10] 41-44. [11] xxi. 1–4.

CHAP. XI.

parable about Lazarus and the rich man, that the two parties seem in Luke's gospel to be thus defined. This is almost the only instance [1] where Mark has accepted an entire narrative which is only recorded by Luke.

Mark's object to spare the Jews again comes to light by his omission of the parable about the marriage feast of the king's son,[2] which in Luke's gospel had been rendered so differently[3] as even to make the Lord imply that 'none' of the Jews should taste of his supper. Again, the long discourses against the Scribes and the Pharisees[4] Mark has concentrated in a few verses [5] which are taken from Luke,[6] where, however, the omission of the entire account is perhaps best explained by the contrary tendency to omit the recognition by the Lord of the authority of the Scribes and Pharisees who 'sit in Moses' seat.' Again, in the thirteenth chapter of Mark, containing almost the entire twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, and a few parallels from Luke,[7] the same deference is paid to the Jews. Luke has in his parallel account strongly expressed the feelings of enmity entertained by some Paulinians against the Jews and Jewish Christians.[8] The 'wrath' of God is to fall upon this people; it shall either fall by the sword or be led captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. In Mark this prophecy, which had at that time probably been already fulfilled, is rendered far more consoling by the passage about 'the abomination of desolation . . . standing *where it ought not.*'[9] And this prophecy is preceded [10] by the insertion of the passage from Matthew,[11] which Mark has rendered in a milder form, whilst also amplifying it by interpolations from Luke. Thus the statement that many shall be deceived is omitted by Mark, and likewise the other about the rising of false prophets, through the teaching of whom 'iniquity,' or rather 'the despising of the law,' shall

[1] Comp. Mark ix. 38, 39; Luke ix. 49, 50. [2] Mat. xxii. 1–14.
[3] Luke xiv. 16–24. [4] Mat. xxiii. [5] xii. 38–40. [6] xx. 45–47.
[7] Mark xiii. 5–37. [8] xxi. 20–25. [9] 14 [10] 10–13. [11] xxiv. 10–12.

abound. The latter expression might easily be interpreted as referring to Paul, who insisted on righteousness 'without the deeds of the law;' and, as a necessary consequence, the deceiving of many would then be understood to refer to the Paulinic opposition to the limited first apostolic Gospel-record by Paul's 'other' gospel about the Hidden Wisdom of Christ. These omissions are, therefore, among the strongest proofs of the conciliatory tendency and the systematic arrangement of the Gospel after Mark. For it is the gospel of strife-allaying compromise, and the monument to the memory of Peter and Paul, the leaders of the opposing parties in the Church, who had sunk their differences in martyrdom, and having been 'salted with fire,' and presented as a burnt-offering before God, had once and for ever atoned for the necessary and salutary warfare for a time waged between their respective followers, the adherents of the original and of the posthumous Gospel of Christ.

For these weighty reasons the Evangelist, who wrote after the death of Peter and Paul, and under the calming and uniting influence of their martyrdom, has omitted other passages more or less open to an interpretation hostile to the establishment of 'the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God.'[1] Thus Mark has not inserted either the milder version of Matthew[2] or the more severe one of Luke,[3] about Noah and Lot's wife, and about the taking of the one and the leaving of the other member of the same household.[4] And in the following parable about the man who, previously to his taking a far journey, appointed 'servants'[5] to watch his house, the expressions recorded in Matthew[6] about the 'faithful and wise servant,' and about the 'evil servant,' are carefully avoided, as if in those days of zealous partisanship those definitions might be respectively applied to Peter and to Paul. And with the same pacifying object in view, Mark

[1] Eph. iv. 13.
[2] xxiv. 37–41.
[3] xvii. 26–37.
[4] See Mark xiii. 32, 33.
[5] Comp. Luke xiv. 16–24.
[6] xxiv. 44–51.

CHAP. XI.

has omitted the prayer recorded in Matthew, that the flight may not be on the Sabbath; for thus the binding rule of the law would have been acknowledged.

Finally Mark has, and apparently for similar reasons, not inserted the account contained in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, about the ten virgins and the talents. It may be that the parable of the wise and the foolish virgins was by some Paulinians interpreted in a manner hostile to the Jewish party, inasmuch as the latter were regarded as too blind and 'heavy with sleep' to see the glory of Christ.[1] The parable of the talents may, as we have seen, be easily understood to refer to the twelve Apostles hiding the treasure committed to their care. And, finally, the account of the last judgment is omitted, and this perhaps because it proclaims 'life eternal' to 'the righteous,' whose works are praised, whilst nothing is said about 'faith only;' and because it makes Christ condemn those to 'everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels,' who have not performed the good works of the former. Such statements could not possibly be inserted in a compromising gospel, at a time when many must have doubted whether Christ could ever have spoken such words as are recorded in this part of the Palestinian gospel, of which it must have been known that it had received various additions in course of time. To sit on the right hand *and* on the left hand of Christ in his kingdom was asked of Christ, as a favour, which the latter declared he could not himself grant, adding that 'it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my father.'[2] How, then, could the same gracious Lord condemn, as hopelessly lost, those on his left by saying to them, 'Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire.'[3] It was in the Spirit of Christ that righteousness was declared to be, not of works, but by faith only; that Luke had shown how the thief on the cross was forgiven, and that Paul proclaimed that God would eventually be 'all

[1] Comp. Luke ix. 32. [2] Mat. xx. 23; Mark x. 40. [3] Comp. Is. xxxiii. 14.

in *all*,' and that there is therefore now *no condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus.[1] CHAP. XI.

The omission of this account about the judgment day by Mark is all the more important, because Luke has not referred to it. But, true to his conciliatory policy, the writer of 'the Gospel after Mark' has in another passage defined hell in the same manner as Ezekiel had described a conflagration of endless duration, destroying '*the surface*' of a certain district.[2] Quoting the words of Isaiah,[3] the writer states that all offenders of those who belong to Christ shall 'go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'[4] This punishment, however, awaits those only who have shown a want, not of works, but of faith, inasmuch as they have not cut off the offending hand or foot, nor plucked out the offending eye, but have allowed them to remain as hindrances to the kingdom of God, instead of preserving the salt within them.

Chapters XIV. to XVI.

The fourteenth chapter of the Gospel after Mark corresponds with the twenty sixth chapter of Matthew, and although it generally coincides with the same, yet nowhere is the interlacing of the two original accounts more evident than in the commencement of this chapter. 'After two days was the feast of the passover,' is taken from Matthew ;[5] 'and of unleavened bread,' is borrowed from Luke ;[6] and so likewise the continuation, 'And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might ... put him to death ;' whilst the words 'take him by craft' point to Matthew's account, with the fifth verse of which the second verse of Mark's narrative literally corresponds. All important alterations introduced by Luke, and which might be interpreted as referring to the twelve disciples, have been left out by Mark; thus the accounts of the strife among them after the last supper, and about the presence of Judas during that ceremony, are omitted.

[1] Rom. viii. 1; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22, 26–28; Eph. i. 10. [2] Ez. xx. 47.
[3] lxvi. 24. [4] Mark ix. 43, 44. [5] xxvi. 2. [6] xxii. 1.

CHAP. XI.

Even the traitor is hardly mentioned, and no room is given for the supposition that Judas joined the others in the question, 'Is it I?' whilst this is clearly implied in Matthew.[1] Again, nothing is said about the withdrawing of Judas; and the incident respecting the thirty pieces of silver is not recorded; it is only said that the chief priests 'promised to give him money.'[2] This is all the more surprising since the Evangelist, as we have seen, is so fond of recording details, and particularly of giving the exact numbers.[3] Apparently for similar reasons he has avoided to follow Matthew in relating that 'the disciples' were filled with indignation about the wasting of the ointment. Mark states that 'there were some' who felt indignant at this.

The mysterious account about the young man who followed Christ when 'all,' even the Apostles, 'forsook him and fled,'[4] has been by early tradition interpreted as referring to Mark himself. For this no reason can be assigned. The Evangelist may have recorded this incident in order to suggest the figurative interpretation of the same, that no outward garment is required at the bridegroom's wedding. The preservation of the salt within, the burning of the lamps, is the one thing needful for the followers of Christ. The 'linen cloth' probably denotes the young man to have been a member of the Essenic body, since according to Epiphanius and Eusebius[5] the Essenes wore only a linen cloth over their naked body.

The fifteenth chapter exactly corresponds with the twenty-seventh of Matthew, and thus Mark has avoided to take notice of Luke's alterations in favour of Pilate and his soldiers, or of such as are directed against the Jewish community. His consideration for the latter explains, more or less, all omissions. Thus even the rebellious clamour of the people, the warning given to them by Pilate's washing his hands, and the blind and self-condemning words, 'His

[1] xxvi. 29. [2] xiv. 11. [3] Comp. vi. 37; xiv. 5. [4] Mark xiv. 51, 52.
[5] See Gfrörer, 'Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit,' p. 360.

blood be on us and on our children,' are traits which Mark has not accepted from Matthew. Pilate appears even more willing than in the latter's account to let the crucifixion take place; and therefore the so often repeated interference of the people is not required, and it is expressly stated that Pilate was 'willing to content the people.' And in order that this may appear to have been done without any difficulty, Mark has left out the account of the warning given to him by his wife.[1] Another omission is the appalling incident about the opening of the graves of the rising bodies of the saints, and of these appearing in the streets of Jerusalem, which account might be regarded as the announcement of a catastrophe, and of a final judgment against the Jews, whilst these passages would offend the Paulinic view of a spiritual resurrection. Again, the sealing of the grave is not recorded by Mark, perhaps because this act likewise implied the bodily instead of the spiritual resurrection of Christ. Finally, neither the repentance nor the end of 'the son of perdition' is mentioned in this chapter.

In the sixteenth chapter of Mark we meet with the same tendency of sparing the Jewish nation. Thus the account is admitted which is recorded in Matthew[2] about the Jews bribing the soldiers, in order that these might say that the disciples had stolen the body. The narrative of the resurrection seems to be composed after Matthew's and Luke's accounts.[3] Following Luke, Mark states as the reason of the women's going to the sepulchre, their intention of embalming the body. Yet, instead of the *two* angels appearing at the grave, according to Matthew and Luke, Mark reports of only one.[4] With this account the Gospel after Mark may possibly have

[1] Mat. xxvii. 19; comp. Mark xv. 10, 11. [2] xxviii. 11–15.

[3] Mat. xxviii. 1–10; Luke xxiii. 56; xxiv. 1 f.

[4] It may here be observed, that the record contained in our version of Luke about an angel appearing unto Christ during the agony in the garden (Luke xxii. 43) is not to be found in the oldest gospel manuscripts.

CHAP. XI.

originally concluded.[1] In our version a reference to Luke's gospel is contained in the account of Christ's appearing 'in another form' unto two of the disciples 'as they walked and went into the country.'[2] It is certain that the concluding part of this gospel, as contained in our version, is not the original one. In the oldest Gospel-manuscripts this part of the record is altogether omitted, and in others a shorter narrative is added to the account of the resurrection, which concluding narrative is written in a style much more resembling the language of this gospel in the first part of the canonical gospel after Mark.

Results.

The above examination of the Gospel after Mark, and its comparison with the Gospel after Matthew and after Luke seem to confirm the supposition at which we had previously arrived, that the second Gospel of our Canon was intended to conciliate the party of the twelve apostles with the party of Paul. It is the gospel of peace by compromise, which takes an intermediate position between the Gospel after Matthew and the Gospel after Luke. The former is the apostolic exponent of the non-apocryphal sayings of Christ, whilst the third Gospel of our Canon is an amended version of the first record, in accordance with the mysteries which Christ secretly communicated to the disciples only, and which the Twelve continued to hide from the people, whilst Paul openly promulgated the Hidden Wisdom. Thus the position assigned to the Gospel after Mark in our Canon is explained and justified, notwithstanding its later origin.

Original Gospel of Mark.

The interpreter of Peter has written a gospel in Greek originally for the Roman Christians; this is established beyond doubt. We have already pointed out various circumstances which do not seem to favour the implied assertion of Eusebius, that 'the Gospel *of* Mark' was identical with 'the Gospel *after* Mark,' of which latter, under this denomination, no specific mention is made

[1] Mark xvi. 8. [2] xvi. 12.

before Irenæus in the end of the second century. The Gospel of Mark in its original form was considered as the substance of Peter's addresses in Rome, according to the unopposed testimony of the early Church. Indeed, Tertullian calls Mark the interpreter and editor of 'Peter's Gospel,'[1] and Jerome even goes so far as to assert that the Gospel after Mark was dictated to him by Peter.[2] No wonder, then, that in the second century a 'Gospel of Peter' was in existence. We meet with the earliest notice of such a gospel in an epistle which towards the end of the second century, probably about the year 190, was addressed by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, to the church at Rhossus, the ancient Orossus, in Cilicia, which church made use of a Gospel of Peter. This epistle, or an extract of the same, as transmitted by Eusebius,[3] is as follows:—

'We brethren receive Peter and the other Apostles as Christ himself. But these writings, which falsely go under their name, now that we are well acquainted with them, we reject, and know also that we have not received such handed down to us. But when I came to you, I had supposed that all held to the true faith; and as I had not perused the gospel presented by them under the name of Peter, I said: If this be the only thing that creates difference among you, let it be read; but now, having understood from what was said to me, that their minds were enveloped in some heresy, I will make haste to come to you again; therefore, brethren, expect me soon. But as we perceived what was the heresy of Marcianus, we plainly saw that he ignorantly contradicted himself, which things you may learn from what has been written to you. For we have borrowed this gospel from others, who have studied it; that is, from the successors of those who led the way before him, whom we call Docetæ, for most opinions have sprung from this sect. And in this we have discovered *the greater part* (to be) *in harmony with the*

[1] Adv. Mar. iv. 5. [2] Hier. ad Hedib. qu. 11. [3] H. E. vi. 12.

CHAP. XI.

sound doctrine of the Saviour, but some things superadded, which we have also subjoined for your sakes.'

From this highly important document, we learn that the Bishop did not at first object to the reading of such a gospel, though it had occasioned differences in the church at Rhossus. It may well be doubted whether Serapion would have permitted the reading in the church of a gospel of which, although he had not read the same, he knew that it went 'falsely' under the name of Peter's Gospel, if there had not existed at that time a gospel which was written, if not on the authority of, at least in the spirit of, Peter, and which might be regarded as substantially the Gospel of Peter. We may even go further, and assume that the gospel in question, after due inspection by the bishop, did turn out to be an augmented copy of the original Gospel 'of' Mark. For Serapion found the greater part of the same 'in harmony with the sound doctrine of the Saviour,' although containing also some extraneous doctrine, which the Bishop pointed out. Apparently for this reason the Bishop does not cancel his previous permission to read this gospel in the church, although the minds of some 'were enveloped in some heresy,' of which we are told that it was of a Docetic character; it cannot however be proved that the name of Marcianus contains a direct reference to the Marcionites. The Bishop does not deem it necessary to do more than to note down which were the things superadded to the wholesome doctrine of the Lord, which, as we know, was based on 'the wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ' and 'the doctrine which leadeth to godliness;'[1] a passage to which Serapion evidently alludes, as expressing the acknowledged test of orthodoxy. According to this rule of faith, heresy was everything which, whilst being contrary to the words of Christ, referred to the vain speculations of 'the science falsely so called.' We have

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 3.

seen that already, in the apostolic age, christian Gnosticism was opposed by anti-christian Doceticism; that this heresy may have been the cause of Paul's party separating at Corinth from that of Apollos; that it is indirectly referred to in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and directly in that attributed to Barnabas; that Clement of Rome indirectly, and Ignatius in the most direct manner, refer to this false doctrine; and that, whilst it can be proved to have originated with Simon of Samaria, it was more fully developed and successfully promulgated by Marcion of Sinope and his predecessors. This great heretic and gospel-forger was the senior contemporary of Bishop Serapion, who had to warn his flock against the Docetic heresy, and against heretical additions to the principles of Christ's doctrine, as proclaimed by the Apostles of Christ. If Serapion wrote his letter towards the end of the second century, we can well understand that he was not aware of strange views having enveloped the minds of some in his diocese. Before judging of the doctrine contained in the gospel named that of Peter, he first studied the heretical gospel of Marcianus (or Marcion?), in order the better to be able to point out which parts of the former were in harmony with the sound doctrine of the Apostolic faith. If we are to be guided by Eusebius, who charges Serapion with having 'relapsed into Jewish narrowness,' the Bishop may probably have been quite as much on his guard against Paul's and John's peculiar doctrines as against those of Docetic Gnostics. Could this be proved by an earlier testimony, it would only show that, even at the end of the second century, one or more bishops were fettered by Jewish narrowness. The epistle of Serapion seems, however, to prove the contrary. A narrowly minded Bishop would not have permitted the reading of a gospel not transmitted directly by the Apostles; and, having found in it some heretical additions, would have prohibited the same, instead of marking the objectionable passages. Such could not have been the conduct of the Bishop,

CHAP. XI.

unless the sayings of Christ referred to in the so called Gospel of Peter had been recorded in at least general harmony with Matthew's original Scripture containing the same. And all further notices transmitted to us about this 'Gospel of Peter' confirm such a supposition, inasmuch as they tend to show that this gospel, at least in its original form, stood in near relation to Matthew's Gospel. We have seen that 'the Gospel of the Hebrews' was, in the second century, and up to the fourth, generally identified with Matthew's Gospel, or, as Jerome states, with 'the authentic Gospel of Matthew,' which, as Epiphanius tells us, the sect of the Nazarenes possessed 'in its greatest completeness in Hebrew,' they having preserved the same 'as it was originally written, with Hebrew letters.' Now, Origen mentions the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Gospel of Peter in such a manner[1] as to suggest that he regarded both as standing in intimate relation to each other. And Theodoret seems to take the one for the other, or to regard both as generally identical; for he says that the Nazarenes used the gospel which was named 'after Peter.'[2] And the sect of the Markosians,[3] who also used the Gospel of Peter, quote passages from the same, which, in a surprising manner, harmonise with the citations of the Clementines and of Justin. These testimonies go far to prove the probability that the gospel which Mark wrote from memory, probably during the lifetime of Peter, and which contained an epitome of this Apostle's disputations with Simon, has been inserted and partly worked up in the so called Clementine recognitions and homilies which we possess. Since Doceticism can even now be proved to have been one of the leading doctrines of Simon, a scripture which purports to contain the principles of Peter's opposition to

[1] Com. in Mat. xiii. 54–56. [2] Fab. Haer. ii. 2.

[3] It might be supposed that the name 'Markosians' points to Mark; but this is not the case. Markos was a Gnostic, belonging to a sect to which Irenæus and the Muratorian list refer (comp. Credner's Kanon, p. 158).

Simon could never have received Docetic additions, as the so called Gospel of Peter had received before the close of the second century. This leads us to examine whether the Gospel of Peter known to Serapion may not have been more or less identical with the Gospel after Mark. We shall first show that the historical parts of the Gospel after Mark may well owe their origin to Peter's interpreter, although the disputations between the Apostle and Simon are not here recorded; and we shall then refer to those parts of the Gospel after Mark which more or less betray a Docetic origin, so as to diminish the probability that this gospel as a whole can have been written by the interpreter of that Apostle who is known to have combated the leader of Docetism, and this in the very city of the Romans for whom the Gospel after Mark was most probably written.

Petrinic source.

According to the Gospel after Mark, Jesus first calls the four disciples, Simon and Andrew and the two sons of Zebedee,[1] near the sea of Galilee, and then heals the demoniac at Capernaum on the Sabbath.[2] Coming out of the synagogue, Jesus naturally enters immediately the house of Simon, living at Capernaum, and heals his wife's mother.[3] It is here, then, that Jesus in the evening heals 'many that were sick of divers diseases;'[4] and when, the next morning, He departed into a solitary place to pray, Simon 'and they that were with him,' that is, the rest of the disciples, followed after Him, and prevailed upon Him to continue to preach and heal in Galilee.[5] Capernaum continues to remain the chief abode of Jesus, to which He returned after His wanderings in Galilee,[6] and this city forms the centre of Mark's gospel-narrative in its early part. This abode of Peter and of Jesus is also shown to be the birthplace of the former, who in this gospel, more than in any other, appears the constant and intimate companion of the Lord.[7] The early history, which is so well connected in the Gospel after Mark,

[1] i. 16-20. [2] 21-28. [3] 29-31. [4] 32-34. [5] 35-39.
[6] ii. 1; iii. 20; v. 21; ix. 33. [7] i. 36; xi. 21; xiii. 3; xvi. 7.

CHAP. XI.

appears disturbed and confused in Luke. Thus the call of the first four Apostles, so intimately connected with the Lord's first appearing in Capernaum, Luke relates at a later period,[1] so that his preceding account of the Lord's first visit to Capernaum,[2] and of his healing miracles in the house of Simon,[3] stands entirely isolated. Instead of Simon and his companions, 'the people' beseech him not to depart from them, and the local and chronological details contained in Mark are omitted in Luke. The confusion of Luke's narrative is not casual; and its object seems to be, not to record the intimacy between Jesus and the Jewish disciples, but, contrariwise, to show that even in His own country and town Jesus could not speak[4] without filling the people 'with wrath.'[5]

Considering the originality and completeness of Mark's historical record generally, and the more prominent manner in which Peter seems to be brought forward as the most intimate disciple of Jesus, it is not unreasonable to suppose that these peculiar traits owe their origin to Peter's interpreter at Rome. His disputations with Simon cannot have been his only object in this city; and it is probable that some of these were not held in public. There is then no difficulty in assuming that, for some reason or other, Mark's record of Peter's disputations was held back, and that the remainder of Mark's gospel was inserted later in the Gospel 'after' Mark. If all the conversations between Peter and Simon which are transmitted to us in the recognitions and homilies had been publicly delivered, it would be difficult to explain how Peter could have urged James, or could in the second century be supposed to have done so, not to divulge the secrets contained in the record of his preaching which he forwarded to Jerusalem. There can be no doubt, according to the record of Peter's preaching transmitted to us, that what this Apostle would dread was, not the publication of his own discourses, in which

[1] v. 1–11. [2] iv. 31–37. [3] iv. 38, 39.
[4] For this see Hilgenfeld, Krit. Studien, &c. [5] iv. 16–30.

he never divulges the secret doctrine of Christ, but the spreading of Simon's teaching, which, notwithstanding his Docetic heresy, was not, as we have seen, in all points contrary to the secret doctrine of Christ, which the Apostles were bound to hide from the people.

Docetic source.

But, although the historical parts of the Gospel after Mark show a peculiar genuineness, and a completeness which may be explained by the assumption that they are formed of materials from Mark's original Gospel, yet we have to mark other peculiarities in the second gospel of our Canon, which do not favour the assumption that, as a whole, this Gospel had either the direct or the indirect sanction of an Apostle. We have seen that, ever since Simon, the Docetics maintained that Christ did not really suffer. They distinguished between Christ and Jesus, between the spiritual Word of God and its incarnation, between the infinite and the finite. And some of them taught that, before his death, the spirit of Jesus quitted the man Jesus. Now, in the Gospel after Mark, a statement is recorded, original to this Evangelist, according to which, Jesus 'cried with a loud voice' before giving up the Ghost.'[1] As in Luke, so it is recorded in Mark, that when the unclean spirit came out of the man, he 'cried with a loud voice.'[2] But these cannot be Docetic additions such as Serapion marked out in the so called Gospel of Peter, which nevertheless he did not forbid in his church, perhaps because his contemporary Clement of Alexandria referred to 'the preaching of Peter' as to a scripture containing words of Peter. Again, after his resurrection the Lord is shown to have first appeared to the women at the grave, as reported by Matthew, and then to have appeared 'in another form' to two disciples.[3] By this latter passage the writer seems to point to Luke's account about the disciples of Emmaus,[4] where the Lord is described as having 'vanished out of their sight,' though he

[1] Mark xv. 37, 39.
[2] Mark i. 26; Luke iv. 33.
[3] Mark xvi. 12.
[4] Luke xxiv. 31, 43; comp. 15.

CHAP. XI.

had broken bread with them before. In the Gospel after John,[1] Jesus is stated to have suddenly stood in the midst of the disciples, assembled in a room, the doors of which had been shut, and to have shown himself at different times to his disciples, and to Mary at the grave. According to the Docetics, the whole life of Christ was a series of apparitions like those of the risen Lord. The above passages, and also that about Christ's being at the same time in heaven and on earth,[2] would, by the Docetics, be explained in accordance with their views; and they would naturally be led to effect interpolations in one or more of the gospels, in harmony with their peculiar doctrines. That Marcion was guilty of such falsifications we have seen.

We have pointed out the striking similarity between the beginning of Marcion's gospel and that after Mark; also the hidden reference in the latter to the spread of heresy; and the Docetic development of the doctrine about the person of Jesus, as traceable in the Gospels, among which that after Mark represents the nearest approach to the Docetic denial of Christ's humanity. To these direct testimonies as to the existence of a Docetic element in the Gospel after Mark, we may add another, though an indirect one. Tertullian, whose activity as a teacher in the African Church falls between the years 192 and 220, shows by his writings that it is one of his principal objects to disprove by scriptural references the tenets of the Docetics, who denied the reality of Christ's humanity. Having for this purpose gone through the books of the O. T., he refers to the gospels; but though he names the four Gospels of our Canon, which his senior contemporary Irenæus had mentioned before him, yet he deducts his anti-Docetic gospel conclusions exclusively from Matthew, Luke, and John, without giving a single quotation from Mark. This shows that the Gospel after Mark did not furnish him with any original materials for opposing Docetism. It may be unhesitatingly asserted, that if Tertullian had wished to

[1] xx. 19. [2] John iii. 13.

prove the orthodoxy of Doceticism, instead of the contrary, he would have referred principally, if not exclusively, to the Gospel after Mark as transmitted to us.

Time of composition.

Throughout this gospel we have traced an evident design to place Paul on a par with the other Apostles, by harmonising the principal differences between Matthew's and Luke's gospels. As the Gospel after Mark has evidently been written for the Romans, and as in all the known writings of the Roman church, dating from the time between Clement and Justin Martyr's death, neither Paul nor his writings are directly referred to, the final composition of this gospel can hardly have taken place before the end of the second century. Again, it is absolutely certain that Rome was quite free of Doceticism in the first years of the second century, when Ignatius wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and when he had to warn so many other churches against the Docetic heresy. Also, the 'Shepherd of Hermas' is an energetic protest against Doceticism; whilst Justin Martyr, especially by his Docetic interpretation of the prophecy about Immanuel, marks the transition in the Roman church from anti-Docetic to Docetic or Marcionic christianity. It is, therefore, only after this phase that we can expect a gospel written for the Romans to show traces of Doceticism. The after-Justinian origin of the Gospel after Mark is likewise supported by the circumstance that, notwithstanding his desire to prove the fulfilment by Christ of every passage which was or was supposed to be prophetic, Justin has not applied the prophecy of Malachi to John the Baptist, nor altered it so as to refer to Christ.[1] Again, we know of Justin's pupil, Tatian 'the Apologist,' that his harmony of the four gospels had a Docetic tendency, since the human descent of Jesus had been removed from the same; just as the Docetic Ebionites had done in their version of Matthew's gospel, for which reason Epiphanius considers Tatian's Gospel as similar if not identical with

[1] Mark i. 2; Mat. xi. 10; Luke vii. 27.

CHAP. XI.

the Gospel of the Hebrews. About the year 170, the Gospel after Mark might therefore have received its final revision. We have seen that the statement of Irenæus does not oblige us to identify the Gospel 'of' Mark with the Gospel 'after' Mark, so that the latter may have received additions at a later period. The earliest manuscript is, as we have seen, of the fourth century.

The first three Gospels.

With regard to the origin of the first three gospels, we come to the following conclusions:—

1. The Gospel of Matthew was the first ever written, and contained principally, if not exclusively, those public sayings of Christ which the Apostles agreed to publish in Hebrew and for the Hebrews of Palestine. It did not contain any of those of the Lord's sayings which he had secretly confided to his disciples. As far as it referred to Christ's sayings, or in its doctrinal part, it must have been essentially identical with the Gospel of the Hebrews, which even in the fourth century was called, according to a Father of the Church, 'the authentic Gospel of Matthew.' Before this time, from which our most ancient manuscripts date, the Gospel 'after' Matthew received various additions, including some interpolations from Luke. The narrative part, containing the principal events of the life of Jesus, in so far as these were not directly connected with his sayings, has probably been added from the original Gospel of Mark, the interpreter of Peter.

2. It is absolutely certain that, during the lifetime of Paul, one of his disciples, and probably Luke, wrote another gospel, for the scarcely hidden purpose of harmonising those sayings of Christ which Matthew had recorded, with the principles of Paul's 'other' or supplementary gospel, contained in his epistles, and which propounded the secret or hidden doctrine of Christ. The Gospel after Luke must be essentially identical with the Paulinic Gospel written in the apostolic age, and of

which Irenæus writes that 'Luke, the companion of Paul, committed to writing the gospel proclaimed by the same.'[1]

3. The original Gospel 'of' Mark was written by Peter's interpreter, possibly before the death of this Apostle. In the first place, it contained the disputations of Peter with Simon, which are transmitted to us in their essential genuineness by the so called Clementine recognitions and homilies, which originally bore the title: 'The preaching of Peter.'[2] In the second place, the Gospel 'of' Mark seems to have contained the earliest and most authentic record of the historical incidents of the life of Jesus, and also some of those records about the apostolic mission which have been transmitted to us in the Acts. Whether based on tradition or not, the historical record transmitted to us in the Gospel 'after' Mark is the most ancient and genuine we possess, although it was probably after the middle of the second century, and perhaps not before the third, composed in the form we now possess it. The object of the Gospel after Mark is to modify or leave out such parts of Matthew's gospel, where the public doctrine of Christ is too exclusively dwelt upon, and likewise to modify or leave out those parts of Luke's Gospel, in which the public doctrine and its apostolic promulgators are too unfavourably contrasted with the more perfect, because more complete, Hidden Wisdom of Christ, as first openly proclaimed by Paul.

We shall see that in 'the Gospel after John,' the secret doctrine, or Hidden Wisdom of Christ, is fully recorded by the disciple whom Jesus loved, without any reference to Christ's public doctrine contained in the earlier gospel-records. First, however, we must refer to the Acts of the Apostles.

[1] H. E. v. 8.

[2] Since Clement of Alexandria refers to 'the preaching of Peter' as containing sayings of this Apostle, the title, 'Recognitions of Clement' may have originally referred to him, and not to the Roman Clement.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ACTS.

INTRODUCTION—STEPHEN—PHILIP—THE HIDDEN WISDOM.

'And they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch. And of the rest durst no man join himself to them, but the people magnified them.'—Acts v. 12, 13.

CHAP. XII.

Introduction.

MATTHEW had written down those of the Lord's sayings which had been publicly pronounced, and which did not refer in so direct and plain a manner to the forbidden apocryphal or hidden doctrine, that the rulers of the Jewish Church could have objected to them. Paul had begun to proclaim the Hidden Wisdom of Christ about twenty years after the Lord's resurrection, and in complete independence of the Apostles at Jerusalem. Luke had ingrafted the newly revealed element of the Lord's secret teaching on the original stock of apostolic Gospel-revelation, as far as the record of the latter permitted of such extension. Thus an attempt had been made to harmonise the original Gospel of the Apostles with the 'other' Gospel of Paul, which, though 'another' when compared with the former, was 'not another,' inasmuch as Christ had taught the doctrines of both, the one in public, the other in secret. A second and similar attempt seems to have been made by Luke, or some other Paulinian, with a view of harmonising the Acts of Paul with the Acts of the Apostles—of showing that their deeds, like their doctrines, might be regarded as harmonising with each other.

This work of harmony, this record of the promulgation of the Gospel of Christ by the Apostles 'and the rest,' might perhaps never have been composed in the form transmitted to us, had Paul been recognised from the beginning as on an equal footing with the twelve Apostles. That could not be the case so long as the apocryphal sayings of Christ remained hidden up in an apocryphal Gospel; so long as the doctrine secretly communicated to the twelve was transmitted only to the few as a secret tradition; so long as the Gospel of John was, as it were, dug into the ground as a hidden treasure. Neither Paul nor Luke lived to see the time when, by the publication of the gospel of the beloved disciple, the great Apostle's doctrine could be proved to have been the secret doctrine of Christ. But probably not long after Paul's death, and under the uniting influence of his martyrdom, a disciple of Paul, perhaps Luke,[1] connected the existing materials about apostolic history, and composed a record of the Acts of the Apostles, with a view to the realisation of the above object.

We have here only to consider the doctrinal contents of this scripture, which is composed of some of the most ancient and genuine records of the activity of the first disciples, though these records may have been strung together at a comparatively late period, perhaps even after the death of the last of the Apostles, and this, probably, in Rome. Since the doctrinal parts of this work are closely connected with its historical parts, we begin by giving an epitome of the latter.[2] We can distinguish three sections. Chapters one to five and the twelfth refer exclusively to the

[1] The only unquestionably valid reasons for doubting the testimony of Irenæus, that Luke composed the Acts, seem to be—1. The discrepancy between the third Gospel and this Scripture about the time of the ascension, which, according to the former, took place on the day of the resurrection, and, according to the latter, forty days later. 2. The discrepancy between the second chapter of Galatians and the corresponding fifteenth chapter in the Acts.

[2] See for this and the following, Zeller's 'Apostelgeschichte,' p. 76 f.

CHAP. XII.

twelve Apostles and the mother church. In chapters six to eleven, if we except chapter ix. 1–30, the Palestinian Apostles are assisted by the two Greeks, Stephen and Philip; the enlarged scene of action comprises the whole of Palestine, inclusive of Samaria; and the principal contents refer to those events which paved the way for the apostolic recognition of the promulgation of Christianity among the Gentiles. Chapter ix. 1–30, and chapters thirteen to twenty-eight, revolve round the person and the activity of Paul, taking cognisance of the twelve and of the mother church only as far as Paul's connexion with them requires it.

This peculiar arrangement, whilst it is a strong confirmation of the assumed fact, that the compiler has strung together essentially genuine documents of the apostolic period, on the other hand does in the outset lead us to expect that the joint activity of Paul and of the twelve Apostles as a body, began at a comparatively late period. And this hypothesis is so strongly confirmed by Paul's own account, as to raise it to the dignity of a fact. We have seen that Paul, after his conversion, conferred not with flesh and blood, that is, with no man;[1] that driven away from Damascus by the enmity of the Jews, and as it seems by the threats of Aretas, Paul went to Arabia, where he probably did remain for several years, before he returned to Damascus. Not until three years after his return to the district of his conversion, he went for the first time to Jerusalem; then he saw Peter and James, to whom he would naturally communicate the history of his conversion, which would be recorded from memory, either by these two Apostles who heard it, or by those to whom they communicated it. Thus would be explained, not only the otherwise inexplicable difference between the two accounts of Paul's conversion; but also the remarkable incident, that the only lengthened record referring to Paul in that part of the Acts which is composed of Palestinian records, is the account of Saul's journey to Damascus, and of what really was, or according to Palestinian traditions

[1] Comp. Mat. xvi. 17.

was merely believed to be, connected with the same. The Paulinic part of the Acts seems, therefore, to be composed of such records as Luke, Mark, Silas, and Timothy might have committed to writing about the time of the events to which they refer. It is quite impossible to assert that during the seventeen or more years which elapsed between Paul's conversion and his first meeting with the apostolic body, this Apostle did not pursue his evangelising mission, or that he may have been earlier recognised or assisted by the Apostles at Jerusalem.

With regard to the teaching of the twelve Apostles, and to the condition of the mother church, the Acts contain nothing but what may be explained by referring to our foregoing investigations. It is the doctrine of Paul's forerunners, as recorded in the Acts, which we have here to consider. Stephen was accused of blasphemy 'against Moses and against God.' It was 'the synagogue of the Libertines and Cyrenians and Alexandrians, and of them in Cilicia and Asia,' which 'suborned' or set up men who raised the above accusation. But in the following verses similar accusations are raised against Stephen by 'false witnesses.' Here it is added that Stephen had announced the second coming of Christ, to bring about the destruction of Jerusalem, and the change of the customs which Moses had delivered. Nevertheless it has been shown as probable, that Stephen, like Paul after him, may have been so 'exceedingly zealous of the traditions' of the fathers, as to be rightly accused, in the opinion of Jewish rulers, of having blasphemed against Moses and against God. For, in Stephen's own defence, not a word is said against this accusation; whilst, on the contrary, 'the fathers' are by him declared to have always resisted the Holy Ghost; and it is at least implied that they, or some of them, like the Jews of his time, were 'stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears.'[1] Again, Stephen declares: 'Our fathers had the tabernacle *of witness* in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses, that he should make it

Stephen.

[1] vii. 51.

CHAP. XII.

according to the fashion that he had seen.' And whilst David desired 'to find' a tabernacle for the God of Jacob, Solomon 'built' Him an house; 'howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands.'[1]

Whilst the more or less Judaising apologies of Christianity in the Acts start from the essential identity of Christianity with the Mosaic religion, and point out in Christ the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies, Stephen takes the contrary course, and admits in general terms the difference between the new faith and the existing temple-service, whilst defending this new way by his reference to Old Testament revelation. Thereby his defence directly becomes a counter-accusation. Whereas he was accused of having despised the divine institutions, he tries to show that, on the contrary, his opposers, with their rigid attachment to the outer forms of the same, act contrary to the true will of God. For this purpose the speaker goes back to the earlier history of the Israelitic people. He proves that the theocratic institutions certainly were already prepared by the events in the lives of the patriarchs,[2] but how, likewise, already at the first introduction of these institutions, notwithstanding their palpably divine origin, the ingratitude of the people was brought out into strong relief, and with it the incapacity of the same to understand the divine dispensations, as shown in the rejection, at first, of Moses, and in the later relapse into idolatry. He finds that a similar way of thinking may be traced back to the building of the Solomonic temple. And, from all this, he comes to the conclusion that it is only the continuation of the earlier stubbornness and hardness of heart, if the Jews despise Jesus as they have despised Moses, and, if on the other hand, they prefer the house of God built by men, with the service in the same, just as their fathers in the desert have preferred the golden calf to the living God.[3]

It is evident that Stephen regards the ark of the covenant which Moses built, as a mere type of the true temple

[1] 44–48. [2] 5, 7, 15, 17. [3] 51.

not made with hands, where alone God dwells among his people. He interprets in a figurative sense the account about the ark, just as Marcion, in his Epistle to Diognetus, interprets allegorically the account about the garden of Eden. It is in the temple, or the paradise, of the heart, that God dwells through His Spirit, Wisdom, or Word from above. And this interpretation leads us to assume that Stephen, a Grecian, perhaps an Alexandrian, was well acquainted with the apocryphal or hidden doctrine of the Divine Sonship. He belonged to, or was connected with, that reformed party among the Israelites, who believed that 'the God of Glory' appeared to Abraham, to the patriarchs, and to Moses, through the Divine Wisdom, Word, or Spirit, which in the beginning was brooding above the waters, covering the earth as a cloud. The tabernacle of the Word was in high places, and God the Creator caused to rest (*shachan*) her tabernacle in Israel, and thus it took root in an honourable people, being given to all her children who are named of Him.[1] Thus it was that the Divine Word 'rested' as the Shechina in the holiest of the holy, because no one was worthy of her as Abraham, the patriarchs, and Moses had been. That same Word of God had inspired the prophets, but the true prophets were of a higher class. And, in like manner, but in a higher degree distinguished was Jesus of Nazareth, 'the Just One,' of whom Moses and the prophets had spoken, and whom the Jews had betrayed and murdered.[2] Thus we see that Stephen's views about the Divine Word were probably not dissimilar to those which have been transmitted to us by the so-called Clementine homilies.

Stephen has therefore probably regarded Christ as the only true prophet, as the perfect incarnation of the Divine Word from the beginning, and at the same time as the prophet like Moses, and as the Just One announced by the unknown prophet of the Captivity. 'Being full of the

[1] Eccl. xxiv. [2] vii. 52.

CHAP. XII.

Holy Ghost,' he 'looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the Glory of God, and (the personification of the same) Jesus standing on the right hand of God.' Being stoned by the Jews with the consent of young Saul, the first Christian martyr cried: 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep.'[1]

The Martyr's fearless declaration of those reformed principles of Judaism, which were purposely kept hidden before the eyes of the Palestinian Jews, and which formed the basis of Christianity, led to 'a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem; and they (the Christians) were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, *except the Apostles.*' It has been difficult, hitherto, to explain this exception; but, from our point of view, the explanation suggests itself quite naturally. If the Christian doctrines in themselves contained nothing essentially new, but were in the main a confirmation, development, and application of the pre-Christian apocryphal or hidden wisdom; if none of the apocryphal Scriptures, though an exponent of the same, ever formed part of the Hebrew Canon; if the verbal teaching of apocryphal doctrines in Palestine was confined to a few guardians of the secret tradition; if a long probation was prescribed for the teachers, before they could be made acquainted, by word of mouth, even with the rudiments of the apocryphal wisdom; if, partly owing to these restrictions, and to the jealous watchfulness of the Pharisees and Sadducees, the Lord expounded these doctrines to his disciples alone, 'in secret and in darkness;'[1] if, what is not improbable, their master warned them against the proclamation of these mysteries immediately after his death; then we are in the outset led to expect that the twelve Apostles would see the wisdom, if not the necessity, of continuing the same caution which the Lord, to a

[1] 55–60.

certain extent, had exercised, and, by the temporary keeping back of Christ's secret doctrine, to save the Christian Church from the persecutions of the Jewish rulers, which would otherwise surely take place.

We need not, therefore, assume that it was merely Pharisaical compulsion which led the Apostles not to proclaim the secret doctrine of their master. If the time had come for the public proclamation of such doctrines, Jesus himself would have defied the jealous opposition of Jewish rulers. How could the Apostles have ventured to do more in this respect than their Lord had chosen to do? The time of figs was not yet. All they could think of doing was, to suggest the truth by parables, as Christ had done. Such a course would not be dreaded by the Sadducees and Pharisees, and, therefore, would not be opposed by them. There cannot have been even a tacit understanding, between the Apostles and the rulers of the Jewish Church, about the necessity of continuing to hide from the people the secret doctrine of Jesus. But, practically, a compromising tendency prevailed, the effect of which was, that the Apostles were not directly opposed, but were even protected, by the spiritual rulers of the Jews. Had this not been the case, the general persecution of Christians must have included the Apostles, of whom we are told, that they were in intimate relations with Stephen. And a most conclusive proof of the extreme caution which circumstances had imposed upon the Apostles may be derived from the recorded fact, that 'of the rest' of the scattered disciples not one did venture to 'join himself to them,' although 'the people magnified them.'[1] The same expression is used in Luke, in order to distinguish the Eleven from Christ's other disciples. For Luke writes about 'the eleven and all the rest,'[2] and 'the eleven, and them that were with them';[3] whilst Paul seems to distinguish 'the twelve' from '*all* the Apostles,' as we have pointed out.[4] From this it follows that Solomon's

[1] Acts v. 12, 13. [2] Luke xxiv. 9. [3] xxiv. 33. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7.

CHAP. XII.

porch was to the Apostles a kind of prison-house or conclave.

The first Gospel record is, as we have seen, an absolute proof of the cautious conduct of the Palestinian Apostles in the beginning. It was soon to be shown, by bloody events, how wise and how necessary such a conduct was. Stephen, 'full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom,'[1] broke asunder those fetters of the faith. His religion was the religion of Jesus, the worship of the Father in spirit and in truth. His temple was the heart of man, the abode of divine grace, the paradise of God. Such doctrines the rulers of the Jewish Church would naturally regard as subversive of the established Church and its authority. It was not difficult, and perhaps did not even require their assistance, to collect an infuriated mob around the dangerous Christian, and to stone the martyr to death.

This was the signal for a general persecution and banishment of all the Christians in Jerusalem, the Apostles excepted. Had the latter publicly recognised Stephen as one of their disciples and fellow-workers, they must have shared the fate of their co-religionists. Anyhow, even within the Apostolic circle, wisdom dictated increased prudence; and we have some reason for believing that, for many years after this event, the secret doctrine of Christ was kept as rigidly secret by the Apostles, as the apocryphal tradition was kept secret by the Pharisees. The Christian doctrines, as at first promulgated by the Apostles, contained nothing in the least degree contrary to the law, but were, in fact, a confirmation of the law and the prophets. Jesus is the Messiah: this was all which was at first declared. But the Messianic expectations, as indeed the Messianic prophecies, were, as we have seen, of a twofold kind. The multitude expected only the promised terrestrial King, whilst the reformed party, and probably others also, expected, in accordance with later prophecies, first a spiritual regenerator, a spiritual Messiah. The

[1] Acts vi. 3.

Jewish Church did not sanction the last-named Messianic expectations, and, therefore, it was difficult to persuade the unenlightened children of Israel that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ.

Philip.

Whilst Saul took the lead in the persecutions against the Christians which arose after Stephen's death, making 'havoc of the Church,' this event led to the enlargement of Christian activity, for 'they that were scattered abroad (therefore *not* the Apostles) went everywhere preaching the Word.'[1] Among these was Philip, who preached Christ to the Samaritans. 'And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them, and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed; and there was great joy in that city.'[2] So great was this success that even Simon was converted. He had given out that he was 'some great one,' had bewitched the Samaritans by 'sorcery,' and yet to him 'all gave heed, from the least to the greatest,' and regarded him as 'the power of God,' that is, as the incarnation of the Divine Spirit, Wisdom, or Word. We have seen that Simon was a teacher of the apocryphal tradition, as the same had been developed, not by Christ, but by Philo of Alexandria. Yet, from the account in the Acts, we may assume that, at the time when he met Philip, Simon believed in the anti-Philonian doctrine, that the power of God can come in the flesh; for he himself gave himself out to be an organ of this Divine power, and therefore such a person as was by many of the Jews expected as the Anointed that should come.

It is an additional proof of the antiquity and genuineness of this account, that the first unquestionably great and lasting success in the promulgation of Christianity is attributed neither directly nor indirectly to the Apostles,

[1] Acts viii. 4. [2] 6–8.

CHAP. XII.

who alone had remained unmolested at Jerusalem. Nor is it denied, in the subsequent part of this account, that the Apostles fully recognised this success. For it is written: 'When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto him Peter and John.' But here we must confess that the author of the Acts seems somewhat to deviate from the purely historical course, and to follow traditions which, though he believed in their veracity, may nevertheless have been the exponents of a view which, in later times, it became important for the rulers of the Church to uphold. We refer to the laying on of hands by the Apostles, for the purpose of the Samaritans receiving the Holy Ghost. According to the recorder of the Acts, it was for this reason that Peter and John were sent to Samaria. And so visibly manifest was it that 'through laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given,' that Simon tried by the offer of money to tempt the Apostles, that by the laying on of their hands they should give him the Holy Ghost, and also the power to communicate it by a similar outward act.

This account implies that the Samaritans could not possibly have received the Holy Ghost by Philip, of whom we are later told that he was a deacon or layman, and yet an 'evangelist,' and 'one of the seven.'[1] Such an assumption would directly contradict the preceding narrative of Philip's success, and its subsequent recognition by the Apostles. All attempts to harmonise these statements, however laudable, must fail before the light of truth.

The account about Philip and the Ethiopian need here only be mentioned, as proving that Philip taught the doctrine of the Divine Sonship, showing that Christ is the Son of God.[2]

Those parts of the Acts in which Paul refers to his

[1] Acts xxi. 8. [2] viii. 37.

own doctrine show that the author has only recorded such of his addresses as contain nothing which militates against the narrower gospel-principles promulgated by James and the other Apostles at Jerusalem. It is not the intention of the writer to show what Paul's peculiar doctrine was, how he preached the hidden wisdom which the Lord had taught in secret, and which the Palestinian apostles long continued to keep to themselves as a hidden treasure. On the contrary, his object is, to bring into relief those doctrines which were common to all, and on which Paul would naturally dwell when addressing assemblies or congregations like those here recorded. Thus, the doctrine of justification by faith is but once shortly referred to,[1] and so likewise is that of the atonement.[2] He opposes monotheism to heathen polytheism; he declares the resurrection and the Messiahship of Christ; insists on the necessity of spiritual regeneration and good works; recommends equity and temperance; and announces the future judgment. But in the last chapter it is shown that Paul despaired of teaching to the Jews at Rome the mysteries of Christ. He compares them with those Jews to whom Christ himself would not speak otherwise than in parables, because of the hardness of their heart, which incapacitated them from hearing 'the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,' according to the Gospel of Paul, and to 'the preaching of Jesus Christ.'[3]

[1] Acts xiii. 38 f. [2] xx. 28. [3] Rom. xvi. 25.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE GOSPEL AFTER JOHN.

INTRODUCTION — AUTHORSHIP — FORM — PROLOGUE — DOCTRINE — HISTORICAL PART — JOHN THE BAPTIST — NATHANAEL — GENERAL PLAN.

'What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops.'—Mat. x. 27.

CHAP. XIII.

Introduction.

THE Reformation which the Jewish faith underwent during the Babylonian captivity had led to important results. It had established the unity and invisibility of God; the nature and the mission of the Divine Wisdom, Word, or Spirit, as the medium of communion between the creature and the Creator, as the organ of sanctification and immortality in the spiritual as well as in the material world. It had laid down the great principle of the universality of God's saving love, and thus had thrown down the walls of partition which had been erected around the Sinaitic law, and which, if not demolished, would have disannulled and made of none effect the promise made to Abraham and his seed, that in him all nations should be blessed. The reformed Israelite had been led to the conviction, that the universal salvation preordained by God in the beginning cannot be accomplished without man's free cooperation. It is not by the performance of the deeds of the law, but by the surrender of the heart to the influences of the Divine Spirit, freely given and freely received, by faith in the regenerating

power of the Holy Spirit from above, that a Son of Man can become a Son of God. This mediatorial power of God was in existence even before the foundations of the earth were laid. It had issued forth from the mysterious personality of the Creator as the breath and image, as the grace of God, which in all ages was poured on all flesh according to the desire of them who felt their need of a Saviour. Because of man's disobedience to the dictates of the power from on high, the Divine Spirit, 'the Saviour of all,' could not be given to any man without measure, the incarnations of the Holy Ghost were imperfect, the fulness of the Godhead could not dwell bodily in the flesh, the aboriginal type of man as the image of God could not be fully realised.

Before the fulness of time had set in, the above leading principles of reformed Judaism had been developed on Alexandrian soil into a science falsely so called, according to which the preordained perfect pattern of mankind could never be realised in the flesh, but would remain an unattainable, an ideal type, the mark of humanity's high calling which man could never reach, however much he might press towards it. It was conceived as impossible that the flesh should in such a measure be pervaded by the Divine Spirit, as to become at one with it. Perfect obedience was deemed to be incompatible with the known imperfections of human nature. The original type of man might be realised in the world above, but these philosophers did not comprehend that it might be realised in the world below.

Still graver obstacles to the full revelation of God's truth and grace were erected on Palestinian soil. The unreformed Jews, the Sadducees, theoretically denied the doctrine of rewards and punishments; to them to live was to satisfy the flesh, and to die was the loss of everything. But even the Pharisees, who acknowledged the principles of the Babylonian reform, showed by their works that they were not the children of light. And though during

CHAP. XIII.

the latter centuries of the pre-Christian period, many of the Israelites, whether as private individuals or as members of such sects as that of the Essenes, endeavoured to carry out in their life and conversation the great principles of reformed doctrine, yet they were not sufficiently influential to stem the tide of Jewish unbelief. The rulers of the Jewish church plainly perceived that, if the enlightened principles which had been superadded to the Jewish faith were to become common property, the all-overruling church-authority exercised by them would be undermined, and the authority of the individual, or rather of the divine light in the individual, would be set up by its side, if not in its stead. They foresaw, in their cunning craftiness, that, if the good news of salvation were openly promulgated, men might put their trust in the all-powerful agency of the divine indwelling Spirit, might regard the same as their life and their light. They also knew that the much coveted unity of church-government would become impossible, if the reformed principles which the Sadducees entirely rejected were openly promulgated as the standard of the faith. These may have been the principal reasons which led the Pharisees to forbid the writing down of the principles of Jewish reform, and to insist on their not being taught in the ordinary national schools, so that the verbal tradition was kept secret, and only communicated to the chosen few. And although before the commencement of the last century of the pre-Christian era apocryphal writings were not only promulgated, but even written, in Palestine, thus showing the impossibility of effectually excluding them; yet, under the Pharisaical rule and example, the study of the Hidden Wisdom was not encouraged, inasmuch as any exposition of it was carefully excluded from the canon.

We have seen that the Messianic expectations, both of a terrestrial and of a heavenly Messiah, were likewise dreaded by the rulers of the Jewish church. When, therefore, in the fulness of time, the Son of David and the

Son of Man was manifested as the Son of God, both the Sadducees and the Pharisees were his most determined enemies. They watched him closely, in the hope of finding some cause or pretext for putting him out of the way. Knowing this, and faithful to his mission, not to destroy but to fulfil, Christ spoke *only* in *parables* to the people, and in darkness and in the ear to his disciples, about the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. To the disciples it was given, but to the people it was not given, to know these mysteries. Yet even to his elect, *as a body*, he spoke in darkness, that is, not only whilst the chosen people dwelt in darkness, but he secretly addressed a body of men not yet fully enlightened. To some of his disciples Christ must, however, have spoken with a clearness and a fulness commensurate with the mission intrusted to them, to proclaim in light, and on the housetops, what he had confided to them in secret and in darkness. Therefore, even in the absence of all historical testimony, we should be compelled to assume that at least some few of the twelve Apostles were sufficiently in the secret, to know what Christ thought about the doctrine of the Divine word. And yet, what their master told them about this secret doctrine and his relation to it, may well not have been all which he would have taught them, had they been in a proper frame of mind to bear such revelation.

We know that it was to Paul the risen Christ fully revealed his glorious Gospel. This posthumous Gospel, as we have seen, was 'another Gospel,' when compared with the original Gospel preached by the twelve Apostles; but it was 'not another,' when compared with the original covenant made with Abraham, who rejoiced to see, in the spirit, the day of Christ. It was Paul who revealed to the world that the covenant with Abraham was 'confirmed of God in Christ;'[1] that is, in Him that should come, and who, in the fulness of time, did come, into the

[1] Gal. iii. 17.

CHAP. XIII.

world. We pointed out that Paul 'communicated his new Gospel to them who had been Apostles before him; and they, recognising the grace which was given to this new Apostle, tendered him the hand of fellowship, on the understanding that he should preach his Gospel to the Gentiles. We have seen that, notwithstanding this peaceable arrangement and compromise, a strong party spirit soon prevailed, and led to the reformation and recomposition of the original, but incomplete, Apostolic Gospel, which was harmonised with the principles of the Gospel newly revealed, as far as it was possible without entirely disregarding the primitive record of apostolic tradition. The regard paid to this revered document was probably the cause, why, even in the Paulinic Gospel after Luke, no reference is made to the doctrine of the primordial Wisdom, Spirit, or Word of God; if we except one single passage, where Christ is identified with the Divine Wisdom, in accordance with the revelation of the mystery by the preaching of Jesus Christ, and according to the Gospel revealed to Paul. This identity of Christ with the Divine Spirit, with the 'name' of God, which was dwelling in the Angel of the Lord, and through which the Lord was revealed to Abraham, the friend of God, formed the central point of the hidden, or apocryphal, Wisdom, which even Paul preached 'in a mystery.' No trace of it is to be found in the Gospel after Matthew, or in the Gospel after Mark, although these two were undoubtedly based on the aboriginal apostolic tradition. This fact would lead us to expect that the cardinal doctrine of the new Gospel, which it was difficult to harmonise with the old, could not find its way into the evangelical records, so long as the Jewish-Christian and the Gentile parties in the Church were not led to see in this doctrine a neutral ground for their joint opposition to the tenets of anti-christian Gnosticism.

Already during the lifetime of Paul, anti-christian theories, based upon this very doctrine of the Divine Word, had been framed and skilfully promulgated. These false

teachers agreed entirely with Paul, so far as the identity of Christ with the Divine Word was concerned. They regarded Christ as the spiritual rock which followed the Israelites, as the Divine Wisdom which fed them with heavenly manna, and which was prototyped by the serpent lifted up in the wilderness. So far, the anti-christian Gnostics had done no more than Paul; they had applied to Christ the pre-christian apocryphal doctrine about the Divine Wisdom, Word, or Spirit. But, whilst Paul insisted on the full recognition of Christ's humanity, the same was absolutely denied by the apostles of heresy. In accordance with Alexandrian philosophy, the notion was excluded, that, by perfect obedience, the Spirit of Man may become absolutely identical with the indwelling Spirit of God; that the Word might become flesh, and by conforming man to the image of God, by raising humanity to the Godhead, might realise on earth the original type of mankind as pre-ordained by the Creator in the beginning. The promulgators of the science falsely so called rightly believed in a saving Spirit of God, which in the beginning was with God, and which in all ages was poured on all flesh, according to the grace of God, and to the desire of them who have need of it. But these men did not believe that the Holy Spirit from above, having taken up his abode in man below, could so overrule and absorb the influence of human nature, as to make, through the absolute union of the finite with the infinite, one new man, created after God, in righteousness and true holiness. They denied the possibility of a Saviour in the flesh: they did not believe that all things are possible to God.

We have seen that Paul wrote some of his later Epistles with a view of preventing the creation of a schism in the Church by these or similar heretical doctrines. We pointed out that, after Paul's death, more vigorous and far more dangerous efforts were made, by the enemies of Christ, to undermine that one foundation of the Church, other than which no man can lay, that is,

CHAP. XIII.

the rock Jesus Christ, who, according to the flesh, was made of the seed of David, but according to the Spirit of holiness, or the Divine Word from the beginning, was the Son of God. Prior to this second outbreak of the schism of heresy, before the end of the first century, the leading Christians must have felt the necessity of showing in what sense the pre-Christian apocryphal doctrine about the Divine Word had been sanctioned, developed and applied by Christ himself. We have seen that the Docetics of the second century insisted on the authority of secret tradition. We shall now show that the earliest testimonies about the existence of the Gospel after John point to its publication about the very end of that century.

Earliest testimonies.

The first writer who attributes the fourth Gospel to the Apostle John is Irenæus, bishop of Lyons from 177 to 202.[1] He states that 'John, the disciple of our Lord, the same that lay upon his bosom, also published the Gospel, whilst he was yet at Ephesus in Asia,'[2] and that he remained with them up to the time of Trajan.[3] Again, the writer of the so-called Muratorian list states, about the year 180, if not earlier, that 'the author of the fourth Gospel is John, one of the disciples. To his urging joint-disciples and joint-bishops he said: "fast to-day with me three days, and whatsoever shall have been revealed to each, we will communicate to each other." In the same night, among the Apostles, it was revealed to Andrew, that, with the recognition of all, John was to write down everything in his name. And therefore, although in the several books of the Gospels, different principles are taught, yet the faith of the believers is in nowise attenuated (thereby) since in all (gospels) all things have been declared in the one and the principal Spirit, about the birth, the passion, the resurrection, the conversation with his disciples, and his second advent; first in lowliness, which already was, secondly in the brightness of royal might, which is to come. What wonder, then, if John

[1] Hær. iii. 1. [2] H. E. v. 8. [3] 98–117.

also, in his Epistles, brings forward so perseveringly the several facts, by saying *to himself*: "What we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, and what our hands have handled, that *we have written*." Thus, then, he professed himself not only as a seer, but also as a hearer, but also as a writer, of all the wonders of the Lord.' The junior contemporary of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, writes: 'But John, last of all, perceiving that what had reference to the body in the Gospel of our Saviour was sufficiently detailed, and being encouraged by his familiar friends, and urged by the Spirit, he wrote a spiritual Gospel.'[1] Again, Origen writes: 'What shall we say of him who reclined upon the breast of Jesus, I mean John? who has left one Gospel, in which he confesses that he could write so many, that the whole world could not contain them.'[2]

The next testimony is that of Jerome.[3] He writes: 'When the first germs of the heretics grew up, of Cerinthus, Ebion, and the rest, who deny that Christ is come in the flesh,' at last John was forced by almost all the bishops of Asia, as also by the deputations of many churches, 'to express himself more deeply about the divinity of the Saviour.' John having yielded to these urgent requests, 'after a general fast, broke forth in that heaven-sent prologue: 'In the beginning was the Word.'[4] To these we will now only add the testimony of Eusebius. 'Let us now also show the undisputed writings of the same Apostle (John). And of these his Gospel, so well known in the churches throughout the world, must first of all be acknowledged as genuine. That it is, however, with good reason, placed the fourth in order by the ancients, may be made evident in the following manner: Those inspired and truly pious men, the Apostles of our Saviour, as they were most pure in their life, and adorned with every kind of virtue in their minds, but common in their language, relying upon the Divine and wonderful

[1] H. E. vi. 14. [2] H. E. vi. 25 [3] About 331–420. [4] Com. in Mat.

CHAP. XIII.

energy granted them, they neither knew how, nor attempted, to propound the doctrines of their master with the art and refinement of composition. But, employing only the demonstration of the Divine Spirit working with them, and the wonder-working power of Christ displayed through them, they proclaimed the knowledge of the kingdom of heaven throughout the world. They bestowed but little care upon the study of style, and this they did because they were aided by a cooperation greater than that of men. Paul, indeed, who was the most able of all in the preparations of style, and who was most powerful in sentiments, committed nothing more to writing than a few very short Epistles. And this, too, although he had innumerable mysterious matters that he might have communicated, as he had attained even to the view of the third heavens, had been taken up to the very paradise of God, and had been honoured to hear the unutterable words there. The other followers of our Lord were also not ignorant of such things, as the twelve Apostles, and the seventy, together with many others; yet, of all the disciples, Matthew and John are the only ones that have left us recorded comments, and even they, tradition says, undertook it from necessity. Matthew also having first proclaimed the Gospel in Hebrew, when on the point of going also to other nations, committed it to writing in his native tongue, and thus supplied the want of his presence to them by his writings. But, after Mark and Luke had already published their Gospels, they say that John, who, during all this time was proclaiming the Gospel without writing, at length proceeded to write it on the following occasion. The three Gospels previously written having been distributed among all, and also handed to him, they say that he admitted them, giving his testimony to their truth, but that there was only wanting in the narrative the account of things done by Christ, amongst the first of his deeds, and at the commencement of the Gospel. And

this was the truth. For it is evident that the other three Evangelists only wrote the deeds of our Lord for one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and intimated this in the very beginning of their history. . . . For these reasons the Apostle John, it is said, being entreated to undertake it, wrote the account of the time not recorded by the former Evangelists and the deeds done by our Saviour which they have passed by. . . . One who attends to these circumstances can *no longer* entertain the opinion that the Gospels are at variance with each other; as the Gospel of John comprehends the first events of Christ, but the others the history that took place at the latter part of the time. It is probable, therefore, that for these reasons John has passed by in silence the genealogy of our Lord, because it was written by Matthew and Luke; but that he commenced with the doctrine of the Divinity, as a part reserved for him by the Divine Spirit, as if for a superior.'[1]

It must be admitted as a mystery, why the Gospel after John, if it was written by the Apostle, is the only one of which no direct mention is made before the very last years of the second century. Why John Presbyter did not mention it, who communicated all he had learnt about the origin of Evangelical Gospels, and who, moreover, certainly belonged to the district of Ephesus, where the Apostle is reported to have lived and died. Again, why Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, congratulates the Ephesians for having seen Paul, without referring to John's having lived and died there so lately. Why Ignatius mentions Peter and Paul in his Epistle to the Trallians, and why Polycarp, instituted by the Apostles as bishop of Smyrna, does not refer to this Gospel nor to John himself. It is more difficult to explain this, since, in his Epistle to the Philippians, a passage is contained which is all but a literal quotation from the first Epistle of John.[2] Or why should Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus about 180, seven of

[1] H. E iii. 24. [2] 1 John iv. 3.

CHAP. XIII.

whose relatives had been bishops before him, refer to John and yet not to his Gospel, which, if he had known in the form transmitted to us, he must have mentioned as an authority against his assertion about the apostolic observance of the passover.[1] Finally, a reason has to be suggested why Justin Martyr only quotes one single saying of Christ which is not recorded in our first three gospels, whilst we find it in the fourth. Now, if we have succeeded in showing that for weighty reasons the Gospel after John was kept secret till after the middle of the second century, then neither John Presbyter nor Ignatius, nor Papias nor Polycarp, nor Justin nor Polycrates, could or would have publicly referred to it. At the same time, our hypothesis would easily account for the fact, that even in the beginning of the second century some few passages of the fourth gospel were known, which were probably derived either from verbal tradition or from written sources based upon it. Thus John i. 3, ii. 4, and iii. 4, are quoted by Hippolytus,[2] who thus refers to Basilides the Gnostic living about the year 125: 'And this, says he, it is, which is said in the Gospels, "The true light, which lighteth every man, was coming into the world."'[3] Again, in the 'Preaching of Peter,' we meet with several more or less probable quotations from, and references to, the fourth gospel. But unquestionably Tatian and Athenagoras, some time after 150, and Theophilus of Antioch, about 180, cite it in all form, and the latter writes: 'Therefore we are taught by the Holy Scriptures and all those who were inspired by God, among whom John says, "In the beginning was the Word," &c.'

The esoteric origin of the Gospel after John, if proved, fully accounts for the late and uncertain tradition respecting this record.

Author-ship.

If it was the full revelation and application of the apocryphal doctrine by and to Christ which caused the

[1] H. E. v. 24. [2] Hipp. Ref. vii. 22, 27. [3] Comp. John i. 9.

composition of the fourth gospel; if this doctrine had been more or less fully developed in the pre-Christian apocryphal writings in Egypt as well as in Palestine, and if the same, as applied to Jesus, had been fully proclaimed and recorded by Paul, then it might be supposed that the Gospel after John need not necessarily have been written by an Apostle. Any expert writer, who had studied the apocryphal Scriptures, and also the Epistles of Paul, might possibly have been competent to write such a supplementary gospel as was then required. Perhaps it was not even absolutely necessary that the writer should know by tradition in what terms Christ had applied this secret doctrine to himself. It might have been enough for him to believe that Jesus was the perfect incarnation of the Divine Spirit or Word from the beginning. Even though the writer of this gospel had not been one of the privileged few to whom Christ had explained the mystery of godliness which was manifested in the flesh; yet since this hidden mystery about the universal and personified Saviour had been revealed to and through Paul, either he himself or any of his disciples might have composed an apocryphal gospel not essentially different from that after John. Had it not been for Paul, that gospel might never have been published to the world. Like him, many others had studied the principles of secret tradition; but for all that, through the influence of Alexandrian philosophy, they might have thought that the absolutely Divine Spirit cannot, in the fullest sense of the word, become flesh and dwell among men. Or, under the influence of Palestinian expectations, they might have waited for the salvation of the terrestrial Israel, and for the setting up of a terrestrial king, on whom the Spirit from above should rest, and this not in measure only, but in all fulness. But to Paul it was given to see that either of those views did not further, but hinder, the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham 430 years before the establishment of the Sinaitic law, 'that the blessing of Abraham might come

CHAP. XIII.

to the Gentiles through Christ,' that in Abraham's seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed, by the receiving of '*the promise of the Spirit through faith.*'[1]

Paul knew and believed, what possibly was not fully known to either of the chosen twelve Apostles, that in all ages all flesh did, by God's grace, in a measure receive the Spirit through faith, according to the desire of them who felt the need of it. But he likewise knew that the universal inheritance of the Spirit through faith, required that the promise should be fulfilled in the one seed of Abraham, which is Christ, the Messiah of the Jews as well as of the Gentiles. Made of the seed of David, that is of the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, the promised seed would fully manifest God in the flesh, and thus be openly declared as the Son of God. And this perfect incarnation of the Divine Spirit, though it had come into his own, although it was raised from among that chosen people where the Wisdom of God had taken root, was not the terrestrial King of the Jews, but the universal Saviour. This knowledge once fully imparted by Paul to his disciples, any gifted individual among them might have been able to compose the required new gospel, by making a free use of existing materials.

But though it might be conceded that a gospel containing the principles of Christ's secret doctrine need not necessarily have been written by one of those who had been Apostles before Paul; yet the gospel-fact that Jesus preached a secret doctrine, and his sublime character as delineated in the fourth gospel, forbids us to imagine that the words herein attributed to him can have possibly been invented by even the most enlightened of his disciples or their followers. Moreover it is in the highest degree improbable in the outset, that to no other than to Paul Christ should have revealed his mysterious Oneness with God through the Divine Spirit. If Christ taught a

[1] Gal. iii. 14.

secret doctrine, allegorically in public, and plainly in private; if he sowed what another would reap; if he foretold that what he had revealed in secret and in darkness would be proclaimed in light; if notwithstanding the fact that the things belonging to Jerusalem's peace were hidden before her eyes, he regarded the fields of the Church as already ripe for harvest; if he charged his disciples, even a few days before his death, that they should tell no man that he Jesus was the Christ; and if after the resurrection he referred to the future setting-up of the Messianic kingdom, then we are compelled to assume that he would communicate his doctrine at least to some of his disciples, with a fulness commensurate with their apostolic calling. The Gospels prove that Peter and the two sons of Zebedee were His most intimate associates; and Clement of Alexandria has transmitted to us the tradition that to these three disciples 'the Lord imparted the gift of knowledge,' that 'these delivered it to the rest of the Apostles, and they to the Seventy, of which Barnabas was one.'[1] These same privileged Apostles are especially distinguished by Paul from the rest; two of them he met during his first short and mysterious stay in Jerusalem, and they all three gave him fourteen years later the hand of fellowship; James was the head of the apostolic body, and the relations between Peter and John are in the Acts and in the fourth gospel recorded to have been peculiarly intimate.[2] All this tends to show that if the guardianship over the secret doctrine of Jesus was specially intrusted to anyone, we must look for him among the chosen three.

Now, since we are told that Jesus in an especial degree loved one of his disciples, we may in the outset of our inquiry assume that the latter was a member of the apostolic trio. Peter cannot have been 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' as he is in the fourth gospel often distinguished from the same.[3] Of the sons of Zebedee, James

[1] H. E. ii. 1. [2] John xx. 2; xxi. 7; comp. xviii. 15; Acts iii. 3; iv. 13; viii. 14.
[3] John xiii. 24; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 20 f.

CHAP. XIII.

was killed at an early period by order of Herod Agrippa,[1] and therefore cannot have been the beloved Apostle, who in the fourth gospel is shown to have had a long life. The other son of Zebedee, John, is by the unanimous tradition of the early Church designated as the privileged disciple of Jesus. In the fourth gospel John is sufficiently clearly implied to have been 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' or the disciple who was 'leaning on Jesus' bosom,' or the 'other disciple,' who went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest.[2] This assumption is confirmed by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus about 180, who writes to bishop Victor of Rome, that John 'rested upon the bosom of the Lord,' and that he 'was a priest.'[3] The interpretation of this passage offers some difficulty, and though it may be interpreted to mean only that he was of priestly descent, yet in either case he would be 'known' if not 'related' to the high priest, whose palace he would feel himself entitled to enter with Jesus, whilst Peter stood without.

Another hidden reference to John in the fourth gospel, may be found in the fact that the sons of Zebedee are in the third, as well as in the fourth gospel, referred to as Peter's partners, who were in another ship on the occasion when they had launched into the deep and inclosed a great multitude of fishes. For we have shown that these accounts, whether figuratively interpreted or not, offer many points of resemblance. In both narratives the sons of Zebedee and Peter are among the party. Luke shows that Peter did not know Jesus till he had beckoned unto the sons of Zebedee; and it seems to be implied that these, or one of them, told him that it was the Lord. For it is after their having come and filled both ships, that Peter 'saw it,' and 'fell down at Jesus' knees.' And according to the fourth gospel it is 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' who after the draught of fishes said unto Peter: 'it is the Lord.' Also according to the first gospel, on another occasion, Peter doubted in his want of faith,

[1] Acts xii. 2. [2] John xviii. 15. [3] H. E. v. 24.

whether it was Jesus who was on the water, and having fallen into the sea, the Lord stretched forth his hand and 'caught' Peter, who according to an account in the fourth gospel, if figuratively interpreted, was caught in the net. All these traits tend to confirm the tradition that John was the disciple whom Jesus loved, and that as such he would be chosen as the principal guardian and recorder of the Lord's secret doctrine or Hidden Wisdom.

A further support for this hypothesis may be derived from the implied fact, that the sons of Zebedee were cousins of Jesus. For it has been shown,[1] that Salome, the mother of James and John, is probably the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, who together with her and with Mary Cleophas and with Mary Magdalene stood by the cross.[2] Such hidden reference to John's mother is just what we should expect in a gospel where the Apostle John is never directly referred to by name, and where John is not called the Baptist, as if such distinction from the Apostle were not needed. It is difficult to explain why, if John be the author of the fourth gospel, his name should have been hidden in this record. But if the gospel was kept hidden till long after his death, and if it was edited by such who thought it necessary to append their testimony to its truth, it would have been very bold to introduce in a direct manner into the narrative the name of the testifying witness, without assigning some reason for its having been so late brought to light. The record of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ was published at a time when the mystery about its origin and its concealment was kept hidden for purposes of Church government.

We hope to have proved that Christ taught a secret doctrine; that the same seems to have been especially confided to Peter, James and John, and that the latter was the disciple whom Jesus loved. After their Master's death, the Apostles were placed in a difficult position. James

[1] Wieseler in Stud. and Krit. 1840, p. 648.

[2] Comp. John xix. 25, with Mat. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40.

CHAP. XIII.

considered the continued validity of the Mosaic law essential for every true follower of Christ, at least in his time. Somewhat influenced by the severe rule of the Pharisees, he had openly protested against the doctrine of righteousness by faith only, and without the works of the law, which doctrine Paul had first openly proclaimed. It could not be supposed that doctrines would by him be sanctioned which, in the darkness which then covered the people, might have done more harm than good. Even such men as Peter and John, who had recognised James as their leader, could not, under such circumstances, have proclaimed on the housetops, or even secretly among the Jews, what Christ had in secret confided to them, if to any of the Apostles. All they could do was, if necessary, to influence James to join them in offering the hand of fellowship to the new Apostle. And the scene which took place shortly afterwards, at Antioch, between Peter, Barnabas, Paul, and those from James, clearly proved that the compromise which was the result of that fellowship was neither unconditional nor unlimited. It is, therefore, in the outset, not only possible, but probable, that James, Peter, and John abstained, for a time, from communicating to the churches the secret tradition confided to them; and that, when Paul proclaimed the same to the world as 'another' gospel, they feared to join him at once, lest the seed should be prematurely sown, or fall on unfruitful soil.

Such persons as Peter and John would then be among those pre-eminently qualified to correct and amplify the primitive apostolic gospel-records. Of Peter, we know by his Epistles, that, after the martyrdom of James, if not before, he made so near an approach to Paul's gospel, that we may consider him to have completely identified himself with this Apostle, with whom he probably suffered martyrdom at Rome during the Neronic persecution. Like Peter's Epistle, the Epistles of John so entirely breathe the Paulinic spirit, that if we accept them as genuine,

the completest identity of the doctrine of these three Apostles is proved. Now, the undeniable similarity, in essence as well as in form, between the Epistles of John and the Gospel after John, does not force us to assume that both were written by the Apostle. The translator of the apostolic gospel-record and of the Epistles, if not the writer of the latter, may have been John the elder, who is by Papias clearly distinguished from John the Apostle. Anyhow we are forced to admit the certainty that the doctrinal parts of the fourth gospel have been based on the secret tradition as transmitted by John; even if this Apostle has not written the entire record as we possess it. The Apostle must therefore have written down in the Aramean language what he recollected of the very words in which the Lord had taught his secret doctrine and its application. And there is now no argument against the probable hypothesis, that the annotation of the Lord's secret doctrine commenced during the days of Christ in the flesh. It is highly probable that so important an apostolic record, if it existed, has been, on the whole, faithfully incorporated in the Greek gospel transmitted to us by the final framers and editors of the same. These declare, at the end, that John, 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' 'is the disciple which testifieth of these things and wrote these things.' The further remark, 'and *we* know that his testimony is true,' is supposed to refer to the presbyters at Ephesus, to whom the Apostle's own record must have been well known. Because the second 'Epistle of John' is written by an 'elder,' it has been conjectured that the same may have been a member of the presbytery at Ephesus. And, since we have no reason to suppose that the first and the two latter Epistles have been written by different authors, this elder may have been the writer of the first Epistle and the recorder of the apostolic tradition contained in the fourth gospel.[1] This

[1] Thus the marked difference between the style of the fourth gospel and the Apocalypse of John might be explained by the assumption, that either

CHAP. XIII.

hypothesis is strongly confirmed by the fact that in this very gospel, if not the writer, the editor is distinguished from the witness.[1] We may therefore firmly believe that the Apostle John has recorded the secret and hidden sayings of Christ, and that during, or after the Apostle's lifetime, one or more of John's personal friends faithfully embodied the apostolic record into the Gospel 'after' John, which the editors composed, in the form we possess it, and not without especial reference to the state of the Church towards the end of the second century.[2] If the principal conclusions of the foregoing investigations have been sufficiently established; if the hidden wisdom of Paul, speaking generally, was the hidden wisdom of Christ; if the Apostles at first excluded the secret doctrine of the Lord from the record of his sayings, then the essentially Paulinic doctrines of this gospel must be in general if not literal harmony with the Lord's teaching secretly communicated to his disciples only, and which his beloved Apostle, *the survivor of the rest*, would be sure

he himself or another amanuensis wrote the latter. And the difference in their doctrinal parts, which has been exaggerated, can be explained by the fact that the Apocalypse was written before the Gospel, and that the peculiar doctrine of the latter could not be otherwise than merely *suggested* in the former, by a close adherence to the ancient forms, which were later, to a certain extent, broken up, and replaced by new ones, better capable of holding the new wine of Christ's secret doctrine. It is strange how it can be asserted (see Credner, N.T. Canon) that, in the Muratorian list, the disciple John, to whom the Gospel is attributed, seems to be distinguished from the Apostle John. Whilst the former is spoken of as belonging to the number of Christ's disciples ('ex discipulis'), the latter is called the predecessor of the Apostle Paul, and is mentioned together with Peter. If the writer had distinguished two persons of the name of John (Comp. Euseb. iii. 11; iii. 39), in the opinion of the writer, the Apocalypse would have been written by the Apostle, and the Gospel and the Epistles by the disciple. But the 'disciple' John speaks to his 'fellow-disciples and fellow-bishops;' and the Gospel is said to contain the conversations of Christ with his 'disciples.'

[1] John xix. 35.

[2] We shall show that the fourth gospel supports the western Paschal rite, in opposition to the rite prevailing in the east which, according to the testimony of Polycarp and Polycrates, was in harmony with apostolic usage. This seems to show that the editors of this gospel belonged to the Latin Church, and therefore probably to Rome.

to preserve. If so, the non-apostolic composition of the essential parts of the Gospel after John, if it could be proved, or rendered probable, would prove nothing. Since, however, it can be rendered in the highest degree probable, if not absolutely certain, that the sayings of Christ herein recorded constitute the Lord's own doctrines, which he secretly and mysteriously revealed, the Gospel 'after' John is the fulfilment of Christ's injunction to his Apostles: 'What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops;'[1] it is the accomplishment of his prophecy: 'Heaven and earth may pass away, but my words shall not pass away.'[2]

Form.

Christ had spoken in parables to the people, and to his chosen disciples in secret and in darkness. Even those nearest to him could not then bear the full light of the glory about to be revealed. The allegorical form had been the means of effecting important results. It had linked together the old with the new; the Sinaitic law with the principles of reform, which, during the Babylonian captivity, had been added as an integral part of the Jewish faith. It had rendered possible the maintenance of Messianic expectations, together with a belief in their more spiritual realisation on an extended basis. Thus the peculiar people had been closely allied with the nations of the Gentiles, among whom God had not left himself without a witness, since they, without having the law, by nature did the works of the law, through their manifestation of love to God and to the brethren. But, although for a time the ancient forms had been the receptacles of new matter; though the life-giving Spirit had been developed from the dead-letter like sparks from the flint; yet the time came when the new wine burst the old skins, and had to be put into new ones. It was only during a short period, that by an allegorical interpretation and spiritual keeping of the law, the same was permitted to stand, until

[1] Mat. x. 27. [2] Mat. xxiv. 35.

CHAP. XIII.

all those things should be fulfilled which were necessary to its abrogation and entire abolishment. As the children used to be accompanied to school by a slave, so the chosen people in its infancy had been led to the school of Christ by the law as a taskmaster. But now captivity had been led captive by the liberty of the gospel, wherewith Christ had made his people free. By the holiness of the first-fruits, the whole of mankind had been sanctified;[1] to be in Christ was to be a new creature.

Already, Paul had found that new wine requires new bottles. The attempt which had been made by his companion and disciple to ingraft the new on the old had for a time answered its purpose. The allegorical sayings of Christ were generally allowed to stand in the parabolic form in which they had been first recorded, although their allegorical meaning received a more fully developed interpretation. But how was it possible to speak in parables on the mystery of godliness, on the manifestation of this mystery in the flesh? On this subject, the original gospel records contained little or nothing, because Christ had not spoken to the people otherwise than in parables, and because what he had spoken in secret to his chosen few, had still been spoken in darkness, because the darkness comprehended not the glimmering light, which could then be only revealed dimly, as through a glass. And yet the secret doctrine of Christ was to be proclaimed in light, and openly on the housetops. But this was not to be done then, for even the chosen band of his disciples could not then bear that their master, who had spoken to them in proverbs, should show them 'plainly of the Father.'[2] However plainly he may have spoken to one or more of his Apostles, as a body they were not fully initiated in the secret doctrine; they could not then have borne it. And when they thought that the predicted time had come, that he would no more speak unto them in proverbs, when they declared themselves ready to believe that he came

[1] Rom. xi. 16. [2] xvi. 25, 29.

forth from God, the Lord had to question their belief, and to point out to them that they would, every one of them, leave him alone, or be scattered, 'every man to his own.'[1]

Since then Paul, making use of the allegorical form, had applied to Christ all the attributes and all the offices which in the apocryphal writings of the pre-Christian period had been bestowed on the Divine Spirit, Word, or Wisdom, which was in the beginning with God, and which, in all ages, was poured on all flesh, in order to give power to the sons of men to become the children of God. Thus Christ had been proclaimed as the spiritual rock, the heavenly sustenance which accompanied the Israelites in the desert; and also as the first-fruits, the first-born among many brethren, and of all creatures. The Anointed was declared to have been in perfect unity with the anointing Spirit or Word of God; Christ was proclaimed as the Spirit, as the medium of communion between the creature and the Creator, as God manifested in the flesh.

In a similar allegorical form, the Gospel of the Sonship could be written; the apocryphal doctrine of Christ could be incorporated with a record of the life of Christ. Inasmuch as the life of Christ, in the highest sense of the word, was hidden in God; as it was a life of the soul, the life of the Son of Man who walked with his God, and who taught his sublimest doctrines only in secret, or in dark parables; the true and comprehensive record of the life of Christ must be based on a record of his secret sayings. The new wine has to be put into new bottles, or it will be lost. The time of parables had passed, the full light of the glorious Gospel must be revealed, and the first apostolic record of Christ's sayings, which had already, by Luke, been unlocked by the new key of Paul's Gospel, must now receive its authentic corollary, which had hitherto been hidden. That primitive evangelical record had fulfilled its mission, as a record of the time when all were shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. With the darkness, the time

[1] xvi. 32.

CHAP. XIII.

of concealment had disappeared, and thus to the record of the Lord's sayings, as recorded by the Apostle Matthew, must now be added, as a necessary complement, such words as Christ did speak in secret, and which he would have spoken openly, if circumstances had favoured his revealing, through the medium of the apocryphal doctrine about the Divine Word, the nature of his relation to the Father, of his Oneness in the Spirit with his God. But although, as far as the words of Christ are concerned, the new gospel must be a purely historical record, yet the mysteries of Christ would, even now in a certain measure, have to be clothed in a mysterious garb. The secret or apocryphal doctrine of Christ would have to be recorded in such a manner as sometimes to clothe the doctrine in the assumed garment of history. The apocryphal gospel would have to be regarded, in some degree at least, not as the kernel, but as the shell; as the alloy in which the jewel was set; as the historical garment of a pre-historical idea. To suit its esoteric contents, the form of the new gospel must be, to a certain extent, allegorical.

Prologue.

The apocryphal gospel begins with the apocryphal doctrine of the Divine Word, which was in the beginning with God, but which, according to Divine Grace, was in all ages of the world poured on all flesh, as the saving mediator between the invisible God in the heavens above and sinful man below. The Apostle addresses those to whom this doctrine, in one form or other, is well known. His object in the introductory part of his gospel is to show what the Divine Word, or the indwelling Spirit of God, has accomplished in the pre-Christian ages; what powers were opposed to the same, necessitating a visible manifestation of its glory; and how this revelation was accomplished by the perfect incarnation of the Divine Word in Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ.

The Divine Word was known to have been with God in the beginning, created before all things, privy to God's mysteries, and not only passively present when He

created the world, but also the means through which all things were created. It was known as the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness; as the pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty; through which God breathed into the first Adam a living soul, creating him as an image of his own eternity. It was known as the Divine name or spirit through which sons of men became sons of God. It was known as a light shining in darkness, as an invisible agency which could not be fully comprehended by all men, because of their unbelief and disobedience. Some there were, in all ages, who, because of their love to God[1] were, through this Divine instrumentality, initiated in the sonship. Such men were sent from God to bear witness of His desire and power to save through His indwelling Spirit, through the light which, in measure, God has given to every man at every time. But the testimony of prophets, apostles, and teachers, did not lead all men to believe in God through His Spirit or His name. They did not all receive the Divine guest, the requisite power to become the sons of God, and thus to be renewed in the spirit of their mind, to become spiritually minded, to be born of the Spirit. They did not form a contrast to those who, yielding to the temptations of flesh and blood, were carnally-minded merely, and born of the flesh. If, then, the revealed aim and end of God's universal salvation is to be accomplished, the free creatures of His love must see the Divine light shining in the face of one of their own brethren. If God is to be all in all, the fulness of this light, the fulness of the Godhead, must so pervade a human body, that the finite becomes the visible manifestation of the invisible infinite; the Word must become flesh, it must become personified as the Word-Man, as the 'Man from (or with the help of) the Lord;'[2] 'the dayspring from on high must shine as the glory

[1] Eccl. i. 10.

[2] Comp. Gen. iv. 1.

CHAP. XIII.

of the only-begotten of the Father, as the Lord from heaven,' so that it can be seen and handled.

Already, Paul had indirectly identified Christ with the Divine Word, the spiritual rock which accompanied the Israelites; and he had declared that the Lord is the Spirit. In accordance with this revelation, John shows, in the first fourteen verses, what was already known about this Divine Word: that it was with God in the beginning, as an indwelling or imminent power, which issued forth from the mouth of the Almighty as a power by which all things were created,[1] which 'orders all things well;'[2] which, ever since the beginning, 'got a possession . . . in the waves of the sea, and in all the earth, and in every people and nation;'[3] which in all ages shone in darkness, although uncomprehended by the same, as the true light of all men; which, if they received it willingly, would give power to them to become children of God by their spiritual new birth. In the fulness of time this Divine Word, which was in the world, by which the world was made, and which its own world knew not, became flesh; the visible image of the invisible God dwelt among men; the Divine Spirit, the first-born of every creature, became the first-born among many brethren; the Son of Man shone on earth as the Son of God, as the unspotted mirror of the power of God, as the glory of the only-begotten of the Father.

The doctrine.

The prologue or introduction of the gospel has shown what was God's eternal plan of salvation, through the medium of His Word; why the mission of this Divine Saviour was frustrated by the non-reception of the same, even by the people specially owned by God; and that in the fulness of time the redeeming Word of God was made flesh. Having thus established the identity of the Divine Word in the flesh and the Divine Word not in the flesh; of the invisible Spirit of God and its visible manifestation; of the Saviour of all in all ages, and the personal

[1] Wis. ix. 1. [2] Wis. viii. 1. [3] Eccl. xxiv. 6.

Saviour in the fulness of time; the Evangelist now proceeds to record the secret doctrine of his master. We purpose to separate the doctrinal from the historical part, and to consider one after the other. In order to point out more clearly the intimate connection between the pre-Christian apocryphal principles and the secret and esoteric doctrine of Christ, we shall consider the latter under different heads, and in the same order in which we considered the former.

1. *God is One and invisible.* 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him.' 'The only-begotten Son' is an expression not used by any other writer than by the Apostle John.[1] The Alexandrian writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews applies the same to Isaac,[2] whilst calling Christ 'the first-begotten,'[3] in harmony with the Apocalypse, where he is called 'the first-begotten of the dead.'[4] When the Apostle speaks for the first time of 'the only-begotten of the Father,' he clearly refers to the Spirit or Word of God, which was made flesh, and whose glory men beheld '*as of*' the only-begotten glory of the Father. It is 'the pure influence *flowing from* the glory of the Almighty;' it is the 'Almighty Word' which in all ages made sons of God of sons of men, by being poured as a Divine gift on all flesh, according to the desire of them who felt the need of it, and loved God. It is the Divine 'fulness' of which all received grace by grace. It is the Divine Wisdom or Word, which is at the same time with the Father in heaven and with man on earth, being 'for ever' with the Lord, and in all ages 'with all flesh according to His gift.'[5] The Word, the only-begotten of the Father, which was by Him created before all things, which is privy to His mysteries, and which in a measure has revealed to sons of men 'the things that are in heaven,'[6]

[1] John i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18; 1 John iv. 9. [2] xi. 17. [3] i. 6. [4] i. 5.
[5] Ecel. i. 1, 10; John iii. 13. [6] Wis. ix. 16.

CHAP. XIII.

and Him whom no man has seen,[1] even the Father who loved her;[2] this same Word, full of grace and truth, and which is in the bosom of the Father, has, through its perfect incarnation in Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son, declared the unseen God to mankind.[3] God is a Spirit.[4]

2. *The Divine Spirit, manifested in the flesh, is the first-born of every creature, the organ of sanctification and immortality, and the medium between the creature and the Creator. Christ is the Spirit.*

We have seen that Paul identified Christ with the Divine Spirit, and also with the Divine ideal pattern of mankind, which, through the operation of the latter and the obedience of the former, should, in the fulness of time, become realised in the flesh. Accordingly the Evangelist, in the first place, shows that Christ received the Spirit 'not by measure,'[5] but in 'fulness.'[6] This it is which makes Him the Christ, though, by His birth in Nazareth, He did not realise the Jewish expectations, that the Messiah, like David, would be born in Bethlehem.[7] Because He has received the Divine Spirit without measure, He is at One with the Spirit, and therefore One with the Father, from whom the Spirit proceeds.[8] In this sense He comes 'from above . . from heaven,' and 'is above all;'[9] He beareth witness of Himself; and his Father, who sent him, beareth witness of him.[10] To see Him, or to know Him, is to see and to know the Father;[11] who believes in God believes also in Christ.[12] It is because of his identity with the Divine Spirit that his body is a temple,[13] that he is built up a spiritual house, which is not made with hands, but is eternal in the heavens. Therefore He could say of Himself, 'Before Abraham was I am;'[14] 'I am the bread of life,'[15] 'the light of the world,'[16] 'the resurrection and the life.'[17] Because he whom the Father

[1] Eccl. xliii. 31. [2] Wis. xiv. 3; viii. 3. [3] John xiv. 7–9; xvi. 25.
[4] iv. 24. [5] iii. 34. [6] i. 16. [7] i. 45, 46; vii. 52.
[8] x. 30. [9] iii. 31. [10] viii. 18. [11] xiv. 8; viii. 19.
[12] xiv. 1. [13] ii. 21. [14] viii. 58. [15] vi. 35.
[16] viii. 12. [17] xi. 25.

has sent has received His Spirit not by measure, therefore he speaks 'the words of God:'[1] he is 'the door;'[2] 'no man cometh to the Father but by him;'[3] he is at the same time in heaven and on earth;[4] where he is, there shall his servants be;[5] he is the vine, his disciples are the branches.[6] Because Christ is one with the Spirit of God, therefore he will pray the Father, that when he shall have gone out of the world, and returned to the glory which he had with the Father in the beginning, the Father shall send 'another' comforter or advocate, another instrument of the Holy Ghost, who shall take of his own, that is, of the fulness of Christ, and make known to his disciples what he shall hear, so as to lead them into all truth, and as the reaper to gather 'fruit unto life eternal,'[7] which their master could not then do because of unbelief.

3. *The universality of God's saving love.* 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'[8] In all ages God has, in a measure, poured on all flesh that 'true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' He has sent men to bear witness of that light, 'that all men . . . might believe.' But the world, as a whole, did not believe in the regenerating power of the Divine light, Spirit, or Word. 'He came unto his own, and his own received him not.' As many, however, as believed in His name, be they Jews or Gentiles, 'to them gave he power to become the sons of God.' In the fulness of time the mark of humanity's high calling was set up in Israel. Many had desired and received the Spirit of God, and had thus been initiated, and in a relative sense perfected in the Divine sonship; yet the aboriginally predestinated pattern of mankind, the perfect incarnation of the Holy Spirit, had not been realised. What was given in measure only, because of human imperfection, was given not in measure, but in fulness, to

[1] iii. 34. [2] x. 9. [3] xiv. 6. [4] iii. 13.
[5] xii. 26. [6] xv. 5. [7] iv. 36. [8] iii. 16.

CHAP. XIII.

the Son of God, to the only sinless descendant of Adam, to the revealer of the Father's only-begotten glory, to the only-begotten Son of God, to the anointed Jesus of Nazareth. In former ages the only-begotten glory, the Spirit, Wisdom, or Word of God, had remained invisible, and had but in part been shown even to Moses.[1] In the fulness of time the glory of God shone 'in the face of Jesus Christ,' and it shone in measure in the hearts of those who received of his fulness grace by grace.[2] From those that turned to the Lord 'the veil' was taken away; for the Lord being the Spirit, all with open face may behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord, and be 'changed into the same image from glory to glory, *even as by the Spirit of the Lord.*'[3]

'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.'[4] The children of God that are scattered abroad shall be gathered together in one,[5] that all whom the Father has given to the Son 'may be one,' even as the Father and the Son are one,[6] so that God may be all in all through the same Spirit.

4. *Righteousness by the Grace of God.* This apocryphal doctrine, as confirmed and developed by Christ, has been so fully dwelt upon in the earlier gospel records, and in the Epistles of Paul; and the same is so palpable a consequence of the doctrine about the Divine Word, that the Apostle John does not refer to it, excepting when speaking of the other comforter who should convince the world of righteousness. Jesus Christ is 'the righteous,'[7] because he is at one with, and abides in the 'righteous Father.'[8] Therefore, the Apostle writes in his Epistle: 'Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also; . . abide in Him; . . if ye know that He is righteous, ye

[1] Eccl. xlv. 3. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 6. [3] 2 Cor. iii. 16–18.
[4] x. 16. [5] xi. 52. [6] xvii. 11; xxi. 22.
[7] 1 John ii. 1. [8] xvii. 25.

know that everyone that doeth righteousness is born of Him.'[1] 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God; . . that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.'[2] 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.'[3]

5. *Atonement through Righteousness.* As in the first gospels so in the last, Jesus is recorded to have spoken of his flesh and blood in such a manner as thereby to imply that the Jewish passover was a type of the redemption effected through him. Because Jesus is the incarnate Wisdom or Word of God, he invites his disciples to eat and drink his flesh and blood. As Divine Wisdom was in Proverbs reported to have said, so Christ says: 'Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled.' In order to throw more light on this important subject we must refer to the pre-Christian apocryphal doctrine, that the Spirit of God issued forth from the mysterious person of the Creator before all creation, and in all ages was sent from above to men below, to make them sons of God, by cleansing them from sin, and by raising them to immortality. Or in the words of Paul: 'If ye live by the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live; for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.'[4] Even in the pre-Christian era this doctrine had been specially applied to the interpretation of the record about Moses lifting up the serpent in the wilderness. In the 'Wisdom of Solomon' the same is described as '*a sign* of salvation,' and it is added that 'he that turned himself toward it, was *not saved by the thing that he saw*,' but by the Divine Spirit, Wisdom, or Word, which is 'the Saviour of all;' by '*thy Word, O Lord, which healeth all things.*' In the same chapter it is stated that it was the Divine 'Word' which fed the people of God 'with angel's food,'

[1] 1 John ii. 23, 28, 29. [2] iii. 3, 6. [3] iii. 36. [4] Rom. viii. 13, 14.

CHAP. XIII.

and which sent them down 'from heaven bread prepared without their labour.' This Divine 'sustenance' was 'altered into all fashions, and was obedient to *thy grace*, that *nourisheth all things according to the desire of them that had need.* That *thy children*, O Lord, whom thou lovest, might know, . . . that it is *thy Word* which preserveth them that put their trust in thee.'[1] And in the Targum of Jonathan it is written: 'He shall be healed if he direct his heart unto the name of the Word of the Lord.' From the above remarkable passage it clearly follows that the words Wisdom, Word, or Grace are synonyms, expressing the Divine agency of the Holy Spirit, the Saviour of all; and that what was lifted up by Moses was a mere sign or token of the invisible Divine instrument or organ of salvation.

Again, the 'flinty rock' from which water was given to the Israelites 'when they were thirsty,' and when they called upon the Divine Wisdom or Word, is evidently regarded by the same pre-Christian writer as a mere sign or instrument of salvation.[2] And this interpretation is fully confirmed by Paul, who having identified Christ with the Spirit of God, clearly states that the rock which followed the Israelites in the wilderness, the spiritual rock of which both Jews and Gentiles were made to drink, 'was Christ.'

Now, there can be no doubt but that in the fourth gospel the lifting up of Jesus, the Son of Man, in the same manner, 'as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness,'[3] has been by the Evangelist, and thus by Christ himself, interpreted in the spirit of the apocryphal and Paulinic interpretation above referred to. Christ was lifted up as 'a sign of salvation;' as the perfect instrument of the Holy Ghost; who the Saviour of all. The Son of Man must be lifted up, 'that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.' Those who look up to the raised Son of Man are saved, not by anything

[1] Wis. xvi. 6-26. [2] xi. 4. [3] iii. 14.

which was at any time visible, but by the Divine Word or Spirit, which, without measure, dwelt in the Man Jesus. To be saved, it is only necessary to direct the heart unto the Divine Word which, personified by Jesus, was lifted up as a sign of salvation, and which, as the indwelling 'Saviour of all' in all ages, 'lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' Now, as in all ages, the Divine Word 'draweth unto her' all her children,[1] that is all men, since she is poured out on all flesh. And in this sense Christ has said: 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, *will draw all men unto me*.'[2]

The foregoing brief analysis of the principal doctrines contained in the Gospel after John suffice to prove that they are essentially identical with those doctrines which were added to the national faith during, or shortly after, the Babylonian captivity.

The historical part.

Every attempt to separate the certainly unhistorical from the certainly historical parts of this or any other gospel must evidently fail.[3] There is but one statement in the fourth gospel which, whilst it is intended to refer to an historical fact, can be proved to be undoubtedly unhistorical. It is the passage by which it is clearly implied that Christ died on the fourteenth, instead of on the fifteenth Nisan, on which latter day, according to the first three gospels, the crucifixion took place. It can be proved that the Apostle John

[1] Eccl. iv. 11. [2] John xii. 32.

[3] Very soon after the publication of the fourth gospel, towards the end of the second century, a party in Asia Minor, the members of which, probably Ebionites, were in the fourth century called the Alogi, or 'the unreasonable,' protested against this gospel, which they attributed to Cerinthus, who, like all Gnostics, insisted on a secret tradition. Their objections chiefly related to the historical part of the narrative, according to which, for instance, there was no time left for the marriage in Cana, or even for the long journey from Judea to Galilee, no more than for the forty days in the wilderness. They may already have pointed out, that Andrew, and not Peter, was according to this Gospel the first to recognise the Messiah (John i. 43), and that Christ called Peter the rock at an earlier period (John ii. 19 f.; iii. 14), whilst in the very outset he pointed out one of them, Judas, as a devil (John vi. 71).

CHAP. XIII.

celebrated the holy Eucharist in Asia, where he died on the fourteenth Nisan, as on the day on which it was instituted by Christ, after that he had partaken with his disciples of the paschal lamb, according to the law. If so, the Apostle John cannot have written, or in any way sanctioned, the statement contained in the fourth gospel, that Christ died on the fourteenth Nisan, that is on the day previous to the paschal meal of the Jews.[1] The eastern churches celebrated the festival of the Lord's passover regularly on the fourteenth Nisan, and they did so because, according to their tradition, which Eusebius admits to be more ancient than that of the western churches, the Apostles celebrated it on that same day on which the Lord had eaten the passover with them, even on the day *preceding* his death. This apostolic tradition had been disregarded in Rome, and a different paschal or easter-rite had been introduced there and in the western churches generally, perhaps even, as we shall see, ever since the apostolic period. Be this as it may it is probable that the general introduction of the Roman paschal rite into all the western churches was a gradual one, and that it was at first considered of no vital importance. Instead of a fixed day of the lunar month, the western churches appointed a particular day in the week, a Sunday at the vernal equinox, for the celebration 'of the mystery of the resurrection of our Lord.'[2]

Paschal schism.

This led in the second century to an open schism in the Christian church. It is important to refer to the same in this place, inasmuch as at the time when the Gospel after John was brought to light in the form transmitted to us, it was found necessary or advisable to support by the same the Roman paschal rite, based on the assumption that Christ died on the fourteenth Nisan, as literal fulfilment of the prophecy in Isaiah about the servant of God, who was to be brought 'as a lamb to the slaughter.'[3]

[1] xiii. 1, 29; xviii. 28. [2] Iren. Ap. Eus. v. 24. [3] Is. liii. 7; Jer. xi. 19.

CHAP. XIII.

We have seen that the Roman church, soon after the beginning of the second century, had fallen from the position which it had maintained in the days of Clement, according to his Epistle to the Corinthians. Paul and his doctrine were set aside, just as much as this had been the case in Palestine, when the feud between him and the twelve Apostles was at its height. The Roman writer of the Shepherd of Hermas, the author of the pseudo-Clementine writings, and Justin Martyr, neither refer directly to the Apostle nor do they quote from his writings. During nearly a century after his death, neither friend nor foe seem to have dared directly to refer to Paul, at least in the Roman church. But we likewise tried to point out the events which seem to have caused a sudden reaction towards the middle of the second century, not only in favour of Paul's doctrine, but even of that docetic gnosticism which he was foremost in combating. During the years 140 to 170, the influence of Marcion, the leading gnostic, was paramount at Rome. He declared it to be the first duty of the time to distinguish Judaism from Christianity, the law from the gospel, the God of Israel from the God of Christ. His first address in Rome announced, as we have seen, a sweeping reform.

This was the state of the Roman church when the venerable Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, came to Rome, about the year 160. Irenæus writes that he, when a boy, met Polycarp in Asia, who had 'familiar intercourse with John' (the elder), and 'with those that had seen the Lord.' Polycarp had 'received the episcopate of the church at Smyrna at the hands of the eye-witnesses and servants of the Lord,'[1] and he 'used to relate their discourses and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord; also concerning his miracles, his doctrine. All these were told by Polycarp *in consistency with the Holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation.*'[2] Eusebius further states that,

[1] H. E. iii. 36. [2] H. E. v. 20.

CHAP. XIII.

according to Irenæus, 'when Anicetus was at the head of the Roman church,'[1] Polycarp came to Rome 'on a question respecting the day of the passover.'[2] Now of Anicetus and his successors Irenæus writes, that they did not themselves observe the fourteenth day, 'nor did they permit those after them to observe it.' On this question, therefore, Polycarp had to confront the opposition of Anicetus as well as of Marcion. But whilst Polycarp called the latter 'the first-born of Satan,' and did in Rome on this occasion succeed in turning 'many' from such 'heretics' as Valentinas, Marcion, and 'the rest of those perverse teachers;'[3] yet the same Irenæus informs us that 'when the blessed Polycarp went to Rome in the time of Anicetus, and they had a little difference among themselves, likewise respecting other matters, they immediately were reconciled, not disputing much with one another on this head. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it, because he had always observed it *with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the Apostles with whom he associated*; and neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, who said that he *was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him.*'[4]

But although at that time, that is, about the year 160, it came to no open separation between the eastern and the western churches, yet soon after, a part of the east joined the Roman rite, and this caused in Laodicea, about the year 170, the breaking out of a more violent feud about the passover rite, which involved the maintenance or the setting aside of direct apostolic tradition. Bishop Melito of Sardis wrote in favour of the eastern, and Bishop Apollinaris of Hieropolis in favour of the western rite. This was but the precursor of the real feud which broke out about the year 190, and which was no more restricted to the church of Asia Minor. The apostolic tradition and usage preserved in the east was principally opposed

[1] 158–169. [2] H. E. iv. 14. [3] H. E. iv. 14. [4] H. E. v. 24.

by Victor, who followed Soter, in the year 190, and who is the first whom Eusebius or any other writer styles a 'bishop' of the Roman church, with which term that of 'elder' was originally equivalent. The Roman presbyters and their president, perhaps already then called bishop, insisted on the general recognition of the presbyterial tradition of Anicetus and 'the presbyters before him,' and opposed 'the remoter' and episcopal tradition derived from the Apostles, and through the 'bishop' Polycarp, who had 'associated' with John and the rest of the Apostles.

Eusebius introduces us into the details of these disputes. Of Melito he says, that in his 'two works on the passover,' which he wrote when Sagaris suffered martyrdom at Laodicea, Melito stated that there was much discussion in Laodicea respecting the passover, which 'occurred at that time in its proper season.'[1] Again, Eusebius writes as follows: 'There was a considerable discussion raised about this time,[2] in consequence of a difference of opinion respecting the observance of the paschal season. The churches of all Asia, guided by a *remoter* tradition, supposed that they ought to keep the fourteenth day of the moon for *the festival of the Saviour's passover*, on which day the Jews were commanded to kill the paschal lamb; and it was incumbent on them, at all times, to make an end of the fast on this day, on whatever day of the week it should happen to fall. But as it was not the custom to celebrate it in this manner in the churches throughout the rest of the world, who observe the practice that has prevailed *from apostolic tradition* until the present time, so that it would not be proper to terminate our fast on any other but *the day of the resurrection of our Saviour*, hence there were synods and convocations of *the bishops* on this question, and all unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree, which they communicated to all the churches in all places, that *the mystery of our Lord's resurrection* should be celebrated on no other day than

[1] H. E. iv. 26. [2] 180–192.

CHAP. XIII.

the Lord's day, and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the paschal fasts.'[1]

Although Eusebius seems to imply that the bishops who assembled at these convocations and synods, and passed 'their unanimous determination,' were the bishops of all Christian churches, yet, on his own showing, this was not the case. For he adds: 'The bishops, however, of Asia, persevering in observing the custom handed down to them from their fathers, were headed by Polycrates. He, indeed, had also set forth the tradition handed down to them, in a letter which he addressed to Victor and the Church of Rome. We, said he, therefore observe the genuine day, neither adding thereto nor taking therefrom.' Having referred to the 'great lights . . fallen asleep in Asia,' such as Philip, 'one of the twelve Apostles,' and John, 'who rested upon the bosom of the Lord,' and Polycarp, and Melito of Sardis and others, Polycrates writes in the above letter: 'All these observed the fourteenth day of the passover *according to the gospel*, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith. Moreover, I, Polycrates, who am the least of all of you, according to the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have followed. For there were seven of my relatives bishops, and I am the eighth; and my relatives always observed the day when the people (that is, the Jews) threw away the leaven. I, therefore, brethren, am now sixty-five years in the Lord, who, having conferred with the brethren throughout the world, and having studied *the whole of the sacred Scriptures*, am not at all alarmed at those things with which I am threatened, to intimidate me. For they who are greater than I have said: "We ought to obey God rather than men."' Eusebius adds: 'Upon this Victor, the bishop of the Church of Rome, forthwith endeavoured to cut off from the community, as heterodox, the churches of all Asia, together with the neighbouring churches. And he publishes

[1] H. E. v. 23.

abroad by letters, and proclaims, that all the brethren there are wholly excommunicated. But this was not the opinion of all the bishops. They immediately exhorted him, on the contrary, to contemplate that course that was calculated to promote peace, unity and love to one another.'[1]

From the testimony of Polycarp, Melito and Polycrates, extending from the first century to the end of the second, it follows :

1. That 'John and the rest of the Apostles,' with whom Polycarp associated, did invariably celebrate the festival of the Lord's passover on the 14th Nisan, which was 'its proper season ;'

2. That 'the Holy Scriptures,' which Polycarp had 'received from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation ;' that 'the gospel,' did even in the days of Polycrates,[2] only recognise the observance of the passover on the 14th day ;

3. That Polycrates, 'having studied the whole of the Sacred Scriptures,' and considering the tradition of seven bishops who had been his relatives and predecessors (perhaps all at Ephesus), knew of no verbal or written apostolic tradition which sanctioned the observance of the passover on any other than the 14th day of Nisan, '*quarto decimo die*,' being the day *preceding* the Lord's death.

Before we consider in how far this testimony agrees with the fourth gospel, we must point out more minutely on what authority the Roman church deviated from such apostolic usage. Even Irenæus, who was raised to the episcopate of the Church at Lyons in the year 178 or 180, and who prevented by his conciliatory advice Victor's excommunication of the Asiatic churches from being carried out, does not deny that Polycarp could support the orthodoxy of the paschal rite as by him observed, by the verbal communications of the Apostles, his associates, by their invariable practice, and by the unanimous testimony

[1] H. E. v. 24.

[2] About 180–192.

CHAP. XIII.

of 'the holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the Apostles.' And although Irenæus, in an epistle addressed to Victor, 'in the name of these brethren in Gaul over whom he presided,' maintained 'the duty of celebrating the mystery of the resurrection of our Lord *only* on the day of the Lord;'[1] yet he cannot advance any other authority in favour of this Roman rite, than that derived from the fact that Anicetus,[2] as well as his successors, were 'bound to maintain' the practice of 'the presbyters' of the Roman church. No attempt is made to connect this presbyterial practice with apostolical tradition. And yet it is not impossible that the Roman rite was sanctioned and even instituted by Paul. Such, however, seems to have been the desire in the fourth century, to let disappear every trace of a difference between this Apostle and those at Jerusalem, that we may thus account for the absence of all allusion by Eusebius, to the apostolic origin of the Roman rite. He admits that the Eastern churches were guided by a 'remoter' tradition, that is, by that which emanated from John and the rest of the Apostles, and from 'many who had seen Christ.'[3] If, therefore, there was any apostolic authority for the Roman rite, it could at best only have been the less remote one of him who was an Apostle, though he had not seen Christ.

Before Irenæus, this western rite had been, as we have seen, supported by Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis,[4] the contemporary of Polycarp, Melito, and Polycrates. The few fragments still preserved from his writings show that, in the opinion of the Orientalists, whom he opposed, the Lord had eaten the passover with his disciples on the 14th, and that on the high-day of the feast of unleavened bread, he had himself suffered. But Apollinaris insists that, '*instead of the lamb, the Son of God*' was slain on the 14th, and that he 'from his side caused the two purifying streams to flow; water and blood, word and spirit,' and that he was 'buried on the day of the passover, after that a stone had

[1] H. E. v. 24. [2] 158–169. [3] iv. 14. [4] Between 160 and 180.

been laid before the grave.' The same view about the Lord's having died as the paschal lamb, that is on the 14th, is taken by Clement of Alexandria, of whom Eusebius informs us that he also wrote against the eastern rite.[1] In a fragment of his writings it is stated, that in the years preceding the year of his death, the Lord did eat the passover with the Jews, but that in that year *he announced himself as the passover* on the 13th, and he suffered on the following day.[2] Again, Hippolytus, in a fragment likewise preserved to us by the Paschal Chronicle, supports the Roman rite, and clearly establishes the point of difference between that and the eastern rite. In his discourse with his opponent he makes the latter say: 'What Christ then did on that day, *was the passover, and afterwards* he suffered; therefore, even I do in the same manner as the Lord has done.' To this, Hippolytus replies: 'It is an error not to know that Christ at the time in which he suffered did *not* eat the legal passover, for *He* was the previously announced passover, which was accomplished on that fixed day.' Again, Hippolytus writes: 'As the Lord had predicted that he would no more eat the passover with them, so he kept the supper *before* the passover; the passover, however, he did not eat, but he suffered, for it was also not the time that he should eat it.'[3] From these extracts it clearly follows,[4] that the eastern churches did not celebrate the 14th as the day of the Lord's death, but as the day on which he still celebrated the passover with his disciples. They argued thus: If Jesus has on the 14th eaten the passover, then he did not die on that day, and it is not suitable to celebrate on this day the memorial of his death, whilst it is obligatory at this time to do what he has done, therefore not to fast, but contrariwise to celebrate a meal, which naturally concluded the usual ante-paschal fast. On the other hand,

[1] H. E. iv. 26. [2] Chron. Pasch., p. 14, &c. [3] Ibid. Bonn. ed.

[4] See the admirable treatise on the paschal feud in Baur's 'Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrhunderte,' 2nd ed. p. 157 f.

CHAP. XIII.

the western churches argued thus: Because Jesus did suffer and die on the 14th, he cannot have on this day eaten the passover, and there is no reason for breaking the fast on the day when the Jewish passover is kept, nor is it necessary to regulate by the 14th Nisan the Christian Easter festival.

Now, if we turn to the Gospels, we see at once that according to the first three, Jesus on the 14th, the day before his death, did eat the passover with his disciples, and with all the Jews. The first three Evangelists speak of the day of the supper as that on which 'the passover must be killed,' and as 'the first day of unleavened bread.'[1] They state, that 'they made ready the passover;' and our Lord himself is recorded by Luke to have called the meal of which he had partaken with his disciples, the 'passover.'[2] But according to the fourth gospel, the day of the supper was the day preceding that of the paschal meal. It is implied to have taken place 'before the feast of the passover,'[3] and this is confirmed by Judas being ordered by the Lord during supper to buy what they had need 'against the feast.'[4] Again, it was about twenty-four hours after the supper, that is on the 14th Nisan, and not on the 15th, that is, it was during that evening when the Jews killed the paschal lamb, that Jesus was led to the judgment hall, wherefore the Jews themselves would not go in, 'lest they should be defiled, but that they *might* eat the passover.'[5] Again, it is stated, that when Christ was standing before Pilate, a few hours before his crucifixion, it was 'the preparation of the passover;'[6] and for this reason the Jews were anxious, 'because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, for that Sabbath day was an high day.'[7]

Whilst the first three Evangelists support the eastern rite, the fourth Evangelist, or rather the writer who finally

[1] Mat. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7. [2] Luke xxii. 15, 16.
[3] John xiii. 1, 2. [4] xiii. 29. [5] xviii. 28. [6] xix. 14. [7] xix. 31.

settled the text of this part of the gospel, in every way supports the western rite. Unless therefore we are prepared to lay aside the above contradictions, and to discredit the unopposed testimony of Polycarp, Polycrates, and even of Irenæus, we are obliged positively to assert, that this part of the fourth gospel cannot possibly have been written or in any way sanctioned by the Apostle John, of whom we know, that up to the end of his life he celebrated the 14th, not as the day of the Lord's death, but as the day on which the Lord for the last time did eat the passover with him and the rest of the Apostles.[1]

No wonder, then, that when the Gospel after John was brought to light, no record of the words spoken by the Lord whilst distributing the bread and the wine was found in it. According to Matthew, as well as Luke, Christ had partaken of the legal passover, after which, as Luke has it, a new rite was instituted. But in John no notice is taken of the Lord's having instituted a new rite, or of his having sanctioned the old one. Instead of this, the ceremony of the Lord's washing the Apostle's feet is here related, of which the other gospels tell us nothing. This is what we should expect in the gospel where Christ is pointed out as the water of life. Again, in an earlier passage,[2] the eating of Christ's flesh and the drinking of his blood is described as a mystery unconnected altogether with any outward formality, if not with any fixed period of time. It is shown to be exclusively a spiritual union with Christ, with the incarnation of the Divine Spirit or Word. As Christ, the rock which followed the Israelites in the desert, was the source from which they all drank, so Christ, the risen Lord, who is the Spirit, is the giver of eternal life to all who have part in him, who are washed by him, who

[1] Some have urged the possibility that the fourth gospel may be right and the first three wrong in this question, and have appealed to Acts xii. 3, 4, in favour of their view (thus of late Mr. Nicolas). For a full statement of the difficulties attached to this conjecture, we refer to Mr. Howson's article on the passover in 'Smith's Dictionary.'

[2] vi. 51–58.

CHAP. XIII.

receive of his fulness grace by grace, and thus dwell in Christ and Christ in them.

It is not improbable that the Easter-rite of the western churches, which is sanctioned by the fourth gospel, was instituted by Paul himself. We have pointed out how the continued celebration of the Jewish passover, even if sanctioned by the Lord, would have proved itself an insuperable obstacle to the introduction of Paul's gospel, which proclaimed righteousness *without any* of the deeds of the law. We likewise tried to show that already during Paul's lifetime, docetic principles began to prevail, whereby the reality of Christ's humanity, therefore his flesh and blood, was denied. We then developed how, under the pressure of these circumstances, Paul seems to have been led to declare, that instead of the blood of the lamb, which God had in times of old given to Israel upon the altar, 'to make an atonement for the soul,'[1] and 'as a token' of Israel's obedience, which would cause the Lord's judgment to pass over, that now 'as our passover, Christ is sacrificed for us.'[2] Again, we compared the account of the Lord's supper as contained in Matthew with that in Luke, and we pointed out, that whereas the former simply refers to the legal feast of the passover which Jesus celebrated for the last time with his disciples at the appointed time, the latter, after having likewise referred to the Lord's last paschal meal, records the institution of *a new rite* by the Lord 'after supper,' that is, after the paschal meal was over. According to this new rite the disciples are henceforth so to celebrate the old passover-rite, as all of them to drink the blood of their crucified Lord, in that same spiritual sense in which their fathers in the wilderness all drank 'the same spiritual drink,' that is Christ, the rock 'that followed them.' The new rite does therefore not imply that the Lord had not celebrated with his disciples the legal passover on the day before his death, and yet it does clearly imply that old things have passed away, and

[1] Lev. xvii. 11. [2] 1 Cor. v. 7.

that in future this rite was to remind them of his blood which would be shed for them, by the Son of Man, who had to be lifted up on the cross as 'a sign' or token of salvation.[1]

If it may be assumed that the disciple of Paul, by the account of this new paschal rite, strove to connect the Apostle's doctrine of atonement with the Lord's last celebration of the passover, as commanded by the law, then the supposition gains ground that Paul, either personally or by his doctrine, was the primary cause of the new Easter-rite established in the west. Already, during his lifetime, the Christians in some churches were in the habit of celebrating the Lord's Supper, the breaking of bread on the first day of the week, the day of his resurrection.[2] And although it cannot perhaps be insisted upon, that the celebration of the Lord's supper here referred to as having taken place in the presence of Paul, occurred at Easter-time; yet, thus much may be assumed, that Christians in the habit of celebrating this rite at any time of the year on a Sunday, would choose the same day of the week, irrespectively of the day of the month, for the Easter celebration. Thus we see a congregation of Christians, presided over by Paul, who celebrate the passover, not according to eastern and apostolic tradition, on the 14th Nisan, but on the first day of the week, in connection with the Saviour's resurrection. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that already in the apostolic period the Lord's supper was celebrated also on Sundays, before or after the time of Easter, the above statement in the Acts sanctions the supposition that the peculiar paschal rite of the western churches was already established in some churches, possibly also at Rome, in the days of Paul. If so, the less remote tradition of the Roman presbyters would certainly refer back to one which had originally Paul for its author. This would

[1] Wisd. xvi.; John iii. 14.

[2] Acts xx. 7.

CHAP. XIII.

constitute another point of difference between this Apostle and those at Jerusalem.

Having pointed out on what grounds we regard the statement as non-historical, according to which Christ died on the 14th Nisan, on the very day when the lamb of the Jewish paschal lamb was slain, we now consider the record of John the Baptist according to the four gospels.

John the Baptist.

It is very remarkable that exactly about the time of Christ's advent, the Messianic expectations had reached their highest point among the Jewish nation, and had even spread to heathen countries, according to the testimony of Tacitus and Suetonius.[1] This could not be mere chance, it was the overruling of Providence. Once more the time had come when it was needful that the Word of God should speak to a Man of God, so that thus enlightened, he might 'bear witness' of that 'true light which lighteth every man,' and that he might serve as a guide to those who longed to know the special relation of the word of prophecy to the present times. Such a prophet was John the Baptist, who most probably belonged to the Essenic body. Of him it is recorded in Luke, that from a child he 'grew strong in the Spirit;' that the Word of God came unto him in the wilderness, and that he preached 'the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,' in the country about Jordan,[2] after having been 'in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel.'[3] In Matthew we are only told that in more literal harmony with the prophecy of Isaiah, John 'came . . . preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, repent ye (or more literally, change your mind), for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' But even in this gospel, as in Mark, it is stated that the people were baptised by John, 'confessing their sins.'[4]

We have pointed out, as one of the marked differences

[1] Tacitus, Hist. v. 13; Suetonius Vesp. 4.
[2] Luke iii. 2, 3.
[3] i. 80.
[4] Mat. iii. 1–6.

between Luke and Matthew, that the Messianic kingdom which, according to the latter, is a limited and terrestrial one, is by the former declared to be a spiritual and universal kingdom of the eternal Messiah, who is from heaven. It is probable that the expression 'kingdom of heaven,'[1] was by the Jews in such a degree connected with their limited and terrestrial kingdom, that Luke, and after him all other Evangelists, when referring to the kingdom of heaven, use the more general term kingdom of God, which, according to Luke's record, was announced by Jesus as having already come, whilst the twelve Apostles expected him to set up the terrestrial kingdom announced by the prophets. Notwithstanding this difference about the Messianic kingdom, both Evangelists agree in stating that, according to John the Baptist, repentance, or rather the renewing of the mind, the new birth, was a necessary forerunner of the promised Immanuel-Israel. And this is what already Jeremiah had done. Although he prophecied about the future king David, whom God would raise up in Israel to set up a terrestrial kingdom in Zion,[2] he likewise announced the future 'new covenant,' when God would write his law in the hearts of his people.[3] This doctrine of the spiritual new birth formed, as we have seen, the centre of that apocryphal or Hidden Wisdom, the promulgation of which the rulers of the Jewish church tried to exclude from Palestine. They dreaded the reformatory power of this Divine Wisdom, Word, Spirit or Grace of God, of which it was written in apocryphal books, that she is 'the breath and (or "of the") power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty, . . . the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power (or "operation") of God, and the image of his goodness;' that she is 'but one, and yet can do all things;' that she 'remaineth the same, and yet *maketh all things new*, and in all ages (or "from genera-

[1] Comp. Mat. xi. 11. [2] Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; xxx. 9. [3] xxxi. 31-34.

CHAP. XIII.

tion to generation,") entering into holy souls, she prepareth friends of God and prophets.'[1] According to this doctrine, and in consequence of this Divine operation, the chosen people of God were in a general sense 'the sons of God;'[2] and in a more restricted though still limited sense, every 'just man' was regarded as a 'son of God.'[3]

John came to bear witness of this enlightening, life-giving and *renewing* power of God. He evidently was a teacher of secret tradition, and probably an Essenic prophet. He came 'in the way of righteousness,' that is he preached not the righteousness which comes by the mere deeds of the law, but the righteousness which is derived from a change of mind and a purification of the soul. This doctrine of the renewing of soul and mind was a great innovation in the eyes of the Jewish rulers, the representatives of the hierarchy. Not being able to put down the popular excitement which was caused by the Baptist, they joined the movement, in order not to loose every hold on the people. The principles of the reform, the hidden doctrines of the tradition of their forefathers, were being gradually revealed in such a manner to the people as to undermine the established authority of the Church. It is from this point of view that the misunderstood record of John the Baptist by Josephus must be explained. It is as follows:—

'John, that was called the Baptist, . . . was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. For that the washing (with water) would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins (only), but for the purification of the body; supposing, however, that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Now, when (many) others came in crowds about him, for they were greatly *excited* by

[1] Wisd. vii. 25-27, and 14. [2] Wisd. xviii. 13. [3] Wisd. ii. 18.

hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise *apostacy* (for they seemed to do anything he should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any *renovation* (reform) he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late.'[1]

Because John the Baptist was a reformer he was the forerunner of Christ. He said 'unto the people that they should believe on Him who should come after him.'[2] For 'he confessed and denied not, but confessed: I am not the Christ.'[3] By the reformed Jews, particularly the Essenes, the Christ or Messiah was expected as we have seen, as the perfect incarnation of the Divine Wisdom. But although John was 'a man sent from God,' yet he came only 'for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him (the light) might believe.'[4] This eternal and universal light or power of God John possessed only in measure, so that he was not a perfect instrument, an absolute impersonification and advocate of that same light 'which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' Although, therefore, the world was made through the instrumentality of this Divine Word of all ages, though it was his own, yet 'the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' The light came unto his own, that is he came unto the hearts of men, the temple of the living God, but he was not allowed to enter. The Divine Wisdom 'cried without;' she uttered her voice in vain, for men hated 'knowledge;' they would not have the 'Spirit' of Wisdom 'poured' unto them, they resisted the revelation

[1] Ant. xviii. 5, 2. [2] Acts xix. 4. [3] John i. 20. [4] John i. 6, 7.

CHAP. XIII.

of the 'words' of Wisdom.[1] The 'blessed of the Lord' had to 'stand without'[2] The new or spiritual birth must, however, necessarily be added to the natural birth, if a son of man is to become a son of God. The Divine sonship, the dwelling of God in the heart of man, as in his temple, must be accomplished before the promised Messianic kingdom can be set up in the land of promise. 'The hidden man of the heart'[3] must become the abode of the 'blessed of the Lord' and the Immanuel-Israel must shout: 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.'[4] In the fulness of time the Divine Word, which was in all ages given according to the desire of them who felt their need of Divine assistance, was poured without measure, that is in its fulness, on the Man Jesus, in whose face shone the inward glory of the Word, 'the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth;' that is, the glory of the Word which was made flesh and dwelt visibly among men. Of this perfect impersonification of the Divine light, of the Word which was in the beginning with God and was God, John bore witness as of 'a man,' who was to come after him and who would be preferred before him, inasmuch as he was before him, and as of his fulness 'have all we received and grace for grace.' It was by Jesus the Christ, the anointed instrument of the Holy Ghost, that grace and truth came, not by the law which Moses gave, but by the man of whom he spoke, by 'the only-begotten Son,' by the Lord who is the Spirit, and who, as such, was even before Abraham, and 'is in the bosom of the Father,' whom (that is whose 'shape') 'no man hath seen at any time,' but whom the fleshy tenement of the Divine Spirit, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, has declared.

Such an incarnation of the Divine Word, such a visible manifestation of the invisible, such a finite representation of the infinite, such an advocate of the Spirit of Truth, was at this time expected by many. Therefore the

[1] Prov. i. 20–23. [2] Gen. xxiv. 31. [3] 1 Pet. iii. 4. [4] Mat. xxi. 9.

Jews sent priests and levites from Jerusalem to ask John who he was, 'And he confessed and denied not, but confessed "I am not the Christ."' This reply was not sufficient. He might not be the Christ, and yet be an instrument of the Divine Word, which had spoken through the prophets and holy men in all ages. Was he Elias, whose re-appearance the Jews expected, or was he 'that prophet,' who, in addition to the one in the Spirit or power of Elijah had been announced as the messenger or angel of the (new) covenant. Although neither of them, he was the prophet seen by Isaiah, who, as 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness,' would proclaim the making straight of the way of the Lord. As such he baptised with water, which the Jews expected Christ or Elias to do. But John told them that the one man was standing among them, whom neither they, nor even himself knew, and whose shoe's latchet he was not worthy to unloose.

Before we refer to the different accounts about Jesus being baptised in the river Jordan, we must consider an important statement which is only recorded in the fourth gospel. We have seen that the doctrine of Christ as the lamb of God seems to have originated with Paul at a time when it was essential to abolish the law with all its ordinances, inclusive of the paschal rite; and when docetic teachers denied the reality of Christ's humanity, and thus especially his blood. We pointed out that the account in the Gospel after John is certainly unhistorical, according to which Christ died on the same day when the Jewish paschal lamb was slain. This fact, added to the probability above referred to, might be supposed somewhat to affect the part of John's record we are about to consider. For in the gospel in which Christ is recorded to have been crucified instead of, and as the paschal lamb, we should naturally expect to find it recorded that John the Baptist, the herald of his coming, pointed him out as the lamb of God. And inasmuch as the blood of the paschal lamb in the Mosaic law was shed for the

CHAP. XIII.

purpose of making an atonement for the sins of men, we should rather be surprised than otherwise if John the Baptist had not referred to Christ as the lamb of God 'which taketh away the sin of the world.' Such a record might be considered to have its natural place in a gospel, the object of which it is to bring to light the secret and long time hidden doctrine of the Lord, the hidden or apocryphal wisdom according to which the redeeming Spirit or Word of God has in all ages enabled some chosen men to make a 'propitiation,' by forsaking iniquity. We have seen that not these chosen instruments, but the Spirit of God by which they were led, was, according to the apocryphal doctrine, the atoning mediator who took away the sin of the world. But since, in the fulness of time, the man has been born who, by his perfect obedience and holiness, was the unspotted incarnation of this mediatorial and atoning Spirit of God, all the attributes and offices of the latter have devolved on the former, inasmuch as the most absolute union has been effected between the cause and the effect. In this sense we should expect, had we no authority for regarding it as a fact, that John the Baptist did prophecy of Christ as the atoning lamb of God. And such a view, as apocryphal, would be naturally excluded from the earlier gospel-records, for the reasons we have pointed out. We therefore accept also this part of the testimony of John the Baptist as it is recorded in the fourth gospel.

According to Matthew, the record of the baptism of Jesus has for its object to show that the prophecy of Isaiah was thereby fulfilled, who had written: 'And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. *And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him*, the Spirit of Wisdom and understanding; the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord.'[1] The Evangelist wishes to show the literal harmony between this prophecy and its

[1] Is. xi. 1 f.

fulfilment, when he writes that Jesus was baptised, notwithstanding John's hesitation, who knew Him as the mighty one who was to baptise 'with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' Having suffered this unnecessary act of water-baptism to be performed on himself for the purpose of fulfilling all righteousness, Jesus 'saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him,' a voice from heaven saying: 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased,' or, according to a possibly earlier version, as we have seen; 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' Thus it is shown that the Messiah, according to prophecy, *received* on the day of his baptism the Holy Ghost *as a permanent guest*, and that in consequence of this he saw the heavens open. It is as if the Evangelist had wished to show that a body had been fully prepared for the worthy reception of the Divine Spirit.

Very different from this is Luke's record, to which we have already referred. Not the Messiah was to be prepared for his office, but 'a people' was to be prepared for the Lord.[1] The Messiah could not at any time of his life on earth require anything which he did not possess ever since his birth, although, like the child John, he 'waxed strong in the Spirit,' and '*increased* in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.' Even as a child he knew 'his Father's business.'[2] According to the record in Luke, Jesus 'also' was baptised, yet all direct reference to the outward ceremony is omitted. This feature well accords with the mysterious fact that in the third gospel water-baptism is nowhere sanctioned by Christ. Again, the heavens were not opened for him, but like the sepulchre of Lazarus, they opened in consequence of Christ's prayer, and for the sake of the people. Not he alone sees the Spirit descending, nor does he alone hear the voice, but these signs were done because of the people, who required to be 'prepared for the Lord.'

[1] i. 17. [2] ii. 49.

CHAP. XIII.

According to the account in the fourth gospel, John did not know Christ, nor is it said that he baptised him with water, still less is it stated or even implied that he hesitated to do so; but it had been revealed to him, that he would see *the Spirit descending and remaining* on 'a man' who was to be preferred before him, and who would baptise 'with the Holy Ghost.' Having seen this descending and *remaining* of the Holy Ghost, John knew, and bare record 'that this is the Son of God.' It is not that Christ then received the Spirit of God, nor even that he received it *without measure* at the time when he began his Messianic office; but this unlimited and lasting possession of the heavenly treasure was for the sake of men manifested on this occasion. At the same time the doctrine was to be exemplified in a striking manner, that 'a man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven.'[1] The reason why Christ 'must increase,' whilst the Baptist 'must decrease,' is clearly given by the latter: 'For God giveth *not* the Spirit *by measure* unto him' whom he 'hath sent,' and who 'speaketh the Words of God.' The bearing of these passages on the event we are considering is equally direct, whether we assume that before his baptism Christ had *not* received the Spirit without measure, or that it was from that time only that the people were to know that in him dwelt, ever since his birth in the flesh, 'the fulness of the Godhead bodily;' that the Divine Word from the beginning has become perfectly identified with *the* Son of Man, who among sons of men was to manifest and realise the ideal pattern of humanity, as the Word which has 'become' flesh. Because of this identity of cause and effect, what could hitherto be only said of the Spirit of God must now be said of the Son of God. The bride has been united and become one with the bridegroom, the Spirit has found its Christ, the anointing agency 'from above' has been concentrated in the predestinated human agency, in the earthly instrument which it has anointed, in Jesus

[1] iii. 27 f.

the Christ. Hence it is no more the Spirit of God which 'cometh from above,' and which is 'above all,' but it is Christ. Therefore, the Man Jesus is not only 'of the earth, earthy,' but likewise, because of his spiritual nature, he is 'from above;' he is not only Jesus but Christ, not only Christ but Jesus; he is he 'whom the Father hath sanctified:'[1] Jesus the Christ.

Having received the Spirit of God without measure, the Divine fulness having taken a permanent dwelling in the human body of Jesus, all enmity between the Spirit and the flesh, between the soul and the body, has been abolished by the combined effect of Divine grace and of human obedience. The Holy Ghost could therefore, at last, accomplish his mission. As the perfect instrument of the Spirit of God, Christ who 'cometh from heaven and is above all,' testifies 'what He hath seen and heard, . . . for He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God,' and 'the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand.' Thus Christ Himself says: 'I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, (and "dwelleth in me,")[2] He gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.'[3] And in another passage he plainly tells the Jews that 'it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life.'[4] Again, he says: 'I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.'[5] And in another place: 'For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth;' and 'I can of mine own self do nothing.'[6]

Christ has been taught by God in the same manner as every other man whom God taught and teaches, that is through the medium of His Spirit. 'It is written in the

[1] John x. 36. [2] xiv. 10. [3] xii. 49, 50.
[4] vi. 63. [5] viii. 28. [6] v. 20, 30.

CHAP. XIII.

prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. *Every man, therefore*, that *hath heard* and *hath learned* of the Father, cometh unto me.'[1] And because Christ 'is' the Spirit, therefore he said: 'Without me ye can do nothing, abide in me and I in you.'[2] For this reason did he say that he 'proceeded forth and came from God;'[3] that he has heard the truth from God, which even Abraham did not;[4] and that he was before Abraham.[5] The Jews *might* have God for their Father, but their Father *is* 'the devil.'[6] And because 'the Holy Ghost was not yet given,'[7] that is, because the Jews were not able, in consequence of their unbelief, to acknowledge and receive the Spirit which was in Christ, therefore he promised that he would ask, and the Father would send them, 'another' advocate or instrument of the Spirit, that is of the Spirit of Truth, whom the Father would send in the name of his Son, and who would 'teach all things,' and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them.[8]

John the Baptist was truly the forerunner of Christ. He was the first to see and to proclaim that Christ had the Spirit of God without measure, and that the revealing and redeeming mission of the latter would be accomplished in the former. Being from heaven, as regards his spiritual nature, and from the earth, as regards his human nature, he was the Son of God whose advent had been prophecied. But it may be that John, like the twelve Apostles, expected Christ to set up the promised terrestrial kingdom, and that therefore he did not join him, but continued to preach to his own disciples, who neither then, nor for centuries later, recognised Christ as the Messiah. He did not know whether Christ was He that should come, or whether they must wait for another. And though he probably died in this uncertainty, yet Christ said of him; 'Among them that are born of woman, there *hath* not risen a greater than John the Baptist;

[1] vi. 45. [2] xv. 5, 4. [3] viii. 42. [4] viii. 40.
[5] viii. 58. [6] viii. 42, 44. [7] vii. 39. [8] xiv. 16, 17, 26.

notwithstanding he that is *least* in the kingdom of heaven is *greater* than he.'[1] Although John did not understand all the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, yet Christ said: 'I know that the witness which he witnesses of me is true,' and that 'he was a burning and a shining light.'[2]

Nathanael.

A person whose Messianic expectations seem to have been similar to those of John the Baptist, was Nathanael. Philip announced to him: 'We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. And Nathanael said unto him: "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Philip saith, "Come and see."' And he did go to Jesus, who greeted him as an Israelite in whom is no guile, or no deceit. This may refer to Nathanael's not having been prevented from coming to Jesus, as the Israelites generally were, by the expectation that the Messiah can only come out of Judea, that is, out of Bethlehem, the city of David. Nathanael recognised Christ as 'the Son of God,' and 'the King of Israel;' therefore, also as the terrestrial Messiah whom John the Baptist expected. And Jesus said unto him: 'Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.' These remarkable words are recorded only by that Evangelist, who has neither referred to Christ's being baptised in the river Jordan, nor to the heaven having been seen open by anyone. It may be that he wished to correct the statement made in the earlier gospels; or that the same was framed at a later period, and after the words here recorded had been written. These are clearly intended to show that he who had received the Holy Ghost without measure, which was by many believed to be transmitted through the mediation of angels,[3] was in uninterrupted and direct communication with the Father in heaven, from whom the Divine Spirit or Word proceeds, which is the organ of

[1] Mat. xi. 11; Luke vii. 28. [2] v. 32, 35.
[3] See Gal. iii. 19; also Hermas in various places.

CHAP. XIII.

all inspiration. As Moses was the mediator of the first covenant, Jesus is the mediator of the new covenant, foretold principally by Ezekiel[1] and by Jeremiah.[2]

General plan.

Method and arrangement are recognisable in every part of the gospel. Yet, although various ingenious attempts have been made to discover the framework, and thus to conjecture what was the leading idea of the final framers of this gospel, if not of the apostolic writer himself, no perfectly satisfactory solution of this problem seems to be possible. If, however, we succeed in showing what reasons the first three Evangelists had not to record any one of those sayings of Christ which we find in the fourth gospel, it ought not to be difficult to throw some more light on this question from such a new point of view. The four gospels do not mark the dogmatic development of the Christian doctrine, but the gradual bringing to light of the same. When the time had come that what Christ had confided secretly and in darkness to no other than to his disciples could be proclaimed in light, the form of the original gospel-records could no longer be preserved. New wine must be put into new bottles.[3]

We have already referred to the allegorical interpre-

[1] xxxvi. 22–27. [2] xxxi. 31 f.; Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24.

[3] We shall also in the interpretation of this gospel follow, as much as our point of view will permit of it, the criticism on the gospels to which we have already referred: 'Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser, und ihr Verhältniss zu einander.'—Leipzig, 1852. The anonymous writer has, in our opinion, fully established, by a comparison of the first three gospels, that the third is a systematic reformation of the first, occasioned by the difference between the teaching of Paul and the other Apostles. For this difference we hope to have given a new and satisfactory reason, and one by which the necessity for another gospel is made more obvious, which should take an intermediate position between the first and the third. And if we have succeeded to suggest a sound reason why the highest development of Christ's doctrine was not brought out in the first three gospels, then we shall have proved more fully than the above truthloving and clearsighted writer has done, that the fourth gospel must have been mainly written by an Apostle. For we hope to prove that to the tradition of no other than to that of one of the twelve we owe the record of the very words in which Christ taught his secret doctrine to his disciples. We cannot, however, agree that Christ died on the 14th instead of the 15th Nisan.

tation of the miracle in Cana, according to which Christ intended not only to show his power, but to explain by an outward sign, that before the Church can be prepared for the bridegroom, before the marriage can take place, the Jew's earthen vessels of purification must hold wine instead of water. This transformation can only be effected by Him who is the vine, and who desires the branches to receive of His fulness grace by grace, that is by Him who is the incarnation of the Divine Word or Wisdom, which in all ages has mingled bread and wine for mankind.[1] The miracle in Cana, thus interpreted, has therefore been regarded as a type of the whole gospel itself.

'And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins a-piece.'[2] Accordingly the gospel has been divided into six distinct parts. We accept this division without, however, laying any stress on the assumption that the Evangelist or the final framers of the same may possibly have intended to arrange this new gospel in literal accordance with the record of the *six* waterpots in Cana.

1. From the first feast of the passover to the next and not specified feast of the Jews.[3]
2. From the anonymous feast until the journey to the feast of the tabernacles.[4]
3. From thence to the feast of the dedication.[5]
4. From thence to the beginning of the last feast of the passover.[6]
5. Then follow the incidents and the addresses of the Lord at the last supper and on the way to Gethsemane.[7]
6. And finally the last events of the life of Jesus, his passion, death and resurrection.[8]

[1] Prov. ix 5. [2] John ii. 6. [3] John ii. 13; iv. 54. [4] Ch. v. and vi. [5] vii. 2; x. 22. [6] x. 22; xii. 50. [7] xiii. 1; xvii. 26.

[8] xviii.–xxi. To the latter part it is not our intention to refer especially, since we have sufficiently considered the subject.

CHAP. XIII.

Whatever may be thought of this division of the gospel in six parts, it will be clearly shown that the miracle in Cana is a type of Christ's reformation of Judaism. The purification of the individual is the theme which runs through the entire gospel-narrative. Thus, in the outset, the temple is purged by Christ, and his body is shown to be the true sanctuary. This doctrine is explained by the conference with Nicodemus on the new birth; by the remarks on the difference between the disciples of John and the Jews 'about purifying,' and by water being explained as a type of the Holy Ghost. This new doctrine of spiritual regeneration is then applied to the reformation of the Jewish doctrine on the resurrection, on the Sabbath, on the rite of the paschal lamb, and finally to the reformation of the Messianic expectations, to which is opposed the revelation of the true Messiah, the incarnate Word from the beginning.[1]

In each of the two first-named divisions three sections may be distinguished, according to the locality. In both Jesus traverses the Jewish country from north to south, and in such a manner that he appears teaching and testifying of himself in each of the three divisions of the country, and again in the principal cities of the same, that is, first in Jerusalem and Judea,[2] then in Samaria and Sychar,[3] and finally in Galilee and Capernaum.[4] In the second division he takes the same journey from Jerusalem[5] to Galilee;[6] only instead of Samaria he goes through

[1] According to Baur's interpretation of the typical meaning of the miracle in Cana, the water was intended to point to John the Baptist, whilst the wine was meant to imply the great superiority of him who was to baptise with the Holy Ghost. The change from water into wine was to mark the transition from the dispensation of John to that of Christ. But in the fourth gospel water is interpreted as the symbol of the Holy Ghost; and although it is written in Luke that 'John came not drinking wine' (Luke vii. 33), yet with the single exception of the record on the marriage of Cana, wine is not mentioned at all in any of the gospels. It is according to the Apocrypha, that 'wine is as good as life to a man if it be drank moderately, . . . for it was made to make men glad. *Joy of the heart and relish of the soul* is wine drunk measurably and in season (Eccl. xxxi. 27-28).

[2] ii. 13–iii. 36. [3] iv. 1-42. [4] iv. 43-54.

[5] Ch. iv. [6] vi. 22–71, especially v. 59.

Perea.[1] In the third and following parts of the gospel Jesus is only shown as being at Jerusalem on feast days, when people from all parts of the world assembled there. CHAP. XIII.

If we consider the contents of the first two parts, we find that in the first, owing to the baptism of John, the subject of baptism predominates, as in the second that of the passover; and this in such a manner that the spiritual, mystical and deeper import of both rites is contrasted to their outward elements.[2] Christ is first represented as the water of life, and then as the bread of life; for all types are fulfilled in Christ.[3] It is clear that in the first division water plays an important part. We have only to refer to the waterpots at the marriage of Cana,[4] to the mentioning of water as a necessary ingredient to man's new birth,[5] to the baptism of John, to the baptising disciples of Jesus,[6] to Jacob's well near Sychar, to the allegorical application which Jesus makes of the same to himself as the true water of life,[7] and finally, to the pool of Bethesda, with its healing waters. Part the First.

A more minute consideration shows that the second chapter refers to the idea that the deteriorated and merely outward temple service must be abrogated and replaced by the new, spiritual and true worship. For this reason the Evangelist introduces in the very beginning of his gospel, and at the commencement of the Lord's ministry, the account about his purging the temple, which the earlier Evangelists have recorded at a later period; and it is not necessary to assume that Christ repeated this act. It is only here that its full solemnity is brought out. What is common in all accounts is, that the house of God had ceased to be a house of prayer. But in the fourth gospel, to the 'house of merchandise' is opposed 'the temple of his body.' The Jews might and would destroy this temple of the Holy Ghost, but in three days Christ, the incarnate Word, would 'raise it Chap. II.

[1] vi. 1–21. [2] Gal. iv. 9. [3] Col. ii. 17. [4] Ch. ii.
[5] iii. 5. [6] iii. 23; iv. 2. [7] Ch. iv.

CHAP. XIII.

up,' and the selfsame Spirit would dwell in 'another' temple of the Holy Ghost, in another comforter or advocate, whom Christ would ask the Father to send in his name.[1] Then the fulness of the Holy Ghost would be 'given' to others, would be in them, and thus would 'abide for ever' with them.[2] The Shechina, the 'resting' of the Holy Ghost, must no longer be looked for in the holiest of the holy, but in the heart of man, in which God would write his law. The temple of the new covenant is the body of man, who was created in the image of God; and the worship of this new covenant is one 'in spirit and in truth,' and no longer confined within earthly walls or holy places. The mediator of the new covenant is the temple of the Holy Ghost, the perfect incarnation of the Divine Word, which was in the beginning with God and was God, which has dwelt or 'tented' among men, and which has found its rest in the Son of Man and the Son of God.[3]

Chap. III.

In the third chapter the Evangelist again contrasts the carnal view of the Jews with the spiritual view of Christ. We have seen that the Pharisees acknowledged some of the hidden or apocryphal doctrines which the Jews had been taught during the Babylonian captivity, and which the Sadducees rejected altogether. The Pharisees did but outwardly profess the principles of the more spiritual reformed doctrine; they did not really believe in the doctrine of the Divine Spirit or Word as the regenerating and life-bestowing power. Far from this, they dreaded the promulgation of such doctrines, which were of a

[1] Comp. Ex. xxiii. 21. [2] xiv. 16 f.

[3] St. Jerome writes (Com. in Is. iv. 11, 2), that according to the Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew, which he copied and translated, it was written, that when Jesus rose from the waters of Jordan, 'the entire source of the Holy Ghost descended and remained on him, and said unto him: My Son, in all prophets I expected Thee, that thou mightest come and I might rest upon Thee; *for Thou art my rest*, Thou art *my first-begotten Son*, who ruleth for ever.' For the allegorical interpretation of the forty-six years, see the Chapter on Chronology.

nature to undermine their authority as the rulers of the Church. It was owing to their restrictions that Christ could not teach his doctrine openly, which essentially consisted in a development and application of apocryphal principles. He, therefore, only spoke 'in secret and in darkness' to his disciples, and in mysterious parables to the people.

Yet among the Pharisees there was one, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, who had, by Christ's works, been persuaded that God was with him, and that he was 'a teacher come from God.' No wonder, then, that he came to Jesus 'by night.' 'For fear of the Jews' nobody ventured to speak of Christ, therefore nobody would dare openly to speak *with* him; and least of all one of those rulers who, as a body, did closely watch the 'Rabbi' or teacher of the secret doctrine. These teachers of the Hidden Wisdom were, as we have seen, called 'tanaïms,' or teachers of tradition; and the most renowned of them were called 'Rabboni.' It is not a little remarkable that in the fourth gospel alone this title is given to Christ; and this circumstance somewhat tends to confirm our view that it is the main object of the Apostle John to publish in a supplementary gospel-record those sayings and doings of the Lord which Matthew, with the consent of the Apostles, excluded from the original record of the Lord's sayings, because they referred to doctrines the open promulgation of which the Pharisees had strictly forbidden.

We are therefore in the outset led to expect that, in this secret interview between Christ and Nicodemus, the former will (1) speak of Himself as one of the teachers of tradition, that He will (2) refer to their principal doctrine of the Divine sonship, (3) and that He will refer to Himself as the Son of Man and the Son of God.

1. We venture to suggest that the Lord refers to His belonging to the general class of teachers, if not to an especial class, when he says: '*We* speak that we do know

CHAP. XIII.

and testify that *we* have seen, and *ye* receive not our witness.'

2. The whole conversation, which Christ or Nicodemus may have communicated to John, turns upon the doctrine of the Divine sonship, and on Christ's relation to the same. Already Luke had shown that the kingdom of God is a spiritual one according to Christ's teaching. Here Christ is recorded to have said that 'except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.' Of course, Nicodemus carnally interprets these words. Whereupon Jesus said, and apparently for the combined purpose of preventing Nicodemus from referring the new birth to water-baptism alone, and at the same time to explain the true nature of the new birth: 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' John the Baptist had preached the baptism of repentance as a preliminary condition to the participation in the Divine kingdom. But he had likewise pointed to Christ, as to Him who would baptise 'with the Holy Ghost.' Thus spiritual-baptism was added to water-baptism. And this distinction is fully maintained by the Lord, when he speaks of the baptism wherewith he is baptised. Even more particularly is it dwelt upon by Paul. He writes: 'For as many of you as have been baptised *into Christ*, have *put on Christ*.'[1] To be baptised into Christ means to be in Christ, that the spirit, the mind which was in Christ be in us, so that the relation between Christ and His Father be imputed unto us, and become the relation of ourselves to our Father. To put on Christ is to put on 'the armour of light,' of that 'true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;' to put on 'the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.' Again, Paul says, that we are buried with Christ in baptism, 'wherein also ye are risen with Him *through the faith of the operation of God*, who hath raised

[1] Gal. iii. 27.

Him from the dead,'[1] to 'newness of life,' in which we also are to walk.[2] There is, therefore, as Christ said to Nicodemus, a birth of the flesh, and also a birth of the spirit. The spirit must come from above; it must be the Spirit of God which, descending upon and remaining within us, 'beareth witness with (to) our spirit that we are children of God.'[3] It must be the Word which was in the beginning with God, and which gives power to as many as receive Him, 'to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.'[4] And yet these were 'earthly' things, and not exclusively 'heavenly things,' of which Christ spoke to Nicodemus. The spiritual birth includes the carnal birth.

3. What now follows is the great mystery. He that spoke to Nicodemus is 'the Son of Man which *is* in heaven,' who *has* come down from heaven, and who likewise already *has* ascended up to heaven. Thus Christ seems to refer to His divine and to His human nature. As at one with the Divine Spirit proceeding from the Father, as the rock which accompanied the Israelites, Christ is 'from heaven;' whilst 'according to the flesh he was made of the seed of David,' he was 'of' the Israelites.[5] His spiritual birth is of heavenly origin, His human birth of earthly origin. The difference between the first and the second, or last, Adam, lies in the 'spiritual body' of either; the 'natural body' was the same.[6] Angels are ascending from, and descending upon Him; He is directly connected with heaven, which is always open unto Him; and He is by the Spirit, and in the Spirit, translated into heaven whenever He wills it. Thus he spiritually ascends and descends, like the angelic organs of the Divine Spirit, whilst on earth He is present in the body.

[1] Col. ii. 12. [2] Rom. vi. 4. [3] Rom. viii. 16.
[4] Comp. Rom. viii. 13, 14. [5] Rom. i. 3; ix. 5. [6] 1 Cor. xv. 44, 45.

CHAP. XIII.

Therefore, he is the perfect incarnation of the Divine Word or Spirit, at once *the* Son of Man and *the* Son of God.

Christ now reveals to Nicodemus that, 'as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.' We have already pointed out that in the pre-Christian and apocryphal book of Wisdom,[1] the serpent in the wilderness is described as a '*sign* of salvation;' and that those who turned to the same were not saved by the thing they saw, but by the Divine Spirit, Wisdom or 'Word,' which is 'the Saviour of all,' by the Word of God, which 'healeth all things.' Or in the words of the Targum: 'He shall be healed, if he direct his heart unto the name of the Word of the Lord.' In the above words Christ has therefore identified Himself directly and in the clearest manner with the Word of God. And accordingly we are justified in interpreting His being lifted up as being 'a sign of salvation;' His humanity as the visible instrument of the Divine Word, which is the Saviour of all, and '*preserveth them which put their trust*' in the same, that is those which are led by the Spirit of God, and therefore are the children of God. We have seen that this is the doctrine of Christ. What now follows in the text fully confirms this view. It is written that the Son of Man will be lifted up, 'that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.' These words almost literally coincide with the above apocryphal quotation. And the concluding part of this conversation with Nicodemus is nothing more than an amplified repetition of what immediately precedes it. It is the love of God which is the cause of His having thus given His only-begotten Son for the redemption of all who believe and put their trust in the incarnate and crucified Word of God. He is not a sign of condemnation, but a sign of salvation for the whole world.

'There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them

[1] xvi. 6-26.

which are *in* Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit,'[1] to them who are led by the Spirit of God, and are children of God. Condemnation there is only for those who commit the sin 'against the Holy Ghost.'[2] Not to believe in the guiding and saving power of the Divine indwelling Spirit of God is to repudiate His grace, and to give oneself over unto perdition. 'Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey.'[3] There is an indwelling Spirit of grace and an indwelling Spirit of evil. The former is the Spirit of the sonship, whereby we call 'Abba, Father:' the latter is the Spirit that 'worketh in the children of disobedience.'[4] And 'the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.'[5] Or in the words of Christ: 'He that believeth on the Son of God is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in *the name* of the only-begotten Son of God.'[6] CHAP. XIII.

'If the paraphrase of Jonathan represents, as it does, the current interpretation of the schools of Jerusalem, the devout Rabbi to whom the words were spoken could not have been ignorant of it. The new teacher carried the lesson a step further; he led him to identify the "name of the Word of the Lord" with that of the Son of Man. He prepared him to see in the lifting up of the crucifixion that which should answer in its power to heal and save, to the serpent in the wilderness. . . . The point of comparison lay not between the serpent and Christ, but between the look of the Israelite to the outward sign, the look of a justifying faith to the cross of Christ. . . . The Crucifixion is the witness that the evil has been overcome by the good.'[7]

In the fourth chapter it is shown how the Son of Man Chap. IV.

[1] Rom. viii. 1. [2] Mat. xii. 31. [3] Rom. vi. 16. [4] Eph. ii. 2.
[5] Rom. vi. 23. [6] Comp. Exod. xxiii. 21.
[7] See Mr. Plumptre's article on the brazen serpent in Smith's Dict.

CHAP. XIII.

and the Son of God, how the incarnate Word, went about to save what was lost. Again, it is 'the gift of God' which is not known to the woman of Samaria. That gift of God is the power of God, the Divine Spirit or Word, which did assuage the thirst of the Israelites in the desert, and which healed all who trusted in the same. Christ reveals himself as the incarnate Word, who was able to give 'living water' to them that ask it. 'Rivers of living water' shall flow out of the belly of him that believeth in 'the pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty.'[1] He who had received the same without measure said unto the woman at the well: 'Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.' As the living water of life, Christ leads to all heavenly blessings; if he is received by the inner man, he causes to spring out therein the source of a new and lasting divine life. The inner man is intended to be the temple of the Holy Ghost, and if instructed by this Divine teacher, man is led to conceive God as a Spirit, and to worship Him in spirit and in truth. This has been the mission of the Divine Word in all flesh and in all ages. But it was left to the fulness of time to reveal to man, in the face of the Lord Jesus Christ the glory of the only-begotten of the Father. Thus, as the mediator of the new covenant which Jeremiah and others had announced, Christ spoke unto the woman, and revealed unto her His power.

So little did even his disciples understand that Christ is the bread of life, that he said to them: 'I have meat to eat that ye know not of,' that is, 'to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish his work.' They did not see that the time of harvest had already begun. Though the fields were 'white already to harvest;' though Christ sent his disciples to reap that whereon they bestowed no labour, that on which Christ and 'other men' had laboured,

[1] Wisd. vii. 25.

yet, the darkness then prevailing, through the conduct of those who had taken away the 'key of knowledge,' prevented Christ from gathering fruit unto life eternal. 'One soweth and *another* reapeth.' The sower of the Word of God was not the reaper whilst on earth. The sower and the reaper could not rejoice together. For darkness still covered the earth, and gross darkness the people, and the Lord had not then risen in his glory upon Jerusalem. The light of the world shone, but the darkness comprehended it not. That embodiment of the light will only be a short time with his disciples, it will return to the Father's glory; and the Father will send them 'another' advocate, who shall come 'in the name of the Lord,' and who shall reap on earth what Christ had sown therein.

The Evangelist has shown in the first part of this chapter that Jesus, as the incarnate Word of God, exercised the same power which the spiritual rock accompanying the Israelites had exercised in times of old, as a source of living water. The difference between then and now was this, that because of the stony hearts of the Israelites, they could not become the direct instruments of the Divine Spirit; so that a flinty rock had to be acted upon by Divine power, in order to satisfy the creature wants of the thirsty wanderers in the desert. Accordingly, they drank water such as Jacob's well in Samaria contained, and of which Christ said: 'Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again.' But now the Divine Word has acted through the instrumentality of a living and holy creature, it has rested in its fulness where it was from the beginning designed to rest, in the heart of man; therefore, the anointed Jesus could say that the water which he would give to him that asks it, 'shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.'

In the latter part of this chapter the Evangelist wishes to show that as of old, in the desert, the Divine Word healed all things according to the desire of them which had need of 'the Saviour of all;' so now the incarnate

CHAP. XIII.

Word can heal according to his good pleasure. The time had not yet come for the Son of Man to be lifted up as a sign of salvation, and as the bodily representation of the Saviour of all ages; but whilst on earth, the Son of Man went about healing all manner of diseases, and thereby showing his identity with the Divine power from above. To give a striking example of this, the Apostle here records the healing of the ruler's son. The original version by Matthew had been already modified by Luke, but he had too much dwelt upon the contrast between righteousness by and without the deeds of the law. In John's opinion, the true faith must not be limited, either in the one way or in the other. He therefore never refers to righteousness by or without the deeds of the law, and in this account shows, by the ruler's example, the necessity of a direct appeal to Christ the Saviour of all. Then he points out that people ought to believe in the power of God, without seeing 'signs and wonders.' And finally, he shows that the divine power which was in Jesus, knows no bounds, and that it was not necessary for the Lord to go to the ruler's house for the purpose of healing his son. His word, 'thy son liveth,' was enough to effect the cure, and the same took place at the very moment when Christ spoke the word.

Part the Second. Chap. V.

In the fifth chapter, the Jewish sensual idea of the Messianic raising of the dead is represented in its true and spiritual aspect. It will not take place outwardly or bodily as an act ushering in the Messianic judgment. It will be accomplished spiritually in Christ, as in Him who carries with Him the true and reviving power of life. Thus also the wrongly-conceived Jewish Sabbath-rest is reduced to its true level, and humanity is raised from that rest of death in which it was buried. For as in Luke[1] the Lord is recorded to have healed on a Sabbath a woman that 'was bowed together and could in

[1] xiii. 11–17.

no wise lift up herself,' having been bound by Satan; so here it is stated, that Christ on a Sabbath healed a certain man who had 'an infirmity thirty and eight years.' This man, like the whole Jewish nation, believed in the healing power of the pool of Bethesda, which according to popular belief was 'troubled' by an angel, and which has by some interpreters been explained as a sort of mineral spring moving at certain intervals the waters of the pool. But Christ, as the water of life, is here represented as having a healing power above that of natural waters, inasmuch as His word sufficed also in this instance to heal the man. The latter has been regarded as the representative of the Jewish nation, which was waiting for a sign of its deliverance.[1] Be this as it may, the new birth is the first thing needful, and this requires the knowledge of and the faith in the doctrine of the Divine sonship, which was taught and exemplified by Christ, the perfect incarnation of the Spirit of God, and the realisation of the Divine pattern of humanity, as eternally conceived by the Creator. But these relations between the Father and the Son were hidden from the Jews by their rulers, and so they could not understand, that as the perfect organ or advocate of the Divine Spirit, Christ could 'quicken' even the dead; that Christ is 'the Wisdom of God,' and that 'to be allied unto wisdom is immortality;'[2] that consequently he who believes in Him *has* everlasting life, and *is* already, by such belief, 'passed from death unto life;' that the hour *had* already come, when the dead who hear the voice of the Son of God shall live; that the Father, having life in Himself, has given to the Son to have life in Himself; and that if they believed in Him, they would have *the Word* (or Wisdom) *of God abiding in them.* It was to no purpose

[1] Even the thirty-eight years have been explained as referring to thirty-eight jubilee periods or 1,900 years, which have begun with the birth of Jesus, and which must elapse before the setting up of the promised theocracy in the Holy Land.

[2] Wis. viii. 17.

CHAP. XIII.

that they searched the Scriptures, if they thought that they had eternal life *in them*, without believing in Him of whom they testify. They may have life if they will come to Him who has come in His Father's name, that is, in his Spirit, which was in Christ, as it was of old in the angel of the Lord,[1] and especially in Moses, who wrote of Christ, and mystically pointed to Him by lifting up the serpent in the wilderness as the type of the Divine Wisdom or Word, which is 'the healer' or Saviour of all.

Chap. VI.

In the sixth chapter the types of the manna and of the paschal lamb are shown to have been fulfilled in Christ, the bread of life. We have already considered part of this subject. The Apostle's object is to show, in the first place, that Christ, the Power of God, works like a leaven in all that he pervades. The feeding of the five thousand men, with five loaves and two fishes, is recorded to have taken place at the time immediately preceding the Jewish passover. Thereby the Evangelist gives a significant hint, that in the Lord's opinion, that rite must be performed in a more spiritual sense. Accordingly, having given thanks, he distributed the casual loaves and fishes to the disciples and these to the people, 'as much as they would,' so that they were filled, and yet twelve baskets of fragments remained. This miracle led those men to believe that Jesus was 'that prophet that should come into the world.' Seeing that 'they would come and take Him by force to make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain, Himself alone.' But in order to show that Jesus was 'more than a prophet,' the Evangelist here records Christ's walking on the sea, which astonished even the disciples. We have seen[2] that this and similar accounts, if allegorically interpreted, seem to refer to the time after Christ's resurrection, when he had more fully revealed himself to Paul, and when the disciples, in their fear, were not at once willing to receive the revelation of their

[1] Exod. xxiii. 21.

[2] p. 74 f.

risen Lord. But the Evangelist apparently here at the same time intends to contrast the Messiah-Son to the Messiah-King. As the former, Jesus is 'the Saviour of all,' the incarnate Wisdom which 'walks in the bottom of the deep,' and has a possession even in 'the waves of the sea,' the providence of the Father having 'made a way in the sea, and a safe path in the waves.'[1]

So little had the people understood the true nature of the miracle, that they sought Jesus, not because they saw the miracle, but because they 'did eat of the loaves and were filled.' Therefore, Christ said to them: 'Labour not for the meat (or food) which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you; for Him hath God the Father sealed.' They are to labour for the fruit of the Spirit, and it is this which Christ will give to them that ask it. They are to be made 'partakers of spiritual things;' and this is the fruit to which they are to be 'sealed.'[2] They are to be established in Christ, to be anointed by God, 'who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.'[3] Christ is the incarnate Word or Wisdom of God, which in all ages seeking rest, abides in the tabernacle of the chosen, enters 'into the soul of the servant of the Lord,' and says: 'Come unto me all ye that be desirous of me, and fill yourselves with my fruits.'[4] 'Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.' The manna in the time of Moses was only the type of the heavenly manna which Christ brought. This heavenly manna, the soul's sustenance, is the Spirit of God in the flesh, whereby Jesus was anointed and sealed. Already, in the apocryphal book of Wisdom, the 'bread from heaven,' the 'angels' food' which was sent to the Israelites in the desert, had been interpreted as having been 'altered into all fashions,' and as having been 'obedient' *to God's*

[1] Eccl. xxiv. 5–6; Wisd. xiv. 3.
[2] Rom. xv. 27, 28.
[3] 2 Cor. i. 22; comp. Eph. i. 13; iv. 30.
[4] Wisd. x. 16; Eccl. xxiv. 7, 19.

CHAP. XIII.

grace, 'that nourisheth all things according to the desire of them that had need. That Thy children, O Lord, whom Thou lovest, might know that it is not the growing of fruits that nourisheth man, *but that it is Thy Word*, which preserveth them that put their trust in Thee.'[1]

It is in this sense that Christ says of Himself, that He is the 'bread of life,' and that He 'came down from heaven.' And as it was written in the Proverbs, in the name of the Wisdom of God, 'come, eat my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled;'[2] so Christ, 'the Wisdom of God,' says that whosoever shall at any time spiritually partake of the bread and wine which He has mingled, and which is typified by his flesh and blood, dwells in that Divine Wisdom, dwells in Christ, and Christ in him. But, since the Hidden Wisdom was unknown to the Jews, this apocryphal interpretation of the heavenly manna was to them a stumbling-block, and they murmured at His words. They could therefore not understand the mystery of eating the Lord's flesh and of drinking His blood, to which he then referred as types of the mystical union between the Son and those who believe in His name, who are led by the Spirit of God, and thus are in Christ as he is in them. As it is the Spirit that quickeneth, so also it can only be the operation of the Divine Spirit which can render profitable to salvation any outward act, which in itself, like the flesh, 'profiteth nothing.'

These sayings of the Lord are recorded to have been spoken in the synagogue at Capernaum. Although, as we have seen, the Jewish authorities closely watched Christ and his disciples, principally for the purpose of preventing the apocryphal doctrine from being promulgated among the people, the rulers, if they knew of it, may well have on a solitary occasion permitted the Lord to speak in public as He is here reported to have done. And this they might do all the more easily, since even 'many of His disciples'

[1] Wisd. xvi. 20-26. [2] Prov. ix. 5.

considered His words a hard saying which no one could hear. These unbelievers among His disciples Jesus knew, and so did he know who of them believed in His doctrine, as one which came from God. Although, therefore, 'from that time many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with him,' yet when Jesus asked the twelve whether they would also go away, Peter replied: 'Lord, to whom shall we go, Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure, that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.'

We see then, that in the sixth chapter the type of the paschal lamb is implied to have been fulfilled, as also the type of the manna in the desert. Christ is the heavenly manna and the heavenly lamb, because He has received the Spirit of God without measure, which in all ages has come down from heaven as the soul's sustenance, as the rock which followed the Israelites in the desert. He is 'the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth,' with which the feast of the passover is to be kept; for thus Paul writes: 'As our passover Christ is sacrificed for us.'[1] The Apostle John has shown in what sense John the Baptist pointed to Christ as to the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. Because of the unity of the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God, the redeeming mission of the latter has been conferred upon the former. Because in all ages God has through His spirit redeemed fallen man; because Christ the Lord *is* that Spirit; because He has by His life and death once and for ever offered unto God a perfect sacrifice and atonement, therefore, Jesus Christ is the atoning Saviour, 'the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'

Part the Third. Chap. VII.

In the third part,[2] Christ is revealed as the light of the world, that is as the true light of all men, which in all ages shone in darkness uncomprehended by the same; as the Divine power which makes of children of men children

[1] 1 Cor. v. 7-8.

[2] vii. 2–x. 22.

CHAP. XIII.

of God by their spiritual new birth, as the Divine Spirit or Word which has become flesh, as the visible image of the invisible God. But His time had not yet come, and for this reason, because the people would not come unto Him, though their time 'is always ready.' He had left Judea, 'because the Jews sought to kill him,' and His brethren complained of His doing secretly what He ought to do publicly, by showing Himself to the world. Again, He went to the feast of Tabernacles 'not openly, but as it were in secret,' and 'no man spake openly of Him for fear of the Jews.' 'Now about the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple, and taught. And the Jews marvelled, saying: How knoweth this man letters (or "wisdom,") having never learned.'[1] Everyone could understand from the reply of Jesus that His doctrine was that of God. But he gave an unfailing test how to know whether the doctrine be Divine or not; it is to do the will of God, and to seek His glory; not merely to search the Scriptures, and to think that to have them is to have everlasting life. The above passages are a strong confirmation of what is recorded in the earlier gospels, about Christ's teaching his disciples 'in secret and in darkness.' And though he spoke 'boldly' in public, yet he seems to have done so exclusively in the form of parables, or such mysterious sayings about the Father and the Son, which the Jews did not understand, and because of which the rulers could not say anything unto him.[2] This is strongly confirmed in this very gospel, where it is recorded that Judas asked the Lord: 'How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?'[3] Again, it is written, that Jesus having spoken to the people in general terms about the light which was yet a little while with them, 'did hide Himself from them;' that they believed not on Him, notwithstanding all His miracles; and that

[1] This may refer to his not having been brought up at any of the national schools, where the Hidden Wisdom was not taught.

[2] Comp. x. 4. [3] xiv. 22.

in fact 'they could not believe,' because, according to Isaiah's prophecy, God had 'blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart and be converted.'[1] CHAP. XIII.

One of the principal reasons why 'they could not believe' was, that the Jewish nation expected Christ to come 'of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was.' How then can Christ come 'out of Galilee?' In vain did Nicodemus urge the necessity of hearing Christ, and of knowing what He did. 'They answered and said unto him, Art thou *also* of Galilee? Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.'

The eighth chapter begins with the history of the woman taken in adultery. It is intended to be understood in its allegorical or dogmatical sense, as well as in its literal or historical meaning. The former alone has here to be considered. The beginning and end of the chapter belong together, the latter containing the key to the allegorical interpretation of the former.[2] The chapter treats of the true and of the merely nominal sons of Abraham. In the latter part it is recorded that the Jews said: 'We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?'[3] They only care for the carnal descent from Abraham, and this is fully acknowledged by Christ, who said: 'I know that ye are Abraham's seed.'[4] But to this carnal connexion He opposes the spiritual connexion. If they were the Ch. VIII.

[1] xii. 35–40.

[2] If so, this story must have been for some unknown reason left out in the two earliest gospel manuscripts we possess. It formed part of the Gospel of the Hebrews. Perhaps it was left out because it marked the opposition of Christ to the letter of the law. For according to the same a 'betrothed virgin' had to be stoned in case of breach of trust (Deut. xxii. 23). In this case, therefore, not only 'one jot or tittle' of the law had been abolished by Christ, but the positive injunction of the written law had been annulled, although it was proved that the woman had transgressed against it.

[3] 33. [4] 37.

CHAP. XIII.

spiritual children of Abraham, they would know him, or rather the mind which was in him; they would *see* their spiritual Father as perfectly as Christ knows, and has *seen* His heavenly or spiritual Father. The Jews then claim to be even in this spiritual sense the children of Abraham. But Jesus said unto them: 'If ye *were* Abraham's (spiritual) children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God; this did not Abraham. Ye do the deeds of your Father. Then said they to Him, We be not born of fornication: we have one Father, even God.'[1]

From this it follows, in the first place, that Christ distinguished in all men a spiritual and a carnal birth, and that this doctrine was sufficiently understood and acknowledged by at least the learned among the Jews. It is the spiritual birth which distinguished Christ from His fellowmen. He said to these very Jews: 'Ye are from beneath, I am from above.'[2] 'If God were your Father, ye would love me, for I proceeded forth and came from God, neither came I of myself, but He sent me; . . . ye are of your father the devil.'[3] Since he was 'a murderer from the beginning,' no wonder that his children should seek to kill a man who told them the truth, of which there is none in the devil, who 'is a liar and the father of it.' As great as the difference of origin is that of effect. 'He that is of God heareth God's words; ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye are not of God.'[4] Like Christ, the Jews might be of God. This he has implied before, when he tried to show them, by their deeds, that they were not children of God. He now confirms it by stating, that if they were, like Him, from above, they would either speak of the truth, as He did, or at least they would believe Him, whom they could not convince of sin, that is, in this sense, of untruth or error of any kind. As 'to be allied unto wisdom is immor-

[1] 39-41. [2] 23. [3] 42-44. [4] 47.

tality,' so to be led by the Spirit of God is to be the child of God, and as such to be born from above, and to have communion with that Divine power which came forth from God in 'the beginning before the world.'[1]

And now Christ condescends to admit, in further arguing with the Jews, that any man, instead of being from above, or child of God, may be from below, or child of the devil. To the accusation, 'Thou hast a devil,' he does not reply by a denial of his birth according to the flesh, but by the confident assertion: 'I have not a devil, but I honour my Father.' If they did so, they would not dishonour him, who came forth from God, as his words testified.[2] He did not seek his own glory whilst demanding that his brethren should honour him as he honoured the Father, the 'one that seeketh and judgeth.' He only wished to be honoured as the human instrument through whom God revealed the truth. The truth is life eternal, and he that is led by the spirit of truth speaks words of eternal life. Therefore Christ said that if a man keep his saying, he should never see or taste death. Thus he, as the perfect incarnation of the Divine Spirit or Word, declared himself to be above Abraham and the prophets. But although every temple of God in the flesh is the combined effect of Divine grace and of human obedience, yet Christ, the man of perfect obedience, who possessed the Spirit of God without measure, said to the Jews: 'If I honour myself, my honour is nothing; it is my Father that honoureth me.' It seems as if he had intended to transcribe his former saying: 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.'[3]

The doctrine of the Divine sonship, which formed the basis of the apocryphal or Hidden Wisdom, was unknown to the Jews generally, and was therefore a stumbling-block to them, and the principal cause of their rejecting the headstone of the corner. They could not understand

[1] Eccl. xxiv. 9. [2] 49. [3] vi. 63.

CHAP. XIII.

that it is only by the Spirit, and in the Spirit, that the heavenly Father can be known and seen. In the same manner as Christ had seen and known the Father, that is in the Spirit, Abraham saw and rejoiced in the day of Christ, and David called him Lord. But the Jews, untaught as they were in the mysteries of the Spirit, understood, in a fleshly sense, what Christ had intended them spiritually to discern. How could he say: 'Before Abraham was I am,' seeing that he himself was not yet fifty years old?[1] 'Then took they up stones to cast at him, but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by.'[2]

We see, then, that in the latter part of the eighth chapter Christ is by the Apostle shown to have taught exactly the same doctrine which Paul had taught in his 'allegory' about the two sons of Abraham.[3] The one, the child of the bondwoman, 'was born after the flesh' only, 'but he of the freewoman was by promise,' and therefore, as is implied, was not merely born 'of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,' that is by the Spirit. Those who, as Christ says, have God for their father,[4] in the words of Paul, are as Isaac was, children of promise. 'But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now . . . so then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.'[5]

In the Old Testament a fallen woman is represented as the type of a people which has departed from the Lord.[6] Her children are, in the prophet's allegory on the house of Israel, called Jesreel, that is 'God scattereth,' and Lo-Ruhamah, or 'she that is not under grace,' and Lo-Ammi, or 'not my people.' The house of Israel is to be scattered because it has departed from the Lord, who will 'no more have mercy' upon the same, for the children of Israel are not the children, nor the people of God,

[1] For the explanation of the fifty years, see 'Chronology.' [2] 59.
[3] Gal. iv. 22–31. [4] 42. [5] Gal. iv. 28–31. [6] Hosea i. 2 f.

and He will not be their God. These forsaken children of Israel are in the allegory contrasted with the children of Judah. They *are* under grace, for the Lord 'will have mercy on the house of Judah and will save them.' But so certain is the prophet that even for fallen Israel there is a day of redemption, when her servitude shall be accomplished and her iniquity pardoned, that he prophesies of her children being called in the future great day of the gathering under 'one head,' no more 'not my people,' but 'sons of the living God.'

These two allegories of Hosea and of Paul on the Divine sonship fully interpret the allegorical sense of the first part of the eighth chapter in the Gospel after John. We have already pointed out that the latter part of this chapter seems to throw much light on the typical meaning of the beginning of the same. The Scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery, who, after the law of Moses, should be stoned; and they ask him to pronounce judgment upon her. Here we see standing before the Lord the fallen woman of Hosea, typically representing the children of Israel who have departed from their God, who are not under grace, not the people of God, and who are therefore to be scattered. The rulers of Israel having made of none effect the law revealed on Sinai, by the literal and anti-spiritual interpretation of the same, 'judge after the flesh,'[1] and accuse the people that it transgresses against the law of Moses. They ask the Lord to judge, thereby tempting him, in the hope that he would declare the law to be no longer binding, and thus give them the long-sought-for opportunity of accusing him. Instead of this, instead of discarding the latter, he developes from the same its spiritual meaning, like sparks from a flinty rock. He who judges no man 'convinced' all who heard him 'by their own conscience.' Even the accused woman was thus judged by her conscience, to which she had been taught to appeal.

CHAP. XIII.

Therefore the Lord condemned her not, but dismissed her with the injunction to 'sin no more.'[1] In like manner Israel's iniquity will be pardoned in the day of Immanuel, when the Spirit of Truth shall make the children of Israel 'sons of the living God.'

Being in the treasury, the Lord again spoke to the people about His being the light of the world,[2] that is the true light which in all ages has lighted every man that came into the world, giving him power to become the Son of God. Again, the Pharisees do not say that the meaning of His words is hid from their eyes; they know full well that doctrine which they hid before the people; they know that Jesus has identified himself with the secret doctrine, and that he has applied it to himself; they knew and trembled. They said therefore unto Him: 'Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true.'

Jesus does not deny that he bears record of himself, but He insists upon it, that yet His record is true. For He comes from God, and returns to God; that is, He is the incarnate Word from the beginning; as such He is one with the Father: He is at the same moment in heaven and on earth.[3] The Pharisees must not judge after the flesh only, but also after the Spirit; they must consider His spiritual as well as His human natures. Then they will understand that though he bears record of Himself, yet that, through His spiritual unity with the Father, the Father that sent Him bears also record of Him. Their law[4] is explicit on this point, and demands the testimony of two men; but if the written law be interpreted by the unwritten law, by the secret tradition, and according to 'the power of God,' then it will be seen that the testimony of Jesus is a double testimony in fact, that is the testimony of the Father and of the Son. 'Yet my record *is* true,' replied the Lord, for 'I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.' In and through the Spirit the

[1] Comp. Eccl. xxi. 1.
[2] viii. 12 f.
[3] John iii. 13.
[4] John viii. 17; xv. 25.

Pharisees might know the one as well as the other, as distinct from one another and as one in the unity of the Spirit.

Since this doctrine was not quite unknown to them, it was a sin that the Pharisees did 'shut up the kingdom of heaven against men,' by not going in themselves, neither suffering them that are entering to go in.[1] Instead of putting the light which shone in the face of Jesus Christ on a candlestick, they had hidden it from them who were entering into the kingdom of heaven. This was the sin against the Holy Ghost, which shall never be forgiven. Therefore Christ told the Pharisees that they 'shall die' in their sins, and not follow him to the place whither he is going. But against the people of Israel the same sentence was declared conditionally, for the truth was purposely hidden from their eyes, and they could not possibly be made responsible for not discerning the meaning of the Lord's words: 'Whither I go ye cannot come.'

The Jews, as a people, were not brought up in the knowledge of the Divine sonship, of the spiritual birth. Therefore the Lord said: 'Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world.' Unlike the Pharisees, they show their ignorance and ask Him: 'Who art thou?' He is a man whom God has sent, and who speaks to the world those things which He has heard of Him; or, as He says a little further on, He is a man who has told them the truth which He has heard of God. And His hearing of the Word of God comes from His Spirit proceeding from God. For 'he that is of God heareth God's words.' Why should they who listened to Him not be of God; why should they not be from above; why not born of the Spirit? It was their unbelief in the power of God which prevented their being brought under its influence, and their receiving 'grace by grace.' They would know that Jesus is the Christ, the anointed of God, but not before having lifted up the Son

[1] Mat. xxiii. 13.

CHAP. XIII.

of Man as 'a sign of salvation,'[1] as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness. Then they would know that He did nothing of Himself, but that He spoke as the Father had taught Him. 'He that sent me is with me; the Father hath not left me alone, for I do always those things that please Him.' Hereupon 'many believed on Him.'

These Jews 'which believed on Him' had been suddenly 'convinced by their own conscience,' like those who had heard the Lord judge but not condemn the woman brought before Him. To these, who by their faith in His Divine power had become His disciples, Jesus said: 'If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye *shall know* the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' They did not know all the truth, but they were not far from the kingdom of God, inasmuch as the Spirit of God had begun in them His saving work. The seed of the Word of God had fallen on good ground, and 'they which in an honest and good heart, having heard the Word keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience,'[2] they would continue to be led by the Spirit of God, and become sons of God; they, or some of them, would be reminded by the 'other' comforter or advocate of the Spirit of Truth, of all that Christ had told them. For them also there is no condemnation, if they henceforth 'sin no more,' and walk 'not after the flesh but after the Spirit.' And if they sin, they have 'an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation' for their sins.[3]

Chap. IX.

Again, in the ninth chapter, Christ is shown to be the light of the world; that is, the Word which was in the beginning with God, which was God, and which in all ages, entering into holy souls, made them friends and sons of God. To Him, as the incorporation of the power of God, all things are possible. The time had come when it

[1] Wisd. xvi. [2] Luke viii. 15. [3] 1 John ii. 1, 2.

was to be proved to the world that God works by means, that the Holy Spirit proceeding from Him is His organ, and man the incorporation of the same, so that if God be with him the most marvellous works can by him be performed. Thus, then, spoke the Divine Spirit or Word through Christ: 'I must work the works of Him that sent me while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work. As long as I am in the world I am the light of the world.' Soon he would leave the world, and the world be left without its true light. But this only for a while, for the risen Advocate, the incarnation of this light, will ask the Father to give to the world 'another' advocate, who shall convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, who shall reap what Christ had sown;[1] and then the Spirit of truth which was in Christ and would also be in His substitute, will be in His disciples and abide for ever with them. Even on the Sabbath must the Son work the works of His Father; since the Father works on the Sabbath, the Son does so likewise. And as if to show that God works by means, and in order to engender faith in the power of God, by faith in the means employed, Christ made clay of the spittle and anointed with it the eyes of the blind man, and ordered him to wash in the pool of Siloam, which, by the literal meaning of the word, might remind him of Christ, whom God had 'sent.' Having had his eyes opened, the man that was blind did boldly confess before the Pharisees that Christ had restored his sight. The question having been raised by the latter, whence Jesus was, the man was led thereby to marvel at their ignorance, for since He had opened the eyes of the blind, no doubt ought to exist about His origin. It is enough to worship God and to do His will in order to be heard by Him, and whosoever is heard by God, hears God's words and is of God.[2] Now, 'since the world began, was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If this man were not

[1] John iv. 37.

[2] Comp. viii. 47.

CHAP. XIII. *of* God, he could do nothing.' It is impossible to deny that this historical incident is likewise capable of a figurative interpretation. The Jew, before whose eyes the secret doctrine of the Divine sonship had been hidden,[1] was suddenly led to see the glorious light of Christ's Gospel.

Thus fearlessly the man spoke to the Pharisees, although these had frightened his parents into silence, who well knew, that 'if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.' The Messiah was expected to do similar miracles, and to act as 'a great light' in the midst of darkness.[2] Therefore, by confessing that Jesus had opened his eyes, the man had confessed his belief in Jesus as the Messiah. Being asked of the Lord, whether he believed in the Son of God, and being told that the same stood before him, he confessed his belief in Jesus as the Messiah, and he worshipped Him. And Jesus said: 'For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be blind,' thus paraphrasing his saying about the wise and prudent and the babes and sucklings. Some of the Pharisees then said: 'Are we blind also?' 'Jesus said unto them: If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, we see, therefore your sin remaineth.'[3] Not those from whom the light was purposely hidden were hopelessly blinded, but those who did hide the light which was intrusted to their keeping.

Chap. X. 1–23. The parable of the good shepherd shows that Christ is He of whom the prophet foretold that he would lead his flock like a shepherd. He is the prophet like Moses, who would be heard by the true Israelites. All who came before Him, all who were guardians of the secret tradition, and thus of the doctrine of Divine Wisdom, the root of immortality, were 'thieves and robbers,' inasmuch as they hid this knowledge from the people, and kept the key of

[1] Luke xix. 42; John ix. 41. [2] Is. ix. 2; Matt. iv. 16.
[3] Comp. viii. 21.

knowledge in their own hands. As the light of the world, as the incarnate Word, Christ is the door[1] of salvation, the food for the hungry, the spring of life. He is the good shepherd who gives up His life for the sheep, so that being lifted up as a sign of salvation, all who turn to Him, even the sheep which do not belong to the Jewish fold, may be saved by faith in the Word of God, which healeth all things, being the Saviour of all,[2] by the 'one shepherd' of the 'one fold.' No man could have taken His life from Him, but the Father loves Him for having of Himself laid down His life, which He has power to take again. Faithful to His Divine mission, He was obedient unto death, and loved His own till the end. And if in all ages the death of the righteous has been accepted by God as a propitiation for sin, how all-sufficient must have been the propitiatory sacrifice of the incarnation of that Word, which as 'the mercy of the Lord is upon all flesh,' reproving and nurturing and teaching and bringing again, 'like a shepherd his flock.'[3]

Constrained by the vigilance and the restrictions of the Pharisees and Sadducees, Christ had spoken but mystically to the people about his Messiahship, on which subject, as we have seen, the opinions and expectations of the Jews were divided. The expected Christ, according to some, was to set up the terrestrial kingdom in the form of a world-spreading theocracy, which the prophets had with striking unanimity proclaimed. But those whom we may now designate as belonging to the reformed party in the Church seem to have foreseen that, without doubting the eventual fulfilment of the prophecies about the great King at Jerusalem, this event must be ushered in by another of far greater magnitude and importance. As Jeremiah and others had clearly foretold, a new covenant must be concluded between God and His chosen people. His law must by Him be written on their hearts. This

[1] Comp. 'The Shepherd of Hermas.' [2] Wisd. xvi. [3] Eccl. xviii. 13.

CHAP. XIII.

moral reformation of the individual, and in course of time of the community at large, had to be inaugurated by the transformation of conscience into the high tribunal of Divine law and human transgression. Conscience must be raised to the dignity of a generally acknowledged temple of the Holy Ghost. Men must be convinced in and by their own consciences. The creature must, through the instrumentality of the indwelling power of God, be brought into direct communion and union with the Creator. Thus must the way of the Lord be prepared. The Immanuel-Israel must be gathered of all nations; and these sons of the living God, united under one head, must promulgate the Lord's new law from Jerusalem, the new centre of the world.

The reformed party of the Jewish Church in Palestine seems to have been represented by the mystical sect of the Essenes, who were, as we have seen, closely allied to the Therapeutæ, or, as we may call them, the soul-healers among the Jews in Egypt. Their principles led them to expect first of all a Christ, or Messiah, in the purely spiritual sense, a man who, by his faith in and obedience to the indwelling and anointing power of God, should receive the same in its fulness, and thus become, in the highest sense of the word, an incarnation of the Holy Ghost, a model Son of Man and Son of God, the sower of the Divine Word, the only-begotten of the Father.

In the fulness of time the Christ of the Essenes came, but not the Christ which the Pharisees had led the people to expect. These, therefore, surrounded Jesus and said unto Him: 'How long dost thou make us doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.' Christ told them what He had said before, that the works which He did in His Father's name bore witness of Him. The 'name' of God was understood in times of old, and most probably up to the days of Christ in the flesh, to denote the indwelling power of God, which had raised, as its instruments, first

some chosen angels, and then some chosen men. Thus God had spoken to Moses, through the mediation of the Divine Spirit, and He had said: 'Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice (and do all that I speak [1]), provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for *my name is in him.*' [2] Again, the Lord, having commanded Moses to communicate unto Aaron and his sons the words through which *they* should bless the children of Israel, added: 'And they shall put *my name* upon the children of Israel, and *I* will bless them.' [3] And He said to Moses: 'In all places *where I record my name*, *I* will come unto thee, and *I* will bless thee.' [4]

The people not believing in the power of God in and through man, not having the 'faith in God' which should render all things possible, were not the sheep of the good shepherd, who in all ages had striven to unite Himself more and more with man, and thus to unite the same with God, from whom the Divine Spirit proceeds. This power of God, through which God 'bringeth again' his own, 'like a shepherd his flock,' [5] this Divine 'Word . . . that healeth all things,' and is 'the Saviour of all,' [6] this Word from the beginning, which in all ages gave power to become sons of God, had become flesh; and by dwelling among men in a human form 'full of grace and truth,' by shining in the face of Jesus Christ, had enabled some of the dwellers upon earth to behold the unspotted mirror of the glory of the Most High: 'the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.' If then the spiritual rock that followed the Israelites in the desert, if the Divine Saviour of all ages, whose perfect incarnation was typified by the sign of salvation lifted up in the wilderness, had come down from heaven, and was made man, then the sheep of this good shepherd will hear His voice, and He will

[1] Exod. xxiii. 22. [2] Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. [3] Num. vi. 22–27.
[4] Exod. xx. 24. [5] Eccl. xviii. 13. [6] Wisd. xvi.

CHAP. XIII.

know them, and they shall follow Him. This is
Christ says of His sheep: 'And I give unto them
life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any
pluck them out of my hand.'

Thus it is that Christ said of Himself: 'I and
Father are one.' The effect has become absorbed
operating cause; the Spirit of Christ being one
Spirit of God, humanity has been raised to the
and in the unity of the Spirit, the creature
Creator, the Son and the Father are one. 'Being
Christ was made God by God's grace, and by his
obedience. The Jews, to whom the Hidden Wisdom
the Divine sonship had remained a mystery, thank
light-expelling efforts of their rulers, could not
this saying of Christ as 'blasphemy.' Yet Jesus,
that being blind without their fault, the Jews
had 'no sin,'[1] graciously condescended to
them. It was of no use to appeal to their
to convince them by the same, for God had not
His law on their hearts. Nor could they have
those parts of the written law where God is
have said: 'This commandment which I com
this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither
. . . But the word is very nigh unto thee, in
and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.'[2] Je
fore, appeals to another part of Scripture, and
it not written in *your* law, I said ye are gods
called *them* gods *unto whom the Word of God*
the Scripture cannot be broken), say ye of Him
Father hath sanctified, and sent into the wor
blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of
I do not the works of my Father, believe me no
I do, though ye believe me not, believe the work
may know and believe that *the Father is in*
in Him.'

In order to understand the meaning of this all-

[1] John ix. 41. [2] Deut. xxx. 11, 14; Rom. x. 8. [3] Ps.

subject, it is necessary to consider the pre-Christian development of the doctrine of sanctification.

The Old Testament doctrine of sanctification[1] had for its object, by the outward acts of sanctification, to typify the inward sanctification of the individual. The sacrifice signified the desired giving over unto God for His own of something over which the sacrificer could dispose. But in its deepest significance, it was the rendering to God the things that are God's. Again, the chosen instruments of God, among the chosen people, were types of the Divine messenger, the Angel of Jehovah, in whom was the name of God, and who, therefore, represented the Divine presence. To be 'chosen' by God was, therefore, to have received the gift of His name, that is of His indwelling Word or Spirit. By this means God sanctified His servants and the people of His choice. Therefore, the Lord said, 'Be *ye* holy, *for I* am holy;' or, in other words: Let the Spirit which proceeds from me be in you, and work in you, both to will and to do of my good pleasure; for this is my will, 'even your sanctification.' Similarity, not identity, of holiness was demanded through Moses, and also through the prophets. The effect was to be assimilated to the cause, the creatures to the indwelling Spirit of the Creator, and thus to God himself. The people were to be 'children of the Most High,' by offering up a broken spirit and a contrite heart.

The history of the chosen people shows that they were '*the* chosen generation, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, the peculiar people,' or rather, God's 'own' people.[2] By His guiding Spirit He made it more and more His own. He led His people out of Egypt, out of the land of promise, and back again to the same. And though the time of the scattering, the time of servitude, is not over, yet the promise still holds good that God will 'gather the house of Israel from the people among whom they are scattered, *and shall be sanctified in them* in the

[1] Comp. Diestel, Die Heiligkeit Gottes; Jahrb. für d. T. 1859. [2] 1 Pet. ii. 9.

CHAP. XIII.

sight of the heathen;'[1] that He will 'bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon the whole house of Israel, and will be *jealous for His holy name*;'[2] that He will *accept them with their 'sweet savour*,'[3] so that they may 'give thanks unto His holy name, and triumph in His praise.'[4]

The lasting object of these past and future blessings is the recognition of the Divine name. 'Thus saith the Lord God: I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but *for mine holy name's sake*, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went. And I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, *when I shall be sanctified in you* before their eyes; for I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and *a new spirit will I put within you*: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And *I will put my spirit within you*, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.'[5] Here the 'name' and the 'Spirit' of God are unmistakeably identified. And of this name or Spirit of God the prophet, in the latter part of Isaiah, says plainly that it was the divine medium of salvation. God said: 'Surely they are my people, children that will not lie: so he was their Saviour.' It was 'the Angel of his presence' who saved them; that is, the Angel in whom was the name or Spirit of the Lord. 'But they *rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit*: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them. Then he remembered the days of

[1] Ez. xxviii. 25. [2] xxxix. 25. [3] xx. 41.
[4] Ps. cvi. 47; comp. xxxiii. 20, 21. [5] Ez. xxxvi. 22-27.

old, Moses and his people, saying, Where is He that brought them up out of the sea with *the shepherd of his flock*? Where is *He that put his holy Spirit within him*? That led them by the right hand of Moses with his *glorious arm*, dividing the water before them, to make himself *an everlasting name*? That led them through the deep (floods), as the horse in the plain, without their stumbling? As the beast goeth down into the valley, *the Spirit of the Lord led them to rest*: Thus didst thou lead thy people to make thyself *a glorious name*.'[1]

It was the holy Spirit or name of God which was in the Angel of his presence, which was in Moses, the shepherd of the flock, and likewise in the people of Israel, the sheep of that flock, and which led shepherd and flock to rest for the purpose of establishing a glorious and everlasting name or Spirit of God in His chosen creatures. Those who are thus sanctified, who are holy, are creatures of the Lord's presence; they are messengers of His grace, earthen vessels containing the heavenly treasure, temples of the Holy Ghost. The degree of holiness is dependent on the degree of obedience to the dictates of the inward monitor, and it manifests itself by holiness or truth in the inward parts. But the Scripture testifies of One whose holiness shall be above all others. It is 'the Holy One,' 'the Holy One of Israel,' or 'the Holy One in Israel.' This name, in its wider and general sense, refers to Israel's holy Spirit—or rather, to the holy Spirit in Israel, for which reason it is frequently identified with the Lord, the Creator, the Redeemer, the Holy One. And in this general application of the name, we have to distinguish a somewhat more limited sense in which it is used. The unknown prophet of the Babylonian captivity refers to the Holy One as to the Spirit of God in the Messianic time. 'Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel: I will help thee, saith the Lord, and thy

[1] Is. lxiii. 8–14.

CHAP. XIII.

Redeemer is the Holy One of Israel.'[1] 'For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel is thy Saviour.'[2] 'As for our Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is his name.'[3] He is 'faithful,' he has 'chosen' Israel,[4] and is Israel's 'king.'[5] In those days of Israel's final restoration, of its new covenant, nations will run unto Israel 'because of the Lord thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel, for He glorifieth thee.'[6] Therefore to Him shall come the 'sons from afar,' with their silver and gold.[7]

In the book of Daniel the expression 'the Holy One,' or 'holy ones,' is only used of angels,[8] of whom we know that, as ministers of His, doing His pleasure, the name or Spirit of God is in them. We have pointed out, that during and before the Babylonian captivity, the Messianic expectations became more spiritual; that, instead of receiving earthly recognition and honour, the Divine instrument, the sower of the Word, the moral reformer, would be 'despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.' Yet, for all that, and though He would set up the divine kingdom in the heart, and not in Jerusalem, he would be in the fullest sense of the word the 'Christ,' the 'Anointed of God.' He would be 'the Holy One,' whose soul God would not leave in hell, and whom God would not suffer to see corruption.[9] 'And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.'[10] 'Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.'[11]

Holiness and righteousness, as fruits of the Spirit of God, were to be the Messiah's principal characteristics. To these was added, as a necessary consequence of these divinely wrought virtues, the atoning power of the

[1] Jes. xli. 14. [2] xliii. 3, 14. [3] xlvii. 4. [4] xlix. 7. [5] xliii. 15.
[6] lv. 5. [7] lx. 9. [8] iv. 13, 17, 23. [9] Ps. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 27; xiii. 35.
[10] Is. xi. 2. [11] xlii. 1 f.

righteous servant of God.[1] These doctrines of the reform which the Jewish faith underwent during the Babylonian captivity, and which were announced as to be exemplified by the Messiah, were more fully developed, as we have seen, and finally recorded in the apocryphal writings of the Septuagint. The 'name' or 'spirit' of God was also called 'spirit from above,' or 'glory,' or 'wisdom,' or 'power,' or 'grace,' or 'word' of God; and its nature was more clearly defined as the 'breath' and 'unspotted mirror' of the power or glory of God, as 'the image of his goodness.' Its mission was declared to have been, 'in all ages,' to dwell with man, whom God had 'made to be an image of his own eternity,' and who, by nurturing and guiding, was to be made a friend and a son of God. Thus fallen man was, like 'the first Adam,' to be brought out of his fall: was, through grace, to be made righteous, and by righteousness to atone for his sin and for the sin of others.

We have seen that these doctrines of apocryphal or Hidden Wisdom were taught and applied to himself in secret and in darkness by Christ, who only confided them to a few of his disciples, one of whom, the beloved one, wrote them down, after Matthew had recorded those only of his Master's sayings which the apostles had at first considered safe to publish, perhaps before Paul had proclaimed the Hidden Wisdom of Christ in a mystery. But whereas in the Jewish Church in Egypt the Messianic expectations had lost much of their original importance, in Palestine these formed the most prominent feature, the very leaven of the Israelitic faith. Some expected the promised great king like David; others a moral reformer; and some, perhaps, first the one and then the other. But in either case the Messiah was expected to be, in the highest sense of the word, a man whom God had chosen, sanctified, and sent; in whom, therefore, the Spirit or Word of God would dwell in an unusual degree, and with whom it

[1] Is. liii.

CHAP. XIII.

would abide, thus enabling him, as the especial organ or instrument of the Divine Spirit, to do marvellous works through his sanctification, and in the name or power of God.

Thus Christ, being a man whom the Father had sanctified, was 'the Son of God;' that is, 'he that should come,' the Christ, who, by his perfect righteousness and perfect atonement, was to realise the mission of the Spirit or Word of God, who in the beginning was with God and was God, and who in all ages, as the light of all men, had given power to such as received him, that is, as *believed in his 'name,'* to become 'the sons of God.' Christ was holy because God is holy; and it is in the unity of the Spirit that the Son and the Father are one.[1]

Chap. XI.

Christ had pointed to his works as the best test of his divine mission. A Pharisee like Nicodemus might well marvel at the Lord's speaking to him of the new birth, because he would understand, though he believed not, the doctrine of spiritual regeneration. But such words would not have caused the ignorant people to marvel. Marvellous works could alone bring them to a right understanding. We have seen, that after healing the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, Christ pointed to this miracle as to a thing which the Son could not have done of himself, and which must be shown him by the Father, who 'himself doeth' these things. And he added: 'And he will show him greater works than these, that ye may marvel,'[2] 'for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.'[3] Thus he had prepared them for the greatest miracle which the Son would do in the Father's name. And he had already implied of what nature this greater work would be: 'Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice.'[4] By the raising of the dead, the incarnate Word was now to show to the people, that by faith in the power of God, man can do all things.

[1] Comp. 1 John ii. 20; Acts iii. 14. [2] John v. 20. [3] v. 19. [4] 28.

The Apostle has shown Christ to the world as the divine word, as the water of life, the bread of life, and the light of the world. He now records the Lord's manifestation as 'the resurrection and the life.' We have seen, that as the good shepherd, in whom God had put his holy Spirit,[1] as he had done of old in the angel of his presence, Christ promised to give everlasting life to his sheep. Already on earth he had sheep belonging to his fold who even in the grave would hear his voice. As it had been said centuries before in Egypt: 'To be allied to the divine wisdom or word is immortality;' so did now Christ, the incarnate Word, say of himself: 'I am the resurrection and the life.' He was to reveal and manifest the 'mysteries of God,' to which the Divine Word 'is privy;' to proclaim the 'wages of righteousness,' that is, the 'wages' which the reapers shall receive, who shall gather 'fruit unto life eternal;'[2] he was to prove the fact, that 'God created man to be immortal, and made him an image of his own eternity;' that 'the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God;' that 'they are in peace,' their hope being 'full of immortality;' they having been 'proved' by God, and found 'worthy for himself;' that the righteous is 'made perfect in a short time;' that he is 'numbered among the children of God and his lot among the saints;' that 'the righteous live for evermore;' that 'their reward . . . is with the Lord, and the care of them with the Most High;' that 'they shall receive a glorious kingdom, and the crown of beauty from the Lord's hand.' For the sake of men, Christ was to prove by a visible act that the Divine Word has 'power of life and death,' to lead 'to the gates of hell,' and to bring 'up again.'[3]

For men who believed in the immortality of the soul, and therefore in the continued life of the individual, for those no manifestation of corporeal resurrection was

[1] Is. lxiii. 8 f. [2] John iv. 36.

[3] For the references of these apocryphal quotations, see 'The Gospel revealed to Paul.'

CHAP. XIII.

needed. But the majority of the people, misled by their rulers, seem to have entertained notions with regard to the immortality of the soul which made the same dependent on the resurrection of the body. Taking in a literal, and not in a symbolical sense, the prophecy of Ezekiel about the resurrection of dry bones, in which God would cause breath to enter,[1] they believed in the bodily resurrection on the last day. They forgot that this prophecy refers to that new birth or spiritual regeneration of Israel in the Messianic time, which Isaiah had pointed out under the figure of the Virgin which should bear the Son whose name should be 'God with us.'[2] The prophecy of the dry bones which shall be made to live by the breath of life, 'the breath of the power of God'[3] entering into them, has been fully explained by the same prophet as referring likewise to the time of the setting up of the Messianic terrestrial kingdom in the Holy Land. For then God will put within his people 'a new spirit' and a new heart, so as to be sanctified in them before the eyes of the heathen.[4] We have seen, that according to the apocryphal tradition, in the pre-Christian times, as well as during and after the Christian era, the resurrection of the individual was taught to be a spiritual one. It cannot be asserted that Christ sanctioned the doctrine of the bodily resurrection; on the contrary, it may be assumed that what he taught about the not marrying of the children of the resurrection was a positive contradiction to those carnal views. Like Paul, Christ must have distinguished between the corruptible and the incorruptible, the weak and the powerful, the natural and the spiritual body.

But unless the Jews saw a sign, they would not believe. By a sign, Christ was about to show them that the time had come when even those that are in the graves shall hear his voice, the voice of the Son of God, to whom the Father has given to have life in himself;[5] the voice of the

[1] xxxvii. 5. [2] Is. vii. 14. [3] Wisd. vii. 25.
[4] Ezech. xxxvi. 22-27. [5] John v. 25 f.

incarnate Word, in whom was life, and whose life was the light of men.[1] 'And they that hear shall live,' whether they be among the living or among the dead. For all the sheep of the good shepherd hear his voice. But this was not all. The Jews were to learn by that sign that it was not necessary to wait until the last day for the resurrection. In all ages God has taken to himself those whom he had perfected. Therefore even then, *now* is the day of salvation for every individual. The Divine Word is ready to dwell in him, and to perfect him into a son of God. For every individual, to be allied to the Divine Wisdom, Spirit, or Word, is immortality. Man is destined to be the image of God's eternity. Not only did Christ intend to show by a sign the extent of the power which the Father had given him, to do his works in his name or spirit, but he seems to have likewise intended to correct the erroneous views of the Jews about the corporeal resurrection on the last day, and thus to impress upon them the necessity of being led by the Spirit of God.

We find that Martha said unto Christ, that his presence would have spared her brother's life; that God will give him whatsoever he will ask, and that according to her belief Lazarus could not rise again before the resurrection in the last day. She believed Jesus to be 'the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world;' but she had not understood that because he was the Christ, he was the Divine Word which had become flesh. She had yet to learn, that in him was life and immortality. He who had received the Spirit without measure, that same Spirit of God which 'maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered,'[2] now interceded for his friends; 'He groaned in the spirit and was troubled.' His sympathising soul being oppressed, was troubled, and out of the depths he cried unto God, and his Father heard him. The people which stood by were to be convinced that the Father always hears the Son, and that he has sent

[1] i. 4.

[2] Rom. viii. 26.

CHAP. XIII.

him. Lazarus being dead, and lying in his grave, heard the voice of the incarnate Word, and came forth at his command.

This sign was the manifestation of God's glory which Christ had promised Martha that she should see;[1] and for which reason he had said that the sickness of Lazarus was 'not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.'[2] The Glory, Power, Spirit, or Word of God, represented as it was by Christ, was to be recognised as a Divine agency, and its instrument as a Divine organ. The Man Jesus, inasmuch as he is the advocate of the Divine Spirit, through which God operates in the heart of man, and in the world generally, has performed this miracle, for the purpose that those who saw it might believe in the power of God, and in its perfect incarnation; that they might know that he did the works of God.

The Pharisees in council assembled, having heard of this and other miracles, said: 'If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him, and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.' Having taken counsel together 'for to put him to death,' Jesus 'walked no more openly among the Jews,' but went to Ephraim, and continued there with his disciples 'near to the wilderness.' As Jesus had to hide himself, so his secret doctrine had to be hidden, and the Apostles were not permitted by the rulers to record the fact that, like Elijah, he had 'raised up a dead man from death, and his soul from the place of the dead, *by the Word of the Most High.*'[3]

Chap. XII.

It was in Bethany, and 'six days before the passover,' that Mary anointed the feet of Jesus 'against his burying.' It is difficult not to connect this statement with the writer's object, to show that the anointing took place exactly six days before the passover. Since the history of the Lord's passion is in this gospel recorded in literal harmony with the proclaimed fact that Christ is our passover, we should

[1] 40. [2] 4. [3] Eccl. xlviii. 5; comp. xxii. 11; xxxviii. 16.

expect that the anointing would be recorded on the day when the lamb without blemish was selected according to the law. And so it is; for the selection of the lamb took place on the tenth of the month, and therefore six days before the high day of the passover, the sixteenth, when Christ was lying in his grave; and the Mary who performs this symbolical act is the same who, with the other women, went to the grave, 'bringing the spices which they had prepared.'[1] Thus every detail in this account seems to point to the sacrifice of the lamb. 'The house was filled with the odour of the ointment.' Already Paul had spoken of the Christian presenting his body 'a living sacrifice,'[2] in the spirit of the Psalmist, who spoke of 'the sacrifices of righteousness,' and especially of the sacrifice of him in whose heart was the law of God, and who said: 'Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, ... burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required; then said I; lo, *I* come.'[3]

The outward anointing of the selected lamb without blemish and without spot was a symbol of that inward anointing with the 'unction from the Holy One,'[4] with the Spirit or Word from the beginning, which having without measure entered into the holy soul of Jesus, and having become incarnate, and thus having remained in him, enabled the Son of God to present his blameless body a living sacrifice unto God, as 'an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.'[5] Let the Jews, therefore, believe that the Jewish sacrifices have been abolished by God in Christ, in order 'that the law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is *without the yoke of any such necessity*, might have *the spiritual offering of* men themselves.'[6] It was a sign of his approaching sacrifice that Jesus suffered his feet to be anointed. Therefore he spoke openly of his burying, and that they would not have him always.

[1] Luke xxiv. 1. [2] Rom. xii. 1. [3] Ps. iv. 5; xl. 6-8.
[4] 1 John ii. 20. [5] Phil. iv. 18. [6] Barn. ii. 4-8.

CHAP. XIII.

As the incarnate Word, Christ, 'the Holy One,' was the eternal Messiah. Even his disciples did not understand these things at the first, nor until Jesus was glorified. 'Certain Greeks,' however, desired to see Jesus, who, being informed of this, declared that the hour was come for him to be glorified. Since the Gentiles, and especially the Greeks, are enquiring after Jesus, it is time for Him to go away, in order that the apostle of the Gentiles, the 'other' Comforter or Advocate of the Spirit of Truth, the first Messianic reaper, may bring them into the fold of Christ, the Messianic sower, the incarnate Word. The Lord now explained to His disciples how this was to be brought about, how the seed of the Word could bring forth fruit. Like the corn of wheat, which must die in order to bring forth 'much fruit,' so his natural body must fall into the ground, that his spiritual body may be raised. Christ prays not to be saved from this hour, for the 'cause' for which he came unto this hour could not be gained but by his obedience unto death, by the cross as the culminating point of his obedience. 'Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven saying: I have both glorified it and will glorify it again.' It was for the sake of the people that stood by that this voice came. As they believed that there is no resurrection before the last day, so did they think that the judgment of this world would not take place before that day. Having shown that the dead can be made to rise, even bodily, before the end of the world, he now declares the judgment of the world to have come.

'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me: this he said signifying what death he should die.' We have already referred to this subject, and shown that Christ has, by these and similar passages, identified himself with the apocryphal interpretation of the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness. He was lifted up as 'a sign of salvation' for those who trusted,

not in what they saw, but in the power or word of God, of which Christ was the perfect organ. He was to make a perfect atonement for the people, 'and pray that they might be healed' by the Divine Word, the Saviour of all, who 'healeth all things.'[1] And as Moses said to the people that they were to 'come unto the serpent that is set upon the pole,' and assuredly to 'trust in him, that though he be dead, yet he is able to give life,' so the people are to 'find grace . . . by the cross' of Jesus, by looking '*not unto the man, but unto Him that dwelleth in him and speaketh by him.*'[2] It is in this sense, as the organ of the Divine Spirit, that Christ said of Himself what had been said in the Apocrypha[3] about the Divine Word or Wisdom; that is, that when lifted up, as the antitype of the serpent who typified an embodiment of the Divine Word, he would 'draw' all men unto him.

Again Christ identifies himself with the Divine Spirit, when he tells the people that the light is yet a little while with them, and that they are to walk while they have the light, lest darkness come upon them. The Word from the beginning 'was life, and the life was the light of men,' that is the 'true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,' giving him power to become the Son of God. Christ had declared that he was 'the light of the world' only so long as he was in the world, and that then 'another' comforter, or advocate of the Spirit, would be sent. But though he was the light, yet he spoke 'in secret and in darkness' to his disciples, and in mystical parables to the people. He well knew that even the stewards of his mysteries would not all be faithful and wise stewards, but would more or less hide, for a time at least, what he had committed to their trust. He who 'knew what was in man,' knew also that instead of at once proclaiming 'in light' what he had told them in darkness, they would hide the light, and that one of them would actually dig his talent into the ground, in-

[1] Wisd. xvi. [2] Barn. xi. 9–11; viii. 13; xiii. 21–24. [3] Eccl. iv. 11.

CHAP. XIII.

stead of turning it to profitable use. Possibly he may, under existing circumstances, have actually forbidden them to proclaim his Hidden Wisdom at once. For darkness would come when the light was gone. And notwithstanding all his miracles and his sayings, the people 'believed not on him.' Nor 'could' they have believed so long as the Spirit of God had not entered into the dry bones and caused the sanctification of Israel. The heart had not been renewed, and God 'hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart,' as Esaias said when he saw the 'glory' of God. 'Nevertheless among the chief rulers many believed on him; but *because of the Pharisees* they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue. For they loved the praise of men better than the praise of God.' Yet the Lord made another effort to convert them, and repeated, that to believe in him, to see him, was to believe in and see the Father who had sent him, whose word he speaks, and whose works he performs. He asks for faith in his words as being spoken by the Father; they will judge, in the last day, him that believes them not. According to the fourth gospel, Christ therefore positively stated that he would not come to judge the quick and the dead at the last day. His Spirit, that is the Spirit of God the Holy Ghost, is the universal judge of all ages.

Part the Fifth. Ch. XIII.

We have fully considered the account of what is here intended to be understood to have been the Lord's last supper, that is not the last paschal meal which he took with his disciples; and we have referred to the symbolical meaning of his washing the feet of the disciples; a rite, the performance of which is enjoined as positively as in the first three gospels the rite of the Lord's Supper is insisted upon at the Passover, or Easter-time. Being the water of life, the outpouring of the same was essential,

for the purpose of applying it to the cleansing of his associates. Yet even Peter had to be told: 'What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know it hereafter.' Still regarding this act in a carnal and not in a spiritual sense, and remonstrating against it, Jesus said to him: 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me;' whereupon Peter desired that also his hands and his head might be washed. Then the Lord tells him that he has been by him washed before; that the waters of eternal life have been poured out upon him, and that the partial renewing of this act is all that is required for those who are 'clean every whit.' What is meant by this is explained by his adding: 'And ye are clean, but not all.' The betrayal of Judas is a sin against the Holy Ghost, a proof that the stony heart had not been exchanged for the heart of flesh, for a vessel meet for the Master's use; that all of them having been called, one had not been chosen, because instead of being led by the Spirit of God to confess Christ, he had betrayed him, their 'Master and Lord.' The spiritual communion typified by the Lord's washing with water is to be practised by his disciples; they are to do to each other as he has done to them. Since the Father works, so also works the Son in his name, and his disciples are to be his fellow-workers.

'The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.' This remarkable passage is a strong confirmation of the views we have developed about the doctrine of the Divine sonship. Whoever is led by the Spirit of God is a son of God, is born not after the flesh only, but also after the spirit; has in him the germ of eternal life, is from above, and born of God. All men are intended to be 'ministers of his that do his pleasure,' yea, even messengers of His presence. The name or Spirit of God being in them, they are to hear and see and do God's words and works. Now, the will of God is the sanctification of man. Being a recipient, and, in a limited sense, an incarnation of the

CHAP. XIII.

Holy Spirit, man is to be holy. All men are made of one blood, and are destined to be brought under the operation of one blood, of one spirit; they are to become organs of the same, that is, servants of God. But as there is a difference between the glory of the sun and that of the moon and stars, so there is a difference between the glory of man, according to the measure of the Divine light which they have received. In the same sense, then, as God, the source from whom the Spirit proceeds, is the Lord and Master of Christ, so likewise Christ is the Lord and Master of His disciples. All are servants of God, and the servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. The true disciple of his Master will have to go out as a sheep among wolves.[1] Persecutions and tribulations will be his lot, since even his Lord and Master had to undergo the same; the disciple of Christ must 'take up his cross, and follow' Him.[2]

As God has sent Christ, so Christ sends his disciples; or, in the words of the Clementine epistle to the Corinthians, 'The apostles have preached to us from the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. Christ, therefore, was sent by God, the apostles by Christ; so both were... sent according to the will of God.'[3] Therefore Christ said: 'He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.' As He is one with the Father, in the unity of the Spirit, so are the disciples to be one with Christ. What is identical in all, as to essence, though not as to measure, is the Spirit. As the water of a stream with its tributaries is essentially identical with the water of its source, so it is the selfsame Spirit, which proceeds from the Father, which is in Christ and in His disciples. But, as the further the river flows from its source the more it is mixed up with other elements which impair its purity, so also those children who are 'afar off' must be brought 'near' to

[1] Mat. x. 16. [2] Mat. xvi. 24. [3] xix. 1–4.

the spring of living waters: they must be brought nearer and nearer to the Father by following in the footsteps of Jesus, who, though he was 'in the form of a servant,' did not think it robbery to be 'equal with God.' Like the Son of Man, they must be glorified, and God must be glorified in them.

'If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself, and shall straightway glorify him.' It is through His Spirit or glory that God's children are to be glorified. The Divine glory, or Word, 'the breath of the power of God, and pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty,'[1] is the sanctifying and glorifying medium. Moses implored God that he would show him his glory, that is, 'part of his glory,'[2] or the highest manifestation of that invisible glory which he could bear. To the children of Israel God showed his glory,[3] which was enshrouded by the veil of the cloud, and they unconsciously possessed that same glory in themselves, ensconced as it was by the veil of their flesh. Their glory was the breath of the Almighty, which, by imparting a living soul unto man, had created him in God's image. But 'they changed their glory into the similitude' of a molten image, and forgot 'God their Saviour.'[4] Therefore God made His glory 'to cease;'[5] He took His Holy Spirit from them, and caused it to rest as His Shechina in the holiest of the holy. It dwelt not with the people as a body, but only with those who felt the need of such a Saviour. Yet, even then, those into whose souls the Divine glory had entered could exclaim: 'I am continually with Thee, Thou hast holden me by my right hand; Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory.'[6]

The expectations of the Messiah and of God's kingdom were, therefore, directly connected with an appearing and a manifestation of God's glory. The rest of the root of

[1] Wisd. vii. 25. [2] Eccl. xlv. 3. [3] Deut. v. 24.
[4] Ps. cvi. 19–21. [5] Ps. lxxxix. 44. [6] Ps. lxxiii. 23, 24.

CHAP. XIII.

Jesse shall be 'glorious,'[1] for on him shall 'rest' the spirit of holiness, so that 'the branch of the Lord shall be beauty and glory.'[2] The Lord, 'the King of Glory,' shall enter into Jerusalem,[3] and be 'the glory in the midst of her;'[4] for the glory of His name, 'a new spirit,' shall be put within the Israel of the 'new covenant,' and God shall be 'sanctified' in them before the eyes of the heathen.[5]

Before this can come to pass, before the dry bones can be made to live by the breath of the Almighty, Israel must be taught to have faith in the power of God, which 'in all ages, entering into holy souls,' made them friends and children of God; faith in the Divine Word from the beginning, which gave power to them that received it to become the sons of God. And in order to teach Israel this doctrine of the Divine sonship, the Word was made (or became) flesh, and dwelt among them, so as to show them the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, shining in the face of one of their brethren. Jesus had been sanctified by the Father, and had become one with the same in the unity of the Spirit. God's purpose was, that Christ 'might be the first-born among many brethren,' as the Holy One, whom above all others He foreknew, predestinated, conformed to His own image, justified, and glorified.[6] To accomplish this purpose, He whom the Father had sanctified by His Spirit without measure must speak the words and do the works of God. The Father being thus glorified in the Son,[7] that is, in the flesh, 'shall also glorify him in himself;' that is, in His Spirit, in His spiritual body, 'and shall straightway glorify him.'

'Yet a little while,' Christ will dwell as the light of the world with His 'little children,' who have only just begun to learn the first elements of the doctrine of Divine sonship. In the darkness which will come upon them when He

[1] Is. xi. 10. [2] Is. iv. 2. [3] Ps. xxiv. 7, 10.
[4] Zech. ii. 5. [5] Ez. xxxvi. 22-27. [6] Comp. Rom. viii. 29, 30.
[7] John xiv. 13.

is gone, they will seek Him, but they will not find Him. CHAP. XIII.
No more than the Jews are His chosen disciples capable of coming whither their glorified Master is about to go. He gives them 'a new commandment.' The law of the Jews, the written law, according to its letter, rules by fear; the law of Christ, his interpretation of the same by the unwritten law, the 'new' law rules by love. The brotherly love which He has taught and manifested, let it be continued through His disciples. They are His true disciples if they continue in His word,[1] that is, in His name or Spirit; and whatsoever they ask in that name will be granted.[2] Not now, but afterwards, they shall follow Him and be where He is. Even the 'rock' among His disciples, He to whom it was given to know Christ as 'the Son of the living God,' instead of at once confessing Him before men, was to deny Him thrice.

Why should the heart of the disciples be troubled? Ch. XIV.
What, as a body, they wanted, was faith in the power of God. They must not only believe in the Father in heaven, but also in the Father on earth. There must not be an insurmountable gulf between the creature and the Creator. For if there were such, a son of man could never become a son of God. If the Spirit proceeding from the Father did not rest in man, humanity could not be raised to the Godhead, and then there would be no object for angels to descend and ascend. Or, to speak in a parable, if the rays proceeding from the body of the sun did not reach the earth, the innate heat proceeding from the centre of the earth would not suffice to act upon the earth's naturally cold crust, there to engender warmth and life. There must be a double action, one proceeding from without, the other from within. So likewise with man. His centre is his heart. From thence the life-blood flows in all directions, without which the flesh could not exist. His heart is by nature the throne of his own

[1] John viii. 31. [2] John xvi. 23.

CHAP. XIII.

free will, and his spirit is the organ of the same. He possesses a living soul, that is the germ of eternal life, and even that is but a spark of the heavenly flame, a gift, a deposit, a talent, which must be turned to profitable account, so as to make the dry bones live. But even this moral life within man is in itself no more the true life of man than the carnal life of his flesh and blood; the living soul must be made a 'quickening spirit,' before the body of man can become a temple of the Holy Ghost. The germ of eternal life in man must be built up a spiritual house; the heavenly mansion must be prepared here below.

How can these things be? This is a great mystery; but it has been fully revealed to us, first 'in secret and in darkness,' then 'in light,' and 'on the housetops.' He who convinced men 'by their own conscience,' enabled his greatest apostle to convince men that the Spirit of God 'beareth witness with (or 'to') our spirit, that we are the children of God.'[1] Thus then it is by the operation of the Spirit from above, that man's 'conscience' bears witness of his high destiny.[2] For 'the sake of conscience' man 'subjects' himself to this operation, for he has experienced that the good spirit within him has to war against the indwelling spirit of evil, that the law in the members wars against the law of the mind.[3] And he knows by a blessed experience that 'the Spirit helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.'[4] Thus 'the testimony of our conscience'[5] leads us to 'serve' God with our conscience.[6] Through his Spirit the Creator speaks to the creature, and the creature to the Creator. Angels, the

[1] Rom. viii. 16; 1 John v. 6. [2] Rom. ix. 1. [3] Rom. vii. 23.
[4] Rom. viii. 26, 27. [5] 2 Cor. i. 12. [6] 2 Tim. i. 3.

messengers of his presence, descend and ascend from and to God, and thus form a bridge, a ladder, connecting heaven and earth.

Conscience, the echo of the Divine Word within us, can be rendered an infallible guide, by the grace of God and by human obedience. Cut off from this Divine intercourse, is only that man who, by habitually quenching the Holy Spirit within him, commits the sin against the Holy Ghost. Again, those are not far from the kingdom of heaven who have begun to discern that there are wants of the soul which cannot be satisfied except by the manna from above. And those who are increasingly led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God. They know, that without faith in the power of God they will not be led by it; that the life of the soul is the life in God; that God lives in man, as man lives in him; that to be anointed with the unction from above, to be in Christ, is to be a new creature, to be born again as citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem.

The incarnate Word, therefore, claims belief in himself. He will go and prepare a place for his disciples. But is the Spirit which is in Christ already in them? Not yet. Therefore he is the light of the world only as long as he is in the world. Then a time will arise when darkness may come upon those who had not sufficiently learnt to walk in that light. This is why the heart of the disciples was troubled. But that light, which was taken from the world, would return to the same. The perfect incarnation of the Spirit of Truth, the advocate at the right hand of God, will pray the Father, who shall give them 'another' comforter or advocate of that selfsame Spirit, that he may abide with them for ever, 'even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not.' But his disciples know him, for he (now) dwelleth 'with' them, and shall (then) be 'in' them. It is only after Christ shall have been glorified, that the Holy Ghost will be given through the instrumentality of another man whom

CHAP. XIII.

the Father will sanctify. Since Christ is one with the Father in the unity of the Spirit, since 'the Lord *is* the Spirit,' the return of the light of the world will be the return of Christ. 'I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you, . . . and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also; and whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.' Not so, said Thomas, speaking in the name of the other Apostles: 'We know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way? Jesus saith unto him: I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me.' The incarnate Word is the way to the Father, for 'the power of God' gives power to every man to become a son of God. Henceforth it is Christ who is the medium of sanctification, who empowers men to become God's children, to follow in his footsteps, to be where he is, to come to the Father.

To know the Son is to know the Father; to see the effect is to see the cause, for both are at one. Again an Apostle shows his utter ignorance of the doctrine of Divine sonship, and says: 'Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.' In vain did Jesus repeat to Philip what he had so often said about his oneness with the Father; in vain did he urge, that the works done by the Father who dwells in him, ought to convince them of his origin and mission. In vain does he promise, that even they, Philip included, shall, as instruments of the Father, do 'greater works' than he, the Messianic sower, has done. Not understanding how the Father was in Christ, they could not understand that he who now spoke to them, if they asked anything in his name or spirit, would himself do it; 'that the Father may be glorified in the Son.' They loved him, but not as they ought, since they did not understand his commandments, and could not keep them.

'But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, what-

soever I have said unto you.' Then they would know that He is in the Father and the Father in Him, and they in Him and He in them. Then they would love Him and keep His commandments, and the Father would love them as well as the Son, who will manifest Himself to them, and both will come unto them and make their abode with them. Thus Christ gave and left His peace to His disciples, who could not understand how they should rejoice at His going to His Father. 'My Father is greater than I.' This was making the mystery still more mysterious. If he was at one with the Father, how could the Father be greater than the Son? How could it be true that to know and see the Father was to know and see the Son? They understood not his sayings. And yet hereafter he would not talk much with them; 'for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.'

The prince of this world is the liar and sinner 'from the beginning,' the father of lies, and therefore the opposer of him who is the truth, and whom no one can convince of sin. Being born of God, man cannot sin—at least he cannot commit the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God,'[1] because he hears God's words and performs God's works, as an organ of the Holy Ghost, as child of God. But the Jews as a nation do not understand this Divine birth; they are not from above, but from below; they are children of the devil. As such, they, that is, their rulers, who have purposely kept them in this state of darkness, do the works of their father the devil, who, as prince of this world, is through their instrumentality a power on earth. But He who is in the children of God is greater than he who is in the children of disobedience.[2] The Jewish rulers will accuse the Son of Man, but since he is the Son of God these instruments of the prince of this world will find nothing in Christ to

[1] 1 John iii. 9. [2] 1 John iv. 4.

CHAP. XIII. support their accusation. This hour must come, that the world may know that he loves the Father.

Chap. XV. The light of the Divine Word, which in all ages enabled men to become sons of God, was the life of men, the germ of eternal life, the seed of the second or spiritual birth. Christ, the incarnate Word, had told his disciples: 'Because *I* live, *ye* shall live also,' or, in other words, *you* shall be born of God as *I* am born of God. And as the Divine sonship had been accomplished in Christ during his days in the flesh, so shall they abidingly receive in their natural bodies the spirit of truth, whom the world could not then receive. Then they also shall know the Father and his entire will concerning them, through the combined operation of Divine grace and of human obedience. This knowledge of the Father will likewise be a knowledge of the Son, and of his oneness with the Father; so that to believe in the Son will be to believe in the Father. Now, to believe in the Son is to *have* everlasting life, to be in the Son as he is in the Father, to be raised like him, to be where he is, provided only that the seed of the Word remains within him and bears fruit. This faith in the Son as the power of God necessarily includes a due appreciation of Christ's obedience, of which his crucifixion forms the culminating point. God having in all ages sent servants to work in his vineyard, sent his son into the world as a sign of salvation through the power of God, typified by the serpent in the wilderness. To turn towards this healer and Saviour of all, to believe in the invisible presence of that Saviour, symbolised by the serpent, and manifested by the crucified Son of God, this is to 'have' everlasting life.

The power of God, the perfect manifestation of which was revealed in and through Christ, is also to be in his disciples; their spiritual life is to have its root in the spiritual life of Christ; it is through the selfsame spirit of God that Christ is one with the Father, that Christ is in

His disciples and they in Him. The relations between God and the first-born among many brethren are to be essentially the same as those between the Captain of Salvation and His followers. They are to 'walk in the light as he is in the light;'[1] His 'light' is to be 'in' them;[2] the Spirit of truth, which in the person of Christ dwelt 'with' them a little while as the light of the world, shall be 'in' them, and 'abide' with them for ever;[3] they are to dwell in love;[4] to be perfected in the love of God;[5] they are, spiritually, to partake of 'the living bread which came down from heaven;' and in this sense they are to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man.[6]

Therefore Christ said to His disciples: 'I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman; every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.' It is the selfsame root which gives life to the vine and to the branches; as the vine is united to the root which the husbandman has planted, so are the branches united with the vine. It is because the vine is in direct and constant communion with the root that the life of the vine is also the life of the branches. It is the sap proceeding from the root which the vine communicates to the branches. It is through that essence which was in the beginning with God, and which in all ages was the life of men, it is through the Divine Word, which has its root in heaven, that Christ has purged His disciples. Therefore He said to them; 'As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me; . . . without me ye can do nothing.' And in other words He has said the same about the abiding of the vine with the root. Unless Christ were at one with the Father, He could not speak His words nor do His works, for of Himself, without the Father, He can do nothing. As the branches which do not abide in the

[1] 1 John i. 7. [2] John xi. 10. [3] John xiv. 16, 17; vii. 39.
[4] 1 John iv. 16. [5] 1 John ii. 5. [6] vi. 51, 56.

CHAP. XIII.

vine are cast forth, withered and burnt, so likewise would the vine, if it were not inseparably connected with the root, if it did not abide in it. If Jesus were not the Christ, were not the Son of the living God, He would profit us nothing.

And if the disciples abidingly receive the heavenly treasure in their earthen vessels, if they abide in Christ, and His words abide in them, they shall ask what they will, and it shall be done unto them, that they may be His disciples to the glory of God the Father. As the vine depends from the root, so the branches depend from the vine; and as Christ has kept His Father's commandments, and has abided in His love, so his disciples are to keep His commandments and abide in His love. Then the 'joy' of Christ will remain 'in' them, and their joy shall be 'full.' Of His fulness they shall receive grace by grace. They are to love one another as Christ has loved them; and His love has been the very greatest, for He has laid down 'His life for His friends.' Had He not done so, the world would not have known that He loved the Father.[1] Had Christ shrunk from the performance of His divine mission, as the first-born among many brethren, as the perfect incarnation of the Divine Word, then He might have escaped the necessity of seeing His life being by force brought prematurely to a close. But then the world would not have known that as His love, so His obedience knew no bounds; that His love constrained Him to be obedient unto the death of the cross; that for this cause He had been sent. The resolution of perfect obedience implied the resolution not to fear a cruel and ignominious death. And what Christ has done is to be done by His disciples; if need be, they 'ought to lay down their lives for the brethren;'[2] at least, in that spiritual sense in which Paul could say, 'I die daily.'[3]

Henceforth, His disciples are not servants, but friends of Christ, for He has made known unto them 'all things'

[1] xiv. 31. [2] 1 John iii. 16. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 31.

that He has heard from the Father. He has chosen and ordained them, that they should 'go and bring forth fruit,' and that their fruit should 'remain;' that whatsoever they shall ask of the Father in His name, He may give it them. As the branches of the vine, the Spirit of Christ is to be in His disciples. Like Him, they are to bring forth fruit, which is to remain in them. Thus chosen and ordained, they are not of the world, but like Christ, they are from above; for the root from which both derive their spiritual sustenance is in heaven. As the root, as the source of the Spirit, as the husbandman who has planted the vine, the Father is greater than the Son; and as the vine, Christ is greater than His disciples. As Christ has been persecuted, so will they be; but, on the other hand, as men have kept Christ's sayings, so also will they keep their sayings; for as Christ has spoken and worked in the spirit or name of the Father, so are the disciples to speak and work in the name of Christ; they are to let that mind be in them which also was in Jesus; they are not only to sow, but to reap. Those who persecuted Christ were the rulers of the Jewish Church, among whom He did the works which 'none other man did.' They have no cloak for their sin, which remains, since He has 'spoken' unto them. In hating Christ, they hate the Father, and this 'without cause.' Yet there were some among those to whom Christ had spoken who had kept His sayings, and who would also keep the sayings of His disciples, inasmuch as the Spirit of Truth, the promised Vicar of Christ, would testify of Him. And as then, so in the days of the other Comforter, and under His influence the chosen disciples, who have been with Christ from the beginning, '*also* shall bear witness.' For the Vicar of Christ will then have taught them to understand that the Son is in the Father, and they in the Son, and the Son in them. They will then know what it is to have part in

CHAP. XIII.

Ch. XVI.

The mission of the indwelling Spirit or Word of God has been in all ages to raise sons of God among sons of men. The mark of humanity's high calling was not a relative, but an absolute identity of the spirit of man and of the Spirit of God. In the fulness of time this aboriginally conceived raising of humanity to the Godhead was to be fully realised by the joint operation of free grace and free obedience. This obedience of man to the Divine Spirit within him must be an obedience unto death. He must overcome the world up to his latest breath; he must be faithful unto death, in order to receive the crown of life. Up to the hour in which his faithful obedience to the cause for which he was sent into the world should culminate, no man may rightly accuse him of sin; the prince of this world must have nothing in him. As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness as a sign of salvation, as a type of the Divine Word, who is the Saviour of all, so must the perfect organ of the Spirit, the incarnate Word, be lifted up, that all who trust in the power of God, represented by Him, might be saved. God must make the soul of that righteous servant who was without sin a sacrifice for sin. He must bear and take away the sin of others; he must propitiate by forsaking unrighteousness; and since 'the tasting of death toucheth the righteous also,'[1] He must die the atoning death of the righteous, and by His perfect righteousness make the perfect atonement. He must offer up to God not his soul only, but also his body, his blood; the Son of Man must be lifted up as the incarnate Word.

If the doctrine of Divine sonship had been fully understood by the disciples, sorrow would not have filled their heart because of their Lord's saying that he must go to the Father. Christ, therefore, had to tell them: 'It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.' It will not now be

[1] Wisd. xviii. 20.

difficult to suggest an explanation of this very difficult passage, which may be in harmony with, and a natural and necessary deduction from, the peculiar point of view above delineated, with respect to the sending of 'another' comforter or advocate. If we have succeeded in showing that Christ regarded himself as the organ or advocate of the Divine Spirit from above; if we bear in mind that although he clearly identified himself with the Divine Word, the light of men in all ages, yet that he declared Himself to be the light of the world, not for ever, but only for as long as he was 'in the world,' then we must expect that as his days in the flesh were coming to a close, he would tell his disciples in what manner the light would in future be conveyed to them and to the world. That 'true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world' was in its fulness then dwelling 'with,' but not 'in' His disciples.[1] This 'Spirit which they that believe on Him should receive,' that is, 'the Holy Ghost, was not yet given.'[2] The seed of the Word was planted in their hearts; and occasionally, as in the case of Peter, it revealed to them what flesh and blood alone could not have revealed, but it did not remain in them. Had it been otherwise, they would have understood that Christ is in the Father, and they in Christ, and He in them.

Of this, then, there can be no doubt, that the full recognition of Christ, even by His chosen disciples, was left to a future 'day.' The question arises, whether the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, which the world could not then receive, and which, abiding with them, should lead Christ's disciples into all truth, was intended to be conveyed to them all at once in its fulness; whether once given it would abide with future generations in its never-varying power, or whether, like the rolling stone cut without hands, which became a great mountain, and gradually covered the earth, the Spirit which shall lead into all

[1] xiv. 17. [2] vii. 39.

CHAP. XIII.

truth will be given in an ever increasing measure, according to the capabilities and requirements of future generations. The spiritual kingdom which Christ announced, the kingdom of heaven, or, as Paul says, of 'Christ within,' is not stationary but progressive. Whether or not its perfect realisation, which is reserved for the future, will be imperfectly typified by a terrestrial organisation, by the millennium of the latter days, there will be a time of reaping on earth, a time so immeasurably more favourable to the establishment of the truth than the apostolic age, that to the seer at Patmos was revealed the absolute identity of heaven and earth.

We have pointed out that Christ has taught, developed, and applied the apocryphal doctrine about the Divine Word, which in all ages entered into the souls of chosen men, for the purpose of making them sons of God. We explained that the introductory part of the Gospel after John recapitulates the principles of this pre-Christian hidden wisdom, and declares that in Christ the Word became flesh. By this complete realisation of the Holy Spirit's mission, the universal character of the same has not been abolished. Because Christ is, like Isaac, not merely born of the flesh, but of the Spirit; because he is from above, and born of God; because in the unity of the Spirit he is one with the Father, from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds; it does not follow that henceforth the Word from the beginning is no more the 'true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,' giving Him power to become a son of God. Christ, the incarnate Word, declares, on the contrary, that He will be in them *as* He is in the Father; that as He has spoken God's words and done His works, so they shall speak the words of the Father, and do even greater works in His name.[1]

The Spirit of God works by human means. It spoke and worked in and through the advocacy and instrumentality of the 'man' who came after 'a man sent from

[1] xv. 20; xiv. 12.

God;' of the man who declared that he, like all other men, could do nothing of himself, but that it must be given him from above; 'a Man . . . that told the truth;' whom no man could convince of sin; who knew 'all things,' even what was 'in man;' and who did the works which 'none other man' had yet done. As much as circumstances admitted, he encouraged his fellow-men to serve him by following him.[1] He assured them that the success of his followers in disseminating the truth and doing the works of the Father would be not only of a similar nature to his own, but even greater. Not that they would, like him, receive the Spirit of God 'without measure,' but that the world would, after his departure, receive the same in a higher degree, and thus be brought to know and understand the spiritual unity between the Son and the Father, as also between the first-born and his brethren.

He must first go away, He must go to the Father, and for a time He must deprive the world of its true light. Then darkness may come even upon His chosen disciples. But He, their Master and Lord, will not leave them comfortless; He, the Spirit of God, will come unto them. As of old, the Divine Word will 'come' unto chosen individuals; but after His departure it will be the Spirit of Christ which will come unto His disciples, because it is one with the Spirit of God. Why was the coming of the Holy Ghost made dependent on the going away of Jesus? Why was Jesus, only during His days in the flesh, the light of the world? And, above all, why does Jesus promise 'another' comforter or advocate? If the Holy Ghost, which was in Christ without measure, was, after His departure, to be poured on His disciples, and through them on others, why did Christ distinguish between the Spirit which was in Him and the Spirit which was to be in the Apostles? It was not to be a lesser Spirit, either in itself or in conjunction with the Apostles, for it would enable them to do greater things than Christ had done.

[1] xii. 26.

CHAP. XIII.

Did He intend to distinguish between the Spirit of God in the form of a servant and the Spirit of God in the glorified Son of God? Are we to assume that the Spirit of God was not given without measure to the Son of Man? Then He whom the Father sanctified could not have been at one with the Father. Again, we know that in all ages the Divine Spirit did dwell with man, according to the desire of those who felt their need of a Saviour, and that they, by receiving the freely-offered Spirit of grace, received power to become sons of God. What was new was not *an* incarnation of the Divine Word, but *the perfect* incarnation of the same. From this it follows that He who *was* at one with the Father during the days of His flesh, could not have *become* one with the Father by His resurrection. Christ could never have given the name of 'another Comforter' to the Spirit which would proceed from the risen Son of Man, as also from the Father. Nor could He have thereby intended to refer to the time of the final Messianic accomplishment, or of His Apostles' capability to receive the fulness of the Spirit of Truth which was in Jesus. It is the selfsame Spirit which is to make all things new.

We hope now to have removed some of the principal objections which might be raised against the explanation of this mysterious passage, which our point of view seems naturally to suggest. If God, at sundry times and in various manners, has worked by means; if in all ages the Spirit of God has communed with the spirit of man; if before the days of Christ in the flesh, the Divine Spirit or Word did dwell with man, for the purpose of making him its perfect organ; if this mark of humanity's high calling could not be entirely reached because of man's disobedience; if the Man without sin was *the* Son of God, the *perfect* organ of the Divine Spirit; if his followers are likewise to be born of God, to hear and speak his words, and do his works; then the 'other' comforter or advocate must be 'another' instrument of the Spirit of Truth;

he must, in a certain degree, take the place which has been left vacant by Christ's departure; he must be the leading advocate of the Spirit which was in Christ; he must pre-eminently be the reaper of what Jesus has sown.

We have pointed out that Christ's prophecy of 'another' comforter or advocate seems to be directly connected with the prophecy of Zechariah about the 'two Anointed Ones,' who in the Apocalypse seem to be called the 'two Witnesses.' We have tried to establish the fact that the Messianic prophecies refer to two distinct individuals, to a Messianic sower and a Messianic reaper, the latter being directly connected with the setting up of the terrestrial kingdom in Zion, and being, notwithstanding his sinfulness, designated as the great king whom God would establish in Jerusalem at the end of Israel's bondage. Even Paul has acknowledged this future of Israel, which is to follow upon the time of Israel's blindness. Although, therefore, Paul was not the other advocate of whose coming Christ prophesied, yet he was the great forerunner of the same. The Lord says: 'And when he (the other Comforter) is come, he will reprove (or rather 'convince') the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.' We shall now have to show that hereby the cardinal doctrines of Paul are sufficiently indicated, and that the further explanation of these words, as given by the Lord, tends to confirm the view we have proposed as to Paul's having been the great forerunner of the terrestrial Messiah, the 'other' advocate of the Divine Spirit. Sin, righteousness, and judgment, these three expressions all refer to the doctrine of grace which Paul was the first fully to proclaim. Sin is disobedience to the voice of the inner man; a neglecting and loosing of the seed of the Word; a want of faith in the grace or power of God: righteousness is the fruit of holiness, the effect of Divine grace and human obedience, the fruition of the hidden seed of the Word: judgment is the result either of being under grace, or, by the continued sin against the Holy Ghost, of being

CHAP. XIII.

more or less excluded from its operation. Paul's doctrine of grace is the doctrine of the sonship, of the Divine power which in all ages gave power to them that were led by the Spirit of God, to become the sons of God. Since this 'great power from the beginning' has become incarnate in Jesus Christ, all judgment has been committed to the Son.[1] Sin is to love darkness better than light, and thus to grieve Christ within us; righteousness is to have faith in the unseen Christ; judgment is to be judged by the word of Christ,[2] by the Spirit of Holiness, through which the saints shall judge the world.[3] Yet all shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ,[4] those who, through their faith, have been led more or less by the Spirit of God, and those who, by habitually resisting its operation, by the sin against the Holy Ghost, have not been prepared for the Divine sonship, for the presence of God.

These cardinal doctrines of Christ, the 'other' Comforter is to teach convincingly to the world. He shall convince the world 'of sin, because they believe not in me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.' We have seen that this doctrine of the Divine Spirit in man, accusing him of sin, leading him to true righteousness, and judging him according to his disobedience, was a pre-Christian and apocryphal doctrine, the promulgation of which was strictly forbidden among the Jews in Palestine, whilst it formed the centre of the Jewish faith in Egypt. It is the doctrine which Christ has developed and applied to himself, and which he was prevented by the rulers of the Jewish Church from teaching otherwise than in secret and in darkness, and by mysterious parables. It was not possible for Christ to accomplish what even Paul was able to do, who, defying the restrictions of the Jews, and of the judaising Christians, proclaimed in light and on the housetops, the glorious gospel which Christ had sown.

[1] v. 22. [2] xii. 48. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 2; ii. 15. [4] Rom. xiv. 10.

Because the time had not come, when his own doctrines could be thus convincingly proclaimed to the world, Christ said, that it was expedient that he went to the Father; and that till he had done so, the other Comforter could not come. This requires to be further explained. To believe in Christ was to have faith in the indwelling Spirit of God, in the Lord who *is* the Spirit, and who by his perfect obedience unto death, was to manifest to the world his love of God. The faith in true righteousness, as the fruit of holiness, implied the belief in the love of One who was loved, though not seen, because he went to the Father. Christ, the Messianic sower, must first die, the seed of the Word must first fall into the ground and die, before it can bring forth fruit, before the Messianic reaper can be sent. Again, the doctrine of judgment could not be convincingly taught to the world, that is to Gentiles as well as to Jews, till it had become apparent to the eyes of the same that the Jewish nation of those days, whose rulers were the instruments of the prince of this world, was judged. For these reasons the departure of Christ was expedient, and a necessary condition of the coming of the other Comforter.

Knowing that his departure would be followed by the anointing of another chosen instrument of the Divine Spirit; and knowing that the Apostles he had chosen whilst on earth could not then receive the required fulness of the Holy Ghost, Christ said to them: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall *receive* of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall *take* of mine, and shall show it unto you.'

The Spirit of Truth is by Christ called his own, and likewise the Father's; because in his case there was an

CHAP. XIII.

absolute identity between cause and effect. Of this fulness all who are children of God receive grace by grace; but like the other advocate in the days of Israel's redemption, Paul was to receive an unusual measure of the same, so as to take up the doctrine of Christ, to show it in light to those who had only heard it in darkness, and to those to whom it had been but partly and mystically revealed through parables; and finally to *proclaim the same* to the greater part of the world.

The other apostles would likewise receive such a measure of the Spirit of Truth as to understand the communications which Paul would make unto them, and to remember all what the Lord had told them, which things Paul would bring to their remembrance. They *also* were to be witnesses. Thus, then, the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit upon the apostles was but a preparatory act, followed by that transcendent communication made by the risen Christ unto Paul, which was the cause of his conversion, and of his communicating his Gospel to the apostles and to the world.

This view about the mission of the other Comforter having begun to be fully accomplished in and by Paul is also confirmed by the intimate connection between his doctrine and that of Christ, and is supported by the fact that this apostle preached 'another' gospel than that which the twelve apostles at first proclaimed; that to the original gospel he added 'the gospel which should afterwards be revealed.' Although, therefore, the apostles were endued with a power from on high before Paul's conversion through that selfsame power; although in receiving the Spirit of Truth they received Christ, and were not left comfortless; although they did see the risen Saviour whom the world did not see; although, after the Lord's departure, they had even learnt to know what it is for man to be in Christ, and for Christ to be in the Father;[1] yet it was left to Paul further to enlighten

[1] xiv. 18-20.

them and the world, and thus to pave the way for the time when the second witness in Zion would, as a special advocate of the Divine Spirit, lead the world into all truth. As Paul was in his days, so will the great king in Jerusalem be in his time, the light of the world, the least imperfect personification of the Spirit of Truth, the personified vicar of Christ, whilst Christ is the perfect organ of the Spirit, is the personal vicar of God. As Christ came in the 'name' or Spirit of the Father,[1] so the other Comforter, the other chosen organ of the Holy Ghost, although a sinner, will come in the 'name' or Spirit of Christ. Hence it follows that, essentially like the advocate in heaven, the 'other' advocate on earth, that is, the Divine Spirit within him, will proceed from the Father; that he will be born of God, will be sent by Him, will hear and speak God's words, will do His works, will teach, remind, testify, convince, and show the way. Like Christ, and as Paul, in a measure, the second advocate of the Messianic time will have 'an unction from the Holy One,' and will 'know all things.'[2] The seed of the Word will abide in him, and he will not need that any man should teach him, but the 'same anointing will teach him all things.'[3] Through him the world will know the Spirit of God, inasmuch as he, as a chosen instrument of the same, will confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,[4] and he will be a witness of Jesus through the spirit of prophecy.[5]

Christ now tells His disciples that in a little while they shall not see Him, and therefore shall weep, lament, and be sorrowful; but that after another little while they shall see Him whom the world shall not see, and that thereby their sorrow shall be turned into joy, like the joy of a woman delivered of a child. The apparitions of the risen Christ will give to the apostles the positive assurance that the doctrines of the Divine sonship are not so many

[1] v. 43. [2] 1 John ii. 20. [3] 1 John iii. 9; ii. 27; Gal. i. 12.
[4] 1 John iv. 2. [5] Rev. xix. 10.

CHAP. XIII.

idle tales, but founded on the reality of the future life, of the raising of the natural body to a spiritual body. Having seen the first-born among many brethren, they know that because He lives they shall live also and be where He is; they know that the groaning after the manifestation of the children of God may now cease, inasmuch that Christ is risen, the first-fruit of them that sleep; they know that the days will surely come when the breath of the power of God will enter into the dry bones, the days of Israel's spiritual regeneration, which Isaiah had described in the figure of a virgin who should give birth to a child, whose name would be 'God with us.' The disciples will then remember no more their sorrow, for joy that a man is born into the world who is not only born of the flesh, but of the Spirit; who is born of God, who, like the incarnate Word, is God manifested in the flesh, God with us. This joy no man shall take from them, though they shall not live to see the birth of the Immanuel-Israel.

They are not to ask Christ for anything, but they are to ask the Father in the name or spirit of Christ. To believe that He came out from God is to love Christ, and to be loved by the Father himself. 'These things *have I spoken unto you in proverbs*, but the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but *I shall show you plainly* of the Father.' He has told them before that this more perfect knowledge would be given them on a future day, yet they thought that He spoke already then plainly and not in proverbs. They thought that they already then believed. But Christ had to tell them that, far from this being the case, the hour had come when even they, like the children of Jezreel, would be scattered 'every man to his own,' and when they would leave Him alone on His way to the cross. But He is not alone, because the Father is with Him. His righteous soul is 'in the hand of God,' He is 'in peace;' but even His chosen disciples, as a body at least, live 'in

the great war of ignorance;'[1] they know not the things belonging to their peace.[2] Let them have peace in Him, and notwithstanding the tribulation which awaits them in the world, let them be of good cheer, for He has overcome the world. CHAP. XIII.

Christ has overcome the world. This was in all ages the mission of the indwelling Spirit or Word of God. But the grace freely given had been freely opposed. By making a wrong use of the liberty with which God had endowed him, man had more or less opposed his own will to the sanctification which, by the will of God, the breath of His power was to effect. Such a sin against the Holy Ghost must become fatal to humanity unless a perfect propitiation and atonement is made. Atonement comes by righteousness, and righteousness or holiness comes by the Word of God. Ever since the first Adam's fall, the Divine Word, the healer of all things, the Saviour of all, has striven to bring His mission of mercy to good effect by not abhorring to dwell in the defiled hearts of men, by making intercession for them with unutterable groanings. And the Father, the source of all good, the giver of every perfect gift, He with whom the Divine Word was in the beginning, and who had sent it from above to dwell with man below, the Father of Spirits and God of all flesh, has heard the intercession of this mediator between the creature and the Creator. As the Word of God had made angels the messengers conveying and representing His presence, so the name of God was in measure glorified in the flesh. The heavenly Monitor revealed to man the mysteries of his high calling by gradually perfecting chosen vessels as ministers of His to do His pleasure. Wisdom brought man out of his fall, and raised friends and sons of God among sons of men. Ch. XVII.

But the Spirit of God had still to strive with the spirit

[1] Wis. iii. 3; xiv. 22. [2] Luke xix. 42.

CHAP. XIII.

of man; the enmity had not yet been abolished in the flesh; the carnal birth had not ceased to be a hindrance to the spiritual birth; the Holy Ghost continued to be imprisoned in the fleshy tenement of the soul, as a stranger and sojourner on this earth. The Divine Word had given in all ages power, to them that received it as a welcome guest, to become sons of God. The Spirit of God had testified to the Spirit of man that he is the child of God. And yet the Spirit of the creature had not become one with the Spirit of the Creator; no perfect incarnation of the Divine Word had taken place; the mark of humanity's high calling had not been fully reached; mankind was not yet raised to the Godhead in the person of the first-born among many brethren.

In the fulness of time the second Adam, the second Isaac, the second David, the Son of Man and the Son of God, was born, not only of the flesh, but of the Spirit: the Word became flesh. To the living soul was added the fulness of the quickening Spirit, and man became a new creature. Henceforth the descent from Abraham or from David, the observance of the Mosaic law, of the slave which had led the children of Israel to the school of Christ, availed nothing. The day which Abraham rejoiced to see had come, when the law of Sinai was no longer permitted to render of none effect the universal gospel of righteousness by faith, which was revealed to Abraham, the inhabitant of Ur of the Chaldees. A man was sent of God who heard and spoke the words of God, and who did His works; such works which no other man had yet done, and which were to be the forerunners of still greater works, which the Spirit of God would perform through the instrumentality of man. He that should come had come; He whom the Father had sanctified; He who, having received the Spirit of God without measure, did not deem it robbery to be equal with God, although he had come in the form of a servant, in the form of the first Adam, who was made in the image of

God; He who was to renew that image, and thus to change the nature of man into the nature of God.

As of old, so in the days of Christ, it was the destiny of men to be gods. A beginning had to be made in the fullest possible realisation of the will of God concerning man. He who upheld the standard of the Divine sonship, by reminding his fellow men that the Scripture speaks of them as gods, he openly declared that he and his Father are at one, that the Son of Man is the Son of God, the perfect organ of the Holy Ghost, the manifestation of God in the flesh.

We have followed Jesus of Nazareth in his gradual revelation of himself as the incarnate Word, both by words and by deeds. He is the water of life, the bread of life, the light of the world, the resurrection and the life, the only-begotten of the Father, the temple of the Holy Ghost, the impersonification of the Holy One, the unction from above. And now, the hour having come in which, through Him, the name of God should be glorified, He 'lifted up his eyes to heaven and said: Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee.' Of himself, even the Son can do nothing; it must be given him of the Father. But the Father 'seeketh such' who worship him in spirit and in truth, and whatever the Son will ask of the Father, he will give it him.

The Son, who had been led by the Spirit of God to a degree in which no other man had been led before; He whom the Father had sanctified, and who, in the unity of the Spirit, was one with His God; Jesus now asks the Father that He would manifest to the world this Oneness, by glorifying the Son that He may glorify the Father. And how is the Son, and through Him the Father, to be glorified? In a twofold manner. God is to take His Son unto Himself, and to keep, through His own name or Spirit, those whom He has given to the Son, and who are to be one in God the Father, even as the Son is one with the same. The Divine sonship having been accomplished

CHAP. XIII.

in the first-born through sanctification and obedience, it is not to die out in humanity, but is to continue for ever in and through mankind. The medium of sanctification, the Mediator of this Oneness between the creature and the Creator, remains the same; it is the Divine Spirit, which will proceed from a double source when Jesus shall have ceased to be the light of the world, when He shall be the Spirit and Advocate at the right hand of the Father. The mission of the selfsame Spirit will be carried on, and in due time this will be done, chiefly through the instrumentality of 'another' Comforter, whom the Father will sanctify through the Spirit of Truth, by giving Him power to carry out his decrees. But since the redeeming Word of God has found its perfect advocate on earth, its mission devolves upon him. It is no longer the Anointing Spirit, but the Anointed Man, to whom God has given 'power over all flesh,' that He should give eternal life to as many as He has given Him. To know the Father, the Sanctifier, as 'the only true God,' and Jesus Christ as Him whom He has sent, whom He has sanctified, who proceeded from God, 'this is life eternal.'

The living soul of the first Adam required after his fall the quickening spirit of the second Adam. Not that at any time God had left himself without a witness in man. But the indwelling power of God was sinned against; for although the Word was nigh unto men, was written in their hearts, yet their conscience did bear witness in all ages, that the Spirit of man opposed the Spirit of God. The Father asked in vain for the free-will-offering of his son's heart. It became a stony ground on which the seed of the Word of God could not take root. It did not remain in him, and it had even to be withdrawn for a time. Yet the living soul of man was the germ of life eternal, the abode of the Divine Spirit. As the Spirit or name of God was in the Angel of his presence, so was it likewise in Moses, the shepherd of the flock, and in the children of Israel, the sheep of that flock. Thus was

typified the shepherd and bishop of the souls of men, of the sheep who form his flock. He has glorified the Father on the earth, he has finished the work which he gave him to do; and the Father, who is a spirit, will glorify the Son, with the Divine glory, with God's 'own self,' with that Word which was in the beginning with God, and which was God, which has been manifested in the flesh, which has become flesh, which has become one with the Spirit of Christ, which has become Christ's 'own self.'

As through the Spirit of God Christ has been drawn to the Father, so through the same Divine agency, men were and are drawn to Christ. He has manifested the name or Spirit of God unto the men which God gave him out of the world. The sheep who hear his voice and who follow him are those who were God's before they became Christ's, who have kept the Word of God in an honest and good heart, and who have known that 'all things whatsoever' the Father has given to the Son are of God. He has done nothing of himself. The words which the Father has given him he has given to his sheep, and they have received them, and known surely that Christ came from God and was sent by him. The good shepherd prays not for the world which then could not receive the Spirit of Truth, but for those who being willingly led by the Spirit of God were the children of God, joint heirs with Christ, ingrafted on the vine which the Father had planted, soldiers fighting under the leadership of the Captain of Salvation, members of one body, directed by its head, which is Christ, whilst Christ is God's.

These children of God and of Christ, in and by whom the name of God is sanctified;[1] these who like Christ are accepted with their sweet savour,[2] the Spirit of the Lord will lead to rest,[3] to that rest which remains for the people of God,[4] to the rest of their souls,[5] to the yoke of Christ

[1] Ez. xxviii. 25; xxxvi. 22-27. [2] Ez. xx. 41. [3] Is. lxiii. 14.
[4] Heb. iv. 9. [5] Jer. vi. 16; Mat. xi. 28.

CHAP. XIII.

and to his glory.[1] Those who ask for and receive the Spirit of God, they are given to Christ, they come to him as the iron is attracted by the magnet, they are drawn by the Father. Christ will in nowise cast them out,[2] for they are still in the Father's hand, and no man is able to pluck them out.[3] As it was the same Spirit which was in Moses and in the children of Israel, so it is the selfsame Spirit of God which is in Christ and in his flock. It is through the operation of the Holy Ghost, and through the willing obedience to the same, that Jesus and that his followers have been sanctified. Both were in the right way which leads to eternal life, in running the race which was set before them. Jesus, whilst pressing towards the mark of humanity's high calling, towards the glory which was set before him, was the 'One' who received the prize; the Captain *led* the way, and he *became* the way, the truth, and the life. As the Father keeps *through his own 'name'* those who are his, so Christ has kept *through the same 'name' of God* those whom the Father gave unto him; except the son of perdition, who in betraying Christ sinned against the Holy Ghost. As one of them was lost by his own will, so others may in the hour of temptation fall away, unless the Son recommends them to the keeping of the Father, now that he is about to leave the world, when he will be no longer the light of the world. They are to increase in the knowledge of the Divine sonship; they are to become one even as the Son is one with the Father, they are to have '*fully in themselves*' the joy of Christ.

As such to whom the Divine Word has given power to become sons of God, the followers of Christ, like himself, belong to the Father, who has handed them over to the Son. 'They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world;' that is, like Christ, they are not merely born after the flesh, but after the spirit. 'And the world has hated them,' just as of old 'he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit;'[4] be-

[1] Eccl. li. 25–27. [2] vi. 37, 44. [3] x. 29. [4] Gal. iv. 29.

cause 'the carnal mind is enmity against God,' and against those who are born of God.[1] But though they were God's and Christ's, their spiritual birth had but commenced, they had not reached 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;'[2] they were 'yet carnal,' even 'babes in Christ.'[3] For this reason, because they had not yet been perfected in the divine sonship, the Captain of Salvation, who had been made perfect, the first-born among many brethren, the first-born of all creatures, the only-begotten of the Father, said: 'I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee.' They are to be perfected in the sonship, therefore the tree must not yet be cut down, though he bear no fruit. If they were now taken out of the world they would not come to the Father, and be one with him. 'I pray, not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from evil.' It is the name or Spirit of God which has made them the Father's children, by ingrafting the spiritual birth on the carnal birth. Through that same name Christ has kept them, and now that he leaves the world the Father is again to keep them from evil. For the evil One may come and take away the seed of the word out of their hearts;[4] and if this seed remain not in them they may lose the sonship altogether.[5] But even now they are not of the world, even as Christ is not of the world. Both have been sanctified by the Father. The One who obtained the prize received the Spirit of Truth without measure; he was 'anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows;'[6] he was in the unity of the Spirit one with the Father. Being sanctified he became the sanctifier, and 'through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God.'[7] Others had also received the oil of gladness, 'the joy' of Christ, but not in its fulness; yet 'both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one.'[8]

[1] Rom. viii. 7. [2] Eph. iv. 13. [3] 1 Cor. iii. 1–4. [4] Luke viii. 11, 12.
[5] 1 John iii. 9. [6] Heb. i. 9. [7] Heb. ix. 14. [8] Heb. ii. 11.

CHAP. XIII.

'Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' Christ *is* the truth, because he has the seed of the word remaining in him, which word is truth. In the consciousness of His Oneness with the sanctifying Spirit or Word of God, he says that he sanctifies himself for the sake of his fellow-men. These are to behold his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father; the true light of the world is to shine in the face of the Son, in the image of God; they are to hear, to see with their eyes, to look upon, to handle Him who is 'of the Word of Life,' they are to be 'eye-witnesses of the Word.' Seeing 'the image of the invisible God,'[1] they are to be 'conformed' to that image.[2] All who believe on him do so 'through *their* word,' through 'the glory' which the Father gave to the Son, and which the Son has given to those who were being led by the Spirit of God. Not only those followers of Christ who then surrounded him, but all who at any time shall believe in Christ through their word, are to 'be made perfect in one,' in the unity of that Word through which God is in Christ and Christ in all believers. The world is to know that God has loved them as He has loved Christ. They are to be where he is, 'that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.'

In the beginning, when the Word was with God, and was God; before that the Word came down from heaven to dwell with man, to give power to them who received it, to become sons of God; before Abraham, before Adam, God had fixed the mark of humanity's high calling in the predestinated Anointed One, in Christ, the second Adam. The Father saw and rejoiced in the day of his Son. He loved the Son of the fulness of times, whom he

[1] Col. i. 15. [2] Rom. viii. 29.

did foreknow and predestinate according to the eternal purpose of his will. And with the same love he loved in all ages those who received his Word, and were thereby enabled to be initiated in his sonship; those who were the Father's own, before they were given to the Son. Until the fulness of time had come, all those whom God did foreknow, he predestinated that they should be conformed to the image of his Son, of that ideal pattern of humanity, of that pattern of heavenly things, which he aboriginally did contemplate, foreknow, and predestinate. And whereas in all ages the Spirit of God makes intercession for the saints 'according to the will of God,' Jesus the Christ, the perfect embodiment or organ of that Spirit, the pattern of heavenly things on earth, and also the advocate with the Father, Christ makes intercession for those who, in the unity of that selfsame Spirit, are to be in him as he is in God. Even his chosen disciples are not yet 'sanctified through the truth,' although Christ has given them the glory which the Father had given him. They are not yet one with the Father, as the Son is one with Him. They have not already overcome the world.[1] And still the Father, who loved the Son 'before the foundation of the world,' *has* loved them *as* he loved him. The Master and his servants are all predestinated to be sons of God. His disciples know that the Father has sent the Son, and that he has declared unto them the name or Spirit of God. This declaration, this gift, will be continued, in order that the love of God in Christ, that Christ himself, may dwell in them. All is theirs, they are Christ's, and Christ is God's.[2] Therefore the love of God is the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, the communion or fellowship of the Holy Ghost. And in this sense the Church of Christ joins in the after-apostolic hymn of praise:—'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.'

[1] Comp. Rev. ii. 7.

[2] 1 Cor. iii. 22.

CHAP. XIII.

Conclusion.

The principal object of the Gospel after John is to proclaim the secret doctrine of Jesus in the very words in which the same had been communicated to his disciples. Only by so doing could it be proved that Jesus taught neither the doctrine of the Jewish Ebionites, nor of the Docetics. Christian Gnosticism was thus shown to be the development and application of the pre-Christian Hidden or Apocryphal Wisdom, as sanctioned by Jesus the Christ, and as first publicly and fully proclaimed by Paul. To the elementary doctrine of Christ was added his more perfect, his deeper and more ideal teaching. The former contained in an allegorical form the rudiments of the latter. The words referring to the one were spoken by him in public; those that referred to the other were uttered in private. And whilst the public teaching of Christ was exclusively clothed in parables, his private teaching was more plain as well as full, although it neither excluded parables nor further enlightenment in future.

It is for these reasons that we only find in the fourth gospel the gradual development of those circumstances which led to the crucifixion of Jesus. In the first three gospels we find the record of a but one-sided Messianic expectation. Even the chosen disciples hoped that their Master would set up the terrestrial kingdom which the prophets had announced, and which Jesus had not denounced, but confirmed, by referring to the uncertainty of the time of its accomplishment. Again, the people expected a Son of David in the flesh, and they received Jesus with enthusiasm on his entry into Jerusalem, hoping that he would fulfil the Messianic prophecies. When the people saw that instead of being crowned he was crucified, even his disciples left him and fled, whilst the Jewish rulers were able to carry out their plans without meeting with any opposition. The people are represented to have been almost as hostile to Jesus as its rulers. Not so in the fourth gospel. Even on the first occasion when Jesus was in Jerusalem, 'many believed in his name

when they saw the miracles which he did;' but knowing 'what was in man, he did not commit himself unto them.'[1] He knew that the rulers had purposely kept the people in ignorance by taking away the key of knowledge; that is, by forbidding the doctrine of the sonship through the Divine Word, 'the Saviour of all.' 'The temple of his body' was consequently a mystery unto the people. This Hidden Wisdom is therefore by the Evangelist purposely referred to in the part immediately following, where the words are recorded in which Christ taught the necessity of regeneration to a Pharisee who dared not to visit him by day. Notwithstanding the jealous suspicion of the Pharisees, Jesus made more disciples than John. This jealousy is stated to have been the cause of his leaving Judea,[2] and it is shown to have led to persecution when, on his next visit to the city, he cured the impotent man on a Sabbath. Because Jesus taught the Hidden Wisdom of the sonship, because he identified himself with the Divine Word, thus making himself equal with God his Father, 'therefore the Jews (that is, the rulers) sought the more to kill him.'

The people of Galilee, seeing the miracles of Jesus, said: 'This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world;' they even 'would come and take him by force to make him a king.' But when he spoke to them on another occasion about his being 'the bread which came down from heaven,' the Jews 'murmured' at a statement, the meaning of which would only be understood by those who had some knowledge of the Hidden Wisdom.[3] It was because the Jews, that is, their rulers, 'sought to kill him,' that Jesus walked into Galilee, and that he doubted whether he would go up to Jerusalem unto the feast of tabernacles. On this occasion some held him to be a good man, others a deceiver, and 'no man spake openly of him for fear of the Jews.' And when he taught in the temple, he taught the Hidden Wisdom, that is, a doctrine of which no man was supposed to know

[1] ii. 23–25. [2] iv. 1–3. [3] vi. 14, 15, 41.

CHAP. XIII.

anything unless he belonged to the learned. This led to a division among the people, some considering him as a prophet, others as the Christ, although he was a Galilean. So great was his success among the people that, although 'some would have taken him, yet no man laid hands on him.' The officers sent by the Pharisees and chief priests to take him, returned without him, saying: 'Never man spake like this man.' Then answered them the Pharisees: 'Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed.' In vain Nicodemus pointed out that the Pharisees have not even heard him, nor knew what he did.[1]

Among those who did hear him there were many who, not knowing even the first rudiments of the Hidden Wisdom, could not understand why Jesus said that they were not of God, and that he who kept his sayings would never see death. They, therefore, said: 'Thou hast a devil;' and they took up stones to cast at him; when he said: 'Before Abraham was, I am.'[2] Then we are told that even among the Pharisees there was a division, some saying that he was not of God, because he did not keep the Sabbath, others pointing to his miracles as a manifestation of his sinless character. Although some of the Pharisees acknowledged that a man if born of God could be sinless, yet they had all agreed, 'that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.' And the man who was born blind, and whose sight had been restored, was cast out by the Pharisees because he tried to prove to them that Jesus must be sinless, inasmuch as God had in so marvellous a manner shown that he heard him.[3] There was again a division among the Jews because of this miracle. Therefore some ask him: 'If thou be the Christ tell us plainly.' This he does not do, but he declares that the works done in his Father's name testify of him. 'Therefore they sought

[1] vii. [2] viii. [3] ix.

again to take him, but he escaped out of their hand,' whilst 'many resorted to him,' and 'believed on him there,' seeing that what John had said about him was true.[1]

Again, after the miracle of the resurrection of Lazarus, 'many of the Jews' believed on him. When the Pharisees heard of this, they and the chief priests held a council, in order to prevent 'all men' from following him, and they determined 'to put him to death.' Jesus having retired to Ephraim, they gave a commandment, that 'if any man knew where he were he should show it, that they might take him.'[2] And when much people of the Jews went to Bethany to see Jesus and Lazarus, the chief priests 'consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death, because by reason of him many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus.' His triumphant entry into Jerusalem showed to the Pharisees that all 'the world,' including Greeks, had gone after him. And yet there were many who had 'heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever,' and who could not understand why he should die. Jesus therefore departed and hid himself from them. For the eyes of the Jews were blinded, and their hearts hardened, by the concealing conduct of their rulers, so that they could not be converted and healed by the incarnate Word 'that healeth all things,' by 'the Saviour of all.' And 'nevertheless among the chief rulers many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.'[3]

We have seen that the betrayal of Jesus by Judas seems to have consisted principally in his informing the Jewish rulers that Jesus had taught and applied to himself the Hidden Wisdom. By so doing he had declared himself to be the incarnate Word. Determined to conceal the Hidden Wisdom, the Pharisees and chief

[1] x. [2] xi. [3] xii.

CHAP. XIII.

priests caused Jesus to be crucified. If the doctrine of the Word of God as the Saviour of all in all ages was conceived to be dangerous to the Jewish hierarchy, more dangerous still was the man Jesus, the incarnate Word from the beginning.

A minute investigation of the contents of the fourth gospel of our canon has strongly confirmed the view which we have tried to establish. Christ spoke to the people in parables, and to his disciples in secret. The reason for this was, that his doctrine consisted in a development and application of the hidden or apocryphal doctrine, which up to the time of the Babylonian Captivity did not form part of the Jewish national faith, and which after this period, contrary to the practice prevailing in Egypt, was in Palestine permitted only as a verbal doctrine, to be secretly transmitted by those few to whom it had been confided under grave restrictions and obligations. The twelve Apostles had been commanded by their Master to proclaim, on the housetops, what he had communicated to them in secret; but they were not told to do so at once. After the crucifixion of Jesus, the circumstances were even less favourable to the growing up of the seed which Christ had sown than they had been during his life on earth. Moreover, the general expectation among Christians, that the final fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies would take place at the time of the evidently approaching destruction of Jerusalem, confirmed the Apostles in their opinion, that it was useless to attempt preaching the Hidden Wisdom of Christ, so long as the rulers of the Jewish theocracy were able to exercise their authority, to the full satisfaction of their selfish jealousy. It was Paul who proclaimed on the housetops the Hidden Wisdom of Christ. By this fearless conduct the mission, if not the very life of the twelve Apostles, was seriously endangered. If the Pharisees had persecuted their Master, his disciples were in danger of being likewise persecuted. If the principal cause of the persecution of Jesus was his having taught the Hidden

Wisdom secretly in private, and mysteriously in public, then a similar conduct on the part of the Apostles would have led to a similar treatment. As it was, they were so closely watched by the Pharisees, that of the rest of the scattered disciples no one durst join himself unto them, although they were magnified even by the people of Jerusalem. CHAP. XIII.

Meanwhile the Apostles kept all their Master's sayings faithfully in their hearts. One of their number, Matthew, recorded those of the words of Christ which he had addressed to the people, and the publication of which the Pharisees could not and did not prohibit. Another of them, the disciple whom Jesus loved, secretly recorded those of his sayings which he had addressed to them only, and which referred to the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. These mysteries continued to be hidden from the people, till Paul began publicly to proclaim them, perhaps after a lengthened period of preparation. More than seventeen years after his conversion, the Apostles at Jerusalem gave him the hand of fellowship, and from that time the Apostles supported Paul in the preaching of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ. Only the Apostle John seems to have survived the destruction of Jerusalem; but it was not till about half a century after his death that his apocryphal and supplementary gospel was edited, and this, probably, by one or more of the presbyters of the Roman church.

Unless we have utterly failed in our attempt to suggest a scriptural solution for two of the most important problems of biblical research, we may hope to have pointed out in what direction such a solution must be sought. What is essentially new in Christianity is the application to an historical individual of the more perfect knowledge about heavenly things, and the perfect manifestation of such gnosis by the life and death of a man. The germs of this knowledge were in the possession of Moses, of Abraham, and of Adam. Yet it was, as a mystery, kept secret since the

CHAP. XIII.

world began. This was systematically accomplished by the guardians of secret tradition, who sat in the seat of Moses. By these spiritual rulers of the chosen nation, the key of knowledge was in course of time taken away, so that the things belonging to the peace of Jerusalem were hidden before the eyes of the people. But the Spirit of Truth worked mightily in Paul and in other Apostles and disciples of Jesus; the talents intrusted to their stewardship were turned to account; and though the spirit of the Jewish hierarchy survived the destruction of Jerusalem, yet in course of time the hidden apostolic record of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ was brought to light, the mystery of the sonship was revealed, and by Divine enlightenment it was gradually interpreted in accordance with the true meaning of the words spoken by the Son of God.

'Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.'[1]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 57.

CHAPTER XIV.

CHRONOLOGY.

THE SEVENTY WEEKS—THE SEVEN THOUSAND YEARS—PROBABLE YEARS OF THE BIRTH AND DEATH OF JESUS.

'I am God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done.'—Is. xlvi. 9–10.

THE beginning of the Babylonian Captivity seems to have been used as an era; at least from the time of Israel's return to the Holy Land, when Ezra edited the Holy Scriptures. In the year 516 the new temple was consecrated, and this solemn event marked the close of the seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy, the commencement of which was dated from the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar. For although already two years before this catastrophe Jerusalem was conquered, and the first deportation had taken place, yet it was the destruction of the sanctuary which the prophet would mark as the end of one period and the beginning of another. It was in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar that Nebusaraddan was dispatched for the destruction of the temple, and for the deportation of the able-bodied among the remnant of the people. Now, since Nebuchadnezzar was proclaimed as 'King of Babylon'[1] in the year 604 B.C., the destruction of the temple took place in the year 586. The seventy years of Jeremiah, therefore, may be assumed to have begun in 586 and to

[1] 2 Kings xxv. 8.

CHAP. XIV.

have ended in 516; that is, in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspes, when the new temple was consecrated.

But Daniel had already prepared the people not to expect so soon the Messianic times.[1] When were the seventy weeks to begin, and what would be their duration? They might be sabbathical years or jubilee years. But it was impossible to overlook the fact that, exactly fifty years after the destruction of the temple, that is, at the end of the first jubilee year of the Captivity, the order was given for the reconstruction of the sanctuary. If, then, the first jubilee period, that is, the fiftieth year of the Captivity, had brought the end of the latter, how far more glorious will be the end of the final scattering of Israel in the fiftieth jubilee, or jubilee of jubilees! Thus the prophecy of Jeremiah would be regarded as a type of the prophecy of Daniel. The history of the first seventy years after the destruction of the temple foreshadowed to the Israelites their future history, to which the seventy weeks of Daniel referred. It was the fall of Babylon which caused the return to the Holy Land and the rebuilding of the sanctuary at the expiration of fifty years, dating from its destruction. Earlier prophets, principally Zechariah, had announced the fall of the Babylon of the latter days as an event which was to usher in the Messianic time.[2] Daniel had shown that the time of Israel's restoration will be the time of the destruction of Israel's enemies. The four beasts, or kings of the Gentiles,[3] who have 'scattered' Israel, must fall, so that the time of Israel's redemption may draw nigh. And when the last enemy has been conquered, and his dominion taken away, then 'the saints of the Most High,' the 'sons of the living God,' shall take and possess the kingdom for ever.[4] When the time of the Gentiles shall be over, when the measure of iniquity shall have been filled,[5] when 'the time of servitude is

[1] Dan. ix. 24. [2] Zech. i. 12–21, &c. [3] Dan. vii. 17; comp. Zech. i. 19; vi. 1–8.
[4] Dan. vii. 26, 18; Hos. i. 10. [5] Zech. v. 6–11.

accomplished' and 'iniquity pardoned,' then Israel shall receive 'of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.[1] The time will have come 'to seal the sins, to cover transgression, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal revelation and seers, and to anoint a Most Holy.'[2]

If the fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy about the seventy years was intended as a type and sign of the fulfilment of the seventy weeks of Daniel, then the last fall of Babylon might be expected previous to the fiftieth week or jubilee period, that is, before the commencement of 2,500 years, dating from the beginning of the Danielic period. Thus from the fiftieth to the seventieth jubilee period, twenty jubilees, or a thousand years, would elapse, as the period for the final accomplishment of the Messianic prophecies; and these last twenty jubilee periods would correspond with the last twenty years of Jeremiah's prophecy. Similar to the latter the prophecy of Daniel ends with the anointing or consecration of a 'Most Holy.' This will be the consummation of the millennial dispensation, whose beginning will be ushered in by the fall of Babylon, which is to be brought about by the rising of nation against nation, by the forerunner of the new Israel's redemption.

The question now arises, when the seventy jubilee periods of Daniel have commenced. Only two explanations seem to be justifiable. Either they begun conjointly with the seventy years of Jeremiah, that is, in the year of the destruction of the temple, 586 B.C., or in the year of the consecration of the new temple at the expiration of the seventy years, that is, 516 B.C. The latter hypothesis we reject, inasmuch as Daniel's prophecy cannot be assumed to have begun at a time subsequent to that of Daniel, since the latter does not refer to the fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy, that is, to the rebuilding of the temple in the Holy Land. He passes over that and the

[1] Is. xl. 1; comp. Ex. xxii. 4, 7. [2] Dan. ix. 24.

CHAP. XIV.

subsequent period altogether, referring only in general terms to the gradual destruction of the kings of the Gentiles, as the enemies of Israel, and especially to the destruction of the last enemy in the latter days of the scattering.

If, then, the seventy jubilee periods of Daniel began with the year 586 of the pre-Christian era, that is, the year One of the era of the Captivity, then the forty-ninth jubilee, which ushers in the fiftieth, or jubilee of jubilees, that is, the millennium, commences in the present year of grace 1864, as the following table will show:—

THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

	Era of Captivity	Christian Era
Destruction of the temple	1	586 B.C.
Order to rebuild the temple	50 A.B.	536
Consecration of the temple	70	516
Commencement of the forty-ninth jubilee .	2450	1864
The jubilee of jubilees, or commencement of millennium	2500	1914
End of seventy jubilees and of millennium	3500	2914

This view about the Messianic millennium being ushered in towards the end of the nineteenth century has been somewhat trivially developed from the fact, that the age of the man who 'had an infirmity thirty and eight years,'[1] if taken to denote the healing of the Jewish nation in the Messianic time, and if reckoned from the birth of Jesus, points to the nineteenth century, that is, to thirty-eight jubilees. Also the 1,260 years might refer to this period, if these are reckoned from the year 637 A.C., when Jerusalem was taken by the Mahomedans; and it is well known that the numerical value of the letters forming Mahomed's name give the sum 666. Anyhow, it is shown by the word of prophecy, that not seventy years, but

[1] John v. 5.

seventy jubilees, or 3,500 years, must elapse, dating from the year 516 B.C., before the end of the seventy weeks of Daniel's prophecy. Now, since this period is equivalent in duration to half a millennial week of 7,000 years, the idea would naturally suggest itself, that the creation of the world took place 3,500 years before the beginning of the Babylonian Captivity. If we turn to the chronology of the Hebrew canon, we find that it favours the supposition that this was believed to have been the case, at all events in the time of Ezra. The following periods may be distinguished :[1]—

	Years
From the creation of the world to Adam	?
From Adam to the Flood	1656
To Abraham's departure from Haran	367
To the Exodus	430
To foundation of Solomon's temple	480
To destruction of temple, about	427
From Adam to the Babylonian Captivity, about	3360

Thus 140 years would be left for the undefined period from the creation to Adam, or twenty years for each of the seven days of creation, and seventy years for the half-week, or each triad of days. Thus also the acknowledgedly-designed and not merely casual variations between the chronological data of the Masoretic Hebrew text, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch, as far as the former is concerned, would be explained in the simplest manner, by assuming that the Hebrew chronologist, impressed by the Danielic prophecy as pointing to half a millennial week, has arranged parts of the chronology preceding the Captivity according to the revelation referring to the time which was to follow it.

The following table will show the principal periods of the Seven Thousand Years, or the Millennarian Week, typified by the seven days of creation :—

[1] See Mr. R. S. Poole's article on 'Chronology' in Smith's Dictionary. We reckon 427 instead of 425 years for the last period, which could not hitherto be exactly determined.

CHAP. XIV.

THE SEVEN THOUSAND YEARS.

	Era of Creation	Era of Captivity	Era of Christ
The seven days of creation, or the two triads of 70 years	1– 140	3500–3360 B.C.	4086–3946 B.C.
From Adam to the Flood .	140–1796	3360–1704	3946–2290
From the Flood to Abraham's departure from Haran . .	1796–2163	1704–1337	2290–1923
From Abraham's migration to Exodus from Egypt. .	2163–2593	1337–907	1923–1493
From the Exodus to foundation of Solomon's temple .	2593–3073	907–427	1493–1013
From the foundation to the destruction of the temple .	3073–3500	427–1	1013–586
Commencement of Daniel's seventy jubilee periods .	3500	1	586 B.C.
Commencement of Daniel's forty-ninth jubilee . . .	5950	2450 A.B.	1864 A.C.
Commencement of Daniel's jubilee of jubilees, or millennium.	6000	2500	1914
End of Daniel's 70 jubilees and of millennium . . .	7000	3500	2914

That the Divine revelation, or, as some will think, the human fabrication of the doctrine about the seven thousand years thus originated, we hope to have sufficiently proved. Many will regard this as an altogether supernaturally-revealed scheme, as the God-inspired framework for the history of the future development of God's kingdom upon earth. They will point out, that if the historical events which took place during the last twenty years of Jeremiah's prophecy were a fulfilment of the latter, they may also be a prophecy of the fulfilment of the latter weeks of Daniel's prophecy. Those who argue thus will insist upon it that this view will prove correct, inasmuch as the twenty years of Jeremiah evidently typify the twenty jubilees, or the millennium, of Daniel, which period, in the revelation on Patmos, is ushered in by the fall of Babylon, by the Exodus from Babylon, and by the setting up of the kingdom in Zion.

We regard the era of creation as the starting point of

Semitic tradition, dating from the spiritual regeneration of man, which commenced, or was supposed to have commenced, 5,810 years ago. If we have succeeded in proving that the account in Genesis about Adam, Cain, and Abel, must be figuratively interpreted, and that it refers to the time of the great Aryan reformer, then we have ascertained at what time Zoroaster was born, or was, about the time of the return from the captivity, supposed to have been born. Zoroaster lived, or was supposed to have lived, at a time from which we are at present removed by 5,670 years. At all events, the 140 years are of no historical value.

The time when Zoroaster may have lived cannot be determined. The dates given by Pliny, Aristotle and others, go back to more than 6,000 years before our era. His time fell in the reign of the Bactrian king, Vistaspa. Now, of the last Bactrian king, Oxathres, we know that he was subjugated by Ninus about the year 1230 B.C. But long before Ninus, in the year 2234 B.C., a Median dynasty ruled in Babylon, whose first king bore the name of Zoroaster. This important fact has been transmitted to us through the Armenian translation of Eusebius, who, together with Josephus, Syncellus and others, made extracts from the Greek work on Chaldæan history by the priest Berosus of Babylon. This historian lived in the time of Alexander the Great, and is said to have derived his information principally from the ancient archives of the temple in Babylon. The name of the great Aryan reformer was, therefore, known centuries before the time when, about the year 2023 or 2078, Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees. If, then, Zoroaster can be proved to have been the forerunner of Abraham, then Ur may already, in the time of the latter, have been one of the principal seats of Aryan science, and our proposition gains in force, that the Hebrew and the Aryan traditions are derived from the same source, that the Adam of the Bible is the Zoroaster of history.

CHAP. XIV.

What must be regarded as an absolutely established fact is, that the present year 1864 is the year 2450 according to the era of Captivity, and commences the forty-ninth jubilee period, dating from the destruction of the temple in the year 586 B.C. If, then, we are right in declaring that the seventy weeks of Daniel, like the seventy years of Jeremiah, date from that year, then the year 1864 ushers in the last jubilee period which precedes the millennarian jubilee of jubilees.

The historical parallel which we have pointed out between the seventy years of Jeremiah and the seventy weeks, or jubilees, of Daniel, is in perfect harmony with the word of prophecy in general, and with the Apostle John's revelation at Patmos in particular. According to the latter, which we shall at present avoid to consider in detail, the fall of Babylon is followed by the Exodus of God's people. We know that the Exodus of the latter days is meant,[1] and that the fall of Babylon, that is, in a general sense, of the kingdoms of the Gentiles, and, in a more restricted sense, the fall of Israel's last enemy, 'the thief' who has stolen the Holy Land, will be brought about by the rising of 'nation against nation.' If, then, the historical fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy was intended to typify the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy, the predicted fall of the Babylon in the latter days would take place in the period immediately preceding the millennial jubilee; for the Exodus from Babylon to the Holy Land was immediately preceded by the fall of Babylon, under Cyrus, the 'anointed' of God. We say, then, that during the fifty years, beginning in 1864, those predicted events will be accomplished, which were typified by the destruction of Babylon, the permission to return, and the order to build the temple; events which occurred about the fiftieth year of Jeremiah's prophecy, the typical jubilee of the jubilee of jubilees, when the millennarian theocracy will be established in the Holy Land, and when

[1] Micah ii. 11, 12; Hos. i. 11; Jes. xi. 11.

Zion will become the spiritual centre of the world. We shall now consider the probable time of our Saviour's birth. Before we proceed with this investigation, we would, however, have it understood, that the new chronological scheme above propounded is in no wise affected by the year of Christ's birth, even if the same could possibly be accurately determined.

If Herod the Great died in the first days of April, in the year of Rome 750, as Josephus tells us he did,[1] then Jesus cannot have been born in the year 754, the first year of the Christian era. Nor can he have been born in the year 750, that is, four years before our era, inasmuch as the flocks of sheep could hardly have encamped in the open field as early as March, and could not have done so earlier. Again, the presentation in the temple, which had to take place forty days after the birth, and the necessary time which must have elapsed between the birth and the arrival of the wise men of the East in Jerusalem, exclude the possibility that Jesus may have been born in the year 750. Now, if we consider that Herod ordered the children of Bethlehem, 'from two years old and under,'[2] to be slain, it is evident that we must go back at least to the year 749 or 748. Jesus cannot possibly have been born later, but his birth may have taken place earlier.

We should be able to determine the exact year of this event, if it could be shown that, according to Luke's Gospel, Christ was about thirty years old in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius; that is, in the year 28 of our era. Even if the fifteenth year of Tiberius could be shown to have fallen in the year 29 or 30 of our era, all attempts to prove that Luke connected the year of the baptism of Jesus with the commencement of his thirtieth year must fail. Having referred to the baptism in Jordan, the Evangelist states that 'Jesus was about thirty years old when he began' to teach. It is highly probable that

[1] Ant. xvii. 8.

[2] Mat. ii. 16.

CHAP. XIV.

hereby Luke intended to refer to the habitual, if not legal, restriction not to appear in public as a teacher before the thirtieth year. And this view seems to be confirmed by Justin Martyr, who writes that Christ would remain hidden to all men 'until he should have reached the age of manhood, which also took place.'[1] And in another passage, Justin states that Jesus lived 'thirty years *or more* before John came forth.'[2] But, independently of these and other indefinite testimonies, we may infer from the gospels that Jesus did not begin to teach immediately after his baptism. Indeed, in the gospel after Matthew, he is shown not to have begun his public mission till after the imprisonment of John the Baptist,[3] of whom we know that neither himself nor his disciples as a body at any time followed Jesus, although in the fourth gospel nothing is recorded about John's doubts and hesitation. Jesus was probably by many taken as the successor of John, in whose words he announced the nearness of the kingdom of heaven, and the necessity for a change of mind. But even if we assume that Jesus began his public ministry some time before John's imprisonment,[4] we know that the latter took place some time after the baptism of Jesus; and we therefore cannot render probable that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Jesus was about thirty years old. We now consider whether in any of our gospels a confirmation can be found for the positive statement of Irenæus, that Christ's life on earth extended over a period of about fifty years.[5]

It has already been pointed out that this testimony is somewhat confirmed by the passage in John's gospel, in which it is recorded that the Jews referred to Jesus not yet being fifty years old, when he said 'before Abraham was, I am.'[6] We must admit that this single reference to fifty years is rather vague, and may possibly have referred to a time when Jesus was only between thirty

[1] Ap. i. 35, 75. [2] Dial. 88. [3] Mat. iv. 12; Mark i. 14.
[4] Comp. John i. 39 f. [5] Iren. ii. 22, 5. [6] John viii. 57.

and forty years old. But there is another passage in this gospel which, if allegorically interpreted, would clearly establish the fact that, in the first year of his ministry, Christ was forty-six years old.[1] The Evangelist having referred to the purging of the temple by Christ, proceeds to state that the Jews had asked him for a sign in justification of his doing 'those things' which were contrary to the established rule and order. This demand was probably made by the temple police, that is, by Levites, and therefore by persons in authority and of education. They would address this demand with all the weight derived from their office, supported as their authority was by the garrison of the adjoining Roman citadel, and with the threatening attitude which may well have been called forth by a proceeding, in their opinion, so disorderly. They may have threatened Jesus even with death, if he persisted in the non-acknowledgment of the established authorities. With Divine calm and authority, Jesus replied: 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' Then said the Jews: 'Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But (or, rather, "now") he spake of the temple of his body.' It is as if he had said: 'Kill me, and in three days, when I shall have been raised, I will raise up again the spiritual temple.'[2]

The Evangelist does not even imply that the bystanders, including the Levites of the temple, misunderstood this reference to Christ's person; and such an assumption becomes quite untenable when we bear in mind the universal habit in the East, up to the present day, to accompany emphatic sayings by gestures with the hand. Jesus could not have pointed to the temple; but if he pointed to anything, he certainly pointed to his person, and thereby

[1] John ii. 20, 21.

[2] We are glad to find that at least one of the renowned commentators has given to this interpretation the support of his authority. See Meyer Ex. Handbuch.

CHAP. XIV.

prevented all possibility of being misunderstood even by the most ignorant, and at a time when he must have wished to be clearly understood. Again, who could possibly have referred, on this occasion, to the destruction of the stone temple? Least of all could a single individual be charged with such an intention. It was evidently not the immediate destruction of the temple which Christ had in view; the time for its demolition had not come. Above all, he intended, as is shown by Mark's record,[1] to substitute the temple 'made without hands' to that which was made with hands, the temple of the heart to the stone temple. Jesus was the 'One greater than the temple.'[2] Though the above record in Mark refers to the testimony of false witnesses, yet we know from the fourth gospel that Jesus did say nothing less than that his only temple was 'the temple of his body.' The 'false witnesses' who testified against Stephen referred likewise to the threatened destruction of the stone temple by Jesus,[3] and it is very important to bear in mind that, whereas the first three evangelists protest against Jesus having intended to destroy the building of the temple, the fourth evangelist shows Jesus to have spoken words about the destruction and rebuilding of a sanctuary, which it is more difficult to refer to the stone temple than to the temple of his body, which at all events he intended to point out as the new sanctuary. The kingdom of heaven, the spiritual temple, *could* be set up without the material destruction of the temple made with hands.[4] It *had* been set up by and in the 'One greater than the temple.' And if his enemies, the Jewish rulers, were to destroy that 'temple of his body,' he would raise it up again after his resurrection.

In order to render the assumed reference to the stone temple possible, it has been shown that, although the forty-six years cannot possibly have referred to the second temple built between the fiftieth and the seventieth year

[1] Mark xiv. 58. [2] Mat. xii. 6. [3] Acts vi. 14.
[4] Comp. 1 Kings viii. 27.

of Jeremiah's prophecy, yet that by them the time may have been marked during which Herod had effected his gorgeous renovations and additions, which were not concluded till after Herod's death.[1] It is uncertain whether these works were begun in the fifteenth or the eighteenth year of Herod's reign, since Josephus mentions both years. But accepting the latter date, that is, the year 734 of Rome, we should have to prove that the events here described took place between the years 779 and 780, that is, during the fifteenth year of Tiberius, the year of Christ's baptism. Whilst, therefore, we are by no means bound to accept this interpretation, the other is based on the almost imperatively necessary assumption, that the Jews, probably the Levites, who replied to Christ, understood him to refer to the temple of his body, and to its resurrection in three days. It seems to have been generally believed, as we have seen, that the resurrection, at least that of the just, took place three days after death. The Levites at all events must have known this, and, if so, they must have understood Christ's referring to himself, even if he did not accompany his words by any sign of the hand.

But every doubt on this point seems to disappear when we connect this passage with the other about the fifty years. Whilst the former refers to the first year of Christ's ministry, the latter refers to his last year. Assuming him to have been forty-six years old when he began his ministry, he would be about forty-nine, or between forty-nine and fifty years old at the close of the same, according to this gospel, which points to a duration from three to three and a half years for this period. And it is an indisputable fact, that no insurmountable obstacles present themselves against the supposition that our Lord lived, as Irenæus tells us, somewhere about fifty years on this earth. The margin which history has traced for the life of Jesus is limited by two historical facts. Herod the Great was still alive when Jesus was born, and at the

[1] Ant. xv. 11, 5, 6.

CHAP. XIV.

time of his death the Emperor Tiberius ruled in Rome. The latter fact we derive from the circumstance, that Pilate was summoned to Rome by Tiberius, in order to defend himself against the accusations of Vitellius, the governor of Syria, based upon the conduct of the former, in consequence of which, as it was alleged, riots in Jerusalem and disturbances in Samaria had taken place, which it was necessary to quell by force. When Pilate reached Rome, early in 790, Tiberius was dead. If, then, the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius be the year 780 of Rome, and if the Emperor died in 790, we may assert that the years of our Lord's teaching fall within this period.

According to the fourth gospel, the public ministry of Jesus was spread over more than two and less than four years. But he may have begun his teaching in a more retired manner and restricted circle at an earlier period of his life. Indeed, we are told that he was about thirty years of age when he began. Now, in order approximatively to ascertain the time of our Lord's birth, we first try to fix the more easily determinable year of his death. The latest possible year for the same is the year 788, or the second year before the death of Tiberius. For Pontius Pilate, who had entered upon his governorship of Judea in 779, must already have been accused in the year 789 by Vitellius, and summoned to Rome by Tiberius. Because when at the very beginning of the year 790 Pilate reached Rome, Tiberius had suddenly died. Now, the year 789 is the latest possible year for Stephen's martyrdom, which seems to have been the primary cause for that general persecution of the Christians, with which it is difficult not to connect the riots in Jerusalem and in Samaria, which took place at the end of Pilate's government. Since, however, the martyrdom of Stephen, and the bloody events which followed it, up to the time of Pilate's accusation, can hardly have taken place in one single year, it is more probable that Stephen died in 788, and that the

latest probable time for the crucifixion is the year 787 to 788.

If we assume that Christ may have been forty-nine years old in the year 787, the year of his birth would be 738. And this year will be found to be the earliest possible date of his birth, when we consider that, on his return from Egypt, he cannot have been older, if as old, as twelve, since at that time he went up to Jerusalem with his parents. Now, as Herod died but a few days before the Passover in the year 750, and as the first journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, on his return from Egypt, took place at the time of the Passover, it is evident that this visit to the temple cannot have taken place in the year 750. It is impossible to assume this, inasmuch as Joseph did not leave Egypt with Mary and Jesus till after the death of Herod, and since he could not at once have gone to Jerusalem, because he feared Archelaus. But though the journey to Jerusalem cannot have taken place earlier than the year after Herod's death; yet in that year, 751, it might have taken place if Christ was born *after* the Passover of the year 738, in which case he would still be twelve years old at the Passover in 751. From this it follows that if Jesus was forty-nine years old when he died, he must have been born between 738 and 739. For, whilst these years mark the earliest period at which his birth may have taken place, the years 787 and 788 are the latest dates for the crucifixion.[1]

The only possible objection to this chronology of the life of Christ may be derived from the passage in Luke, which is supposed to refer to his having begun to teach when about thirty years old. Now, according to our hypothesis, he had attained the age of forty-one years in the fifteenth year of

[1] It has been shown that, according to Rabbinical tradition, Jesus was born in the year 735 of Rome; that is, nineteen years before the Dionysian or Christian era. We have proved this to be impossible, and that the year 738 is the earliest when his birth may have taken place, if we consider that he spent the Passover of his twelfth year in Jerusalem *after* the death of Herod, early in 750.—Block, Das wahre Geburtsjahr Christi, Berl. 1843.

CHAP. XIV.

Tiberius, that is, in the year 779 of Rome, if we reckon the reign of Tiberius from 765. This objection, if insisted upon, we must admit as fatal to our explanation of the tradition transmitted to us by Irenæus, that our Lord's days on the earth extended over a period of even above fifty years. But Luke does not even imply that Jesus was about thirty years old in that year. He vaguely refers to the earliest time when Christ, like all others, could have begun to teach. This view is confirmed by the still more vague testimony of Justin Martyr, which, as we have seen, is more in harmony with that of his contemporary Irenæus. Another reason may be noticed for not laying too much stress on the habitual interpretation of the above passage in Luke. It is this: the fall of Jerusalem would most naturally, and by the Gentile Christians especially, be regarded as the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy about 'the abomination of desolation' standing in the holy place.[1] If so, this event would be connected with the prophecy about seventy weeks in Daniel, and regarded as the forerunner of the final accomplishment of that prophecy. Now, as the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem under Titus, according to a tradition recorded in the Talmud, took place in the year of Rome 824, that is, in the seventieth year A.C., the birth of Jesus would be assumed to have taken place in the year 754, and the first year of the life of Christ would be regarded as the commencement of Daniel's prophecy, 'the end' of which was expected in the year 70 of the so-constructed Christian era. At that late period the exact year of his birth may not have been known; and it was a favourable feature in the above chronology that, according to the same, Christ was between thirty-three and thirty-four years old, or 'about' thirty, or 'thirty and more,' in or soon after the fifteenth year of Tiberius, when he is assumed to have begun to teach, in accordance with the restricting custom of the time. This may account for the blunder of placing the birth of Christ four years later than the death of Herod.

[1] Mat. xxiv. 15; Dan. ix. 27; xii. 11.

Under these circumstances it appears reasonable to assume that the above passage in Luke only refers, in general terms, to the time when Christ began his mission as a teacher; an office from which those were excluded who had not passed the thirtieth year.

Conclusion.

Whether the life of Jesus on this earth extended from the year of Rome 738 to 787, as we believe, or whether it commenced in 749 or 750, and ended in 781 or 782, that is, about the seventeenth or nineteenth year of Tiberius, dating his reign from 765, and not from 767, of the Roman era, at which latter year he began to rule independently of Augustus; in either case the present year 1864 (1878) A.C. is the beginning of the jubilee, which is to usher in the millennarian jubilee of jubilees, dating from the year 1914 (1930) and ending in 2914 (2930) A.C. During the coming fifty years we therefore have to look forward to the fall of 'Babylon,' to the Exodus of God's especial people from the Israel of all nations, to the rebuilding of Jerusalem and of the temple, and to the establishment of the Messianic theocracy in the Holy Land. The future will show in how far these views are correct.

CHAPTER XV.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

THE ARYAN BROTHERS—APOCRYPHA—ISRAEL'S CALL—THE GENTILES' CALL—THE KEY OF KNOWLEDGE—JESUS CHRIST—ANOTHER COMFORTER—THE PROPHET—NATURE OF PROPHECY—ON THE INTERPRETATION OF PROPHECY—TRADITION AND CANON—THE CHURCH—THE PROBLEM.

CHAP. XV.

The Aryan brothers.

THE allegorical interpretation of the biblical record about Cain and Abel, which we have suggested, has the disadvantage of being, as far as we know, the first attempt to vindicate the historical character of this ancient record, by pointing out its hidden reference to an historical event. If the literal interpretation of the history of Cain's wife and of his enemies must be abandoned, it is only by allegorical interpretation that we can fairly combat those who suggest or insist upon the mythical origin of that account, although in the form transmitted to us the same has, in a mystery, conveyed to the world the doctrine of the Divine sonship in all ages. It has been said by a very high authority that 'the form of the Semitic records, their essentially Oriental, *figurative*, poetical cast, is an unquestionable and unquestioned difficulty. *That form was inseparable from their life, their duration, the perpetuity of their influence. In no other form, humanly speaking, would they have struck so deep into the mind and heart of man, or cloven to it with such inseverable tenacity. It is as speaking, frequently in the noblest poetry, at all events as addressed to the imaginative as well as the reasoning faculty of man, that they have*

survived through ages, have been and still are imperishable.'[1] As Paul has allegorically interpreted the biblical account about the sons of Abraham; as the sons of Noah are by almost general consent so interpreted, we may do the same with the sons of Adam. If, then, the history of Cain and Abel points, in its figurative meaning, to the separation of the Aryan brothers, the first biblical account about the human family refers to the time when 'a small clan of Aryans,' having left their aboriginal home, and having probably settled on the highest elevation of Central Asia, spoke 'a language, not yet Sanskrit or Greek or German, but containing the dialectic germs of all;' a language so fully developed, that 'the whole framework of grammar, the elements of derivation, declension, and conjugation,' had already become settled. The Semitic archives of revelation begin with a reference to the time when 'the Aryans led the life of agricultural nomads;' when 'they knew the arts of ploughing, of making roads, of building ships, of weaving and sewing, of erecting houses;' when 'they had counted, at least, as far as one hundred;' when 'they had domesticated the most important animals, the cow, the horse, the sheep, the dog;' when 'they were acquainted with the most useful metals, and armed with iron hatchets, whether for peaceful or warlike purposes;' when 'they had recognised the bonds of blood and the bonds of marriage;' when 'they followed their leaders and kings;' when 'the distinction between right and wrong was fixed by laws and customs;' when 'they were impressed with the idea of a Divine Being;' and when 'they invoked it by various names.'[2] The generally acknowledged writings of the Aryan reformer, the Zoroaster of history and the Adam of the Bible, permit us to assert, that the first man who was created to the image of God knew his Creator as 'the Father of all

[1] Milman's 'History of the Jewish Church,' Pref. p. xiii.

[2] Lectures on the Science of Language, by Max Müller, 4th edit. i. pp. 220, 243, 245.

CHAP. XV.

truth,' as the 'Wise Spirit,' who is the Father of the good spirit in man; as 'the living God,' who, 'through the holiest spirit and the best mind,' has given to man 'fulness and immortality;' as 'the Creator of the universe,' as 'the Holiest One,' to whom belongs 'the kingdom, the might, and the power.'

The revelation of the doctrine of Divine sonship dates from the days of Adam. For then already God was revealed to man as the 'friend, brother, or father' of those who, by the indwelling Divine Spirit or 'Word,' are led to purity in 'thought, word, and deeds.' It was known to 'Adam, the Son of God,'[1] that through the 'spiritual power' God has 'revealed' to man the Divine 'knowledge' or wisdom, that is, '*the mysteries hidden in his mind.*' The Hidden Wisdom revealed to and by Adam was by him transmitted through 'the original text,' which was interpreted from the earliest times by a verbal tradition, the record of which was later added to the original 'Holy Word,' as a 'second law.' Both the written and the verbal tradition, dating from the days of Adam, became the treasured inheritance of the Semitic race, ever since Abraham left Ur, the centre of Aryan learning. Moses was the prophet of that same Hidden Wisdom, which, because of the hard-heartedness of the Israelites, he could not fully disclose in writing. As among the Aryans, so among the Hebrews, to the original text of the law was added, in course of time, a second law, a Deuteronomy, embodying the principles of interpretation, which had been preserved by a secret verbal tradition. Hence the frequent reference of Jesus to Deuteronomy; hence Luke's partial ingrafting of the Hidden Wisdom of Christ on the first Apostolic record, which excluded it, and the full revelation of the former in the latest gospel, about the same time when the Mishna, 'the second' or 'the verbal' law, was published as the

[1] Plato calls Zoroaster the son of Oromazes, that is, the son of God (Alc. i. p. 122*a*). It is remarkable that soon after Christ's birth the Magi are recorded to have offered the customary gifts of subjection.

first record of the Talmud, or science properly so called. We hope to have established a certain degree of connection between the earliest traditions of the ancestors of the Indo-Germanic races, as transmitted to us by the Avesta, and the Apocryphal or Hidden Wisdom, as contained in the Septuagint, and which was developed and applied by Christ Jesus. It cannot be assumed that the Avesta was harmonised with the Septuagint, since a Greek version of the Avesta existed centuries before the commencement of the Christian era, and at the very time and place of the composition of the Septuagint, the apocryphal writings of which clearly point to a development of the national Israelitic faith, which may have commenced about the time of the Babylonian Captivity. If long before the age of the patriarchs, of which we know so little, monotheism was established in those countries which formed the very cradle of mankind; if that monotheism was the result of a religious reform, caused by Divine revelation; then the antediluvian traditions referring to such a reform, and to the consequences of the same, would be preserved and recorded in the time after the Flood. If such has been the origin of those parts of Genesis which refer to Adam, if Genesis contains a hidden reference to the migration of the Aryans to the Indus, then these records allude to historical events, and they are not 'myths which had been verbally transmitted during a long period of time, till they were finally committed to writing, but which by this long traditional transmission had received a thoroughly mythical stamp.'[1] CHAP. XV.

The history of the Apocrypha proves that, in all ages to which our records refer, the Spirit of God has testified to the spirit of man that he is a child of God. Thus monotheism was gradually revealed. In course of time God was discerned as the living Creator of all, as the Holy Spirit, the Light of light, the source of man's inborn Apocrypha.

[1] Bruch, Weisheitslehre der Hebräer, 1851, p. 29.

CHAP. XV.

glory, as the Father of the good spirit in man, as the Eternal Father of all truth. Thus endued with an infinite spirit, the reasonable creature would have been the unspotted mirror of Divine power, were he not free to determine his actions. This liberty in thought, word, and deed, led to a contest between the indwelling Spirit of the Creator and the spirit of the creature, so that the thoughts of men accused or else excused one another. The Divine and Infinite Spirit revealed to the human and finite spirit the nature of God's will, the progressive development set before him. In the full exercise of his liberty man associated himself, more or less willingly and effectively, with his indwelling Divine Teacher. To co-operate with the Spirit of God is, therefore, to walk with God; and religion defines, manifests, and developes the relations thus to be established between man and his Maker.

Israel's call.

If since the days of Adam the great mystery of God manifested in the flesh was dimly known to some descendants of the human race; if the promises made to Abraham, the chosen friend of God, referred to the anointing of all nations through faith in the leading and saving power of God's Spirit in man, the question arises, What could be the object of God's choosing a people unto himself? He had not withdrawn his Spirit from mankind; so that the Messianic mission of the former, although checked by man's self-willed opposition, had at no time absolutely terminated. Why, then, should one people be, for a time at least, privileged as the most favoured nation? Why should the Divine Spirit be shed more abundantly on the descendants of Shem than on those of Japhet and Ham?

Like individuals, nations and races are selected as special instruments for the accomplishment of a preconceived purpose. In order to spread the knowledge of the true Word of Prophecy, an organisation was required which should centre in the prophetic office. Prophets had been raised before, but the truth thus proclaimed

could not be applied to a living organism, capable of preserving and developing the roots of the tree of knowledge and of the tree of life. Still less could the paradise of God be established in the heart of man, in accordance with the eternal purpose of the Divine will. Far from excluding other nations by assigning a privileged mission to the people of Israel, the same was to become a depository of God's revelations to mankind; the Israelites were to be 'the librarians' of the Christians. Accordingly, the predestinated firstborn among the nations was successively brought into contact with the people which stood foremost in the ranks of civilisation and progress. The Egyptians, the Chaldæans, the Greeks, and Romans, were all to contribute to Israel's education, and to give their aid to that development which was to be manifested in Israel.

The Gentiles' call.

The connection between the Gentile world and Israel cannot be rightly discerned so long as the mystery of the Gentiles, the mystery of their being fellow-heirs with Israel, though not *by* Israel, is not more clearly discerned in the light of Paul's gospel. If the mystery of the universal 'God with us' has been 'hid from ages and from generations;' if every individual of the human race was before the foundation of the world called by God in Christ, that is, in the spiritual rock which accompanied the Israelites, and of which Gentiles as well as Jews have drunk, or in the Messianic spirit, the Saviour of all in all ages; if the mark of humanity's high calling, the race and its prize, were eternally predestinated; if 'the mystery among the Gentiles' was first fully revealed by the preaching of Jesus Christ and by the Gospel of Paul, although it had been kept secret since the world began, then the calling of Israel as a chosen nation can at no time have excluded the Gentiles. For to them, as well as to Israel, the promises belong, though their perfect realisation was reserved to the Jews first, inasmuch as, according to the flesh, Christ Jesus was made of the seed of David.

CHAP. XV.

If the history of Israel points to Christ, so also does, to a certain degree, the pre-patriarchal and even the pre-diluvian historical development. In all ages God has worked by means; he has taken the initiative, and revealed his will unto mankind by ingrafting his Spirit and will on man's spirit and will, without destroying the liberty of the latter. The never-varying Spirit of God has always worked through the instrumentality of the ever-varying spirit of man. Revelation, therefore, is the unity of stability and development, of the infinite and the finite, the supernatural and the natural. Reason, unaided by revelation, can never reach the predestinated mark; but since God has at no time left himself without a witness, and since humanity lives, moves, and has its being in God, the revealing truth and grace of God has in a measure belonged to mankind in all ages. Revelation by miracle is but a peculiar kind of the manifestation of the revealing power of God. The line of development is the same in the Gentile world and in Israel; but application constitutes the difference. Revealed truth received its *imperfect* application in the Gentile world, and later in the Jewish theocracy, and its *perfect* application in Christ Jesus. Thus heathenism led to Judaism, and Judaism to Christianity.[1]

The Key of Knowledge.

Although holy men and prophets spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, yet the hearts of the Israelites were so little prepared for the sowing of the Divine Word, that the full light of revealed truth had to be

[1] This problem is solved in the book of Job. Whether it be of Chaldæan or of Arabian origin, whether it was written at the time of Solomon, or before or after, this dogmatic poem, which is probably based on historical events, proves that Judaism had not that exclusive character which is generally assigned to the same in the absence of a clear scriptural definition. The Israelitic writer shows that Job, though not an Israelite, walked with God; that he served him faithfully, and proclaimed and glorified him in the face of the world; that the trials sent upon him, instead of being taken as an earnest of God's love, misled him into the fatal belief that God had forsaken him; and that yet he was led to take comfort in the assurance that the merciful communion with God is never cut off from the man who believes in the power and love of God, as manifested through 'the Saviour of all.'

hidden from them ever since the days of Moses. As they would not be brought into direct individual communion with their God, as they did not listen to the correcting and teaching of the still small voice within them, they had to be told by a written law what to do and what to leave undone. Stony tables had to take the place of the fleshy tables of the heart. Thus a few privileged men became the stewards of mysteries which were hidden from the people. About the time of the Babylonian Captivity the hidden things of old were gradually proclaimed to the Israelites. But by this time Moses was by some supposed to have communicated in the writings attributed to him all that it was desirable to know at all times and in all places. A schism in the Israelitic Church became necessary; the adherents of the new light of the Hidden Wisdom separated themselves as Pharisees from the conservative or Sadducean party. Probably it was a consequence of the continued influence of the latter, that the principles of the Hidden or Apocryphal Wisdom were not generally promulgated, nor preserved by written records, but were kept strictly hidden from the people in Palestine; whereas, in Egypt, they were recorded soon after the Captivity in apocryphal writings, one of which may have originated in Babylon. Thus the Septuagint became the canon of the apocryphal reform, whilst the Hebrew or Palestinian canon continued to mark the exclusion of the principles of the Hidden Wisdom, as the former was probably decreed in the time of Ezra. The Hidden Wisdom was forbidden to be taught; the Key of Knowledge was taken away.

Jesus Christ.

Then there arose a prophet, and more than a prophet, in Israel. That Word which was in the beginning with God and was God, which had inspired the prophets, and which had followed the Israelites as the spiritual rock, by which all those who had received the Divine guest, whether Gentiles or Jews, were empowered to become children of God; that power of God and wisdom of God

CHAP. XV.

being unopposed by the sinless man, Jesus of Nazareth, became identical with this its perfect human advocate; the Word became flesh, the Divine glory shone in the face of Jesus, who thus became the Christ, the incarnate Word, and in this manner rose to the spiritual Oneness with God the Father.

Incarnation.

The mystery of the perfect incarnation of the Word, the mystery of the Son of the living God, of the firstborn among many brethren, was first revealed by the heavenly Father to a chosen disciple of the Son of man. Gradually the Son of God taught in secret and in darkness to the chosen few the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, which he could not reveal to the people, to whom, therefore, he spoke only in parables. Even the most privileged individuals could not then bear to hear the many things their Master had to tell them. The day was not come when even they could understand that the Son was in the Father, and the Father in the Son. Before that even the Apostles of Christ could be brought to that knowledge, one of them was to betray him. Having been informed of what Jesus had done in secret and in darkness, the suspicions of the rulers of the Jews having been confirmed by the faithless communication of the fact, that Jesus of Nazareth had secretly taught the forbidden Hidden Wisdom of the Divine sonship, and that the same had been applied to himself, the rulers of the Jewish Church brought about his condemnation and crucifixion.

The betrayal.

Confirming miracles.

His terror-stricken disciples were strengthened in their faith by their Lord's resurrection from the dead; and although they seem at first to have retired into Galilee, yet, on their return to Jerusalem, they waited till they should be endued with power from on high. As the anniversary of the promulgation of the law on Sinai, as the day of Pentecost drew near, they all raised with one accord their common petitions unto God, and on that day the promise was publicly fulfilled by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. At once they convinced many that the

man Jesus had been approved of God among them by miracles and wonders and signs, and had made that same Jesus, whom they had crucified, both Lord and Christ. Not only the Sadducees were 'grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead,' but the high priest and his kindred, alarmed by seeing that the name (or Power, or Spirit) of Jesus was mighty in his disciples, threatened them, that they should speak 'henceforth to no man in this name.' Obeying 'God rather than men,' they filled Jerusalem with their doctrine, and did many miracles. In consequence of this, it is recorded that they were put into the common prison, and that, after Gamaliel's conciliatory address, they were set at liberty, on the express condition 'that they should not speak in the name of Jesus.' This notwithstanding, 'they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ,' that is, they proclaimed him as the expected Messiah, and through him they preached the resurrection. To this the Pharisees would not object. What they dreaded was the Hidden Wisdom of Christ. Because Stephen proclaimed it he was killed, and his martyrdom caused the persecution of all Christians, excepting the Apostles. Such was the determination of the Jewish authorities to prevent by all means in their power the promulgation of the Hidden or Apocryphal Wisdom, that the Apostles of Christ did not consider the time come when they were to proclaim in light what they had been taught in secret and in darkness. Accordingly they never referred to their Master's secret doctrine, and only recorded those of his sayings which had been uttered in public. Perhaps it was for this reason, that 'of the rest' of the scattered disciples 'no one durst join himself to them.'

Exclusion of Hidden Wisdom.

Suddenly it pleased God to reveal his Son in a new convert and Apostle. The Jews of Damascus seeking after his life, Paul fled into Arabia, and, having prepared himself for his mission among the Gentiles, he first met

Proclamation of the Hidden Wisdom.

CHAP. XV.

Peter and James at Jerusalem, and fourteen years later received the hand of fellowship from those three Apostles who had been the most intimate asssociates of Christ, and whom he had especially instructed in his mysteries. One of them, Peter, was about to join Paul publicly at Antioch, but was prevented from doing so by James, after whose death, if not before, the rock-Apostle openly preached the Hidden Wisdom which Paul had been the first to proclaim. Both Peter and Paul having suffered martyrdom, John wrote down what was revealed to him at Patmos, having, at a probably earlier period, recorded those sayings of Christ which referred to the apocryphal and forbidden wisdom, and which for this reason had been necessarily excluded from the first apostolic gospel-record. This supplementary gospel of Christ was kept hidden till after the middle of the second century, when, as a necessary antidote against Docetic gnosticism, the Gospel after John was probably edited under the supervision of one or more of the elders of the Roman Church, the original Aramean record of the Apostle having perhaps been translated into Greek by his contemporary John, the elder of the Church at Ephesus, or elsewhere.

The prophet like Moses.

Like Moses, Jesus Christ was a steward of God's mysteries, which had been kept secret since the world began. By the organisation of seventy elders and seventy disciples, both laid foundations to the universal proclaiming of God's saving love to mankind, manifested by the Messianic mission of the Holy Ghost in all ages. Moses wished that all Israelites might be endued with the prophetic spirit, and Jesus, whose testimony is the spirit of prophecy, longed for the day when all might know the Lord, and thus be initiated in the doctrine of the sonship, according to which all men are to be in Christ as Christ is in God, are to be holy as he is holy, are all to be at One in the unity of the Spirit. As Moses had probably done, so Jesus, the prophet announced in Deuteronomy, taught a secret doctrine. But, instead of preaching abstract

verities, he applied to himself, and exemplified by his life, that one great truth in which all others centre, that the Spirit, Wisdom, Power, or Word of God, which in the beginning was with God, and which was God, had been in all ages poured on all flesh, according to the desire of them who felt the need of such an indwelling Saviour, making them friends and sons of God, and thus leading them to immortality. Christ Jesus taught that he was the incarnate Word; that by always doing the will of God he heard his words and saw his works, whilst uttering the one and performing the other. He revealed by his own person the mystery of godliness which was manifested in the flesh. He knew that God spoke by his Son.

Thus the eternal spiritual Messiah, 'the Saviour of all,' in all ages, had come down from heaven, had become flesh, had become perfectly identified with a predestinated human individual, who after death was raised as David's Lord to the right hand of God, to a participation in the government of the world, to that place which God had from the beginning predestinated as the prize of humanity's high calling. The spiritual Messiah had become a personal Messiah in Jesus. The Spiritual Rock from which Gentiles and Jews had drunk became the rock of the Church on earth. Although this was a fulfilment of Messianic prophecies, for the uttering, recording, and preserving of which Israel had been selected among the nations of the world, yet the manifestation of the mystery of God in Christ went far beyond all prophecies in one sense, and in another it did not reach all what they had in view. Jesus did not fulfil what had been regarded as the principal prediction; he did not set up the terrestrial kingdom, an event the time of which God has reserved to his power. Christ's kingdom, the kingdom of the spiritual Messiah from heaven, is not of this world. And yet the prophets had foretold, Christ had confirmed, and the seer at Patmos had seen what we may interpret to be the

The Spiritual Rock.

CHAP. XV.

setting up of a model state, of a theocracy in the Holy Land. The prophecies referring to the Messianic future had not been distinguished, and, therefore, the commencement of the fulfilment fell far short of the general expectations; whilst even six days before his transfiguration, which took place shortly before his entry into Jerusalem, the disciples were charged by Jesus 'that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.'

Another advocate of the Messianic spirit.

In the face of Jewish opposition the Christians, by almost general consent, looked forward to a bodily return of the same Jesus, who, as the perfect organ or advocate of the Divine Spirit, would on some future occasion set up the promised kingdom upon earth. This event was expected by the Apostles in their own days. The non-fulfilment of this expectation hardened the Jews in their rejection of the doctrine about the sonship, and thus of Christ Jesus, whilst it somewhat shook the confidence of the Christians in the person of Jesus Christ as he had by the Apostles been originally proclaimed. This could not have been the case had the secret doctrine of Jesus at once been published abroad. For in the apostolic record of the very words in which Christ had referred to the Hidden Wisdom, Jesus is distinguished from 'another' advocate of the Spirit of truth, and not the bodily but the spiritual coming of Christ is proclaimed. The Spirit or Word of God which, as the Saviour of all, had in all ages been shed on mankind; through which God had spoken in divers manners unto the fathers by the prophets, and in the latter days unto all people by his Son, by the incarnate Word, by Christ Jesus; that same Messianic spirit, the eternal revealing organ of God, the Spiritual Rock of which Gentiles and Jews were made to drink, would at the appointed time enable 'another' human Being to speak in its name; the selfsame 'Spirit of truth' would receive 'another' advocate or comforter, a second witness, who, coming in the name or spirit of the Lord, would remind the world of the words spoken by the Son of God, would

take of his own and make it known to more willing ears and better prepared hearts, would reap what Christ Jesus had sown; and the new Israel of all nations and in all countries, whose spiritual centre is to be the theocracy at Jerusalem, whilst accepting the doctrine of the Messianic Word, would have that Spirit of truth, the eternal Messiah, the Saviour of all, remaining with them for ever: the glory of the Lord would rise upon Jerusalem, and kings would come to the brightness of her rising. CHAP. XV.

Is this other advocate of the Divine Messianic Spirit destined to be, like the anointed Cyrus, the setter-up of a kingdom in the Holy Land? Is he one of the two Messiahs or Anointed Ones predicted by Zechariah; one of the two witnesses announced in the Apocalypse? Before we can consider whether it is justifiable thus to interpret prophecy, we must refer to the prophet's office and to the nature of prophecy.

The Prophet.

If it is the object of God's love to raise mankind to the mark of its eternally predestinated high calling; if the Spirit of God testifies to the spirit of man that he is destined to be a son of God; if those who are led or driven by the Spirit of God are the children of God, then there must be a few chosen ones who, among the many that are called, become spokesmen or advocates of the indwelling Divine Spirit. The revealing power of God must so seize them that their heart bubbles forth of good matter, that they are constrained to pour forth and to announce the hidden mysteries of God. By so doing men become 'sons of God and prophets,' that is, instruments of the Divine Word from the beginning, which is privy to God's mysteries, and reveals them according to the capabilities of the individual and the requirements of the time. This Divine agent chooses man as its mouthpiece, and enables him to declare what he has seen or heard in visions or dreams, or by a more direct visitation of the spiritual power. If we have succeeded in identifying the Zoroaster of history with the Adam of the Bible, then Adam was

CHAP. XV.

the first prophet of whom we have any knowledge. Those parts of the Avesta which, according to general consent, contain the doctrines of the great Aryan reformer, point to him as to a man resembling in all respects the prophets in Israel. It is through the spiritual power, the gift of God, that he was the messenger who revealed Divine mysteries. The spiritual power probably formed the distinguishing feature of the Magi; it is certain that originally the Magi were not priests, but members of the prophetical order. They were divided, according to a classification ascribed to Zoroaster, into disciples, 'harbeds,' teachers, 'mobeds,' and the more perfect teachers of a higher wisdom, 'destur mobeds.' The latter, the teachers of a deeper and more speculative wisdom, or of the gnosis, were represented among the Israelites by the highly-revered 'tanaims,' or teachers of tradition, who, in the time of Herod the Great, if not earlier, enjoyed the privileged title of 'Rabban,' or 'Rabboni,' thus placing them above the 'Rabbis,' whilst these stood higher than the 'Rabs,' although even this name denotes chiefs.

'Mobed' is a modern and vitiated form of 'magavan;' in Sanskrit, 'Maghavat.' The root is 'maga' or 'magha,' meaning greatness or power. In the Zendavesta, 'magavan' occurs as a name of Ormuzd, but it is applied to, and generally means, the fullgrown man. Thus already in 'the original text' of the Aryans, the 'power' and the 'name' of God were identical expressions, and applied to man. Since God was conceived as the Wise Spirit, and since the gift of his Spirit or Power was considered as man's choicest treasure, 'magavan' must originally have been the title of the man peculiarly gifted with the name or Power or Spirit or Word of God, the chosen organ of the same, the prophet who comes in the name of the Lord, and through whom God reveals the Divine 'knowledge,' that is, as God is recorded to have said to Zoroaster, 'the mysteries hidden in my mind.'

The doctrine of the spiritual or prophetical power, the

prophet's name and office, and the organisation of the prophetical order, all these point to Aryan sources. It was during the Babylonian captivity that the Israelites, as a people, came into contact with the purer principles of the Aryan faith, of which Cyrus, according to the Behistun inscription, had been the propagator. Here it was that Daniel the prophet accepted the office of 'master of the magicians,' which is probably identical with that which was held by Nergal-Sharezer, 'the Rab-Mag,' whom Nebuchadnezzar sent to Jerusalem.[1] Even the latter knew, according to the Borsippa inscription, that he 'who lends his ears to the orders of the highest God' is a 'wise man' and a 'saviour.' It was in Babylon that Cyrus, the restorer of the worship of the Aryans, and whom the prophet had called the Anointed One, openly declared that 'Jehova, the God of Heaven,' who had given him his dominion, had 'charged him to build him an house at Jerusalem.'[2] It was after that Abraham had left Ur of the Chaldees, the seat of Aryan wisdom, that 'the Word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a vision,' and that he fell in 'a deep sleep.'[3] The ecstatic state into which Abraham, 'the prophet,' fell is fully described by Daniel. On the approach of Gabriel, who is commanded to make him understand the vision, Daniel was afraid, and fell upon his face, and whilst he was speaking with him he was 'in a deep sleep' till the angel 'touched' him and set him upright.[4] Like Abraham, Adam fell into 'a deep sleep,' which God himself had caused.[5] We have seen that this account, if figuratively interpreted, refers to the spiritual creation of man to the image of God, who breathed into him the breath of life, and thus endued him with a living soul. This communion of 'fulness and immortality' we may assume to have been effected whilst Adam was in an ecstatic state, under the direct influence of the breath or

[1] Jer. xxxix. 3, 13. [2] Ezra i. 1–4. [3] Gen. xv. 1, 12.
[4] Dan. vii. 16–18; comp. Mat. xvii. 6–8; Acts x. 10; xi. 5; xxii. 17; Rev. i. 10.
[5] Gen. ii. 21.

CHAP. XV.

Spirit of God. So interpreted, even this part of the account contains a confirmation of our supposed identity of the Adam of the Bible and the Zoroaster of history. What God 'brought unto the man' was the Wisdom or Word which he had created, and of which the apocryphal scriptures speak as 'the mother of all good things.' Since the Semitic tradition did not reach beyond the days of Zoroaster, the history of Adam was recorded in such a manner that to the initiated only its figurative sense could be known, whilst the record in its literal sense would be understood to refer to the first creation of man.

The Word of God, which was with God and in man, was presented to the spiritual eye of Adam, the prophet, as an impersonification of that Divine Word or Wisdom unto which the soul of 'the first Adam' had been joined, as the Church is joined unto 'the second Adam,' that is, unto 'Christ, the Wisdom of God.' It was presented to him in a vision as the Wisdom through which, like the Church, Adam was sanctified, and which, in the fulness of time, became flesh of man's flesh and bone of his bone in the sanctified Jesus, thus accomplishing the 'great mystery' of 'Christ and the Church.' At the time of man's spiritual creation, when he was allied unto Wisdom and thus to immortality, God covered those who were created to his image with 'garments of glory,' according to the targum, so that they need not have been 'ashamed,' if they had not fallen into sin. Already in Adam 'the seed which is from God, even the Word,'[1] did dwell; the eternal Christ, the Messianic Spirit was with him;[2] he put on 'the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness;' he saw the day of Christ in the flesh, and rejoiced over it. But he did not give himself over to that Divine guide, and

[1] Justin writes: 'That which is called by the prophet in the spirit the *garment*, are the men which believe in him (Christ), in whom dwells the seed which is from God, even the Word' (Ap. 41).

[2] We have seen (i. 229) that, according to the targums, the Messiah was in paradise and in the desert as 'the rock of the Church of Zion.'

instead of being led by 'the Holy Spirit,' he was instigated by 'the evil spirit' to impure thoughts, words, and deeds.[1] Thus 'evil seed' was 'sown in the heart of Adam,' who, 'bearing a wicked heart, transgressed.'[2] The Semitic tradition, therefore, begins with the record of a time when, according to Japhetic tradition, the causes and the nature of man's fall were fully known, though not in the allegorical form transmitted to us through Genesis. Thus the first spiritual creation of man to the image of God was identified with the first creation of the pre-Adamite man in pre-historical times, to which no recorded revelation refers.

Nature of prophecy.

The prophets in Israel[3] are called by God to be the depositaries and the organs of the belief, that the kingdom of God will come, and first for Israel. They proclaim this belief as prophets; they prophesy that the communion will be fully realized which God had established with Israel's beginnings in the time of the patriarchs, then, in the time of Moses, with Israel, the chosen people: a communion which God has held firm, and has nurtured with a mighty hand, from the days of Moses until the days of the prophets, notwithstanding the faithlessness and the falling away of the people. The prophets prophesy that this communion will be realized, as in the inner parts of the individual Israelites, and in the moral deportment of the people, so also in the crystallisation of all outer conditions in the country and in the state, not through Israel's merit, but through the grace of God, who for the sake of his holy name will have mercy on his people, will take away sins and transgressions, and will sprinkle clean water upon the unclean people, that it may become clean;[4] who will fill with his Spirit, will increase, restore, and bless those whom he has chosen, that they shall live in

[1] See Avesta.

[2] 2 Esd. iv. 30; iii. 21.

[3] Part of the following is translated from Bertheau's article in the 'Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie,' iv. 595, f. 1859.

[4] Ezech. xxxvi. 25.

CHAP. XV.

communion with him.[1] But, as certain as it is that salvation comes from the grace of God, so certainly must the people do its own part, in order to become capable of receiving the manifestations of God's mercy. The announcement of the future glory is therefore connected with the solemn warning, with the urgent request to listen to the call of the long-suffering and merciful God, to advance in the ways which he has prepared, to take hold of the salvation which he has brought near and offered. For though Israel is the chosen people, yet salvation shall not fall to its lot, if by its stiff-neckedness it continues in its sin, and misinterprets the judgments of God, that is, his doings and his providential dispensations, whose object and aim is not only the destruction of sin and of the sinful powers, but also the new creation, the strengthening, and the protection of such a life of the individuals and of the people, as shall be in accordance with his Divine will.

Wherever the word of prophecy points to Israel's future salvation, not only in general to some future salvation, it speaks of the transformation and re-organization of specified conditions, and of the removing of existing evils. The prophets describe Israel's future glory as it will be realized within the limits of given historical relations. Therefore their prophecies, which refer to Israel's future, do not move in undefined, colourless representations; not in mere images, the application and the reference of which they leave it to their hearers or readers to make at pleasure; not in mere expressions or formulas, which admit of manifold interpretations. Their speeches do not present a framework of ideas and thoughts, which would have first to be filled with positive contents; they rather contain a description of salvation as it would realize itself on the respective foundation of the present time. Having in view, in the first place, the warning and reminding, the strengthening of the faith, and the repentance of

[1] xxxvi. 6–38.

their contemporaries, the prophets delineate with living clearness how the historical conditions of their time will after God's will re-form themselves to a new historical reality, not affected by sin and transgression. The future organization of Israel and of the people of the earth, the realization of the kingdom of God on the domain of history and of visible nature, in short, the blessed time which the prophets longingly expect, it is not separated by a great gulph from their own days, it does not presuppose a long development passing through unmeasured periods of time. No; it is near, and that which it will bring will be, on the whole, the transfiguration and reformation of present conditions.

Because all prophets prophesy about the salvation which is near, and about the approaching realization of the same, the contents of each prophecy must be dependent on the respective historical relations of Israel and of the nations of the earth. Inasmuch as there is no salvation for a people continuing in sin, nor generally for the wicked; the fulfilment of each distinct prophecy must depend on the moral deportment of man, especially of Israel in the time in which the prophets respectively prophesy, or in the time immediately following thereon. For the living God who sends his prophets, is a God of liberty, who allows himself to be determined by the moral deportment of men. Now, we know that the people Israel was a stiff-necked people, which did not listen to its prophets, and which again and again rejected the salvation which God proffered and the prophets announced. Each time it rejected the salvation which was proclaimed by the prophets in a manner conformable to the historical conditions which existed in their time. Yet, with an eternal love, God loves his people, and therefore he mercifully spares it. Though Israel has so often misinterpreted, in the events of the world and in its own history, the providential dispensations which God had brought about, for the realization of his thoughts of

CHAP. XV.

salvation; although it has so often not listened to the call of the prophets, to take hold of the near salvation, he does not rest, but prepares new ways, and removes the obstacles which the powers of the world and the sin in Israel oppose to the realization of his purpose. And as he himself, through his government of the world, unremittingly worked for the foundation of a Divine kingdom, which should bring to all its members peace and blessedness, so he ever raised up until the days of Malachi new prophets, who prophesied about the coming of his kingdom. Yea, even in the times when the word of prophecy had become dumb, there were men in Israel to point to the great events which God had caused to come to pass. Human sin and human opposition may retard the coming of the Divine kingdom, but it will come; and the belief in its coming is the unalterable foundation for the entire prophecy of salvation, in however different forms it may be presented in the course of centuries.

Prophecy had to be presented in different forms; for, in the first place, it has never become in Israel a dead possession, nor a formula which, having come down from times of old, was transmitted without change, and repeated in the original form. Again, it has pleased God to call, as prophets, men of different dispositions and gifts, from different classes and circles of life, men of different education and knowledge. Yet, the hand [or Spirit] of God came powerfully over the prophets;[1] they beheld the visions which God showed unto them; they heard the words which, as commissioned by him, they were to communicate to the people. Everywhere we trace the selfsame spirit, which was working in them; but their individuality is not destroyed. The peculiar kind and form of their prophetic activity is dependent on the historical conditions under which they laboured, on their respective course of development, and on their gifts.

[1] Is. viii. 11.

Again, the Scriptures of prophets, who in the course of centuries succeeded each other, are influenced by the peculiar literary stamp of the times. But in all, we trace the influence of that same Spirit of God, to which also the Christian Church owes its origin.

To this view of prophecy another has been opposed, which may be briefly stated as follows.[1] Prophecy points to the future; it treats of those things which shall come to pass at the end of days; it also describes the aim and end of God's ways: the final and perfect setting up of the kingdom of God; the blessed communion of the individuals and of the people Israel; then also of all nations of the earth with God, and the transfiguration of the heavens and of the earth. The entire prophecy, therefore, points to the same aim and end, and it was permitted to the prophets to see this one final aim and end. How could differences occur in the description of the same? As the prophets were seers, beholders of visions; as they were in an ecstatic state, in which the truth was communicated to them by God in the way of a direct manifestation; as their task consisted in only describing that which was communicated to them; as they were essentially called upon to render but an instrumental service; nothing could be found in their prophecies to which could only be assigned the passing importance of a link in a chain of historical development; nothing of which the fulfilment were connected with the deportment of the people, or dependent on the evolutions of history. It is not to be expected that the prophets should represent the final development in its entire connection and according to all its relations. For they express each time only that which results from their inner intuitive perception, and only that was given them which under the respective conditions was the most useful and the most effective. Some prophets may not take cognizance of essential parts of the great picture; but it does not follow from this that they

[1] Comp. Hengstenberg's Christologie, 2nd edition.

CHAP. XV.

did not know them. Because they were seers, it must be considered as natural that they never gave more than what they had seen, without mixing up that which, according to their reasonable consciousness, they knew from the revelations of other men of God and from the universal faith of God's Church.

It stands in connection with this beholding in an ecstatic state that everything is represented to the prophets in the present time, and that they speak in such a manner about events and persons of a more or less remote future as if they stood before them, as if they were present. They are not merely chronological historians, but rather describers of a picture. Therefore the distance of time remained generally unknown to them, unless a special revelation in this respect was added.[1] If, for instance, they saw the Messiah standing before them in the picture, how could they know how much time would still elapse before his coming? And finally, if the prophets were describers of pictures, if they received their information by intuitive perception, it must in the outset be agreed that an extensive use of the image (type, allegory, or metaphor) would be made in prophecy. Although through the intellectual beholding the prophets may grasp the word even without the casket of imagery, yet every spiritual conception prefers the type. It is a consequence of the visionary character of prophecy that the image must be distinguished from the reality. And although the typical, allegorical, or metaphorical character is with the prophets, tempered by the object to make themselves understood by the Church and to influence the same, it is founded on the very essence of prophecy that, on the whole, a figurative character must be attributed to it. All that is required, therefore, is to find safe rules for defining the limits between the figure and the thing itself. For much which appears to belong to the latter belongs to the former. Where the fulfilment can already be compared

[1] Is. vii.; Jer. xxv.; Dan. ix.

with the prophecy, there the separation of the figure from the reality is easily effected; but even where that is not the case, proper landmarks are not wanting.

Against this ecstatic view of prophecy it has been objected that, unless it can be rendered probable by a minute investigation of all the different phases of the prophetic element which we can trace in the prophetic writings, that all prophecies were written in an absolutely ecstatic state, the above theory cannot be accepted. It is not a peculiarity to be attributed only to the ecstatic state or to the visionary beholding, or to the speaking in tongues, that the reflecting activity of man is more or less neutralised. The same likewise cedes to a certain extent before the inspiration of the poet or the artist, and before all those conditions in which man is taken hold of by a higher power; when a truth reaching beyond the horizon of his own consciousness flashes before him as lightning; when from the mysterious depth of the connection with God, and from the innermost essence of the Spirit new light arises about the enigmas of life and the aims and ends of human aspirations. This is indirectly confirmed by biblical testimony. For prophets especially refer to those moments when they were in direct communion with God.[1] It follows, therefore, that they did not receive the revelations of God always in the same manner; that upon moments of extreme sensation calmer states followed, in which the Divine influence also gave place to human thought and reflection, to that activity of reminding and teaching which refers to the outer world, and also to the influence of scriptural composition.[2] Thus Paul distinguishes among the spiritual gifts the unedifying gift of speaking mysteries in unknown tongues and *without* the understanding, from the edifying gift of speaking mysteries *with* the understanding. Only inasmuch as the former

[1] Is. vi.; xxii. 14; comp. v. 9; Jer. i.; Ez. i. f. comp. iii. 14; viii. 1; xi. 5.

[2] Comp. 1 Sam. ix.; x. 5 f.; xix. 24; 1 Kings xxii. 5-27; 2 Kings ix. 11; Hos. ix. 7.

CHAP. XV.

state may possibly lead to the other does the Apostle recognize the absolutely unconscious or ecstatic state as the manifestation of a spiritual gift. Interpretation is by the Apostle recommended as a check and as a test; for all spiritual gifts are given for edification. We may, therefore, even assert that the more that individuals have advanced towards an undeviating walk with God, the less outward will be the revelation, the less ecstatic will be their state; inasmuch as the blending of the human will with the Divine renders unnecessary the absolute neutralization of the former.

On interpretation of prophecy.

Having considered the nature and the object of prophecy, we turn to its interpretation. Like the prophecies themselves, their interpretation before fulfilment cannot be otherwise than spiritually discerned. Every right interpretation of prophecy is a gift of that same Spirit of God which enabled the prophets to see what they saw. And as the sight of the seer was more or less blinded by his individual consciousness, so likewise will the sight of the interpreter be dependent on the degree of direct communion which he may have been enabled to establish with his God. Now, when towards the close of the second century the apocryphal gospel after John was published, such had already then been the misinterpretation of the Lord's doctrine about the future Messianic fulfilment, that the true sense of Messianic prophecies remained hidden. And so it has been ever since, and is it even in our own days. The now prevailing views with regard to the future development of God's kingdom may be classified as follows:

Messianic expectations.

1. According to some, the Bible contains no prophecy at all, in the literal sense of the word. Those who were called prophets were not seers of future events, but more or less clear discerners of a development of which the germ was, or was supposed to be, contained in the circumstances and conditions of their times. The expectation of an anointed individual raised from among his brethren,

is deemed to have been a fallacy, consequent upon an erroneous opinion about the privileged mission supposed to have been intrusted to Israel as a chosen people.[1]

2. Some have tried to establish, with much erudition, that the prophecies about the kingdom of God were addressed to Israel, the servant of God; yet that Israel, having repeatedly rejected the Messianic call, by not answering to the required conditions, the development of the Divine kingdom upon earth will for ever be independent of Israel in the flesh, which has no future. And even Christians must not look to the fulfilling realization of those so-called Messianic prophecies which are not yet fulfilled. Although it is acknowledged that the kingdom promised to David, and which is to come in the name or spirit of God, was not established by Jesus, who referred to the future setting up of the same, yet Jesus as Christ, as the Messiah of the spiritual kingdom of God in the hearts of men, is assumed to have thus fulfilled all Messianic prophecies, and the announcements of a future setter-up of a terrestrial kingdom, of a visible organization of the spiritual kingdom, are not denied but rejected.[2]

3. The majority of Christians, fully acknowledging the Messianic element contained in the Bible, believe that the Messianic prophecies have been partly fulfilled by Christ Jesus at his first coming, and that they will receive their final fulfilment at the second *visible* coming of the same Saviour.

4. The Israelites, not believing in the Messiahship of Jesus, do not connect the expected fulfilment of Messianic prophecies with the person of Jesus; but they look for another, for the desired messenger of the covenant, who is to come in the name or spirit of the Lord, at the time when Jehovah will come to his temple.

[1] This view has been ably maintained by Colani: 'Jésus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son temps.' 1864.

[2] For this view see also Bertheau's article, to which we have referred.

CHAP. XV.

Whether the Christian view about the Messianic future cannot by a more spiritual interpretation of Christ's second coming be so harmonized with a true interpretation of the Israelitic view, as to acknowledge what is right in the one without rejecting what is right in the other; or whether without such a fusion Israel's future may not be intended for a time to remain independent of the Christian development, agreeing about the doctrine of the Divine sonship, but disagreeing about the part which Jesus is to take at the time of the final Messianic realization: these are questions which it is hoped will be seriously considered by the Church, and to which our suggestions refer. The catholicity of the future will centre in the belief that the Divine Word has in all ages been God's revealing organ; that Jesus was the perfect advocate of the same, and thus became the Anointed One who raised humanity to the Godhead; that to become instruments of that selfsame Word or Spirit of God is the high destiny of those who desire that their spiritual life shall be hid with Christ in God, and who press forward towards the mark of humanity's high calling, striving to be followers of him who, having run the race, obtained the prize.

Tradition and Canon.

In the foregoing outlines of a history of the Apocrypha, we have traced the origin of secret tradition to the times of Moses, and Abraham, and Adam, if not beyond, to that pre-historical period which preceded the art of writing, and when verbal tradition was the only memorial of man's activity. Such tradition required secrecy. For only in a limited circle could it have been at all possible strictly or even generally to preserve the same. Even recorded tradition would be at first intrusted only to the disciples of verbal tradition. Thus a powerful class of privileged individuals would be created, to whom the stewardship of God's mysteries was delegated. Now, it is one of the main characteristics of absolute religion, in contradistinction to natural religion, that it cannot be accepted without some degree of reflection. And whilst

reflection on religious maxims presupposes the teaching of the latter, teaching leads to written records. The canonicity or authority of Scripture will depend as much on the circumstances in which they were composed as on the men who wrote them. If, therefore, a verbal tradition continued from earlier times by the side of written tradition, and if the latter was for a time and in part destined only for the limited number of those who were initiated in the mysteries of revealed religion, then Scripture must at certain periods of history have been entitled to a more or less secondary authority. Again, if the typical and allegorical form recommended itself as the best medium for scriptural transmission, those only who at the time of composition knew the hidden meaning of such types and allegories, were in a position rightly to interpret the written records. And though even those who had not been brought up to the knowledge of the hidden things, might be sufficiently enlightened to decipher the hieroglyphics of the past, yet such enlightenment would be rendered difficult by the perplexing and prejudicing effects produced through apocryphal Scripture. Not until the spirit of prophecy and of enlightened inquiry leads men to unravel and to divulge the secret, can the deep meaning of Scripture be understood without the aid of tradition.

We hope to have sufficiently established the fact, that even the original and for some time the only gospel-record of Matthew was written under restricting conditions, and such as were adverse to the proclamation of the full light of Christ's preaching. After that the Apostle who did not labour under the yoke of such bondage, after that Paul had boldly proclaimed in light what Christ had preached in secret and in darkness, that is, 'the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began,' even then the Paulinic disciple considered that he could do no more than, by ingrafting the Hidden Wisdom on the apostolic record which excluded it, to pave the way for the later promulgation of that apostolic apocry-

CHAP. XV.

phal gospel-record, which, in its more essential parts, must already then have existed, and this, perhaps, without Luke's knowledge. Which, then, were the men who in the first and in the second century, as guardians of the secret tradition, could more or less fully know and understand what Christ had really taught? This question is of the highest importance, since the beginning of Christian development must be traced back to the person of Jesus, whose life, as the Son of God, is the great mirror of biblical history, into which concentrate, and from which radiate, all the rays of revelation.

Are we to look in Jerusalem or in Rome or elsewhere for the organs of secret tradition, and thus for the best interpreters of Scripture in their own time? We have seen what were the baneful light-excluding effects of the Jewish hierarchy at Jerusalem, and that after the fall of that city Rome soon became the new centre of the Church. Here, if anywhere, at the end of the first and at the beginning of the second century, there must have been men who, if they did not know it, could know from such men as Polycarp all about Christ's mysteries. And yet we have seen that the Roman Church did not openly acknowledge the Hidden Wisdom of Christ, that is, his most essential doctrines, till after the middle of the second century. Then it was that the Docetic Gnostics pointed to secret tradition as to the authority for their views, insisting upon it, that the Scriptures must be interpreted according to these hidden mysteries, and even falsifying the only one gospel, that after Luke, which they recognised. We owe it to the Gnostics of the second century, that the Church, in self-defence, published the Gospel after John. And it is the glory of the Roman Church, that by its opposition to the Docetic attacks against historical Christianity, it rendered possible the transmission of the gospel texts we now possess, whilst by its constant recognition of the Apocrypha of the Septuagint, it preserved the key of knowledge which the Jewish hierarchy had

taken away. But this key of knowledge, the keys which the Lord gave unto Peter, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, have been by the Roman Church preserved in secret and in darkness. It has not made known to the world the connection between pre-Christian and Christian apocryphal doctrines, the connection between Paul and the other Apostles, the hidden relations between the fourth gospel and the three earlier ones; it has not told us, what it must have known in early if not in later times, why the first three Evangelists abstained from referring to any of those important sayings of Christ which we only find recorded in the fourth gospel of our Canon. How absolutely futile is, therefore, the assertion, that the Roman tradition contains 'what was always, everywhere, and by all believed!' How grave is the assumption that Christ continues to live and to act exclusively through the hierarchy!

We cannot attempt to draw the line between the authority of tradition and the authority of the Canon. We must judge by the result. What Scripture teaches we can more or less clearly discern, but what is the essence of tradition we ignore. Although the Divine element cannot be clearly separated from the human, yet to every believer in God's supernatural action upon his soul, the Bible reflects the history of that action upon the chosen men of a chosen people; it contains the revelation of the great mystery, how God glorifies himself in mankind. This mystery is gradually revealed by the word of prophecy and the true interpretation thereof. By rightly understanding the development recorded in the Bible, and by the proper interpretation of the mysteries it contains, the ever-advancing consciousness of the Church will be harmonised with the revered records of the past, and thus the Bible will more and more become the universal standard of Christianity. But where are we to look for a parallel result of tradition? History shows that secret tradition has been used for hierarchical purposes, that it has not furthered, but retarded, the

CHAP. XV.

course of truth. If it be said that, as the Canon is not faultless, neither can tradition be expected to be so, both being imperfect manifestations of the revealing Spirit of God, what then becomes of the boasted infallibility of the Pope, with or without the consent of councils? Tradition ought to be, but Roman tradition is not, 'the memory of the Church.' Neither the Canon nor tradition constitutes an infallible authority. If the one is brought to bear upon the other, and if such investigations are assisted by Divine enlightenment, due value will be assigned to either. But the saving action of God's Spirit on the heart of man is independent of all knowledge which it is not in the power of the individual to acquire. The individual's relation to Christ is not dependent on his relation to the Church: but, contrariwise, the relation of the individual to the Church is dependent on his relation to Christ. Not the visible Church is the prior, and the invisible Church the posterior, but the visible Church follows upon the invisible, just as the creation of the material world followed the creation of the spiritual world. Not where the Church is, is the Spirit of God, but where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church.

The Church.

The true Church is essentially invisible, because the result of that common faith in Christ, which originates in the operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man. But Christ, 'the author and finisher of our faith,' the 'Spiritual Rock' which accompanied the Israelites in the wilderness, the Rock of which also the Gentiles have drunk, did receive its perfect outward manifestation by the Divine glory shining in the face of Jesus, who thus became the human incarnation of that invisible Christ, the embodiment of the Divine Word, the absolutely perfect organ or advocate of the indwelling Saviour of all in all ages. Already in the pre-Christian period the 'Rock' was interpreted as the Divine Word, which was in the beginning with God, and whose mission it was to raise sons of God among sons of men. Before that Jesus could reveal to

any of his disciples the mysterious application to himself of this principal doctrine of the Apocryphal or Hidden Wisdom, the same was revealed by God to Peter, who confessed Jesus to be the Son of the living God, and thus the anointed instrument of the anointing Word, the very rock of salvation. On the rock of this confession, or on the rock of the Divine sonship, that is, on the foundation of what then in Palestine was a hidden and forbidden doctrine, Christ declared that he would build his Church. That Church is to be universal and individual, for he promised that 'where two or three' shall be gathered in his name, that is, in his Spirit, there he will be in the midst of them, thus remaining with mankind unto the end of the world. The Church of Christ is therefore the kingdom of heaven on earth, the kingdom of God within man, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. The keys of this spiritual or heavenly kingdom, that is, 'the key of knowledge' which had been taken away by the Jewish hierarchy, Christ especially intrusted to that same Apostle to whom the Divine sonship had been first revealed from heaven, to Peter,[1] who later proclaimed the universal priesthood of mankind.

But although Peter was thus distinguished even among the three Apostles who were the Lord's most intimate associates, and whom, as was early believed, Christ instructed in a special manner in the knowledge of his mysteries, yet to his twelve disciples as a body, and not only to these, but also to his other disciples, the command was given to proclaim in light what he had told them in secret and in darkness. All his disciples were appointed instruments for preaching the gospel of the kingdom among all nations. The twelve Apostles or 'messengers' were, as it seems, only in so far distinguished from 'the rest' of the disciples, that their mission was principally, and at first exclusively, confined to spreading the elementary principles of the good news of the kingdom among the twelve tribes. Seen in the

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9.

CHAP. XV.

light of the Apocalypse, it was Christ's intention, by the selection of twelve Apostles, to foreshadow the future organisation of the promised theocracy in the Holy Land, the times and seasons of which God has reserved to his power. But already in the apostolic age this title was extended to others, and not only to Paul and Barnabas, but to Epaphroditus and Titus, and all 'the messengers' (or Apostles) of the churches.[1] Not to the twelve only, but, as we may assume with Luther, to all his disciples, was the power given to bind and to loosen on earth, whether we interpret this mystical saying as referring to the binding to, or the loosening from, the injunctions of the law, or whether we explain it otherwise. For it is only in the Palestinian Gospel that the term of his disciples is exclusively applied to the twelve Apostles. The mysteries of heaven were known also to other disciples,[2] and he invited '*the people* with his disciples' to follow him,[3] whilst the selection of the seventy showed the universality of the Gospel and of the apostleship. Therefore, writing to the Romans, Paul salutes his fellow-prisoners, saying of them that they are of note among the Apostles, *who also were in Christ before him.*[4] Again, whilst Paul seems to distinguish between 'the twelve' Apostles and 'all' Apostles, thus applying this title also to other disciples, Luke writes of 'the eleven *and all the rest*' of the disciples, or of 'the eleven *and them that were with them*'[5] To be 'in Christ' was by the great Apostle declared to be the test of true discipleship. As in the unity of the Spirit Christ was at one with the Father, so is every disciple to be at one with Christ in the unity of the selfsame spirit, the manifestation of which is in some measure given to every man, be he Jew or Gentile. To believe in the Divine Word as the indwelling Saviour of all in all ages, and to manifest this faith by the fruits of the Spirit: this was to be a disciple of the incarnate Word Christ Jesus, of the Spiritual Rock

[1] Phil. ii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 23. [2] Mark iv. 10; Luke xii. [3] Mark viii. 34.
[4] Rom. xvi. 7. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7; Luke xxiv. 9, 33.

of the Lord who 'is' that 'One Spirit,' of which 'all have been made to drink.' 'The same God worketh all in all,' whether they be apostles or prophets, or teachers, or workers of miracles or healers, or helpers in the ministry, or in governments, or speakers in divers tongues; there are 'diversities of gifts,' and 'differences of administrations,' and 'diversities of operations;' but the great mystery which has been kept hidden from the beginning is, that as 'Adam' was the son of God through the operation of the Holy Spirit, so all sons of men are called to the Divine sonship, though but few be chosen as special instruments or advocates of that selfsame Spirit, which was in Christ Jesus.

In the days of its origin the Christian Church was nothing more than the result of the Holy Spirit's operation in such who were made conscious of the individual communion and walk with God. At first,[1] the Church was the invisible communion of the faith and the faithful, although it necessarily became a gathering institution for the latter. All inner life requires its outward manifestation. From the beginning, therefore, the Church had to strive after becoming the outward organ, and, in a certain sense, even the locality of Divine manifestations. Therefore the 'society of the faith and of the Holy Spirit in the hearts' had necessarily to develop itself into a 'society of the outward signs of the Church;' the inner, invisible communion of the faithful, had to constitute itself also as an outward, social community in the faith and for the faith. We have seen that in the beginning of the Christian era the prevailing circumstances and conditions were adverse to such an outward development and organisation; the ceremonial law was upheld in all its rigour and outwardness; and although the synagogal services were not suppressed, yet the public teaching of the Hidden Wisdom was strictly excluded, so that it was only in the form of

[1] Part of the following has been taken from the valuable work of Höfling: 'Grundsätze Evangelisch-Lutherischer Kirchenverfassung,' 1853.

CHAP. XV.

parables that its precepts could be gradually inculcated. The proclamation, and still more the personal application of the doctrine of Divine sonship, was punished with excommunication and with death. The consequence of this was, that the Apostles at Jerusalem acknowledged and took part in the ceremonial temple services, which had not been frequented by their Master, and that, although the people magnified them, of the rest of the Christians, that is, of the scattered remnant which had been spared by the persecution which followed Stephen's death, 'no one durst join himself to them.' How then could an outward communion of the faithful have been established at Jerusalem? It was at Antioch that a Church was founded in general harmony with the principles of Christ; and, as if to show that the members of that Church were not ashamed of following the author and finisher of their faith, as if to proclaim the doctrine of Divine sonship through the anointing of the Holy Ghost, they here were first called Christians. Not only had this first Gentile church been established independently of the twelve Apostles, but circumstances are recorded which lead us rather to assume, that this Church was not at once recognised by the Palestinian Apostles. For whilst Paul seems to have here begun his public work in the ministry,[1] to have started hence on his first missionary journey,[2] and to have returned hither,[3] the first meeting between Paul and the apostolic body at Jerusalem took place about seventeen years after his conversion, when the Apostles wrote letters to the Church at Antioch, and sent 'chosen men of their own company' to the same, with Paul and Barnabas. How long before this time the Church at Antioch had been established it is impossible to conjecture. Anyhow, at a later period a difference arose at Antioch between Paul and the Apostles, and generally the times continued to be unfavourable to the unity in the Christian

[1] Acts xi. 22–26; see xiv. 26–28; also xv. 35 and xviii. 23.
[2] xiii. 1–3. [3] xiv. 26.

Church. Jerusalem having been destroyed, and its precincts by Hadrian forbidden to those of the circumcision, Rome soon took its place as the mother-Church. But here the Hidden Wisdom, the most essential doctrines of Christ, were not publicly acknowledged till after the middle of the second century, when the apocryphal gospel after John was brought to light.

The gospels and the history of the early Church sufficiently show, that the origin of the Christian Church cannot be dated from the calling of the twelve Apostles, but rather from the day of Pentecost. It was then that they received further enlightenment as witnesses of Christ for all the world. But the same Spirit of God, which 'wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty' in Paul 'toward the Gentiles.' Paul had not been converted through the instrumentality of the Apostles; but, if through any human instrumentality, through Ananias, a simple disciple of Christ, who did not belong to them 'which were of reputation,' to the persons held in respect, to those transcendently great Apostles who *seemed* to be pillars, whilst before God there is no respect of persons. Nor did Paul learn anything new from them when he met the apostolic body, more than seventeen years later; and yet the leading Apostles gave him the hand of fellowship when they perceived the grace that was given unto him. Before this Apostolic recognition of Paul, we may assume that he had written several of his epistles. For his second epistle to the Corinthians was written 'above fourteen years' after his conversion, according to his own statement. It cannot be denied that the powers intrusted to Paul were of a much higher nature than those with which the twelve Apostles were endued; nor does the account transmitted to us of their labours after the Pentecostal enlightenment justify us in assuming, that from that day they all understood the mysteries of Christ, as these were revealed to and proclaimed by Paul. Unless, therefore, it can be

CHAP. XV.

proved from the gospels that the twelve and Paul were the only chosen Apostles, and that all other disciples of the Lord were called to different functions in the Church, we are not justified in assuming that, by the selection of twelve Apostles, Christ has instituted a permanent and privileged Apostolic corporation. With the death of the Apostles ended their special mission, which seems to have consisted in typifying in their corporate capacity the hierarchical organisation of the future theocracy in the land of promise. The theory of Apostolic succession cannot, therefore, be established. If Christ said to his disciples: 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you;'[1] 'He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me;'[2] or 'Feed my lambs;'[3] then Christ has either thereby established a continuing Apostolic institution, or he has established an office which *only in the outset* requires divinely appointed representatives of the same, but which once founded seeks its own men, and which by Divine right is with all who in faith perform it according to the intention of its founder. The Lord does not continue to say, after the words above quoted, As I send you, so send ye others in my place; or Whosoever heareth those whom ye have sent in my place, he heareth me; but, contrariwise, *he does not pray that the Apostles shall be followed by lawful successors, but 'for them which shall believe through their word.'*[4]

Again, not the twelve Apostles are here exclusively referred to as the teachers by whose word others shall be led to the faith, but Christ declares that he has manifested the name or Spirit of God unto the men which he gave him out of the world. Thus all those are referred to who, by keeping the Divine Word, the seed of the Word in their hearts, have followed Christ in the regeneration, have received the words which he had received from

[1] John xx. 21.
[2] Luke x. 16.
[3] John xxi. 15.
[4] John xvii. 18–20.

God, have believed that he came out from God, and was sent by him. The gospels clearly show that this could not be said exclusively of the Apostles. Moreover, these were not by Christ excluded from the number of those who could not then bear all what he had to tell them, and who on some *future* day would know the great mystery that the Son is in the Father and the Father in him. And finally, it is sufficiently proved by the Acts of the Apostles, that beyond the precincts of Jerusalem, in which city the twelve remained, as if laid under restraint, and where of 'the rest' of the disciples 'no one durst join himself unto them,' Christianity was first promulgated not by, but independently of, the Apostles. Not the Apostles, but 'the rest' of the disciples,[1] that is, 'they that were scattered abroad went *everywhere* preaching the Word.'[2] Some of them 'which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the Word *to none but unto the Jews only*.' But, on the other hand, 'some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, *spake unto the Grecians*, preaching the Lord Jesus.'[3] Even Barnabas and Paul, when they first came to Antioch, already *found* the Church which the grace of God had created there. And in like manner, when some of the Apostles first went into Samaria, they had been preceded by one of the disciples that were 'scattered abroad,' by Philip, the future deacon, who *had* preached Christ unto the Samaritans, and these *had* received the Word of God, having believed Philip's preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.

The promulgation of Christianity did, therefore, not exclusively originate with the Apostles. Far from it: it would seem that they were at first not in the position to form a centre for the Christian faith. They remained at Jerusalem, where they were regarded as harmless by the

[1] Comp. Luke xxiv. 9. [2] Acts viii. 4. [3] xi. 19, 20.

CHAP. XV.

Jewish rulers, probably because they 'continued daily with one accord in the temple,' which their Lord had only visited for the purpose of protest, and because, by their not referring to their Master's Hidden Wisdom, they in fact sanctioned the continued validity of the law and its ordinances, being 'all zealous of the law.'[1] We may assume that it was owing to the cautious and compromising conduct of the Apostles that the persecution did not reach them, although its centre was at Jerusalem. Nor did the Apostles establish any new ministerial office by causing or sanctioning the election of elders or bishops, which two titles were originally equivalent, whilst, by the institution of elders, the natural want of an organisation and management of the local churches was satisfied. The form in which this want was supplied was not a new one, but one which had been borrowed from the constitution of the synagogue and of the Gentile municipality. Even the Jewish synagogue had its elders or pastors, and its subordinate officers or clerks. Already, in the time of Moses, the elders formed a sort of senate, as heads of houses representing the people, and helping Moses in bearing the burden of government,[2] that is, participating in the management of public affairs. In the Apostolic age, the bishop-elders were superintendents over the spiritual well-being of the flock. 'At first it appears, from the description of the practices of the Church,[3] the work of oral teaching, whatever form it assumed, was not limited to any body of men, but was exercised according as each man possessed a special spiritual gift for it. Even then, however, there were some inconveniences attendant on this freedom, and it was a natural remedy to select men for the special function of teaching.' 'According to the measure of the gift of Christ,' the Lord appointed some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers.[4] The Apostolic office, in its general

[1] Acts ii. 46; iii. 1; xxi. 20 f.
[2] Comp. Num. xi. 17.
[3] 1 Cor. xiv. 26.
[4] Eph. iv. 7, 11.

sense, must be connected with the government of the universal Church, the evangelist with a missionary cause, the pastor with a local church, and the teacher with the school.

Already in the days of Moses, the people in its collective capacity, the congregation or church, was invested with legislative and judicial powers. 'The tabernacle of the congregation,' where Moses and the elders stood before the Lord, may well have been an inheritance from the patriarchal age, in the record of which we vainly seek for a trace of an hereditary or caste-priesthood. For, even of Melchisedek nothing is said about his having had either a predecessor or a successor; whilst Job, the man of Uz, ignores altogether the institutions of the Mosaic theocracy. In Egypt the Israelites came in contact with an hereditary priesthood; and that there was a connection of some kind between the Egyptian priesthood and that of Israel has been fully established. The priesthood of Aaron was a deflection from the true primeval and perfect priesthood of Melchisedek, which has been restored in and through Christ, who, however, was not merely, like Melchisedek, an especial organ of the Divine Word, but the perfect incarnation of the same. 'The synagogue and not the temple furnishes the pattern for the organisation of the Church. The idea which pervades the teaching of the epistles is that of an universal priesthood. All true believers are made kings and priests, offer spiritual sacrifices, may draw near, may enter into the Holiest, as having received a true priestly consecration. They, too, have been washed and sprinkled as the sons of Aaron were. It was the thought of a succeeding age that the old classification of the high-priest, priests and Levites, was reproduced in the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Christian Church.[1] This definition is in perfect harmony with the words of Luther. 'The keys belong to the entire congregation of all Christians, and of every individual who is a member

[1] See Mr. Plumptre's Articles in Smith's 'Dictionary' on 'bishop,' 'deacon,' 'evangelist,' and 'priest.'

CHAP. XV.

of that same congregation; . . . they are common to all, inasmuch as they are nothing else than the office through which the Word is turned to use and practice.'[1] 'Where the faith is, there also is the Church; where the Church, there also the bride of Christ; where the bride of Christ, there all which is of the bridegroom's. Therefore the faith contains all what follows upon the faith: keys, sacrament, power, and everything else.'[2] 'For all Christians are truly belonging to the priestly state, and there is among them no difference, except solely for the sake of the office;' . . . 'it is not seemly for every individual to practise such office. For though we all are priests, no one must put himself forward by himself, nor without our granting and choosing must he venture to do what we all have equally the power to do. For what is common to us nobody may take to himself without the will and command of the congregation.'[3]

There ought, therefore, not to be a twofold priesthood in the Christian Church, a clerical and a so-called lay priesthood. A corporation of priests is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. Only in so far can the priestly office be distinguished from the universal priesthood of the faithful, as an executive is necessary for carrying out the offices which are the common heirloom of all Christians. The priest ought, therefore, to be the acknowledged executive of a local, or of the universal Church. And such distinction is not only necessary, but it follows from the due recognition of the different spiritual gifts which, notwithstanding the unity of the Spirit, will always be manifest in the Church. The office of the Church ought, therefore, to be, not so much the choosing as the acknowledging of its ministers, according to the grace which God has given them. Thus Luther writes, 'Because the Christian Church cannot and shall not exist without the Word

[1] Luther in his 'Epistle to the People of Prague.'

[2] Luther in his 'Writings against Eck,' 1519.

[3] Luther in his 'Epistle to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation,' 1520.

of God, it follows . . . that there must be teachers and preachers who administer the Word. And because in this confounded latter time bishops and the false spiritual government are not and will not be such teachers, nor will give or suffer them, and because God is not to be tempted, that he may from heaven send new preachers, we must regulate our course according to Scripture, and ourselves call and set up from among us those that are found suitable for it, and which God has enlightened with understanding and ornamented with gifts for this purpose.'[1]

Local and national churches, whatever their difference of form, and even of creed, ought not to stand in the way of a universal Church. If local congregations have the innate right to choose and acknowledge their ministers, an organisation might exist through which the representatives of the local churches choose a visible head of the universal Church. If the final aim of the Church on earth is that there shall be one fold and one shepherd; if Christ, the Shepherd and Bishop of the souls of men, will not visibly return to the earth; if the Spirit of Truth is to lead the Church into all truth, then there will be in future either no visible representative of the universal Church, or another human advocate of the Divine Spirit, 'another comforter,' will be raised up by God for the purpose of bringing about the fulfilment of his unfulfilled promises. If there is to be a visible head of the real universal Church, such a man ought to be the delegate, if not the advocate, of all the local churches, the highest executive of the highest interests of mankind. Such a Catholic Church, either with or without a visible head, would put an end to all theories about individual infallibility, or the everlasting authority of the letter of the Bible or of the creeds, as the result of an error-preventing special grace; it would lay the foundation for the best manifestation of the ever-inspiring Holy Ghost; it

[1] Luther in his 'Reason and Cause from Scripture,' 1523.

CHAP XV.

would allow Christians to dwell together in unity, agreeing to differ, if differ they must, and striving to come collectively to the unity of that faith which is founded on the true knowledge of the Son of God. The Holy Catholic Church glorified, the true Church of Christ will be built on the rock-confession first made by Peter, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of the living God; it will be founded on the mystery of the Hidden Wisdom applied to Christ Jesus, the Spiritual Rock, the incarnate Word, the Saviour of all in all ages.

The Problem.

'The Church has neglected the humanity of Jesus Christ, and has occupied herself exclusively with theoretical speculations about his Divinity. It is thus she has often fallen into an irreducible dualism, which did not permit a living knowledge of his person, and which reduced to nothing what the Gospel says about his childhood, his growth, his temptation, his cries, his tears. Scripture was treated like Christ; the human side was suppressed, or, at least, reduced to a mere appearance. This put an end to all criticism, and thus the great tradition of the Reformation was left behind. Thence the painful and tragic reaction of rationalism, of which we still suffer. The Church of the seventeenth century had suppressed the man in Jesus; rationalism suppressed God; and to the Doceticism of orthodoxy was again opposed Jewish Ebionism. The last point of this reaction is reached by the works of Renan and Strauss. The only means of gaining over our adversaries consists in getting hold of that portion of truth which is in them. Let us no longer sacrifice the real humanity of Christ to an abstract dogmatism. Jesus Christ must be presented as a real man; it must be shown that he really did place himself under the law of every human life.'

'It will be said: Will you then sacrifice his Divinity? Certainly not. The constant effort of incredulity is to establish a radical opposition between the natural and the supernatural. We start from directly opposite principles.

It is not true that imperfection and sin belong to the true nature of man, as Strauss and Renan pretend. Man has been created to the image of God; he is made to possess and to manifest that image; and the consummation of his nature lies in an absolute union with God. It is for this reason that Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is the ideal man, the perfect man, the absolute realisation of the human type. God had destined the human heart to receive in Jesus the fulness of his Divinity. The supernatural is nothing else than the sovereign intervention of Divine liberty in history. History without liberty in God and in man, history such as Strauss and Renan comprehend the same, is nonsense. It is a river without a source and without an outlet. Jesus Christ has divided history into two epochs. He has established a new beginning, which had become necessary by the fall of humanity. He has been, in the fullest sense of the word, the God-man, the Son of God, made man. He has known our tears, our strifes, but not our sins. He has placed himself in absolute dependence with regard to his Father, and this constitutes the moral vocation of man. He has prayed, he has manifested his faith by deeds, he has obeyed. It is as representative of humanity that, according to Paul's expression, he has been highly exalted by God, and judged worthy to receive a name above every name. This Divine humanity appears to us in its perfection in the historical Christ.'[1]

'The true image of Christ we shall ourselves be better able to conceive as the highest ideal of our humanity, in the same degree that our own moral faculties and spiritual affections expand, and our whole being becomes more thoroughly assimilated to his Divine life. But to enjoy this faith we must first believe in a human reality; we must have satisfactory evidence of a historical Christ. . . .

[1] Extract from Professor Beyschlag's opening Address at the 'Kirchentag,' in Altenburg, 1864. See M. E. de Pressensé's Article in the 'Revue Chrétienne' of October 1864, and the last 'Bulletin Théologique.'

CHAP. XV.

Christ's is not an exceptional, but a typical, humanity. His superiority to his brethren is not in kind, but in degree. God is in each of us as he was in Christ, and would be equally in us if we were equally holy. His place in the world's history, and the stimulus which his Spirit gives to the highest aspirations of our nature, suffice to prove that God set him in the midst of us, to be our spiritual leader to a higher state of being. Profound conviction of his having risen from the dead, and of his still maintaining spiritual communion with his brethren on earth, passing through inspired souls with a contagious sympathy into the popular heart, sowed in it a trust in immortality which has taken root and will never die, because it is nourished by secret hopes and aspirations, which spring up to meet it in the heart itself. . . . What is true of Christ is true of humanity as a whole. He reveals its possibilities. What cannot be predicated of our nature cannot be affirmed of his. It is the Spirit, the presence of the living Father, which all may seek in prayer and grasp in faith, which enfolds Christ and all men, our collective humanity, in one comprehensive bond of faith and love.'[1]

It has been our object to show that the concealment of the secret doctrine of Christ Jesus during more than one hundred and fifty years paved the way for Jewish Ebionism on the one side, and Docetic Gnosticism on the other. The alternate negation of the Divinity and of the humanity of Christ prevented the Church from discerning the mysterious relation between the human and the Divine nature of Jesus. At the time when the Gospel after John was published to the world, Docetic Christianity had already taken such deep root, that the true nature of Christ's personality remained a mystery. The promulgation of creeds in the fourth and later centuries added to the difficulty. The so-called Apostolic Creed cannot be proved to have been recognised as such even in the fourth

[1] See Mr. J. Tayler's Article in the 'National Review,' November 1864.

century; whilst the passage referring to the descent into hell is notoriously a still later interpolation.[1] Yet most of its component parts were probably known much earlier in the Church as baptismal declarations, whilst later additions referred to particular heresies of the time. We cannot regard it as an epitome of the Apostolic preaching in the time when the secret doctrine of Christ was necessarily hidden from the people. Though the Creed alludes to Christ as the only-begotten Son of God, and as the virgin-born, it abstains from defining the Divine nature of Jesus, whilst it does not in any way refer to his personal existence before the days of his flesh.

A comprehensive history of the Hidden Wisdom ought to throw light on the origin of the Gnosis, and on its development into Doceticism; it ought to form the missing link in the Gospel-chain; it ought to restore the Key of Knowledge which the Jewish rulers had taken away.

It is hoped that the sketch here presented of a history of the Apocrypha may point out in what direction the solution of this great problem is to be found.

[1] In the year 600 the text of this Creed was as follows:—'I believe in God the Father Almighty; and in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and Virgin Mary; and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried; and the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth on the right hand of the Father; whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the flesh, Amen.' Comp. Ruffinus, Exposit. in Symbol. Apost. § 20.

THE END.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE