

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The moral lessons of this narrative, and the interest of Lot in it would insure its preservation among the records of Abraham, and it would commend itself to the lawgiver, who insisted so strenuously on the punishment of sin in this world. It was left for Christ to show that in the judgment to come greater guilt will attach to the rejection of His loving message of salvation, than to any iniquity chargeable against the wicked inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah.

We must reluctantly pass over the times of Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, which are replete with interesting proofs of the thesis of these papers, and must in the last of the series go on to the Exodus, in the account of which, if our hypothesis is correct, we shall find Moses writing of the events of his own time, and in which he himself played a great part.

J. WILLIAM DAWSON.

NEW TESTAMENT NOTES.

(1) THE HOLY SPIRIT AS A DOVE.

IN the Gospel according to St. Luke iii. 21, 22 we read : " Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that, Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon Him, and a voice came out of heaven, Thou art my beloved Son ; in Thee am I well pleased."

My remarks will bear upon the comparison of the Holy Spirit to a dove. The words of St. Luke are : *ἐγένετο . . . καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶ εἶδει ὡς περιστέραν ἐπ' αὐτόν.* The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark omit *σωματικῶ εἶδει*, e.g. St. Matthew says : *εἶδεν (Ἰησοῦς) τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστέραν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν.* St. Mark says : *εἶδεν (Ἰησοῦς) τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστέραν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν.*

No one I think will deny that the plain sense of St. Luke's narrative is that the Holy Spirit took bodily form, and appeared outwardly and objectively as a dove, and this not to the eye of Jesus only, but also, it would seem, of the people assembled. St. Luke thus affords a norm by which to interpret the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke. And so in the Speaker's Bible the commentator on Matthew iii. 16 has the following note:—

“Like a dove, *i.e.* in bodily shape like a dove (Luke iii. 22). This seems to be the natural meaning of the passage, and nothing is gained by attempting any less literal interpretation. The whole narrative implies . . . that a visible form, like the cloven tongues as of fire on the day of Pentecost, appeared as the token and evidence of the Holy Spirit's descent. Thus much being granted, it is more natural to suppose that the actual appearance seen was that of a dove.”

The above may be called the literalist view, *viz.*, that the Holy Spirit took the actual shape and appearance to the eye of a dove, and in that form alighted upon Jesus. This is what St. Luke would have his readers believe, and what, according to the Speaker's Bible, the Evangelists Matthew and Mark meant also, though they are less explicit.

I will now pass on to another school of commentators, namely, those who interpret the passages literally and non-literally—both at once. As an example of this school I will take Canon Farrar, for I consider that the great popularity of his *Life of Christ* proves that his interpretation is that which specially approves itself to English-speaking people. The following then is Canon Farrar's treatment of the incident (*Life of Christ*, ch. viii. *sub finem*):—

“So Jesus descended into the waters of Jordan, and there the awful sign was given that this was indeed ‘He that should come.’ From the cloven heaven streamed the Spirit of God in a dove-like radiance that seemed to hover over his head in lambent flame, and the Bath kôl, which to the dull, unpurged ear was but an inarticulate thunder, spake in the voice of God to the ears of John—‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.’”

Farrar adds the following note :—

“We need not necessarily suppose an actual dove, as is clear from John i. 32; the expression in three Gospels is *ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν*, though St. Luke adds *σωματικῶ εἶδει*. Cp. Targum, Cant. ii. 12, “Vox Turturis vox spiritus sancti”; and 2 Esdras v. 26; 1 Mac. i. 2; and Milton’s “with mighty wings outspread, dove-like, sat’st brooding on the vast abyss” (*Par. Lost*, 1, 20). In the tract *Chagigah* we find, “The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters like a dove” (Gen. i. 2).

Let us analyse the above account phrase by phrase.

(a) “From the cloven heaven.” This is from St. Mark: *σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς*. So far Canon Farrar follows the canonical gospel.

(β) “Streamed.” Martial, *Epig.* 8, 32, may have suggested this phrase to a mind so scholarly as Canon Farrar’s:—

“Aera per Tacitum delapsa sedentis in ipos
Fluxit Aratullae blanda columba sinus.”

(γ) “Dove-like radiance?” Here we ask:

(i.) Why radiance at all?

(ii.) How does a *dove-like* radiance differ from any other radiance?

In a footnote on “Bath kôl,” Canon Farrar hints at the reason of (i.). “The Apocryphal Gospels,” he writes, “add that a fire was kindled in Jordan (J. Martyr c. Tryph., 88).” This is partly true; for in Justin M. c. Tr. 315 D we read: “κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ”; and the context hints that this is what ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Carmen Sibyl.*, vii. 82, conveys the same idea in somewhat obscure language: ὡς σε λόγον γέννησε πατήρ, πατέρ, ὄρνιν ἀφήκα ὄξυν ἀπαγγελτήρα λόγων, λογε, ὕδασιν ἀγνοῖς ραίνων σὸν βάπτισμα, δι’ οὗ πυρὸς ἐξεφαίνθης. In the Gospel of the Ebionites, called the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew (*Εβριη. Haer.* 30 c. 13) we have the idea repeated: ὡς ἀνηλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἠνοίγησαν κ.τ.λ. καὶ εὐθύς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα.

We thus see that Farrar accepts the account of the "Apocryphal" Gospel as no less credible than, and indeed as supplementing that of the canonical N. T., and as such embodies it in his narrative.

(ii.) I now turn to the epithet "*dove-like*." "We need not necessarily suppose an *actual* dove," says Farrar, and appeals to St. John i. 32, a text which merely runs *καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης λέγων ὅτι τεθέαμαι, τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν.* The phrase "*dove-like radiance*" is thus Farrar's alternative to the necessity of supposing an actual dove. Perhaps others will grasp the meaning of this phrase better than I can. To me it seems that Canon Farrar merely tries to describe in rhetorical words what he has seen in certain stained-glass windows, though even in them the dove is clearly portrayed. His alternative, therefore, is no real alternative at all, but only the well-turned phrase of a writer who has not the courage either to suppose with the author of the Commentary in the Speaker's Bible "an actual dove, or appearance of a dove," or to interpret the reference to a dove as merely metaphorical.

We have seen that Matthew, Mark and John use the phrase, "descending like a dove from heaven." Luke binds us down to an actual dove: "descended in a bodily form like a dove." Justin Martyr asserts that "the apostles of this very Christ" wrote that as Jesus came up from the water *ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν;* and he clinches the actuality of the dove's appearance in his next sentence: "*τοῦ ἐπελθόντος ἐν εἶδει περιστερὰς πνεύματος.*" In *Ephraïmus Haer.* i. 13 we read that in the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew used by the Ebionites it was written as follows: *καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἠνούγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἶδει περιστερὰς κατέλθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν.*

We see that the Gospels and the other early accounts we

have quoted of the baptism of Jesus admit of being graded according to the degree in which they objectify the dove. In Matthew and Mark it is only Jesus who "saw" the Holy Spirit descend as it were a dove. In them too it is the Spirit, not the dove, which descends (*κατάβαινον εἰς αὐτὸν* and *ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτὸν*). In St. John it is still the Spirit which descends, but now it "rested upon Jesus" (*ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν*); moreover John the Baptist saw it and recognised in it the sign that Jesus was He that should come. In Matthew and Mark it is apparently a subjective vision of Jesus' alone. In Luke, on the other hand, the people also may have seen it descend in bodily form and shape as a dove, for that is what *σωματικῶ εἶδει* means. Justin, by his use of *ἐπιπτῆναι*, commits us to a very objectivist view of the matter, for it is the word by which the alighting of a bird is expressed. He also uses the phrase *ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς*. According to the Hebrew Matthew it is the dove itself rather than the Holy Spirit which seems to descend and enter *into* Jesus. The Jewish Sibyl is of all the accounts the most boldly materialistic. "I despatched a bird (not specifically a dove) the swift messenger of my words." Presumably the words meant are: "This is my beloved Son," etc.

Thus the supposition of an actual bird entertained by St. Luke is supported by the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, by the Apostolic writ, as far as we can glean it from Justin, and, most expressly of all, by the Sibylline poem, which must embody a very early tradition of the event.

I shall now prove that even before the baptism of Jesus could have taken place, and certainly long before the earliest evangelic tradition was committed to writing, the regular symbolic equivalent of the Holy Ghost in the allegorising theology of the Hellenistic Jews was the dove.

The work of Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum hæres*, can hardly have been composed later than the year 30 A.D.

There, in Mangey, Ed. i. p. 490, Philo comments thus *ὁ* the text, Genesis xv. 9 :—

“Take me a turtle-dove and a young pigeon.’ The turtle-dove and the pigeon,” he says, “are respectively the divine and human wisdom (*σοφία*) both of which are winged and practised in leaping upwards (*πτηνὰς μὲν ἀμφοτέρως καὶ ἀπαρηδῶν μεμελετηκυίας*), but different from one another as the species is different from the genus, or the copy from the archetype. For the divine wisdom is fond of the desert (*φιλέρημος*) on account of the only God, whose possession it is, loving solitude. It is symbolically called a turtle-dove (*συμβολικῶς αὕτη, ἰ.ε. ἡ θεία σοφία, τρυγῶν καλεῖται*), but the other kind is tame and domesticated and gregarious, haunting the cities of men and pleased to dwell with mortals. This they liken to a pigeon.”

A few lines further on we read :—

“*τῆς μὲν οὖν θείας ἐπιστήμης, ὄρνιθος τρόπον, τὸ αἰεὶ μετεωροπολεῖν ἴδιον*, it is the property of the divine knowledge ever to roam aloft, after the manner of a bird.’”

Here Philo, by his use of the expressions *συμβολικῶς καλεῖται* and *ἀπεικάζουσι*, shows that he is referring, not merely to his own, but to a recognised system of symbolical theology, which was already in vogue. He recurs to the idea in the same treatise, p. 506 :

“There are two natures or principles of intelligence and reason, the one in man, the other in the universe, and both are indivisible wholes, wherefore it is said, ‘but the birds He did not divide.’ Now our reason [or *nous*] is likened to a pigeon, because that animal is tame and feeds with us, but the turtle-dove is likened to the pattern of this. For the ‘Word’ of God is fond of the desert and solitary (*ὁ γὰρ θεοῦ λόγος φιλέρημος καὶ μονωτικός*), not mixing with the throng of things which come to be and pass away, but accustomed to roam and soar aloft (*ἀνωφοιτᾶν*) and trained to be the attendant and companion of one alone (*ἐνὶ ἀπαδός*). These two natures, therefore, cannot be parted—I mean that of reason [*λογισμός*] in us and of the divine Word [*λόγος*] above us. Being, however, themselves not to be sundered, they yet sunder a myriad other things (*ἄτμητοι δὲ οὖσαι μυρία ἄλλα τέμνουσιν*, cp. Heb. iv. 12). For the divine Word [*λόγος*] divided and distributed all the things in nature, and our reason [*νοῦς*] unceasingly divides into infinitely numerous parts whatsoever things and bodies it rationally apprehends. And this is so because of its resemblance to the Creator and Father of the whole.”

In Philo's Armenian commentary upon Genesis; iii. 3, p. 174, we have a couple of very similar passages, the last of which I quote in the Latin of Aucher:—

“Rationis vero duplex est species: una ex natura, qua res persolvuntur sensibilis mundi; altera autem earum, quae incorporales species appellantur, quibus sane persolvuntur res mundi intelligibilis; his ergo similes comperiuntur columba et turtur. Columba nimirum physicae theoriae, avis est enim magis familiaris, ut sensibilia nimis familiaria visui sunt: et physiologi anima sursum volat tanquam alis armata, atque superius elata circumfertur coelum, cernens cunctorum partes singulorumque rationes. Turtur autem imitatur intelligibilem, et incorpoream speciem; nam quemadmodum istud animal solitudinis est studiosum, sic praeterit et superascendit sensuum species, cum invisibili uniens sese per ipsam essentiam.” Cp. S. Ambros. Lib. ii. de Abr. c. viii. n. 56.

The same symbolism is to be found in the *Catena* of Nikephorus, p. 150, h.; there an anonymous commentator is quoted in illustration of the sending forth from the ark of the crow and the dove.

“These birds are the symbols of vice and virtue. Vice, on the one hand, delights in, and gambols over the billowy sea of the passions, whereas virtue leaps away therefrom—ἀποπηδᾶ. Thus they symbolise the two peoples: the Jews on the one hand, and the six races on the other. The former, because they remained outside the pale of grace; the latter, because they hastened into the Church of Christ. And the dove is also the symbol of the Holy Spirit, for that the deluge of sin was taken away in Christ.”

Except for the definitely Christian allusion the Greek of the above is from Philo's *Quæst. in Genesin.*, ii. 38, preserved in Armenian. It may be remarked how nearly the terms of the Sibylline poem recall the picture in Genesis of the sending forth of the dove. In the catacombs, it will be remembered, the dove, with the branch of olive in its mouth, often recurs, as an emblem, perhaps of peace, but more probably of the Holy Spirit.

We cannot really understand a book written down long ago unless we are able to breathe ever so little the intellectual atmosphere of those who wrote it and of those for

whom it was written ; unless we can, so to speak, put ourselves on the same plane of thought which they occupied. I hope that the citations which I have brought together in my paper, all bearing on the one point, may assist towards such an end. I think they prove that the identification in the Gospels of the Holy Spirit with a dove grew out of the symbolism which was in vogue among the Hellenised Jews at the very beginning of the first century. What was originally a mere metaphor, the Evangelists took quite literally. Even if we had only the narratives of Matthew and Mark and John, we could scarcely avoid the supposition that the Holy Spirit was believed to have assumed the actual form of a dove. We would anyhow have had to admit that the Holy Spirit was believed to have had a material and corporeal form of some kind, and in virtue of that form to have slid earthwards from the heavens as they were parted to let it go forth. Even so much as that may perplex devout minds, which would rather think of the Holy Spirit as an unseen, immaterial and purely spiritual agency. But the narrative of Luke leaves us no escape from the alternative which the Speaker's commentator boldly accepts ; and Luke is confirmed, if confirmation be needed, by Justin Martyr, by the Hebrew Gospel, yet more by the Jewish Sibyl, who also turns the narrative in such a manner as to remind us irresistibly of the beautiful story in Genesis of the sending forth of the dove from the ark. In the four Evangelists we therefore have to do with writers who, not deliberately of course, yet none the less certainly, interpreted a metaphor as an historical fact, and they were on that mental plane, or level, upon which it is possible for such a confusion to arise between the mere symbol on the one hand, and the thing symbolised on the other.

(2) THE SEAMLESS COAT.

In regard to St. John xix. 23, it is impossible to feel

the same assurance as about my last point, and I only give my remarks upon it by way of suggestion. In St. John xix. 23, we read that the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took His garments and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also the coat. *Now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout.* They said therefore one to another, "Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, they parted My garments among them, and upon my vesture they cast lots." The synoptic Gospels simply relate that the soldiers parted His garments among them, casting lots. Now we know that the recognition of Jesus as the Logos or Word of God is a special feature of the Fourth Gospel, and I venture to suggest that we have in this fact the reason of the mention therein of the seamless coat. For it can be proved that it was a recognised element in the pre-Christian doctrine of the Logos or Word of God, that He should wear a seamless coat or tunic. So much can be proved from the *Liber de Profugis*, of all the writings of Philo the most distinctly anticipatory of subsequent Christian doctrine. In chapter xx. of this treatise, vol. i., p. 562 of Mangey, we read as follows:—

"The true High Priest is not a man, but the Divine Word, free from all stain of sin, not voluntary only, but involuntary as well. For Moses—Lev. xxi. 11—declares that He cannot be defiled in respect either of His father who is reason, or of His mother who is sense. Moses thus speaks, I think, because the Word hath parents immortal and most pure, His Father being God, who is also the Father of all, and His mother being Wisdom, by whom the whole universe came into being. And because "He hath been anointed on the head with oil," which means that the leading part of Him (τὸ ἡγεμονικώτατον) is haloed around with radiant light. Thus He is deemed worthy to be clad with the raiment. Now the most ancient Word of the living God is clad with the world—Kosmos—as with raiment, and putteth on as His vestiture water and air and fire, and all that is wrought of these. Just as the individual soul is arrayed with the body, or the mind of the wise man with wisdom. And because from His head "He shall never put off the mitre," that is, He shall never doff the kingly diadem, the symbol of a

rule and authority which is not indeed supreme, but still wonderful, for all that it is disputed. "Nor again shall He rend His garment," for the Word of God is, as hath been said, the bond of all things, and holds and welds together all the parts, and prevents them from being dissolved or sundered. Just as the individual soul, so far as it hath the power allotted unto it, suffers no one of the parts of the body to be sundered and cut off in violation of nature, but so far as it can, bringeth all intact into harmony and unity one with another; and just as the purged reason—*νοῦς*—of the wise man preserves the virtues unbroken and unimpaired, rivetting their natural kinship and communion in yet surer goodwill."

Other passages occur in Philo of similar tendency. I would venture to suggest that they give a clue to the introduction in the Fourth Gospel of the seamless tunic of Jesus, the Logos of God. The seamless raiment was, to begin with, the indissoluble unity of the world, which came into being in and through the Word. In John xix. 23, what was in Philo's age a metaphysical truth or proposition has been transformed into a narrative of a supposed historical event.

(3) THE KISS OF PEACE.

The Kiss of Peace. Was it a practice of the Jewish Synagogue? In St. Paul's Epistles we have exhortations to a "holy kiss" and a "kiss of love," e.g. in Rom. xvi. 16, *ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ*. So 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 26, 1 Pet. v. 14, *ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης*.

In the early liturgies it was called the kiss of peace, or simply "peace"—*εἰρήνη*, hence *εἰρήνην διδόναι*. As such it was specially given in the celebration of the Eucharist. Wherefore Chrysostom calls it *φρικωδέστατος ἀσπασμὸς*, which *συμπλέκει τὰς διανοίας ἡμῖν καὶ ποιεῖ σῶμα ἕν γενέσθαι ἅπαντας, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐνὸς σώματος μετέχομεν οἱ πάντες* (Hom. in prod. lud.), and *διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ἀσπαζόμεθα ἀλλήλους, ἵνα οἱ πολλοὶ γενώμεθα ἕν*. Cyrill. Hieros. calls it an *ἐμπύρευμα τῆς ἀγαπῆς, ἵνα ἀνακαίῃ τὴν διάθεσιν, ἵνα οὕτως ἀλλήλους φιλῶμεν ὡς ἀδελφοὶ ἀδελφούς, ὡς παῖδες*

πατέρας. Clem. Alex., Paedag. III. c. xi., calls the Eucharistic kiss *φίλημα μυστικόν*. Maximus in *Mystag.* c. xvii. *πνευματικὸς ἄσπασμός*.

Neither in Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie*, from whom I draw the above citations, nor in Wace's *Dictionary* is there any attempt to trace the Kiss of Peace to the practice of the Jewish Synagogue. These authorities leave it to be inferred that it was a purely Christian institution.

Kraus, indeed, refers to Genesis xxxiii. 4, 2 Kings xiv. 33 (?), Job xxxi. 27, but none of these passages seem really to bear on the question of the kiss as a part of early Christian ritual; or to carry it back to pre-Christian ages.

In Kraus' *Encyclopædia* reference is also made to the ceremonial kiss of Roman law, the *ius osculi* among the *cognati*, who might not intermarry.

In Philo's *Quæstiones in Exodum*, preserved in Armenian, there occur, at least, two passages which seem to imply that the *φίλημα ἀγαπῆς* or *ὁμονοίας* was a formal institution of the Jewish Synagogue. The first is in *Quæstiones in Exodum*, Sermo ii., § 78 :—

“Quare lucernæ candelabri septem? Cunctis notum est septem lucernas symbola esse planetarum, secundum septenarium numerum divinum et sacrum connumeratarum quarum quae per zodiacum motio est et circumlatio, omnibus iis quae sublunaria sunt causa est, iis quae consuevere in *osculo concordantiae* esse, scilicet in aere, in aquis et in terra et in omnibus temperamentis animalium semper plantarumque.”

The sense of the Armenian is a little obscure, and as Aucher's Latin version is not quite satisfactory, I have given my own.

It is clear, however, that all creation is viewed in this passage as united in a *φίλημα ὁμονοίας*.

In the *Quæstiones in Exod.*, Sermo ii., § 118, Philo again speaks of the Word of God, the Mediator, as the solidest and surest bond of all, binding together, and cementing in one whole, all parts and contrarities of the universe.

These, which from their nature are alien and hostile to each other, the Word constrains and brings together into concord, communion, and into the *kiss of love* (*φίλημα ἀγάπης*).

The use of such a metaphor points, I think, to such a formal and ceremonial use of the kiss as we have recorded in St. Paul's Epistles, and such as there was in the early ritual of the Christian Church.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

DR. ROBERTSON SMITH AT CAMBRIDGE.

It is difficult perhaps for any except a few of his most intimate friends to measure the full extent of the loss which all who knew him have suffered by the death of Professor Robertson Smith. It resulted from that extraordinary versatility of powers and variety of interests which distinguished him, perhaps more even than the vast range of his knowledge, that he showed himself in different lights to different men. And so it may be hard for some of his older friends in Scotland to appreciate the ties by which he became bound to his new home in the south. But I think that every one who saw him amid the Cambridge surroundings of his later years must have felt how congenial those surroundings were, and how thoroughly happy was his Cambridge life.

Professor Smith's settlement in Cambridge was largely due to his association with leading Cambridge scholars on the O. T. Revision Committee. From this association resulted that close friendship with Professors Wright and Bensly, and Mr. Aldis Wright, which had the singularly happy effect of making him their colleague in the oriental school at Cambridge. In 1882 the Lord Almoner's Professorship of Arabic became vacant through the death of Professor Palmer, who had held it since 1871. The loss of that great and original scholar must have produced a feeling