

portrays Schleiermacher as 'a richly gifted personality, but pre-eminently great in character. Though we do not regard him as a saint, nor as an infallible teacher, whose opinions we repeat without criticism, we recognize in him one who revived theology and the Church, — a witness to the emancipating, deepening, and transfiguring

power of the Spirit of Christ.' Students of German theology will be grateful for the announcement that Dr. Clemen intends to publish Schleiermacher's Lectures on *Theologische Encyclopädie*.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Problems of the Fourth Gospel.

BY REV. ROBERT SMALL, M.A., NORTH BERWICK.

I.

CHRIST'S TEMPTATION RETAINED IN THE SUBCONSCIOUSNESS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

3. The Fourth Gospel arranges its subject-matter on a ground-plan antithetic to the Three Temptations.

ASSUMING, in the light of chapter 6, that Judas was the real *διάβολός* by whom Christ was tempted immediately after His baptism, we turn now to the first chapter and to Christ's reappearance at the Jordan, as our Evangelist narrates it.

1. The worldly solicitations and counsels of Judas have been shaken off. He has departed from Jesus 'for a season'; and what experiences ensue, *compensating the resolute Protagonist for his struggle*, and soothing Him like 'angels' ministrant? 'On the morrow' of the Baptist's encounter with the priestly delegates, Jesus is saluted by him as 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' On the very day when Judas made his last attempt, and sought in vain to dazzle Jesus with the prospect of a world-wide empire, this great preacher at the Jordan had been publicly acknowledging (1²⁶. 27) that Jesus was greater than he; and now his attestation expands into something more definitive, more striking, the moment he sees Jesus again—'Lamb of God,' 'Sin-bearer for the world.' The Tempter had queried, 'Son of God'? and had pointed to the regalia-bearers and 'all the kingdoms of the world.' Here is his answer on the morrow.

2. But John is not content to adumbrate the sufferings of Jesus, and His sacrificial function, by applying to Him this name, 'The Lamb of God.' *He proceeds to reaffirm* (in verse 34) *that*

very truth which Judas had assailed with his scepticism: 'I have . . . borne witness that this is the Son of God.' And then, to give his testimony threefold strength, he reiterates in the hearing of His two disciples the appellation, 'Lamb of God.'

Threefold he makes it, or the Evangelist, selecting the material which lay to hand, assorted it in threefold citations. Three men, summoned from the less conspicuous of the *dramatis personæ* in the Synoptic Gospels, assume the rôle of subsidiary witnesses,—Andrew declaring 'We have found the Messiah,' and thereby forestalling his brother's notable confession of faith; Philip using language not less decisive, 'We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write'; and finally Nathaniel, uttering the full-toned pronouncement, 'Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.'

How calmly Jesus receives this chorus of reverential acknowledgment after His conflict! 'The Son of Man,' says He (v.⁵¹), as though mere names and designations were minor things.

3. Without pushing one's thesis to an extreme, may one not trace *an antithetic reference to the Three Temptations* in these three testimonies? Why does this Evangelist antedate the renaming of Simon, and conjoin it with his earliest introduction to Jesus, although the three Synoptics permit a year and a half to elapse before the memorable words are spoken at Cæsarea Philippi, 'Thou art Peter'? We may hazard the suggestion that the

κηφᾶς or πέτρος has its place here because in John's reminiscences the transformation of his old shipmate Simon into rock-like strength of character, a veritable πέτρος, was one of the most signal wonders done by Christ. Let Judas importune Him to change a stone into bread. Behold, a more extraordinary thing has happened, — 'Simon the son of John: thou shalt be called Cephas'!

Similarly the second attestation, that of Philip reported in v. 45, emphasis what 'the prophets did write,' as if our Evangelist were thinking of that Messianic passage in Malachi which underlay the second Temptation and the theurgic use of the Temple-pinnacle. And, to complete the triad, is it not significant that the Third Testimony (Nathaniel's) reverts to the root-idea embedded in the third Temptation, namely, Kingliness? (1⁴⁹).

The nexus in each of those three allusions may seem slight and filmy; but it is the sort of nexus which the mysticism of our author frequently spins out of some coincidence or some etymological meaning.

4. *It is in the second chapter, however, that the Evangelist's special knowledge of the three Temptations should be read into his narrative.* When this is done we obtain a clue to the solution of that *questio vexata*, the 'first' cleansing of the Temple.

The miracle at Cana may be regarded as a set-off, an antiphonal *Semeion*, to the transmuting of the stones into loaves. For the appeasing of His own hunger Christ would not exert His superhuman power upon those blocks of stone in the wilderness; but yielding to altruistic motives, and for the good of His fellow-guests at the marriage, He changed the six stone-jarfuls of water into wine. The first of the three Temptations is thus repelled at Cana with a divine irony.

The second Temptation had to do with the Temple, and the fulfilment of that prophecy which Jewish literalism had wrested from the pages of Malachi. Well, but the Lord did 'suddenly come to his temple . . . like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap' (Mal 3¹⁻²). Of course, it was at the end of his ministry, and not at the beginning, as John the Apostle knew perfectly. But what of that? The Synoptics had set down the incident *in situ* chronologically where it did occur. John,

however, has a thesis to maintain, a Satanic negation to overwhelm with cumulative proofs; so here he foreshortens and rearranges some of the events in Christ's life to suit his purpose. The writer has been moving placidly along the course of his reminiscences. 'After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples: and there they abode not many days. And the Passover of the Jews was at hand.'

The Passover was at hand! As he dwelt upon these words the apostle glided into reverie. The final Passover flung all its predecessors into the shade. And how near at hand from the beginning it seemed to him, now that he retraced his own long pilgrimage of ninety years! What a transient reprieve there was for Christ between the marriage at Cana and the tragedy at Golgotha! Capernaum, in the interval, was His headquarters, but 'there they abode not many days,'—all told.

Futile ingenuity has been expended upon the effort to show that this Temple-cleansing related by John is distinct from that one which the Synoptics have assigned to the fatal week. It is even argued that the details which differentiate the two are extremely significant, and that the double exercise of Judico-Messianic authority gives a full-orbed completeness to Christ's mission. The fact remains, however, that an impartial student of the passages is arrested by the psychological inappropriateness of such an episode at the commencement of Christ's ministry, quite as much as by the *primâ facie* suspicion that something has been misdated or displaced.

According to this theory the Purification of the Temple narrated by the Fourth Evangelist took place (as the Synoptics had already affirmed) on the Monday of the Passion week. Sundry details in John's narrative seem to bear the impress of those cloudy and dark days.

(a) *Little importance may be attached to the adverb ἔτι* which the Jewish authorities used (*vide* Mt 27⁶⁸) when recalling, on the Friday night after Christ's death, these words of His, 'Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' ἔτι ζῶν — 'being *yet* alive,' said they, 'he spake thus.' The expression gains in vividness, however, if we suppose the prophecy to have been made on the previous Monday, when His death was so near. Then, rather than at the Passover three years before, He was 'yet alive.'

(b) *The passage*, Mt 26⁶¹, in which this same prediction is quoted as an indictment of blasphemy, tends—if anything—to confirm the view that it was a recent utterance of His. The other charge formulated against Him harked back no further than the Tuesday, to his opinion anent the tribute-money and the jurisdiction of Cæsar (Lk 23²). Instead of raking up a remote past, his accusers were giving a garbled reversion of what He had said two or three days before.

5. The whole incident of the Temple-cleansing, as reproduced by John, *has the anticipation of Christ's death portentously flung upon it*. Are we to believe that Jesus foretold His doom and His resurrection so plainly three years in advance; and that He so soon confronted the public with a semi-defiant manifesto—'Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up?' Such an attitude is explicable at the last, but not at the first, of the Passovers which He attended during His ministry.

The Evangelist may be said to obtrude the Shadow of the Cross upon this narrative. He might have followed the Synoptics in quoting John Baptist's testimony as the plea with which Jesus repelled the question, 'By what authority doest thou these things?' John's name would have re-emerged naturally and appropriately at this early stage of the memoirs. His 'witness' has prominence assigned to it in the very next chapter (3²⁷, etc.). Yet the aid which Jesus sought from his precursor's announcement is ignored, and instead of reverting to the Baptist's words Jesus points forward to His own death and resurrection as the predestined *σημείον*.

If we ask, why did not the Evangelist quote what Jesus said of John, we may ask with still greater reason, why did he quote from Ps 69 "The zeal of thine house shall eat me up"? How strange that the disciples 'remembered' this obscure passage rather than the familiar quotation from Malachi! The explanation presumably is this.—The episode of the Temple-cleansing was by and by impregnated with memories of Christ's death. Indeed, it transpired upon the threshold of His Crucifixion. It was one among the solemn and immediate pre-ludes of the day on which the Passover was eaten. In this respect it harmonized with another incident on which John lays emphasis, although the Synoptists have overlooked it amid the fracas of Gethsemane. When Jesus said to the cohort and the Sanhedrim constables, 'I am he,' 'they went

backward' (according to John), 'and fell to the ground.' This is a concomitant of the Great Passover ceremony. It is an echo of Ps 27²,—*ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν ἐπ' ἐμὲ κακόντας τοῦ φαγεῖν τὰς σάρκας μου . . . αὐτοὶ ἠσθένησαν καὶ ἔπεσαν*. To that same cycle of incidents and memories belongs this Purging of the Temple, upon which the disciples, and especially their spokesman, John, made the comment, *ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου κατεφάγεται με*.

6. The Evangelist has in his mind the Divine Sonship of Jesus, and the scepticism of the Tempter, 'If thou art the Son of God.' He is also brooding over the three Temptations. The first was countered and repelled at Cana, when Jesus transmuted the water into wine. The second Temptation was finally silenced, and the distorted prophecy on which it had been based was fulfilled, when Jesus appeared suddenly in the Temple, an embodiment of Messianic righteousness and indignation.

Where did the Evangelist look for the most signal rebutting of the third Temptation? At what juncture in Christ's life did he see the kingdoms of the world coming under the sway of Jesus, while Jesus Himself retained His unworldliness and spirituality unsmirched? It was when the Greeks paid reverence to him on the day after his Purification of the Temple. The Tempter had spoken of 'Glory.' 'Now,' cried Jesus exultantly,— 'now is the hour come that the Son of man should be glorified' (12²³). The scheming, carnally minded Judas had expatiated on the world and its princeliness. 'Now,' says Christ, 'is the *κρίσις* of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out' (12³¹).

There, in that rallying of the Hellene proselytes to Jesus, the Evangelist had his answer ready for the third Temptation. And he uses it as such. He introduces into the entourage of this episode Philip and Andrew, the 'ministering' ones who counterpoise the Tempter's influence, first at the Jordan, then on the hillside of the five thousand. True, he does not usher these two men into his third chapter, nor does he there narrate the advent of those Greeks, but he deliberately fastens upon something which was the sequel to that interview, and was even more significant than it and more germane to the subject in hand. *He disjoins the visit of Nicodemus from its real context, and transfers it from his twelfth chapter to his third.*

What was his purpose in so doing? He was pre-

occupied with the thought that the world-wide dominion of Christ emanates from nothing but His death. This conviction was lying almost oppressively upon the soul of Christ Himself when He welcomed the Greeks, and a few hours afterwards when He conversed with the rabbi under cloud of night. Compare the two passages (3¹⁻¹⁶ and 12²³⁻³⁶), and the inference seems inevitable that they spring from the same psychological crisis, and shade off imperceptibly into each other. Says Jesus to these foreigners, 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me' (12³²). In His dialogue with the rabbi this idea recurs (3¹⁴), 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up.'

Apart from the tinge of prescient melancholy which characterizes the language of Jesus in both interviews, observe how the context of both has been infiltrated with such words and phrases as these, — 'belief' and 'eternal life' (3^{15, 16, 18, 12^{44, 50}}), 'judging the world' (3^{17, 18, 19, 12^{47, 48}}), 'light' and 'darkness' (3^{19, 20, 21, 12^{35, 36, 46}}). Above all, compare 12⁴² with 3¹—'Even of the rulers many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him'; 'Now there was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came unto him by night.'

This interview, then, with Nicodemus has been antedated, as was the Temple-purification, in accordance with the dominant hold which Christ's Divinity and His threefold Temptation have laid upon the Evangelist's thinking. It has been the easier for him to 'lift' these two incidents and concatenate them thus upon a hidden thread of reminiscence, because they did actually occur upon consecutive days in the Passion week. It is to this substratum of reverie and self-conscious argument that we may attribute John's quotation of the Synoptic phrase 'the kingdom of God,' which occurs nowhere in his Gospel but in this interview with Nicodemus. How spontaneously that phrase comes to the lips (or to the pen) of one who has been brooding over the third Temptation and all its pageantry of kingliness!

7. *Something is gained in our estimate of Nicodemus* when we allocate his visit to Christ as having occurred not at the commencement, but near the very end, of Christ's ministry. This man did not repress and veil his secret affinities, his quasi-discipleship, for three years, voting meantime

with the antagonists of Jesus and associating with them daily. He spoke up for Jesus in the Sanhedrim (7⁶⁰) months before they had this interview. And, when they did meet, there may perhaps have been in Christ's words, 'Art thou the teacher of Israel,' an illusion to that courageous and enlightened rôle which he had played among his fellow-sanhedrists. Moreover, when that High Court came to its final compact with the traitor, there was one besides Joseph that 'had not consented to their counsel and deed.' It was Nicodemus; he was an absentee that night. Perhaps he and Judas passed each other somewhere on the hill-track, the one moving furtively toward Jerusalem and the other toward Bethany. 'The wind bloweth' there, on the slopes of Olivet, 'and this is the judgment that . . . men loved the darkness' (3^{8, 19}).

8. From Jerusalem and its rabbinic representative we look away toward the confines of the Gentile world, and *the widening sphere of Christ's influence is rapidly surveyed* for us by the Evangelist.

Judea yields its homage to Christ with such universal and ardent enthusiasm that the Baptist's more immediate retainers are chagrined, although he himself—to his credit—evinces gratification at Christ's success.

Beyond Judea lies Samaria. Here also, at a lengthened radius, the influence of Jesus makes itself powerfully felt. The individual submits to it, and so do the masses (4³⁹⁻⁴²), as in Judea. The woman of tarnished reputation is not less amenable to His beneficent sway than was the Pharisee, the ruler of the Jews, the teacher of Israel.

Still farther does Jesus press His conquests. Samaria had submitted with a loyal and outspoken confession of faith. Would the Jewish world, would His own province of Galilee, harden itself against Him? A profound impulse urged Him to abridge his stay among the Samaritans, and to annex, if He could, the hearts of His Galilean compatriots. Thirsting for new accessions to His 'Kingdom,' realising that Galilee might offer the hardest opposition in His campaign, 'he went forth into Galilee; for Jesus himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country.' When we analyse His motives we are not menaced with such alternatives as these,—that v.⁴⁴ is a *non sequitur* (in which 'for' should be 'although').

or that the Evangelists regarded Judea, not Galilee, as Christ's 'own country.' Crossing the border into Galilee, Christ found a cordial reception awaiting Him there also. There, as in the two southern provinces, the individual vied with the populace at large in paying Him the tribute of respect and confidence.

The question remains, however, is the individual who figures in this part of the narrative identical with one whom the Synoptics (Mt 8⁵, Lk 7¹) have presented in another guise? Instead of collating the differentia and emphasizing them (*e.g.* Capernaum *v.* Cana, centurion *v.* nobleman, palsy *v.* fever), we have but to read the Evangelist's footnote, 'This is again the second sign that Jesus did, having come out of Judea into Galilee.' It is almost as if the writer were saying, 'This is not that similar miracle which has its place at a later stage of Christ's ministry, and farther down the Synoptic list of supernatural cures effected by Him.' Even more decisive, however, is the Evangelist's subordination of this incident, and its doctrinal import, to the main thesis which he is steadily keeping in view.

(a) He is introducing this βασιλικός ('King's officer') into the circle of that βασιλεία which Christ is winning, in lieu of the spurious and mundane kingliness proffered by the Tempter. This βασιλικός has about him the aroma of Jewish birth and Jewish piety. He is nearer to Nicodemus, the ἄρχων of the Jews, than to the Roman centurion of whom the Synoptics speak.

(b) The Evangelist makes this narrative of his a palimpsest upon that earlier double-narrative. He desires that we should read between his lines that familiar and well-authenticated story, and should see, in the background of this Jewish βασιλικός, the Roman proselyte and the vast Gentile world of which he was a native. We are to remember that even while the sphere of Christ's influence expands from Jerusalem to Judea, from Judea to Samaria, from Samaria to prejudiced and unresponsive Galilee, yet the shadow of rejection and failure continues to attend him everywhere. Does Nicodemus approach Him with deferential words? Look behind Nicodemus and you see the vague throngs of Hellenism, by means of their delegates at Jerusalem, doing better than he, the Jewish rabbi. Does this Jewish nobleman come bending and beseeching, Κύριε κατὰβηθι? Gaze beyond him, and you catch a glimpse of Roman

paganism surpassing him in the person of its proselyte, the centurion. Listen how Jesus says, almost querulously, to the one, 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe'; while He bestows His highest approbation upon the other,—'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven,' (Mt 8¹⁰⁻¹¹).

The counterpart-replies to the Temptations, the σημεῖα bearing on Christ's Divinity, are now complete. The cycle of them is rounded off—where it began—at Cana.

9. There runs through this portion of the narrative, a *thread of chronological sequence*, thin, but strong and consistent. It is overlaid at 2¹³ by the Evangelist's reverie and his excursus on the Temple-cleansing. It reappears in the 23rd-25th verses, however (cf. 4⁴⁵), and carries (as will be shown at a later stage) a good deal of significance compressed into a phrase or two. It was during this visit, for instance, that a leprous Pharisee, Simon by name, found healing; and a number of personal friendships, at Bethany and elsewhere, entered into Christ's life.

The first twenty-one verses of the third chapter have nothing to do chronologically with the period under review. It is the Apostle's side-glance at the third Temptation, and his loyal desire to rebut it, that has introduced here the dialogue between Christ and Nicodemus. So entirely does John relax the thread of sequence that he interpolates (vv. 16-21) a brief résumé of his own evangelistic preaching. Indeed, the three preceding verses (18-15) are possibly not Christ's words at all, but an epitome of His redemptive work summarized in a dreamy monotone by John—the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, and the Ascension.

From this deep and protracted reverie the writer awakes at 3²², resuming the thread of narrative at that point, and henceforward adhering to it more closely. His formula, in making such a transition, is μετὰ ταῦτα (as Lücke was the first to point out). The singular μετὰ τοῦτο (*e.g.* 2¹²) is used by him when the sequence is immediate.

In 7⁵⁰ Nicodemus is parenthetically described as 'he that came to him before.' Does not this militate against the view that the conversation with Nicodemus occurred at a *subsequent* date, namely,

on the Tuesday (or Wednesday) of Passion week? (a) The *textus receptus* has ὁ ἐλθὼν νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτόν, a reading which is rejected by the best MSS and critics. (b) Even if the whole parenthesis be not a gloss, or a marginal note, which has found its way into the text, and if πρότερον be substituted for νυκτὸς, the word "before" is simply the equivalent of our 'supra' or 'above,'—the reference being made by the Evangelist himself to Nicodemus as the person who 'came before,' i.e. in a *previous* chapter, or in the manner *before-mentioned*. (c) This reference reappears in 19⁴⁰, 'he who at first came to him by night,' τὸ πρῶτον being substituted for πρότερον. The meaning may still be the same. In 10⁴⁰, for instance, our Author designates Βηθανία πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, mentioned in his first chapter (v. 28) as 'the place

where John was baptizing at the first,' τὸ πρῶτον. Similarly, turning back the leaves of his Gospel, he points to the name of Nicodemus, where it occurs 'at the first'—among the earliest chapters. (d) The phrase may be applicable to the tentative, incipient faith of Nicodemus. 'At the first,' in contrast to the bolder step which he is now taking, 'he came by night.' In 12¹⁶, τὸ πρῶτον has this force, 'These things understood not his disciples *at the first*' (i.e. on the Sunday of his Triumphal Entry).

To sum up, therefore, we may hold that the Nicodemus interview and the Temple-cleansing belong to the Passion week, and that the Evangelist has transferred them to their present place in his narrative because of their antithetic bearing upon the second and third Temptations.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE V. 8.

But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'**Simon Peter.**'—This is the only place in his Gospel in which Luke gives Peter both names, and it is the first mention of the surname.—PLUMMER.

'**When he saw it.**'—Apparently it was only when he saw the boats sinking to the gunwale with their load of fish that the tenderness and majesty of the miracle flashed upon his mind.—FARRAR.

'**Depart from me.**'—Did Peter then wish Christ to leave him? Verily no. His all was wrapt up in Him (see Jn 6⁶⁸). 'Twas rather, 'Woe is me, Lord! How shall I abide this blaze of glory? A sinner such as I am is not fit company for thee.' Compare Is 6⁶.—BROWN.

THE wonderful event which he had just witnessed had impressed Peter with the nearness of the Divine power. The sense of God's presence brought to his mind a strong feeling of his own sinfulness and infirmity: he felt that He who now stood before him, and in and through whom God had shown forth His mighty power, was too pure and holy for him to draw near to.—COOK.

WE find the expression of analogous feelings in the case of Manoah (Jg 13²⁰); the Israelites at Sinai (Ex 20¹⁹); the men of Beth-Shemesh (1 S 6²⁰); David after the death of Uzzah

(2 S 6⁹); the lady of Zarephath (1 K 17¹⁸); Job (Job 42⁵⁻⁹); and Isaiah (Is 6⁵).—FARRAR.

'**For I am a sinful man.**'—The voice of conscience is awakened by the perception of something superhuman in Jesus. This gives no excuse for the outrageous statement of the so-called *Epistle of Barnabas*, that the apostles had been excessively wicked men.—ADENEY.

'**O Lord.**'—The change from ἐπιστάρα, Master (see v. 5), to κύριε, Lord, is remarkable, and quite in harmony with the change of circumstances. It is the 'Master' whose orders must be obeyed, the 'Lord' whose holiness causes moral agony to the sinner (Dn 10¹⁶).—PLUMMER.

THE SERMON.

The Making of a Disciple.

By the Rev. James Hastings, D.D.

WE may call this incident the making of a disciple. Is there not some significance in the name given to the apostle who is most prominent in it? 'Simon Peter' he is called. Simon was the name of the fisherman of Galilee. Peter was his name after he became a disciple. There are three things in the making of a disciple.

I. *What a disciple is made out of.*—He is made out of a sinner. This is always so. For Christ never had, and never will have, anything to do with those who are not sinners. In His day upon