

"They were come to the multitude," a connection of thought which is strikingly illustrated in the last great picture of Raphael, which suggests a concluding lesson for us, a lesson of the deepest practical import—privilege is but the prelude to duty. We must ever go down from the mount of contemplation to mingle with our fellow-men in the business of life—our one desire to follow in the steps of Him who went about doing good, of One who left the Mount of Transfiguration and all its glory to comfort a father's heart and heal his lunatic boy. May we, by our every thought and word and action, in little things as well as in great things, in our homes as husbands and wives, as parents and children, as masters and servants, in our business lives, in our social engagements, and in our seasons of recreation and rest, so live and act as those who have seen some glimpses of the glory revealed in the mount. People who live in the Riviera count the days in the season in which they have seen the distant island of Corsica. How often do we see in private prayer and in the services of the sanctuary, it may be faintly and afar off, the hills that are round about our eternal home, the holy mount, the city of our God, where our Lord is now unchangeably and eternally transfigured!

J. W. BARDSLEY.



ART. II.—LOISY'S SYNTHESIS OF CHRISTIANITY.

III.

I PRESENTED in my last paper two curiously conflicting answers to the question, "What is Christianity?" To the ordinary reader the difference in the definition of the "kingdom" of the Saviour is probably less startling than the license claimed by both Harnack and Loisy in handling the actual narrative of the Gospels. In this respect there is not much to choose between the two critics. It is assumed by each that the province of the exegete is to "devour and break in pieces, and stamp the residue with the feet," and then claim a special veneration for his own footmarks. It is a method that, of course, would not be tolerated in the case of ordinary ancient literature. The comparison of the two interpretations of Christianity may, at least, be useful as illustrating its arbitrariness. Sometimes the elements in the Gospels dubbed spurious by Loisy contain for Harnack the essence of Christianity. On the other hand, the Acts, on which Loisy's system really depends, is for Harnack a "late book," whose reception is "perhaps the most striking

phenomenon in the history of the canon."¹ Which is the true prophet of the Higher Criticism?

I propose to deal in this and my next paper with that which strikes me as the most serious defect in both syntheses—viz., the elision from the Gospel story of the preterhuman personality of the Saviour. I believe that the "kingdom" He came to establish cannot be defined till we have fully realized the claims of the King. Reserving, then, the former subject, let us ask whether either critic has really presented to us the Jesus of the Synoptic narrative.

We have seen how Harnack and Loisy respectively interpret the Saviour's claim to the title "Son of God." The French critic has, of course, struck a true note when he argues that the term connotes primarily the Jewish Messianic ideal, not, as Harnack says, a subjective realization of God. "En tant que le titre de Fils de Dieu appartient exclusivement au Sauveur, il équivaut à celui de Messie, et il se fonde sur la qualité de Messie."² But, according to Loisy, the preterhuman attributes of Messiah had no correspondence in the Saviour's own consciousness. "Jésus lui-même a vécu sur la terre dans la conscience de son humanité." His Divinity is a doctrine "qui a grandi dans la conscience chrétienne, mais qui n'avait pas été expressément formulé dans l'Évangile." The divergence here from the Catholic belief is so serious, and so vitally affects the question, "What is Christianity?" that we may well ask for substantial proofs of this statement. The only positive answer we get is an appeal to the Epistles, in which Loisy thinks he finds a gradual Christological development from the earlier discourses presented in the Acts. Negatively, the result is reached by an elision from the Gospels of the most striking passages militating with the theory.

It is, of course, most difficult to grapple with a criticism that assumes these rights of arbitrary expurgation. In my present attempt to defend the Divine personality of the Jesus of the Gospels, I enter the arena with one arm tied up. To meet Loisy on his own terms, one must accept for the nonce the position that the fourth Gospel is in no sense history. Jesus could only have paid Jerusalem a single visit—the one connected with the crucifixion. The plain assertion of the Divine Sonship, which we are told was made when the cripple was healed at the pool of Bethesda (John v. 19-47), was really never uttered; the miracle itself is imaginary. Christ's claims to be "the Light of the world," "the Son" who alone

¹ "History of Dogma," vol. ii., chap. ii.

² "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 91.

³ "Autour," etc., pp. 116, 117.

can make men free, the One who was "before Abraham," and has the attribute of eternal self-existence (John viii.), are "the experiences of three-quarters of a century of the Gospel" strung upon purely fictitious incidents and ideal speeches. Thomas's confession, "My Lord and my God" (John xx. 28), is merely a piece of bold *prosopopœia*. The historic data which we find in the fourth Gospel "n'y sont pas à raison de leur caractère primitif, mais à raison du sens qui y a été rattaché." Besides this elision of the evidence of the fourth Gospel, the story of the birth of Jesus as given in the first and third, with its recognition of the "Emmanuel," the "Son of God," the "Light for revelation to the Gentiles," of course cannot be claimed for "le Christ de l'histoire." Much certainly is lost when these elements in the biography are gone. Yet even so there remain, I think, intact the outlines of the orthodox Christology. Supposing the Gospel records thus mutilated, let us see how Loisy's conception of a purely eschatological Messiah, who was identified by the Apostles only after the resurrection, and whom later on they deemed to be Divine, squares with the Synoptic narrative of the ministry.

I first assail the statement that Christ only proclaimed a future, not a present, kingdom, and that "le rôle du Messie est essentiellement eschatologique." This was not the Jewish expectation. Neither is it a fair account of the actual claim of Jesus, for it is obvious that He professed to have certain powers *on earth* by reason of His Messiahship, notwithstanding reservations in His revealing to men all that this Messiahship implied. To construe John Baptist's question as meaning "si Jésus ne va pas être le Christ" is a mere evasion of the words, "Art thou He that cometh?"¹ John meant just what the woman of Samaria meant when she said, "I know that Messiah cometh: when He cometh He shall tell us all things"; or, if the fourth Gospel be inadmissible as evidence, what the Jews meant when, in the language of Ps. cxviii., they hailed Jesus as "He that cometh in the Name of the Lord." A Messiah was generally expected whose powers were to be manifested on earth. "It is by no means the case," says Schürer, that "pre-Christian Judaism did not expect the Messiah till after the judgment. In decidedly pre-Christian documents Messiah appears for the overthrow of ungodly powers."² It is just this work of "overthrow" that the Gospel story sets forth as confirming the claims of Christ. To it He actually appeals in the reply to John Baptist, with

¹ Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19.

² "The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. ii., p. 158.

its instancing of miraculous cures. It being the work of His followers, we find similar "authority over the power of the enemy" delegated by Jesus to the seventy (Luke x. 17-20).

It is doubtless impossible to say that the Jews always defined the expected Messiah as Divine. But it is clear that in certain quarters the predictions of a Davidic King familiar to us in one stratum of Old Testament prophecy, and those of a Theophany, or reign of God on earth—patent in Isaiah and the later Psalms—had been merged in the anticipation of a preterhuman Being, a "Son of God," who should establish God's kingdom on earth, and reign as His vicegerent. In this development we Christians may see a Divine guidance; and it is no objection if this current Messianic terminology was capable of yet higher adaptation, and Judaism uttered truths profounder than it knew. Blended with crude material elements, this anticipation meets us in such works as the Book of Enoch and the Psalter of Solomon. It familiarized men with a Messianic terminology, which Jesus appropriated and enriched with deeper significance. It has been sufficiently shown that Enoch is of prechristian origin, and it is here especially that we find this important link between the Old Dispensation and the New, and the title "Son of God" supplementing the more usual Messianic attributes of King and Judge. Harnack's attempted subjective limitation of the term, as meaning "nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God," is ruled out by all Jewish usage. In the Old Testament it is functional or titular, denoting angels or theocratic vicegerencies. At the time our Lord appeared it evidently had a more special connotation as a designation of the Christ. "Inasmuch as the Messiah is the chosen instrument of God,"¹ says Schürer, quoting Enoch and the fourth book of Ezra,¹ "He is called the Elect, . . . or, like the theocratic King in the Old Testament, the Son of God." It is this use of the term that explains to us Peter's confession of his Teacher as "the Christ, the Son of the Living God." It also elucidates the scene before Caiaphas, where the trial is brought to a climax by the accused appropriating to Himself the titles "Son of the Blessed" and "Son of Man." From this scene Loisy quite rightly infers "que le Sauveur a été condamné à mort pour avoir affecté des prétentions à la royauté d'Israël, c'est-à-dire, au rôle de Messie." But what ground is there for Loisy's other inference that Christ had never definitely asserted this claim until that final visit to Jerusalem? We who accept "les récits de l'enfance" may read in Luke ii. how, with a dawning sense of the significance

¹ Enoch ev. 2; 4 Ezra vii. 28, 29, xiii. 32, 37, 52, xiv. 9.

of His mission, Jesus as a boy of twelve claimed that he must be *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου*. Peter's very confession shows that Jesus had made sufficiently distinct assertion of the claim. It is consistent that the Synoptics (especially Matthew) continually present Jesus as speaking of a Sonship¹ that is His peculiarly. There is no reason here to distinguish the subjective from the objective significance. His use of the phrase "My Father" naturally connects with the Messianic assumption a consciousness of an unbroken oneness in spirit with God. The whole portraiture is that of one who claims that His relation to God as Son "is not that of other men, but that He is the Son *par excellence*—the Son of God in a special and solitary relation of life and affection."² This claim is easily connected by us with the appropriation of the Messianic character. Its significance in the field of consciousness is fully enunciated in the passages Matt. xi. 25-27, Luke x. 21, 22, which, as I shall show below, there is no reason for repudiating.

But this term, "Son of God," is scarcely more significant than that other title which Christ claimed in the audience before Caiaphas. Its meaning is not so apparent to the ordinary reader of the Gospels; but it is strange that Loisy, while devoting a chapter to "Le Fils de Dieu," has nothing to say about the designation "Son of Man." For this, too, was a Messianic title, and, as we all know, our Lord appropriated it long before that final scene, and distinctly applied it to the circumstances of His ministry on earth. In the old prophetic passages which lie behind this designation "Son of Man" (Dan. vii. 13, 14; cf. ii. 42), it seems that a kingdom of the saints of the Most High, as contrasted with the four bestial kingdoms, is in view, rather than one of any personal Messiah. As in the case of the titles "Servant of the Lord" and "the Chosen" in Isaiah, Israel may be the primary object of the prophetic aspiration, and it was, perhaps, only in the realization of the Messiah as the centre of all Israel's hopes that the term received a personal interpretation. But be this

¹ Cf. Matt. xii. 50, xvii. 26, xviii. 35, xx. 23, xxii. 41-44, xxiv. 36; Mark xi. 35-37, xiii. 32; Luke xx. 13, xxi. 41-44, xxii. 29. The evil spirits cry out, "Thou art Christ, the Son of God," and He restrains them (Luke iv. 41; cf. Mark i. 24, v. 7).

² Professor Orr, in Hastings' "Dictionary," *s.v.*, "Son of God." A recent article by Rev. C. T. Shebbeare well illustrates the consistency of this portraiture. "Christ speaks always as One sure of Himself, as One who has no fear of any moral failure . . . never admits to Himself the possibility that His judgment may be wrong. . . ." He is confident that "He is giving the last word on the subjects on which He speaks, the word by which men are to be judged at the last day." "He never . . . speaks of His own 'faith' or 'hope.'"

as it may, "Son of Man" was at the time when Jesus taught a title applied to the expected Messiah as the determiner of all human destinies. The author of the Book of Enoch, in his second allegory (chaps. xlv.-lvii.), so applies the term in his description of Messiah's mission and the establishment of His kingdom.¹ Nor is there any reason to suppose that his use is peculiar. I infer, however, from John xii. 34² that this Messianic designation, the "Son of Man," was less familiar to the Jews than "Son of God." The celebrated passage containing Peter's confession (Matt. xvi. 13) shows, too, as we might perhaps expect, that it was not so directly significant of the Divine personality as that other title "Son of God."³

Just as Jesus here bids men read into "Son of Man" all that they associated with the "Son of God," so does He elsewhere distinctly connect the title with a spiritual rule suggestive of Divine authority. It is not the case that Jesus applies the term prophetically to a posthumous reign mainly connected with eschatology. He appropriates it in connection with certain distinct pronouncements authoritative now, and with the circumstances of His whole career on earth. This fact of itself contradicts Loisy's postulates—"Jésus lui-même a vécu dans la pleine conscience de son humanité," and "Jésus ne s'avouait pas Messie dans sa prédication." Thus, the three Evangelists represent Jesus as claiming to have power to forgive the sins of the paralytic man before curing him, a power which the bystanders rightly discern to be peculiar to God. His justification is that "the Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins." That this incident is at the beginning of the ministry disposes of Loisy's reservation: "Il n'a voulu avouer sa qualité que le jour de sa mort."⁴ Again, all three ascribe to Jesus a claim to reshape the method of Sabbatical observance. What is the ground taken on the occasion of the disciples plucking the ears of corn? "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath." So, again, we have, "The Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost" (Matt. xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10). "Likewise shall also the Son of Man suffer of them" (Matt. xvii. 12). "The Son of

¹ Schürer, "The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. iii., pp. 57-69.

² What a meaningless fiction this question of the Jews in John xii. 34 becomes when the Gospel is regarded from Loisy's point of view! (See "Le Qu. Év.," p. 692.)

³ On this passage see Liddon's "Bampton Lectures," pp. 7-10. I agree with the writer that it shows that the title "Son of Man," though to the disciples it implied "first of all Messiahship of their Master," bespoke, though "less prominently," the relationship to our race as the ideal Man, and the fact of his "true humanity."

⁴ "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 88.

Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28). Elsewhere, of course, we find this term applied to the Messiah of the eschatology. The original vision in Daniel is appropriated by Christ, who as the "Son of Man" is to be revealed in the glory of His angels, and sits as Judge of mankind. But it is plain that this claim has already been vindicated by a sufficiently distinct revelation of Himself as the Teacher and Legislator on earth.

It is important to press this feature, because Loisy, in his insistence on the *posthumous* realization of the Messianic character, forgets that it was a most distinct work of reshaping the Jewish Law that Jesus attempted in this character of Messiah, and that it was just this attempt that first caused hostility to His teaching. Misinterpreting the text, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil," Loisy really robs the human Jesus of all ethical originality. "Il ne s'est pas présenté comme le révélateur d'un principe nouveau." "Chercher dans l'Évangile un élément tout à fait nouveau par rapport à la religion de Moïse et des prophètes est y chercher ce que Jésus n'y a pas voulu mettre."¹ My answer is that the Sermon on the Mount of itself takes us beyond this ideal. However we connect its precepts with the Decalogue, their ground is obviously a personal claim to transcend and reshape at will. Was it not "un principe nouveau" for a Jew that he was "not to swear at all"? Where is there anything like this prescription in Moses and the Prophets? And what larger claim can be made than that which is here assumed? "Ye have heard that it was said to [not "by"] them of old time . . . but I say unto you. . . ." When we recollect that these Commandments with which Jesus deals were attributed by His hearers to the very voice of Jehovah instructing Moses, we understand the comment, "He taught as one having authority." It is this same phase of the Messianic claim that interprets the scene where our Lord dispenses His disciples from the customary weekly fasts observed strictly by the Pharisees and by John Baptist. Those two parables of the patch on the old garment and the new wine in old bottles are themselves a teaching that Jesus' ethical "principles" meant something more than a reformed and purified Judaism, that His was a kingdom present, not only future, and that the old forms were inadequate to contain the spirit of the new religion. We observe, moreover, that in making this claim Jesus uses a simile suggestive to every Jew of something far higher than

¹ "L'Év. et l'Égl.," pp. 46, 47.

human authority. He is the "Bridegroom" of the faithful. "As long as He is with them they cannot fast." The choice of this metaphor would itself recall the many Old Testament passages where Jehovah is represented as the Husband of the Jewish Church. We who accept the fourth Gospel read that it was this same figure of the "Bridegroom" that John Baptist used when he declared that his own work was to be superseded by that of "the Christ."¹ Those who reject that Gospel must admit the same significance in the eschatological parables of the wise and foolish virgins and the expectant servants (Matt. xxiv.; Luke xii.). It is the return of a "Son of Man" who had already claimed a union with the human spirit on earth. His second coming is the glorious antitype of the first.

I have assumed that Christ's use of these terms "Son of God," "Son of Man," must be viewed by the light of current Jewish literature. Schürer² may again be quoted to show that this literature, however imperfect, at once takes us to a higher plane than that of Loisy's Messiah. "The whole view of His Person is in both the above-named works ('Enoch' and 'The Solomonian Psalter') one essentially supernatural. In the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch it is said of Him that He was (before this manifestation on earth) hidden and kept with God (xlvi. 1, 2, lxii. 7). His name was named before the Lord of Spirits, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars were made (xlviii. 35).³ *He was chosen and was hidden with God before the world was created, and will be with Him to eternity (xlviii. 6). His countenance is as the appearance of a man, and full of grace, like one of the holy angels (xlvi. 1). It is He who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is concealed, because the Lord of Spirits has chosen Him, and His lot before the Lord of Spirits has surpassed anything through uprightness for ever (xlvi. 3). His glory is from eternity to eternity, and His power from generation to generation. In Him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit of Him who gives knowledge. . . . And He will judge the hidden things, and no one will be able to hold vain discourse before Him, for He is chosen before the Lord of Spirits, according to His good pleasure" (xlix. 2-4).⁴*

¹ John iii. 27-30.

² Schürer, "The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. iii., p. 161.

³ Schürer compares Targum Jonathan on Zech. iv. 7—"The Messiah whose name was named *before eternity*"; but this, of course, is a later work.

⁴ The fourth Book of Ezra is in essential agreement with this description; but this is, in part at least, a post-Christian work. On the other

The passages I italicize in the above quotation are to me suggestive of the most definite Christological teaching which we find in the Synoptic Gospels. In Matt. xi. 25-27, Jesus thanks the Father "because He has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes," adding, "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." In Luke this utterance recurs, with little variation (x. 21-22), on the occasion of the return of the seventy from their successful mission. Matthew, on the other hand, loosely connects it with Christ's rebuke of those who condemned John as an ascetic and "the Son of Man" as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, to which reproach there is attached the saying "Wisdom is justified by her works" (*var. lect.*, "by her children").

Of course, this utterance is in the very spirit of the fourth Gospel, but why is it therefore to be suspected? Its different setting in the two Gospels may suggest that one of the Evangelists has given the wrong occasion, though it is perhaps as probable that our Lord so spoke more than once. But surely it is the poorest criticism to regard a saying so well attested as a posthumous invention because it does not square with one's preconceived theories about what Jesus must have taught? Loisy, indeed, goes on to show that the diction in this passage may perhaps have been affected by the prayer of Ben Sirach in the Apocryphal book Ecclesiasticus,¹ wherein the "unlearned" are summoned to put their neck under the "yoke" of the Heavenly Wisdom (*cf.* verse 26 with Matt. xi. 28, 29). He remarks, "Il est malaisé d'admettre que Jésus dans une oraison ou un discours tout spontané ait voulu imiter l'Ecclésiastique,"² and he attempts on this ground to attribute the words to "le rédacteur évangélique." Yet every critical student of the Gospels knows that the eschatological discourses of Jesus embody repeatedly the diction, not only of the Hebrew Scriptures, but of the current Apocalyptic literature. The very term "Son of Man," perhaps, comes directly from the Book of Enoch. Why is the appropriation of phrase more "malaisé d'admettre" here than elsewhere? Loisy's attitude in regard to this utterance, however, illustrates what I have said above as to the arbitrary textual

hand, of the section of Enoch quoted above, Schürer says: "Anyone who candidly weighs the arguments on the one side and on the other must feel constrained to admit that the pre-Christian origin is decidedly more probable than the Christian one" ("The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. iii., p. 69).

¹ Chap. li.

² "L'Év. et l'Égl.," *loc. cit.*

methods of the "higher" critics. "What is Christianity?" asks Harnack, and while rejecting much else, builds his answer on this very text, however short he falls of its true interpretation. "What is Christianity?" echoes Loisy, and just because he sees the significance of the passage, quietly postulates that it could never have been spoken by Jesus at all. The words accordingly are "un produit de la tradition chrétienne des premiers temps," "un témoignage considérable en ce qui concerne l'évolution de la christologie au premier âge de l'Église."¹ There is, of course, no reason to doubt that our Saviour thus expressed Himself at least once when on earth, and it is an assertion of His Messianic claims which we may read along with His repeated assumption of the titles "Son of God" and "Son of Man."

Before leaving this passage I notice that for the identification of the Messiah with the Heavenly "Wisdom" men's minds were prepared, not only by Ecclesiasticus, but by the so-called "Wisdom of Solomon." Shortly before Christ's coming this work had depicted "Wisdom" as an assessor on God's throne (*ἡ τῶν σῶν θρόνων παρέδρος*, Wisd. ix. 4-9), understanding the works of God, present when He created the world. When, then, our Lord says "Wisdom is justified by its works" (*var. lect.*, "by its children"), or when we find the words "Therefore said the Wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets, etc." (Luke xi. 49), there seems to be good reason to think that along with the Messianic titles "Son of Man" and "Son of God" He appropriated that of the hypostasized "Wisdom."² That the latter passage occurs in Matt. xxiii. 34 in the form "Therefore, behold I send unto you prophets, etc.," is not, as Loisy suggests, an argument that a later hand inserted the identification. On the contrary, we may fairly infer that Luke has here the fuller and more exact terms of the saying, and that Christ's hearers sufficiently understood that by the "Wisdom of God" He meant Himself. It is to me an argument in favour of our Lord's appropriating thus the current terminology that the early Christians did so, and that St. Paul speaks of his making it the substance of His Gospel at Corinth, not twenty years later, that Christ is "the Power of God" and "the Wisdom of God." The Abbé would probably reply that this passage (1 Cor. i. 24) is only another proof that "la révélation du secret messianique se fait

¹ "L'Év. et l'Égl.," pp. 80, 81.

² Possibly even the designation "Word," of the Johannine theology. In Wisd. xviii. 15, *ὁ παντὸς δυνάμεις σου λόγος* is personified in a manner that approaches the hypostatic union, and Philo's "Word" is practically identical with "Wisdom" here.

réellement par l'Esprit qui agit dans la communauté des premiers croyants."¹ But the disciple is not above his Master. To most Christians I think it will appear reasonable that the human Jesus had at least as much claim to such inspiration as St. Paul.

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

(*To be continued.*)



ART. III.—THE BOOK OF GENESIS (*continued*).

HITHERTO we have been discussing such subjects connected with the study of Genesis as are dealt with by Dr. Driver in the introductory part of his volume, whilst making such references as were necessary to the main body of the work. We pass on to the commentary itself and to the essays which will be found incorporated in it. First in order is placed, as is natural,

THE CREATION OF THE WORLD,

and what is called the cosmogony of Genesis.

Here we come at once to the problems the elucidation of which is very often held to point to a divergence or opposition between science and religion. But, as has been already clearly laid down, when we read the Bible we are not reading in any particular book anything professing to form part of a scientific manual. What is described to us is narrated in popular language. When the book was written—no matter for the moment at what date—it was written by a man of his time, and not by a scientist of the twentieth century, and for men of this time. It would have been useless to have described the creation then in language such as many would understand nowadays. And, after all, we are still, many of us, far from possessing a deep acquaintance with science, and even the scientist himself takes up the language of the past and uses it. He still speaks of sunset and of sunrise, whilst he tells us, when he is talking scientifically, that the sun does *not* set, and that the sun does *not* rise. If it is permitted him to use such language as this in such an enlightened age, why should he put the writers of a less informed age out of court for expressing the broad facts of creation in similar language, and accuse them of contradicting scientific truth because they use the language and imagery of the time? But we

¹ "Autour," etc., p. 118.