

peculiarities of this Alexandrian version, and I have probably said enough to shew that it abounds in points of interest and value to the theologian. I hope in a second paper to furnish a few other instances in which the LXX. supplies us with particulars of great interest, derived from the ritual practices or the floating traditions of the Jews. Apart from any intrinsic interest which they may be found to possess, some of them throw very valuable light on the condition of the text, and suggest the solution of more than one historical difficulty.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE GLORIOUS COMPANY OF THE APOSTLES.

BY THE LATE REV. T. T. LYNCH.¹

ST. MARK iii. 14.

It is both instructive and pleasant that we should have an acquaintance with the twelve apostles at least so intimate and friendly as that we shall know each of them when we meet him, and be able to distinguish the one from the other. But it is not easy to remember twelve separate men, and it is much less easy to remember twelve separate names, unless we so group them as to aid the memory and that one shall serve to recall another. The apostles are grouped in this helpful way in the Scriptures of the New Testament. We have a list of their names in each of the Gospels, and again in the Acts of the Apostles. In all these lists Peter stands first, and

¹ Notes of an Expository Discourse by the late Rev. T. T. Lynch. Expanded by the Editor.

Judas Iscariot last ; first, we have the warm-hearted disciple who denied his Lord ; and, last, the cold-hearted disciple who betrayed his Lord. And between these two we have men of the most various qualities and types of character.

We may take these twelve men as including and representing the leading types of human character, as indicating that in the service of Christ there is a place and a work for every man, whatever his bent, whatever his gifts. We conceive of Christ, and we rightly conceive of Him, as able to draw unto Himself all mankind, and, therefore, every kind of man. We conceive of Him, not as specially adapted to the high or the low, to the learned or the illiterate, to the highly or slenderly endowed, but to all. His humanity embraced all qualities and types of manhood. He was for us all ; and in Him there are affinities with all, attractions for all ; through Him a spiritual career is thrown open to all ; by his Spirit and association with Him the special gifts of each are perfected : by our common communion with Him we are all brought into communion with each other.

But can any twelve men represent the innumerable varieties of human character ? Can they even so much as represent the varieties necessary to a complete spiritual manhood and to a complete spiritual ministry for mankind ?

At any rate, as twelve months give us a tolerably varied and complete year, so twelve men may give us a tolerably varied and complete apostolate. It is enough if we take the Twelve and their varieties of character to indicate the fact that men of many

kinds—yes, and of every kind—are wanted, and welcome, in the service of Christ.

Of the Twelve three received new names from Christ: Simon was called Peter; James and John were called Boanerges, or, "Sons of Thunder." It must both have surprised and pleased Simon to hear Jesus say to him, "Thou art *Peter, the rock*;" for it was quite contrary to his experience of himself that he should be a firm, steadfast, rocklike man. And yet, like most men of a vacillating and impulsive temperament, he must have desired to have the firm, temperate, steadfast, will; nay, he must have felt that some, though only some, elements and rudiments of the character he desired were already his. His very qualifications for being "the rock" would make him more keenly conscious of his disqualifications, more earnestly bent on rising out of them. But if we may say that from the outset Simon both was, and was not, a *Petrine* man, so we may also say that from the outset James and John were *Boanergic*—vehement, passionate—men. They *were* what Christ called them; and by calling them what He did, He inspired them to become more perfectly what He had named them. So, too, no doubt, each of the Twelve had that in him through which the world might *mar* him, through which the grace of Christ might *make* him. New names were not given to them all; but all, we may be sure, received through Christ such newness of nature as befitted a new name. And, taken together, they represent the various kinds of renewed men needed for the service of the kingdom of heaven.

Of course the names of the Twelve might have

been given by the Inspired Writers in any order, and not have been separated into groups of any kind. And it can hardly be without significance that in *all* the apostolic lists they are divided into the same three groups. These groups are as follow : (1) Peter, James, John, and Andrew are always named together—the two sons of Jona and the two sons of Zebedee. Peter invariably heads this first group, and the others follow in different orders in the different Gospels. (2) The second group consists of Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, and Thomas ; Philip always first, and the others following in different orders. (3) The third group is composed of James, the son of Alphæus—always first ; Jude, his brother ; Simon Zelotes, another brother ; and Judas Iscariot—in every sense the last.

1. In the First Group we should naturally expect to find the men of the largest and strongest make—those whose capacity and force of character would fit them to lead the rest. And this expectation is justified by the event. Peter and Andrew, John and James, *are* the natural leaders of the apostolic company. But for spiritual leadership in a great public cause, something more than natural strength and force is requisite. We admit that size, bulk, and weight, are required ; but, besides these, we demand in the larger leading men passionate affection to *the* Leader, hearty enthusiastic devotion to Him and to his cause. And this demand also is met by the first four apostles. There is an intense passion and fervour in their devotion to Christ (at least in the two of them we know best) corre-

sponding to their natural force of character. We might almost call them the *Boanergic* group, so marked and emphatic is the strain of passion in their service. Not that the other apostles did not love Christ. 'Tis evident they did; but in the first four the love is more impetuous and adventurous.

Peter, as we all know, was the most forward of this group; and next to him, not his own brother, Andrew, but his friend and brother, John. John was his most constant companion, his supporter, and, as it were, his supplement. *John's* was a stiller deeper nature; and if Peter's eager love worked more through the will, John's more through the heart. The love of *James* and *Andrew*, equally intense perhaps, worked more in practical effort, in action, in obedience; so, at least, we judge from the slender indications given of their character.

In the men of this first group, then, there was a more general and genial fulness of all the great constituents of human nature than in the others. They were bigger men—men of more force and weight; and they were still further characterized by an intense personal devotion to Christ, a more profound enthusiasm for his cause.

As for their differences and relations among themselves, we may note that, if anything had to be *said*, Peter comes to the front; if anything had to be *done*, Andrew. Of the teaching, Peter did the more outward, popular, elementary part; John, the more inward, select, advanced. John and Peter go together as the speakers and teachers of the group; James and Andrew as the men of action and affairs. Of James we know nothing individual and dis-

tinctive, and only credit him with a practical quality and habit of mind because he seems to pair off with practical Andrew, as John pairs with loquacious impulsive Peter. But, little as we are told of him, we know that James became a man of mark—great enough to be worth killing by King Herod. He loved Christ well enough to die for Him; and Herod was sufficiently afraid of him to adjudge him to prison and the executioner's sword. A man of great worth and great importance, we yet know next to nothing of him—a fact worth considering; but Heaven has the records of unrecorded virtue and devotion unrewarded in good keeping. His name is fragrant in heaven; perhaps all the more fragrant because it does not float here on what Shakespeare calls "the stinking breath" of the multitude.

It is noticeable, too, that, in this first group, we have natural brotherhood which is also spiritual; and yet spiritual brotherhood overriding natural brotherhood. Andrew and Peter are brothers in the flesh and in the spirit, so also are John and James; yet Peter and John go together, not Peter and Andrew; and James and Andrew are bosom friends, not James and John. Often in families you will see a young man more with his friend than his brother, though he loves his brother too; and it is well that this feature of family life should find place and sanction in that great family in heaven and earth which we name "the Church of Christ."

2. The Second Group consists of Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, and Matthew; and all these are well-known and well-marked men. They are all *reflective* men, all *sceptical* men. *Philip* is the

leader of this group—a man well versed in what “Moses and the prophets did write,” familiar with the prophetic “signs” of the Messiah. He is the friend of Nathanael: he is “found” of Jesus—found, approved, called; and these are testimonies indeed! He appears twice in the Sacred Narrative. The first time, when Jesus “proves” him, by asking his advice as to how a hungry multitude is to be fed, he falls into the error of calculating how much the loaves would cost at a baker’s, forgetting the wealth of power stored up in his Lord. The second time, when the Lord Jesus tells his disciples that they have known and seen the Father, Philip cries, “*Shew* us the Father, and we shall be satisfied,” forgetting that the Father is in Christ; and incurs the tender reproach, “Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?” Philip, then, was a man that would *see* rather than *believe*. He could not see how the multitude was to be fed, nor had he seen, as he wished, the God whose Son had “found” him: and he could not easily believe what he could not see.

His friend *Nathanael* is also called Bartholomew, *i. e.*, Bar-Tolmai, or son of Tolmai, just as Simon was called Bar-Jona, or son of Jona. And this Nathanael was “an Israelite indeed, without guile and without hypocrisy:” a man much given to sitting under his fig-tree and meditating on holy things, reflective and sceptical, like the rest of this group. “Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?” he asks, in a somewhat hopeless despondent way. “Can this vile earth ever in very deed become a kingdom of heaven?” It is not till he finds that

Jesus can read the very secret of his heart, that he confesses Him to be "the Son of God" and "the King of Israel."

Philip's mind and doubts busied themselves with affairs in general, with "pence" and "loaves" as well as with "the Father." Probably he was a man of an active life, though of the thoughtful class, a student of men rather than of books. But his friend Nathanael was a thoroughly good quiet man, not so much fitted to make the world a better world as to make a few people in it happier and better people. It is quite conceivable that, when on his travels with Christ, going from city to city, the son of Tolmai sometimes wished himself safe at home and under his fig-tree. He liked Philip; Philip liked him. Philip went more into the world, and could bring home news of it; and quiet men, who live uneventful days, are very fond of having news brought them of the great eventful world. Nathanael went more into meditation, and could say many a wise and thoughtful word to his friend, such as active men love, of the past history of Israel and of its ancient Scriptures. Philip liked to go to Cana of Galilee, we fancy; and Nathanael would always be glad to see him: and when once they were settled under the leafy shelter of the fig-tree, there was often nice, comfortable, unbelieving talk about the various impossibilities that were soon however to become possible, nay, accomplished facts, by the power and grace of Christ.

Matthew, the third member of this group, we know well as the author of a Gospel; but of his personal life we know nothing, save that he was a son of

Alphæus, a cousin, or "brother," of our Lord's; that though bred in the straitest and most honourable habits, he became an outcast from Israel and the disgrace of his home, in becoming a Publican; and that when Jesus recalled him to patriotism, to virtue, to religion, he made a great feast for his Master and Lord. He is the only one of the Twelve who writes a memoir of Christ, and in this memoir he inserts no sayings of his own—surely a characteristic and admirable fact. It was not his special gift to put himself forward or to originate. He seems, from his writings, to have been a man of a catholic and careful temper, mindful in new times of old words and ways; a plodding observant man, of excellent common sense and of a just honourable disposition, but by no means brilliant or sanguine. Obviously he was a humble man. When he copies out the apostolic list he puts himself *last* in his group, as one who felt that he had been forgiven much, and that a lowly place beseemed him. Humble men are often diffident and doubtful, and from the company in which we find him we infer that Matthew had his mental difficulties and troubles. Perhaps the question that was asked at, or near, his own table, when he feasted Christ, may indicate the kind of question by which he himself was sometimes troubled: "Why does your Master eat with publicans and sinners? Can God care for them? Is it possible that any kingdom of heaven can be thrown open to them? to *me*? any kingdom for which they will care, and in which there will be care even for them?" These doubtful questions, springing from his humility, from his profound sense of unworthi-

ness, may have given Matthew many painful hours and much food for talk with his companions who were like-minded with himself.

Of *Thomas* we know only what John tells us. Matthew seems to have spared his friend, or else he did not see how serviceable the story of Thomas's unbelief would be. But John, either because Thomas was dead when he wrote, or because he felt how many would come to faith by his unbelief, tells us much in the little he records of Thomas *Didymus*, *i.e.*, Thomas *the twin*. When Christ speaks of the end to which, and the way by which, He travelled, Thomas professed that he knew neither way nor end, though the Father was "the end" and Jesus Himself "the way." When Jesus would go into Bethany, to wake Lazarus from the sleep of death, Thomas apprehends that, instead of giving life to Lazarus, Jesus Himself will be put to death. When Jesus rises from the dead, Thomas will not believe unless he sees, unless his finger, nay, his whole hand, vouch for his eyes, unless *he* has a far weightier testimony than has already satisfied his brethren. But we must remember his faith and love as well as his doubts and fears. He could not see what way Christ was about to take, but whatever way that was and wherever it led, Thomas never thought of leaving it for any other way. He was quite sure that Christ would die if He went near Jerusalem, but he was quite resolved to die with Him. He was perfectly certain that Christ had not risen from the dead, but he was overwhelmed with joy to find that He had risen. In Thomas we have a man incredulous, but tenacious; despondent, but true;

with little hope, but much courage ; sincere in love, although perplexed in faith : neither rushing to the right conclusion, as Peter might have done, nor rushing away from it into danger and dishonour, as Peter did.

Here, then, in this second group, are four excellent and thoughtful men—Philip, Nathanael, Matthew, Thomas—who, despite their excellence, will not do much for the world apart from men of a more forward and adventurous spirit than their own. They all believe, but they all have a good deal of unbelief in them. They require proof, which is right; but they are apt both to ask too much proof and to be quite hopeless of ever getting it, which is wrong. And yet we cannot but love them, and thank God that, with bolder spirits, these also were included in “the glorious company of the apostles.” Those of us who think and meditate see our own faults reflected in them; and from Christ’s conquest of their faults we infer a hope that we too may find some place in his service and grow perfect as we serve Him.

3. The Third Group consists of James, the son of Alphæus; Jude, his brother; Simon Zelotes, another brother; and the traitor, Judas Iscariot. And as we termed the first group the Boanergic, and the second the reflective and sceptical, so we may call the third the *Hebraistic*, or the *practical* group—Hebraistic in virtue of one set of qualities which they have in common, and practical in virtue of another set of qualities. The three brothers James (*i.e.*, Jacob), Jude, and Simon were named after three of the ancient patriarchs of Israel, and held stoutly to the Hebrew forms of truth and righteousness,

even after they became Christian apostles ; while, in Iscariot, the Hebrew love of gain worked out into its most monstrous and fatal development.

James, Jude, and Simon were all sons of Alphæus, or Clopas, who married the sister of the Virgin Mary ; they were all, therefore, the cousins of our Lord, or, as they are sometimes called in the New Testament, "the Lord's brethren," the Greek word for "brother" having a wider scope than our English word. It is significant that we should find *them* in the last group, and associated with the traitor who sold his King for the price of a slave. It surely indicates that mere outward nearness to Christ, any merely external connection with Him or relationship to Him, is of little avail. But why are they classed with the traitor ? Were *they* also traitors ? In a modified sense, perhaps, they were. For, as they were slow to believe in Christ, so also they never seemed to have imbibed the full catholic spirit and scope of the gospel. *James* became bishop of the Church at Jerusalem, the leader of "the circumcision" in the Church — that very "circumcision" which dogged the steps of St. Paul, and of which he speaks with so much scorn and resentment ; and, till the hour of his death, James was held in as much reverence by the Jews, who persecuted other of the apostles, as by the Christians. Obviously, a very Hebraistic man and brother. *Jude* wrote an Epistle, but his Epistle has a tone as distinctively Jewish in many parts as it is unquestionably Christian in a few. *Simon* remained *Simon the Zealot* even after he was called to be a minister and an apostle of Jesus Christ ; and "the Zealots" were a faction con-

spicuous for their fierce and extreme advocacy of the Mosaic law and customs. Of all these it may be said that they were at least as much Hebrew as Christian even to the end.

But, on the other hand, all the apostles of this group were men of eminently practical gifts. *James* was chosen bishop, or gradually rose to be bishop of the Primitive Church, the Church at Jerusalem, even while Peter was still a member of it; and rose, one thinks, by mere force of his fitness for rule, by his safe practical sagacity. *Jude, the Hearty*, is stamped as a man of action by his very name; and the one question he asks in the Gospels betrays the same practical habit of thought. When the Lord Jesus promised to manifest Himself to his disciples, after that He should be hidden from the world, Jude did not see how that could be done, and asked, "Lord *how* wilt thou manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" and had to be taught that when men keep Christ's words they feel Him to be present with them. *Simon, the Zealot*, must have been a man with a ready hand, a man apt to hate wrong and to fight against it; though possibly he was also apt to think that right would build itself up without his help; that if he only rooted out wrong and left the ground bare, right would somehow sow itself and bring forth its fruit. *Judas Iscariot*, Judas "of the apron," Judas of the bag, was a man of the same type: a man chosen to carry the bag because he was careful, prudent, busy, good at buying and selling, conversant with the world: a man who wanted to make a good thing of his very religion—"profit" rather than "profiting" being his aim.

A very valuable type of man is this practical man, and much wanted in the service of the Church, which is apt to think itself "unworldly" when it is only imprudent. And, in process of time, no doubt Christ laid a strong hold on all the apostles of this valuable type. Three of them learned to risk, and to suffer, the loss of all things for his sake,—James we know, had his brains beaten out with a club because he *would* testify to Christ at an inopportune moment. And even on the miserable traitor, Christ got more hold than Judas knew. Even he, after his unparalleled sin, was bold enough to fling down the evil gains it brought to him, and mad enough with remorse to hang himself, if by any means he might escape the guilt of "innocent blood," or the intolerable sense of that guilt. Men of this practical habit were valuable, and even invaluable companions to reflective sceptical men, such as Thomas and Philip; valuable, and even invaluable ministers of bold and impulsive leaders, such as Peter and John. The Apostolic Company would not have been complete without them. But for them the Church of to-day would soon fall about our ears.

The glorious company of the apostles, then, is divided by the sacred historians into three groups, each group having certain characteristics in common. First, we have the Petrine or Boanergic group, consisting of Peter and Andrew, James and John; men of a large nature and intense enthusiasm; men of a rocklike firmness and an electric and kindling energy, the born leaders of the rest. Then, to keep them within bounds, we have the reflective and sceptical group, consisting of Philip and Nathanael,

Thomas and Matthew ; men who want to see before they will believe ; incredulous rationalistic men, apt to ask questions and to start doubts, but tenacious of the convictions they have once reached, ready to die for them, ready even to live by them. Then, to save these from mere speculation and a dreamy remoteness from the world of affairs, we have the Hebrew and practical group, consisting of James, Jude, and Simon—bishop, author, zealot ; and of Iscariot—the housekeeper, treasurer, and traitor of the Company.

And thus we come back to the thought with which we started : that in the service of Christ there is room and a work for all sorts and conditions of men—for men of genius, for men of thought, for men of action. Are we impetuous, adventurous, original ? Christ has chosen and called us. If we are true to his call, we shall become steadfast as a rock, and while we thunder and blunder on our way, we shall announce the coming and presence of the Lord. Are we of those in whom the pale cast of thought is all sicklied o'er with doubt ? Christ has chosen and called us. If we are true to his call, we shall see that we may believe, until we can believe even greater things than we can see. Are we practical men, conversant with affairs, capable of handling them to purpose ? Christ has chosen and called us, that we may be with Him and preach his gospel, that we may bear witness to Him by a life which reflects his own ; and if we are true to his call, we shall also be with Him where He now is, seeing and sharing his everlasting and indisturbable peace.