

him the protest which Theodore had raised against the egegetical tendencies of his time finally dies away. It was an egregious *ignoratio elenchi*. The battle between the two methods was never fairly fought out. The Nestorians appealed to Theodore in support of their doctrine of the two natures; and they and he were condemned together. His genuine merits counted for nothing, and the field was left in possession of the adversaries.

W. SANDAY.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL

IN THE SUPERSCRIPION OF HIS EPISTLE TO THE
ROMANS.—NO. 4.

THE Apostle adds, *according to the Spirit of holiness* (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης), an expression which seems to be the correlate of the expression, *according to the flesh*, at the conclusion of the third verse. It would, therefore, appear to be most naturally interpreted as referring to the higher element, the Divine nature in our Lord's complex being as θεάνθρωπος.

The Greek expositors, however—Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Photius, and Theophylact—take a different view. They suppose that it is the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Godhead, who is spoken of; and they interpret the expression as exhibiting, in addition to the Saviour's power of miracles (ἐν δυνάμει), a second item of means divinely employed to mark him off determinately as God's Son. They would understand the entire verse somewhat as follows: *who was proved to be God's Son, firstly, by his miraculous power; secondly, by the Holy Spirit given as a Spirit of sanctification to those who believe; thirdly, by his resurrection from the*

dead. Theodoret agrees with the other Fathers in referring the expression, *the Spirit of holiness*, to the Holy Spirit ; but, instead of regarding the evidence of our Lord's Divine sonship as distributed into the three particulars specified, he looks upon it as condensed into a unity, thus, *determinately marked off as God's Son by power according to the Holy Spirit*—that is, by the power of the Holy Spirit—*after His resurrection from the dead.*

The Syriac Peshito translator had evidently taken the same view of the expression and its preposition as Chrysostom and his followers. He translates the first half of the verse thus : "Who was known (as) the Son of God by power 'and' by the Spirit of holiness." But it is a remarkable fact that Chrysostom, when quoting the passage in his *Sermon on the Holy Spirit*, takes an entirely different view of the construction from that which is given in his *Exposition*. He assumes, indeed, that the phrase refers to the Holy Spirit, but he connects it with the first verse, throwing all that intervenes into a parenthesis : *Paul, Jesus Christ's servant, a called apostle, separated unto God's gospel according to the Spirit of Holiness after the resurrection of Jesus Christ.* He says that many suppose that the words *according to the Spirit of Holiness* are to be grammatically connected with the phrase, *determined to be God's Son.* "But," adds he, "this is not the case." Œcolampadius follows this construction of Chrysostom ; but it is altogether unnatural. And indeed every interpretation which assumes that it is the Holy Spirit that is referred to is strained and unnatural. The whole circle of the Spirit's operations has been ransacked for the interpretation of the phrase. Some,

such as Ammon, have supposed that the reference is to the Spirit's testimony in the Old Testament. Some, such as Michaelis, have thought that the reference is to his testimony in the New. Some, again, have supposed that the reference is rather to what the Spirit did than to what he said. And, among these, several, such as Pelagius and the late Dr. Wardlaw, imagine that there is a reference to the Spirit's agency in our Lord's incarnation. Others, such as Fritzsche and Niemeyer, imagine the reference to be to the Spirit's agency all along the currency of our Lord's terrestrial career. And yet others, such as Vaughan and Terrot, think that the reference is to the agency that was put forth by the Spirit in our Lord's resurrection. Vaughan translates the expression thus: *by the operation of the Holy Spirit*. Luther, again, supposes that the reference is to the outpouring of the Spirit after our Lord's ascension. But every phase of this mode of interpretation stamps improbability on itself in virtue of ignoring the natural correlation and antithesis that subsists between the two expressions, *according to the flesh* and *according to the Spirit of Holiness*, and by failing, moreover, to suggest a reason of the slightest consideration or significance for the substitution of the unique phrase *Spirit of Holiness* for the common phrase *Holy Spirit*.

How should the phrase be translated? Some have supposed that it should be rendered *the Spirit of sanctification*. That is the Vulgate rendering. It is Erasmus's also, and Luther's, and Tyndale's, and Beza's in the first five editions of his New Testament. It is probable that these interpreters regarded the word as a derivate of the verb *ἁγιάω*, *to sanctify*. Such, indeed,

is the derivation that is given to the term by Niemeyer in his Programm on the expression. But the word is really derived from ἅγιος,¹ and means *holiness*. The word does not occur in classical Greek, but it is common in ecclesiastical Greek, and is frequently used appellatively, "your holiness," "his holiness." It is found in the Septuagint four times, Psa. xcv. 6; xcvi. 13; cxliv. 5; 2 Macc. iii. 12, in none of which passages can it be translated *sanctification*. It is found in only two other passages in the New Testament, 2 Corinthians vii. 1; 1 Thessalonians iii. 13; and in both of these places it must mean *holiness*. Henry Stephens, the lexicographer, apprehended the true import and the true derivation of the word, and referred to a known rule that accounted for the long vowel, viz., *When the penultimate syllable of the adjective is long, then the vowel of the noun is short* (δικαιοσύνη, &c.); *but when the penultimate syllable of the adjective is short, then the vowel of the noun is long* (ἁγιασμένη).

The expression, then, which the Apostle employs does not mean *Spirit of sanctification*. It is correctly translated in our present English version, *Spirit of Holiness*.

To what does it refer? We have seen that it is utterly improbable that it refers to the Holy Spirit, the third subsistence in the Trinity. We have likewise indicated our conviction that it refers to our Lord's Divine nature. But might it not rather refer to *our Lord's holy moral character*? This is, in substance, the view taken by Stengel and Van Hengel. It seems also to be the view taken by Conybeare, who prints the expression thus: "according to the spirit of holi-

¹ After the manner of ἀγαθωσύνη, ἱερωσύνη, μεγαλωσύνη.

ness," not "according to the Spirit of holiness." He says that "we may observe that the virtues which marked Jesus as the Son of God, are here declared to be *power* and *holiness*. Neither," he adds, "would have been sufficient without the other." But it is a fatal objection to this interpretation, that it is inconsistent at once with the antithetic expression *according to the flesh*, and with the adjunctive expression *in power*, and with the concluding expression *by the resurrection of the dead*. In the antithetic expression there is no reference to a moral and morally corrupt element. In the adjunctive expression there is reference to an element that must have had something else in which to inhere than spotless excellency of moral character. And in the concluding expression it is assumed that the fact of sonship could be determinately marked off and established by the fact of resurrection, whereas *sonship in respect of moral character or of moral similitude to the Father* shines by its own light, and is not susceptible of demonstration by acts of power.

Is it, then, our Lord's Divine nature that is referred to in the phrase, *the Spirit of holiness*? We believe that it is. Yet there is still one other alternative of interpretation possible. The expression might be conceived to refer to *our Lord's holy human spirit, instead of his holy Divine Spirit*.

Had there been no other passages in Scripture, in which discriminative mention is made of the twofold elements involved in the being of our Lord, and had it been in this passage only that he received the designation *God's Son*, it might have been difficult to determine to which alternative of interpretation we should turn. If the reference were to his holy human spirit, then

the word *flesh*, in the antithetic clause, would require to be understood as used in its strictly physical acceptation. But if the reference be to the holy Divine nature, then the word *flesh* will be used in the more extended and peculiarly Hebraistic signification, already explained, comprehending in its import all the essentially complementive elements of human nature which subtend the element of *flesh*.

But we know that the Apostle Paul held that our Saviour was "in the form of God" before he appeared "in fashion as a man."¹ And although we need not doubt that his philosophy regarding substances, essences, natures, personalities, did not run in the ruts of our systems, still no candid critic can deny that he recognized in Christ something that transcended the entire creation, and on which indeed the entire creation, material and spiritual, hangs.² It will not then be at variance with the fundamental principles of St. Paul's Christology to suppose that in the expression before us there *may be a reference to our Saviour's Divine nature*.

If, moreover, we may, in this inquiry, be allowed to assume that St. Paul's ideas of the Saviour were akin to the ideas of St. John, and that St. John's ideas were drawn, not from Alexandrian philosophy, as distinguished from Palestinian theosophy (Rückert), but from the teachings of the Saviour Himself, then there rolls over to us an immense accumulation of evidence that in the passage before us *there may be a reference to our Lord's Divine nature*. Our Saviour, according to St. John, was "in the beginning."³ He was "with God."⁴ He "was God."⁵ He is emphatically "the

¹ Phil. ii. 6, 7.

² Col. i. 16, 17.

³ John i. 1.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

Son of God," in such a sense that He was "the only begotten of the Father."¹ The "Father was in Him, and He in the Father."² He and the Father were "one."³ He that had seen Him, "had seen the Father."⁴ It was the wish of the Father "that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father."⁵ "If a man love me," says the Son, "he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and 'we' (mark the unity) will come unto him, and make *our* abode with him."⁶ "And now, O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self, *with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*"⁷ In the unity with the Father, which these sayings express and assume, we find the reason and the vindication of the importance attached to Himself by the Son, and of the immeasurably high position accorded to Him by the Apostles. He says "Come unto *me*, and *I* will give you rest; come *all ye that labour and are heavy laden.*"⁸ He says, "He that believeth on *me* hath everlasting life."⁹ "He that believeth in *me*, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth on *me* shall *never die.* Believest thou this?"¹⁰ This assumption would be superlative presumption, except on the hypothesis of a unity with the great Father, infinitely transcending all human possibilities. And the Apostles are unanimous in declaring that there is "no other name given under heaven among men, whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus."¹¹ No wonder, accordingly, that the unbelieving Jews deemed our Lord guilty of blasphemy for claiming such a sonship as made him "equal with God."¹² He "made

¹ John i. 18.⁴ John xiv. 9.⁷ John xvii. 5.¹⁰ John xi. 25, 26.² Ibid. x. 38.⁵ Ibid. v. 23.⁸ Matt. xi. 28.¹¹ Acts iv. 12.³ Ibid. x. 30.⁶ Ibid. xiv. 23.⁹ John vi. 47.¹² John v. 18.

himself God" in their estimation,¹ And when they accused him before Pilate, and insisted that he should be crucified, they said, "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, *because he made himself the Son of God.*"²

There was, then, according to St. John's representations, something Divine involved and assumed in the designation *Son of God* as applied to our Saviour. There was the idea of community of nature, metaphysical as well as moral, with the Father. We find no hint, indeed, either in the passage before us, or in the second Psalm, or in any other portion of Scripture, of an eternal generation. We find nothing of derivative divinity. Nevertheless, we cannot coincide in the notion that it was in regard to his human nature that our Lord was the Son of God. We take it that as *θεάνθρωπος* he was both *the Son of Man* and *the Son of God*. Considered in the element of his humanity, he was *the Son of Man*. Considered in the element of his divinity he was *the Son of God*. He was both, because he had, in relation at once to men and to God, a real community of nature. In his own theanthropic person He was truly human, "born of a woman," and truly Divine, "begotten of the Father."³

The Apostle Paul, then, if in harmony with the Apostle John, not only held that his Saviour was Divine; in the very act of calling him *God's Son* he was conscious of ascribing to him divinity. Such ascription of divinity was one of the *principia* of his Christology. And hence the expression, *in respect to the Spirit of Holiness*, succeeding discriminatively, as it does, the ex-

¹ John x. 33.

² Ibid. xix. 7.

³ See Luke i. 35; Acts xiii. 33; Psalm ii. 7.

pression *determined to be God's Son in power*, must refer not to our Lord's holy human spirit, as Oltramare and Mehring suppose, but to his holy Divine nature, as is supposed by Melville, Cameron, Turretin, Venema, Day, Hammond, Winzer, Hodge, Alford, Philippi, Glöckler, Olshausen, &c.

The word Spirit, in the expression *Spirit of Holiness*, does not, of course, as a word, mean *nature*, or *Divine nature*, although it refers to the Divine nature of our Saviour. It just means *spirit*, and, as such, it stands in a finely significant antithesis to the word *flesh*, as designating our Lord's human nature. When the Hebrew mind contrasted, in a simple and primitive manner, *man* and *God*, it fixed upon the antithetic characteristics of *flesh* and *spirit*. Man is flesh.¹ God is spirit.² Man, as flesh, is visible. God, as spirit, is invisible. Man, as flesh, is subject to infirmities and pains, and decay. God, as spirit, is incorruptible. In thus discriminating man and God, it was only a single relativity that was seized and made prominent. The discrimination was merely partial, but it served as a starting-point of representation, and became the basis of conventional appellations. And hence, in contemplating our Saviour's theanthropic being, the Apostle employed the nomenclature which usage laid to his hand; but connected with it a far-reaching philosophy. The word *flesh* he retained, as bringing into view that element of humanity which is outermost, if we consider human nature from without inward, and which may be represented as nethermost, if we view human nature from beneath upward. The word *spirit* he likewise retained, even as it is conventionally retained in the

¹ Gen. vi. 3.

² John iv. 24.

analogous appellation "Holy Spirit." And he retained it, apparently, as bringing into view that element of divinity which is most strikingly correlative to humanity as *flesh*. But he added to it the qualitative expression "of holiness," as exhibiting in relief the great ethical distinction of the Divine nature, as contrasted with the existing character of the sons and daughters of men. God is the "holy, holy, holy" One.¹ He dwelleth in the "holy of holies," in "the beauty of holiness." And the Apostle uses the expression *Spirit of Holiness*, rather than the kindred expression "Holy Spirit," for the simple reason, apparently, that the latter had got fixed into the conventional appellation of another subsistence or personality in the unity of the Godhead. It is for a similar reason, we apprehend, that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews uses the expression "eternal Spirit," when he refers to the agency of our Lord's Divine nature, in relation to his humanity, in the accomplishment of the great propitiatory sacrifice.

Some expositors, inclusive of Winzer, Hodge, and Heubner, have supposed that the word *holiness*, in the expression we have been considering, does not mean *holiness*. D. C. F. Schmid and Heubner regard it as meaning *Divine majesty*; Winzer, as meaning *Godhead* or *Divine nature*; Geissler and Hodge, as meaning "that attribute of a person which renders him worthy of reverence." Other expositors give reins to other freaks of inventiveness in reference to the word. Even Bengel staggers. But all of them were forgetting for the moment that they might as reasonably and consistently maintain that *divinity* means *holiness*. They

¹ Isa. vi. 3.

failed to bear in mind that the metaphysical coincidence of attributes is one thing, and the names of these attributes is something very different. Metaphysical coincidence by no means necessitates the rhetorical synonymy of nomenclature.

We now come to the clause "by the resurrection of the dead" (ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν). Some have supposed that the preposition has here its temporal import, *since* or *after his resurrection from the dead*. This was the view of Theodoret, and was adopted by Luther, Tyndale, and many others, such as Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Stuart, Turnbull. The translation, however, rose from an incorrect view of the import and reference of the preceding clauses. It must be abandoned if we are to suppose that the Apostle indicates at all whence the evidence is obtained in virtue of which our Lord "was determined to be God's Son in power in respect to the Spirit of holiness." We may add that the translation reposes upon an unwarrantable exposition of the expression which the preposition introduces—"the resurrection *of the dead*." It reposes upon the assumption that the expression simply means, "his resurrection *from the dead*." We must give the preposition its native and common import. *It denotes source*. The Apostle points to the source of evidence whence the demonstrative determination of our Lord's Divine sonship issued. It issued *from the resurrection of the dead*, so that the demarcation took place *by, or by means of, the resurrection of the dead*. This is the view that is taken of the preposition by Chrysostom, Œcumenius, and Theophylact, and by almost all the modern critics.

There is diversity of opinion, however, regarding the expression ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν. It naturally means

resurrection of the dead. But many contend that it must here be translated *resurrection from the dead* (as if it were ἀναστάσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν). They say that the Apostle cannot be intending to point to the general *resurrection of the dead* as the evidence of our Lord's Divine sonship. That, as they allege, would be postponing the determination of the sonship till the final winding up of the affairs of the world. It must, they urge, be the resurrection of our Lord Himself that is referred to. And hence, they consider, we must mentally repeat the preposition before the phrase *the dead*. The preposition was probably omitted, as some add, because its repetition was fitted to grate upon the ear.

This idea of a jar upon the ear is rather ticklish ground to hold. It might lead many a critic beyond his depth into the subject of rhetorical euphony and rhythm. It must be abandoned; more especially when we take into account that the Apostle, if peculiarly sensitive in the direction indicated, could easily and most euphoniously have modified and mollified his expression.

But why, then, should the preposition be wanting if the Apostle meant simply to express the idea, *by his resurrection from the dead*? It is rather a puzzling question to answer; more especially when we take into account that in every other passage in which the expression ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν or ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν occurs, it means, not *resurrection from the dead*, but *the resurrection of the dead*.¹ Cardinal Cajetan could discover no legitimate exit from the difficulty, and hence he boldly maintained that, as the expression does not

¹ See Matt. xxii. 31; Acts xvii. 32; xxiii. 6; xxiv. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21 42; Heb. vi. 2.

mean *by his resurrection from the dead*, but must mean *by the resurrection of the dead*, the reference is to the general resurrection of the future. Mehring feels shut up to take the same view.

Erasmus Schmid fell on another device, by way of accounting for the absence of the preposition. He attributed to the word *resurrection* a transitive import, making it mean, not *again-rising*, as Wycliffe renders it, but *again-raising*; and he supposed that the reference of the Apostle was to those instances of *again-raising of the dead* which occurred during our Lord's ministry on the earth, and which signally shewed forth his Divine power. He thus translates the phrase in a way in which the great Erasmus of Rotterdam had long before suggested for consideration, *by the resuscitation of the dead*. The interpretation is strained, and looks too narrow. For why specify, from among our Lord's miracles, the few instances that occurred of resuscitation from a state of death?

Erasmus, in his long note on the expression, throws out another suggestion—that, as the word *resurrection* did not, of itself, suggest the specific state out of which the uprising took place, the adjunct expression *of the dead* was appended to determine that it was *uprising from a state of death* that was meant. He thus throws out for consideration whether the phrase might not be viewed “complexly,” and “as a periphrasis,” though referring only to the resurrection of Christ Himself. The suggestion is ingenious; but still the wonder remains that the Apostle did not simply say, “by his resurrection *from* the dead.” Sebastian Schmidt's idea is remarkably akin to that of Erasmus, and so is Meyer's, and De Wette's, and Krehl's. Meyer puts

the case ingeniously thus: The Apostle's expression is a general expression of a certain category of things. The explanation, however, is strained. And no explanation would seem to be natural that does not present the expression as the announcement of a great and wonderful concrete reality.

The resurrection of the dead, wheresoever, whensoever, and howsoever realized, postulates and demonstrates the Divine Sonship of our Lord.

There had been Old Testament instances of resurrection, though issuing in but a temporary effect. These, as mere sporadic details, may possibly have been shaded off beyond the sphere of the conscious contemplation of the Apostle. But they were earnest nevertheless. They emanated proleptically from the coming Messiah, as a Redeemer who was to die, and conquer death, and rise again, and live for evermore.

There were likewise a few instances of resurrection during the currency of our Lord's public career on earth. These, too, were proleptic; and so were the additional instances that occurred on the accomplishment of the atoning work on Calvary. They all sprang from the fulness of resurrection-life that was and is in the Saviour. It was Christ Himself who, in his resurrection, was the Sum and Substance of all the prior resurrections, and of all that are yet to come. His own resurrection was the archetype of all the rest. It was the logical antecedent even of those which, in mere chronological sequence, it succeeded. It was in virtue of it that all others that are past took place, and that all others that are to come will eventuate. *Christ is "the Resurrection" and "the Life."* Both in the sphere of the outer part of human nature—the body, and in

the sphere of the inner part—the soul, Christ is “the Resurrection and the Life.” It is in Him that all live who have life. It is from Him that all who, having once been dead, are “made alive,” whether in the sphere of the body, or in the sphere of the soul, or in both spheres, reciprocally ensphered.¹ “The second Adam is the Life-giving Spirit.”² “In Him” was and is Life.³ “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in Himself.”⁴ And hence it is that “whosoever believeth in him *hath everlasting life.*”⁵ “This is,” says Jesus, “the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, *may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.*”⁶ He who hath the inner life must obtain the outer also.

It is true, then, that the introduction into humanity, dead or dying, on both sides of its being, of such a wonderful phenomenon as *resurrection*, is evidence of a Saviour and of his divinity. It is proof that the Saviour who exists is *God's Son in power*. Such seems to have been the Apostle's idea. It has been seized with more or less of comprehensiveness and exactness by Bengel, Philippi, Alford, and Van Hengel.

We need not doubt, indeed, that the resurrection of the Saviour Himself, accomplished by the coincidence of his own power and that of the Father, stood prominently out to the view of the Apostle. No doubt it did. When he wrote the words *by the resurrection of the dead*, he would be emphatically regarding them as including within their import the idea *by his resurrection from the dead*. We may reasonably suppose,

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 22.

² Ibid. xv. 45.

³ John i. 4.

⁴ Ibid. v. 26.

⁵ Ibid. vi. 4, 7.

⁶ Ibid. vi. 40.

besides, that he regarded the Saviour's resurrection as the Divine confirmation of all that He had claimed to be, and specially of that which was the culminating point of all his claims, *that He was the Son of God*. Hence we would attach very great weight to the special relation of his own individual resurrection to the charge of blasphemy which was brought against Him because He said that *He was the Son of God*. "We have a law," said the Jews to Pilate, "and by our law he ought to die, *because he made Himself the Son of God*."¹ When He was on his trial at the bar of the Sanhedrin, the high priest said to Him, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, *the Son of God*. Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said."² "Then said they all, Art thou then *the Son of God*? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What need we any farther witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth."³ "Ye have heard the blasphemy," said the high priest, "what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death."⁴ It was under a charge, then, of blasphemy that our Lord was adjudged to death. And the hinge on which the blasphemy was made to turn was the claim which he preferred, that He was *the Son of God*. This claim was met and answered by our Lord's resurrection. And, indeed, our Saviour had all along appealed to his coming resurrection as the sign and evidence of the validity of his claims. "What sign shewest thou?" said the Jews. Jesus answered, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again."⁵ "An evil and adulterous generation

¹ John xix. 7.² Matt. xxvi. 63, 64.³ Luke xxii. 70, 71.⁴ Mark xiv. 64.⁵ John ii. 18, 19.

seeketh after a sign : and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas ; for, as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." ¹ It is thus the case that the resurrection of Christ was the Divine attestation to the truth of all that He had claimed to be—the sum and substance of all which claims was the one transcendent claim *that He was the Son of God*. Our Lord's resurrection was hence, as Bengel expresses it, the fountain as well as the object of faith. And hence the immense importance attached to it by the Apostles.² Hence, too, the joy at finding it pre-intimated in the Old Testament Scriptures.³ *It did determine Him to be the Son of God in power*. And thus we may be sure that the Apostle did not lose sight of the individual resurrection of our Lord when he used the generic expression, *the resurrection of the dead*. Yet we may likewise be sure that, by his generic expression, he purposely extended his view. He looked backward into the past ages, and forward into the far future, as well as Jerusalem-ward to the stupendous events that had recently transpired on Calvary and in its neighbourhood. His eye, moreover, would take in the successive tiers of reference as regards the planes, material and spiritual, of death and life. We cannot doubt, in short, that he saw the resurrection of all those who have in times past been "made alive," or who will by and by be raised again. He saw the whole panorama of human resurrection, subtending the archetypal resurrection of our Lord

¹ Matt. xii. 39, 40.

² See Acts ii. 24-32 ; iii. 15 ; iv. 10 ; xiii. 30, 34-37 ; I Cor. xv. 13-23, &c.

³ See Acts ii. 25-31 ; xiii. 34, 35 ; xxvi. 22, 23 ; I Cor. xv. 4, &c.

Himself. It was a magnificent view. It was in the light of it, as we conceive, that he wrote the words we have been considering: "Who was determined to be God's Son in power, in respect of the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead." JAMES MORISON.

BEFORE THE FEAST OF THE PASSOVER:¹

ST. JOHN XIII. 1.

A WAY of reconciling the accounts of the Last Supper which are contained in the first three Gospels with the statements regarding it in the fourth, has not met, I think, with the attention which it deserves. It is this: St. John in speaking of the Last Supper as occurring "*before* the feast of the passover" means "before the seven days' feast" which succeeded to the Paschal sacrifice and supper.

Eight days of unleavened bread were assigned to the Passover. The first day might, in a sense, be included under the general designation of "the feast." Thus Josephus says (*Ant.* xi. 15. 1), "We keep a feast of eight days, which is called the feast of unleavened bread." He also says (*Ant.* iii. 10. 5), "The feast of unleavened bread *succeeds* that of the Passover." But he speaks more accurately and scripturally when he says (*Ant.* xi. 4. 8), "They offered the sacrifice which is called the Passover on the fourteenth day of the same month, and feasted seven days." St. Paul, I believe, observes this distinction when he says (1 Cor.

¹ The hypothesis suggested in the following pages by a clergyman who, for the present, would prefer to remain unnamed, appears to me to be worthy of careful consideration: nor has it yet, so far as I know, obtained the consideration it deserves. —ED.