

DR. H. H. WENDT ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE work of Dr. Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, of which the second part has recently appeared, is of the utmost importance for the study of the Gospels, both with regard to the origin of them and to their doctrinal contents. It is a work of distinguished learning, of great originality, and of profound thought. The second part, which sets forth the contents of the doctrine of Jesus, is the most important contribution yet made to biblical theology, and the method and results of Dr. Wendt deserve the closest attention. The present paper will be limited to the Fourth Gospel, and indeed to one part of his inquiry into the unity and congruity of that Gospel.

Briefly put, Dr. Wendt's view of the Fourth Gospel is, that the source of it was a genuine writing of the Apostle John, similar in kind to the *Logia* of Matthew. The writing of John contained, not merely sayings of Jesus, but also some short account of the historical circumstances in which the words were spoken. While the *Logia* of Matthew extended over the whole ministry of Jesus, the *Logia* of John were limited to the last, the culminating period of our Lord's ministry. The writing had as an introduction a few statements of the apostle; and these statements, with a few additions, now form the prologue to the Gospel. The Johannine source is related to the Fourth Gospel as the *Logia* of Matthew is related to the first canonical Gospel. This writing of the Apostle John was edited and added to by the circle of his disciples after his death. The additions made to it by them are derived from

various sources: partly taken from the other Gospels; partly from oral traditions, reaching back to the apostle himself; and partly from dogmatic views and the postulates which such views seemed historically to demand (*Die Lehre Jesu*, part i., p. 218) *passim*.

How, according to Dr. Wendt, are we to distinguish the original writing of John from the additions made by the circle of his disciples? In various ways, but chiefly from the difference in tone, in doctrine, and in spirit, between the original writing of John and the additions made to it by his disciples. Dr. Wendt thinks he has discovered many places where the original connexion (*Zusammenhang*) has been broken by the additions and changes which the editors have made. The second chapter (pp. 219–238) of the discussion on the Fourth Gospel sets forth in a somewhat preliminary way the places where this lack of connexion can be traced. When the unity of the existing Gospel has thus been broken, Dr. Wendt proceeds to set forth a discovery he thinks he has made, that there are two radically different views of the grounds of faith set forth in the Fourth Gospel; and this result is next used as a criterion of the parts which are original, and those which were added by the editors. This is done in the following chapter, and done with the skill and patience characteristic of Dr. Wendt.

The question we are briefly to discuss is, Are there two views of the grounds of faith in Jesus Christ as the Messiah set forth in the Fourth Gospel? Is the canonical Gospel a unity? or is it a book in which the unity is broken up by discordant materials—in which one view is set forth in the historical sections, or in the sections in which the evangelist speaks in his own name, and another view set forth in the sayings of Jesus? In almost all quarters, with the exception of Weisse, Schenkel, Schweizer, and Tobler, and some others, the unity of the Fourth Gospel has been insisted

on. It has indeed been the basis of the attacks made on its historical character. But Dr. Wendt holds a different view; and he differs also from others in making the sayings of Jesus to be the original and trustworthy part of the Gospel, while the historical parts are additions by the disciples of John. It is well to have the testimony of such a man as Dr. Wendt to the effect that the sayings of Jesus as recorded in the Fourth Gospel are altogether credible.

It would lead us too far afield to cite the testimonies to the unity of the Gospel from all kinds of critics, nor is it necessary to do so for our purpose: for it is always open to any one to disregard everything that has been written and assumed on this topic, and to show cause why the book should no longer be considered a unity; and the only question is, Has Dr. Wendt made out his case? Our main reference is to the chapter, "Die Incongruenzen der religiösen anschauung in vierten Evangelium" (*Die Lehre Jesu*, erster Theil, pp. 238-258). He maintains that this Gospel has not arisen out of a onefold (*einheitlichen*) religious view, but that two very different views are set forth in it. In the historical parts of the Fourth Gospel faith in Jesus as the Messiah is the result of the signs which He did. These signs proved that Jesus was the bearer of a supernatural, superhuman power, and that He, by His supernatural insight into character, His supernatural knowledge, and His supernatural power, proved Himself to be the Messiah. But in the sayings of Jesus recorded in the Fourth Gospel, this view falls altogether into the background, and His claim to be the Messiah is grounded in the grace and truth manifested in His person and work. Stress is laid by Jesus, Dr. Wendt thinks, not on the signs which He did, but on the ethical and spiritual revelation of God made by Him for the salvation of men. In a word, in the historical parts faith is grounded on the miraculous, in the discourses faith is based on the character of Christ.

In proof of this statement Dr. Wendt directs attention to the fact that in the historical parts of the Gospel the idea of signs (*σημεῖα*) obtains, while in the discourses the ideas of works (*ἔργα*) and words (*ῥήματα*) are the ruling expressions. Between these two sets of ideas Dr. Wendt draws a distinction, and the distinction as drawn by him is of overwhelming importance, if it is true.

“The great difference of this point of view indicated by this interchange of the idea of *σημεῖα*, on the one hand, and *ἔργα* and *ῥήματα*, on the other, scarcely needs a detailed exposition. If the proof of the Divine origin, the Divine fellowship, and the Divine significance for salvation of Jesus is laid in His *ἔργα* and *ῥήματα*, so far as they set forth the truth (*ἀλήθεια*), then the view rules, that the perfect religious-ethical relation corresponding to the will of God, as Jesus proclaims and realizes it, if it manifests itself in the usual forms of creaturely, earthly life, still is no product of human spiritual power, and has not merely creaturely, perishable worth, but is a manifestation of true godly power, and of a true, godly, eternal life of salvation. Above all, ethical willing and doing are so clearly the distinguishing marks of revelation, that where these are manifest we have a real and perfect revelation of God. On the other hand, when the *σημεῖα* of Jesus are made the grounds of faith in His Messiahship, then omnipotence and omniscience are the distinguishing marks of the revelation of God; and phenomena, or work beyond the ordinary course of nature, and proofs of a knowledge which passes beyond the ordinary bounds of human knowledge are held to be sufficient tokens of a real revelation of God” (pp. 241, 242).

Into the value of this distinction in itself we need not now inquire. For the question is, is there such a distinction in this Fourth Gospel? and does it coincide with the distinction between the historical parts of the Gospel and the discourses?

Immediately Dr. Wendt is confronted with the fact, that in one place at least Jesus speaks of *σημεῖα* in such a way as to make them a legitimate ground of faith in Him. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek Me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled” (John vi. 26). And, on the other hand, we have the evangelist saying in his own name, “We beheld His glory,

glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (i. 14). And these two facts seem subversive of his theory. He admits also that there is a difficulty in distinguishing the words of Jesus from the words of the evangelist, and that both views of the germs of faith in Jesus as the Messiah appear in the words which the evangelist writes, and in the words which Jesus speaks. All he can affirm is, that in the words of the evangelist one view, and in the words of Jesus another prevails. The inference he draws is, that the words of Jesus are given to the evangelist, and he has not rightly understood them. The sayings of Jesus are over the head of the editor, and he has not been able to rise to the height of the great view of revelation contained in the prologue and in the discourses of Jesus.

There is a long and interesting discussion of the passage John v. 27 ff., in which he tries to show that there is really no connexion between the twenty-seventh verse and the following discourse. The next point in the proof is that in the words of Jesus, and in the historical part of the Gospel, there are two different conceptions of the works of the Messiah. What is the proof that Jesus is the Messiah? The answer to this question consists in an exposition of the passage John v. 21-28, in which Dr. Wendt contends that vers. 28, 29, "Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment," breaks the connexion of thought, and introduces another view of judgment than that contained in the verses which precede and follow. In the words of Jesus it is implied that, in the exercise of His Messianic calling, He has during the time of His earthly activity exercised the functions which properly belonged to the Messiah; *viz.* by His preaching to communicate eternal life, on the one hand, and to award judgment, on the other.

His preaching as exercised there and then had this twofold function; and the state of men is determined by their relation to the preaching of the Messiah. They who hear have life, while they who do not hear are under judgment. But the passage, vers. 28, 29, brings in, Dr. Wendt contends, another view of judgment, simply states, as a matter of fact, that there will be a future judgment, grounds that judgment, not on the acceptance or rejection of the preaching of the Messiah, but on the good or ill which men have done; and he concludes therefore that these verses are an addition to the words of Jesus. May not this universal quickening and judgment be regarded as the consummation of the partial quickening and judgment which took place during the earthly ministry of Jesus? Dr. Wendt considers this view and rejects it, mainly because the statement of the universal quickening and judgment is introduced as a matter of fact, and its logical connexion with the context is not set forth. But the same paradox meets us frequently in the writings of the Apostle Paul. In his writings we are told that there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, and we are also told that there is to be a universal judgment when "we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10). Are we to set down all those passages as interpolations wherein Paul sets forth the principle of the final judgment as a principle of judgment according to works, or where he introduces the final judgment simply as a matter of fact?

Finally the difference of view is found in those passages in which the evangelist attempts to explain certain words of Jesus, and instead of explaining them shows that he has misunderstood them. These passages are the following: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," and the explanation of the evangelist, "But He spake of

the temple of His body" (ii. 19, 21). "Now in the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." And the evangelist misunderstands when he says, "But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believed in Him should receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified" (vii. 37, 39). Another mistaken explanation is found in the passage (xii. 32), "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me"; which is thus explained, "This He said, signifying by what death He should die." And finally the evangelist has misunderstood the words of Jesus (xvii. 12): "While I was with them, I kept them in Thy name which Thou hast given Me: I guarded them, and not one of them is lost"; which he thus explains (xviii. 9): "That the word might be fulfilled which He spake, Of those whom Thou hast given Me I lost not one."

How do these supposed mistakes and misunderstandings of the words of Jesus bear on the thesis of Dr. Wendt, that there are in the Gospel two views of the ground of faith in Jesus as the Messiah? In all these instances the words of Jesus refer not to a *σημείον* in the outward sense, not to a particular work of God's power which is outside of the ordinary course of nature, but to something said or done by Him which, though within the usual course of nature, is a higher proof of Divine working than any outward *σημείον* could be. But the evangelist has in all of them given an interpretation of the words of Jesus which limits them to an outward and external interference with the usual course of nature. With regard to the passage in the second chapter, Dr. Wendt says that if the comment of the evangelist be correct, then Jesus had given utterance to a dark saying, the meaning of which must neces-

sarily be misunderstood. Again, he lays stress on the active form of the verb *ἐγερῶ*; and says that the New Testament form is always passive: that Jesus did not raise Himself from the dead, but that He was raised from the dead by God, on which it is sufficient to quote Meyer:

“It is only a seeming objection to John’s explanation that, according to New Testament theology, Christ did not raise Himself from the dead, but was raised by the Father. Any such contradiction to the Christian mode of view, if real, must have prevented John himself, above every one, from referring to the resurrection. But the objection disappears if we simply give due weight to the figurative nature of the expression, which rests upon the visible contemplation of the *resurrection*, according to which the *subject* that arises, whose resurrection is described as the re-erecting of the destroyed temple, must also be the subject that erects the temple, without affecting the further doctrine, which moreover does not come under consideration, that the *causa efficiens*, i.e. the actual revivifying power, is the Father. Christ, receiving this life again from the Father, and rising again, Himself raises up by His very resurrection the destroyed temple” (Meyer on John; Clark’s translation, vol. i., p. 156).

It is not therefore clear that the evangelist has misunderstood the word of Jesus. Such a conclusion must be the result of exegetical despair, and is not to be held, if any other explanation is tenable. So also of the other passages. As we read the remarks of Dr. Wendt, we cannot help feeling that his exegesis is somewhat strained, and the attempt to show that the comment of the evangelist is grounded on a misunderstanding fails. To deal with the details of his exposition would take too much space. The points on which he lays stress are familiar to all students of the Gospel, have been considered in detail by competent exegetes, and by them have not been held to prove that the comment of the evangelist has misunderstood the statements of Jesus.

But these views of Dr. Wendt ought to be well grounded, inasmuch as they are made the fulcrum from which the whole fabric of the Fourth Gospel is broken up, and resolved



into its various parts. Having thus established his principle, he next applies it; and with the result that he presents us with the *disjecta membra* which remain. Part of the prologue is from the original source, and part is interpolated. The part after the prologue, from the eighteenth verse of the first chapter to the twelfth verse of the second chapter, contains no trace of the original source. The account of the cleansing of the temple belongs to the source, except that ver. 17 is a gloss of the evangelist. There are a few sayings in the section ii. 23 to iv. 54 which belong to the source. The conversation with Nicodemus, with the exception, that the passage which grounds the Divine mission of Jesus on the signs which He did, "No man can do these signs which Thou doest, except God be with him," is an addition made by the evangelist. So Dr. Wendt goes through the Gospel, and with the utmost confidence separates the parts belonging to the source from the additions made by the subsequent editor. Let what is given suffice as a specimen. We ought to be very sure of the strength, sufficiency, and delicacy of the instrument with which such work is to be done.

One important result flows from the labours of Dr. Wendt. Taking the first part of the book along with the second part, in which the contents of the teaching of Jesus are set forth, and we have this significant conclusion: that there is essential agreement between the teaching of the Synoptic Gospels and the teaching of the Fourth Gospel. This is a great gain, inasmuch as the more common opinion has always represented the sayings or conversations of the Fourth Gospel as the chief source of difficulty in ascribing the authorship of it to an eyewitness. We may take Dr. James Martineau as an exponent of the more common view, and he expresses it thus:

"Nor is it possible to piece together, as expressions of the same personality, the synoptical *discourses of Jesus* and those of the Fourth

Gospel; and the same circle of disciples cannot be answerable for both. If it be true (Mark iv. 34) that 'without a parable spake he not unto them,' no address of his is given us by the last evangelist; for of this picturesque and winning type of public teaching, so locally true, so personally characteristic, not a single instance appears in his narrative. Instead of these coloured lights upon the teacher's doctrine, we have it wrapped in dark disguise; the concrete language of life, born in the field, the boat, the olive ground, is exchanged for the abstract forms of philosophical conception; the terse maxims of conduct and epigrams of moral wisdom, for doctrinal enigmas and hinted mysteries of sentiment. The simple directness with which, in the earlier reports, the speaker advances to his end, and leaves it, is here replaced by the windings of subtle reflection, and the repetitions of unsatisfied controversy. He passes from the breadth and sunshine of the hills to the studious and nocturnal lamp of the library; and exchanges the music of living voices, never twice the same, for the monotonous pitch of speech, which flows unvaried through the lips of Jesus or the historian, of Nicodemus or the woman of Samaria, of this disciple or of that" (*Seat of Authority in Religion*, pp. 214, 215).

What Dr. Martineau has declared impossible has actually been done by Dr. Wendt, with masterly power and decisive success. Whoso shall read the various sections in the second part of the work of Dr. Wendt, which expound the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, and note the correspondence between the ideas contained in them and in the Synoptics as it is set forth by Dr. Wendt, must be persuaded that both flow from the "same personality." The worth of this part of Dr. Wendt's book is conspicuous. It is full of originality, it is effective and convincing. No greater contribution to the study of biblical theology has been made in our time. The value of it is enhanced by the fact that it is so far independent of the analysis of the Gospel made by him in the first part of the work. Those who are unable to accept either the method or the results of the process set forth in the first part of his work may well be thankful to him for the brilliant and satisfactory exposition of the teaching of Christ contained in the second part. No one who has not read what Dr. Wendt has

written on the subject can have a right to speak as Dr. Martineau has done, and as others have done, of the discourses of the Fourth Gospel. Into a discussion of Dr. Wendt's exposition we cannot now enter. But we direct attention to it, because of its great ability and exceeding importance.

Accepting what Dr. Wendt has established as to the discourses of the Fourth Gospel, is it necessary for us to separate them from the more historical parts, or to regard them as unhistorical, the work of a later editor who has misunderstood the meaning of the sayings? Even where we dissent most widely from the method and results of Dr. Wendt, we are deeply indebted to him. While his statement of the difference in the point of view of the discourses and the other parts of the Fourth Gospel cannot be accepted, we may feel thankful to him for calling attention to the fact that there is a difference. In the words of Jesus all things are referred to the Father: He does the Father's works, He speaks the Father's words. He does nothing of Himself; as the Father teaches Him, so He speaks. He has come from God, He does the work of God, He returns to God. The consciousness of relationship to the Father runs through all the discourses, and every claim He makes is made because of His relationship to the Father. Along with this habitual reference to the Father, we have also the assertion that He is the indispensable bearer of salvation to the people, and the only means of life for them. In His relation to the Father, Jesus ever speaks in these discourses of His dependence on the Father; in His relation to man He makes the most stupendous claims in virtue of His consciousness of oneness with the Father. With regard to men He says, I am the light of the world; I am the Bread of life; I am the door; I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me; and many other sayings of a similar import. In the historical parts of

the Gospel, it may be freely granted, the relationship to the Father is less conspicuous, falls more into the background. To the evangelist Jesus is in the foreground. His person, His work, His glory fill the whole horizon; he is so occupied with Jesus that, however real his knowledge is that Jesus is the Son of God, yet that knowledge is not prominently set forth or insisted on. If the disciple dwells on the glory of the Son, that is not to the exclusion of the glory of the Father. Nay, to the evangelist the glory of the Son is the glory of the Father, and the Father and the Son are one. There is no inconsistency between the statement, "This beginning of His signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested His glory; and His disciples believed on Him" (ii. 11), and the other statement, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? the words that I say unto you I speak not from Myself: but the Father abiding in Me doeth the works" (xiv. 10). The disciple does not for the moment look beyond Jesus. And he speaks simply and naturally of His Master and His Master's glory. From his point of view, it is scarcely possible that he should speak otherwise. The glory of the Son is indeed "the glory of the only begotten from the Father," but none the less is there a proper glory of the Son. And the evangelist delights to set forth the glory of the Son.

It is quite true that the evangelist dwells with delight on the signs which Jesus did. He selects and he records some instances of the more than human insight into character and motive manifested by Jesus, and of works in the doing of which more than human power was exercised by Jesus. It is also true that, in the words of Jesus, these are described as *εργα* which He was enabled to do, because He was commissioned and empowered to do them by the Father. This however is the whole extent of the difference, and it is not sufficient to warrant the inference drawn by Dr. Wendt.

Nor can the contention be made good that the *ἔργα* referred to in the words of Jesus are limited to the religious-ethical sphere. This limitation is arbitrary, and yet it is on this limitation that Dr. Wendt bases his whole argument. In various ways and from various points of view he sets forth this distinction, and insists that the view of Jesus and His work set forth in the historical parts is contrary to the view set forth in the words of Jesus Himself. It would be scarcely relevant to say that in this interpretation Dr. Wendt stands almost alone; for an opinion must be tried on its merits, and not by the number of those who hold it. But it is relevant to the argument to give the view of another distinguished critic and theologian on the same subject. Thus Weizsacker (*Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, p. 244) says: "The faith which His miracles produce is only a preparation (*Nothbehelf*) for the faith which rests on the view of His unity with God, and is obtained from His personal self-revelation in word. But so much the more is the history ruled by the thought with which the author begins his exposition. This is manifest pre-eminently in the miracles of Jesus and in His relations to His opponents. The miracles which the evangelist has selected for exposition are not set forth as deeds flowing out of the goodness and pity of Jesus, but as necessary revelations of the Divine glory present in Him." Here we have a view different altogether from the view presented by Dr. Wendt, and more in agreement with the real position of the evangelist.

It is admitted by Dr. Wendt that the works of the Son have a supernatural character, though he limits their supernatural character to the religious-ethical sphere. They are supernatural so far, and only in so far, as they manifest the grace and truth which are in Jesus. But as Baur has pointed out (*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, p. 320), the Messianic signs of the Fourth Gospel are "the imme-

mediate reflex of the highest Divine energy, and it is utterly superfluous to discuss the question of how these *ἔργα* are related to miracles properly so called, or acts of Divine activity; as manifestations of the might of the Father working in the Son, all Messianic *ἔργα* have a supernatural character." Jesus had done works which no other man had done, and it seems somewhat arbitrary to limit these works to the spiritual sphere. It is to be observed also that the evangelist always lays stress on the spiritual side of the *σημεῖα*. They are of value and of significance to him, not as works of power or as works of supernatural insight, but as signs, manifestations of the glory of Jesus. Nor does he attach much value to the faith which is grounded even on signs. He records that "when Jesus was in Jerusalem at the feast, many believed on His name, beholding the signs which He did." But the following verses reveal the estimate in which the evangelist held such faith. It was not a faith which Jesus could trust, nor of the kind which would outlast a day of trial. It is significant also that Nicodemus was at the outset one of the kind of men who believed in Jesus because of the signs which He did. That part of the verse which Dr. Wendt would strike out—"for no man can do these signs that Thou doest, except God be with him"—is precisely the part which is needed to make the subsequent conversation intelligible. It is necessary in order that we may understand how a faith grounded on signs must advance if it is to become true and living faith in Jesus Christ as the Saviour. The way in which Nicodemus persists in attaching the barest physical meaning to our Lord's words, and the slow, hesitating fashion in which his mind opens to receive spiritual truth, prove that he was just the kind of man to place in the foreground the signs which Jesus did as a proof that He was a teacher come from God. But the fact that the evangelist has placed the statement on record shows that he was quite

alive to the spiritual significance of the *ἔργα* and *ῥήματα* of Jesus.

The same tendency to look at the words of Jesus on their physical side appears in the woman of Samaria. She persists in thinking of the water of Jacob's well, while the Master speaks of the living water. The interest of the conversation lies in the manner in which her mind and heart are slowly awakened to the understanding of the deeper meaning of the words of Jesus. By slow degrees her moral nature is quickened, her conscience aroused, and her intelligence opened to understand the spiritual significance of the teaching of Jesus. True, no doubt, Jesus does manifest in His intercourse with the woman of Samaria and with Nicodemus an insight into character and motive which is more than human, but not more than was needed by Him for the proper exercise of His Messianic calling. But the thing to be noted is, that the evangelist, in recording this conversation, strives with all his strength to make us understand that the significance of the conversation lay, not in the superhuman knowledge of Jesus, but in the fact that the woman was spiritually persuaded, and was enabled to receive the spiritual gifts which Jesus desired to give her. In other words, the evangelist tells the story of the sign, not for its own sake, but because, by means of it, the woman was enabled to receive the grace and truth which were in Jesus. If Jesus was the only begotten of the Father, if He was the bearer of grace and truth to the human race, then we might have expected Him to be the possessor of exceptional knowledge and power. If He had so much insight into the character and purpose of the Father as to be able to say, "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son," and, "God is a spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth," need we be surprised that He should have had such knowledge of men as He manifested in His intercourse

with Peter, with Nathanael, with Nicodemus, and with the woman of Samaria? In all these cases, if faith began with the "signs," it speedily passed beyond "signs," and became that faith in Him which recognised Him to be full of grace and truth. The evangelist perfectly understood the bearing of the words of Jesus.

As we follow Dr. Wendt through the Gospel, we are increasingly impressed with the untenableness of his view. For notwithstanding the strenuous attempts which he makes to tear asunder the historical parts and the discourses, they still cohere together. The "signs" selected are significant works, and are inseparably connected with the words which follow. When Dr. Wendt declares that historical introduction (chap. v. 1-16) was not contained in the traditional form of the source, and was a reminiscence of the work of healing recorded in Mark ii. 10, transformed to form a suitable introduction to the following words, we are conscious that considerable violence has been done to the passage. For the words in the concluding part of the chapter have precise reference both to the kind of work and to the fact that the work was done on the Sabbath day. "The Jews did persecute Jesus, because He did these things on the Sabbath." Their persecution of Him had this twofold source; His answer to them had reference as much to the kind of work as to the fact that it had been done on the Sabbath. On Dr. Wendt's view of the passage the words of Jesus, "My Father worketh even until now, and I work," become unintelligible. The further development of the conversation has also most precise reference to the historical introduction. In healing the man at the Pool of Bethesda, Jesus was doing the same kind of work that the Father did. The work of the Son was identical with the work of the Father: "For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth Him all things that Himself doeth"; "As the Father hath life in Himself, even so gave He to the



Son to have life in Himself." In this saying we have the point of union between the two views which Dr. Wendt declares to be contradictory. We have in them the view which prevails in the words of Jesus, His way of referring all things to the Father; and the view of the evangelist, which lays stress on "signs" as manifestations and revelations of the character of the Son. The life which Jesus has is from the Father; but then the Father has given to the Son to have life in Himself, and to be the source of life to others. The work of the Son is given Him by the Father, but to us it is still the work of the Son.

In this and in other instances Dr. Wendt has failed to make his contention good. The feeding of the five thousand, the healing of the man blind from his birth, and the raising of Lazarus from the dead, are inseparably connected with the teaching of Jesus in the words which are ascribed to Him by the evangelist. No one has shown this more clearly than Baur, particularly in his *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, which, as an objective exposition, is of surpassing merit. But our space is done, and the fact can only be stated, not proven. For a complete statement would need to follow Dr. Wendt step by step, and would need to show unity where he finds disagreement, and to show that there is really an inward coherence between the historical parts and the sayings of Jesus. This cannot be done here.

But one remark may be made in conclusion. Dr. Wendt quotes often and lays great stress on the words (John xx. 31), "These signs are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life in His name": and he maintains (p. 243) that in the words of Jesus "there is an altogether different view of the ground of faith in Jesus as the Messiah from that which is set forth in the words John xx. 31. But the "signs" to which reference is made are the "signs" written in this book, and the sign immediately preceding

is the appearance of the risen Lord to Thomas. It seems arbitrary to limit the use of the word "signs" to the works of power or to the wonders of knowledge which were manifested by Jesus. The words ought to be taken in all their breadth, and they include all that is written in the book. Both the *ἔργα* and the *ῥήματα* of Jesus recorded in this book are *σημεῖα*, indications of the personality of Jesus, signs of the Divine power, grace, truth, and love which dwelt in Him. All the "signs" written in these books, and those which are not written, all the works done by Him, all His recorded words, are "signs" of the glory of the only begotten from the Father, manifestations of Him out of whose fulness we have all received, and grace for grace.

JAMES IVERACH.

*THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EARLIER CHAPTERS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.*

THE metaphor which has often been used of late, that the Church passed into a tunnel in the last quarter of the first century and emerged into the open daylight in the middle of the second, admits of another and an earlier application. The Church may be said to have passed through a shorter tunnel at the very commencement of its course. It entered it after the death of the Lord; it emerged in the time of St. Paul's active work. Whereas from the year 55 to 70 A.D. we have definite authorities and documents of fixed date, between the years 30 and 55 A.D. the case is very different; our knowledge of the events of those years comes to us either from documents of uncertain date or from those of an admittedly later date. Can we then feel any certainty of being able to reproduce the life of that time, of being able to enter into the thoughts, the beliefs, "the love, hope, fear,