

of the name as *Σκυθῶν πόλις*, or, City of the Scythians, who are said by Herodotus to have invaded Palestine in the reign of Psammetichus.¹ Bethshan lies on the line of such an invasion. It has also been suggested that Scythopolis is Succothopolis²—the name Succoth occurring in the neighbourhood—but Robinson naturally objects to the probability of such a hybrid, the like of which indeed does not elsewhere occur. It may, however, easily have happened that the Greek colonists, hearing some Semitic name in the district, should have wrongly supposed it to be the same as Scythian. This Semitic name may have been Succoth; or it is just possible that it was that word of similar radicals to Succoth, which is used in the Old Testament as a synonym for the second syllable of Beth-sha'an, if Beth-sha'an be really the *House of Security*.³

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

A GROUP OF PARABLES.

II.

IN a recent paper in *THE EXPOSITOR* an effort was made to point out the relation in which the three parables of chaps. xvi. and xvii. of the Gospel of St. Luke stand to one another. Instead of there being little or no connexion between them, and especially between the third and the first two, we saw that the interrelationship of the three was of the closest kind, and that they all relate to varying aspects of the same great topic—faithfulness to a steward-

¹ Herod., i. 103, 105. It is absurd to give the statement of G. Syncellus, a historian of the eighth century A.D., in support of this.

² By Reland, with whom Gesenius agrees. *Thesaurus*, sub voce בית שן.

³ סכת, to be still or silent, is related to שׁ, sh'k't, which is synonymous with שן. It is used like שן of land as well as men. See Judges iii. 11 and parallel passages. The two words occur together in Jer. xxx. 10 and xli. 27: ושקט ושן.

ship committed to us, to a work given us to do. It remains now to apply what was said to a serious but not un- plausible charge often brought in recent times against the author of the third Gospel.

St. Luke, it is said, was a democrat, or rather a socialist, to whom the possession of private property was obnoxious, and who beheld in riches what was offensive, in poverty what was acceptable, in the sight of God. We are invited to notice the different forms in which certain portions of the Sermon on the Mount are given by the first and the third Evangelists. In particular, while St. Matthew quotes our Lord as saying, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 3), St. Luke quotes Him as pronouncing His blessing upon those who are simply poor, "Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God" (Luke vi. 20). Not poverty of spirit, but poverty in itself, makes men children of that kingdom the coming of which had been announced by Mary in the words, "He hath put down princes from their thrones, and hath exalted them of low degree. The hungry He hath filled with good things; and the rich He hath sent empty away."

The chief ground, however, upon which this view of the third Evangelist rests is the second of the parables spoken of in our former paper, that of the Rich Man and Lazarus. No language can be more explicit than that in which Schwegler asserts that the guilt of the rich man was his riches, the merit of the poor man his poverty, and that the standard by which the recompense of a future world was to be adjudged to them was not the good or evil done in life, but the degree in which happiness or misery had fallen to them here.¹ He proposed therefore a symbolical interpretation of the parable to which it is at present unnecessary to make further reference. Then Baur came in, and in his

¹ Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeitalter*, ii. 59.

most remarkable, perhaps at the same time his ablest work, that on the Canonical Gospels, allowed that the circumstance in the parable giving most offence, and therefore most needing explanation, was this very strength of contrast between the estimate of riches and poverty taught in it as Divine. He saw no need, however, for a symbolical interpretation. It was enough to refer to the Ebionite conception of the relation between riches and poverty, and to the opposition (*Gegensatz*) resting upon this of the present and future worlds.¹ Baur saw indeed that such an interpretation would not suit the latter portion of the parable beginning with ver. 26, where elements of an altogether different kind are introduced. Yet the remedy was easy. He adopted the opinion of Schwegler, that this part of the parable does not belong to its original form. It was a later addition, intended to point out the guilt of the Jews, who amidst all the rich store of their religious blessings, revelations, and prophetic teachings, had failed to penetrate to what was their true meaning—Jesus the promised Messiah risen from the dead. The rich man becomes the symbol of Judaism, the poor man of heathenism; and Judaism and Pauline Christianity are contrasted with one another. No real attempt is made to explain how these two most heterogeneous pieces of the parable came to be attached to one another, unless it may be thought that the words of ver. 26, *καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις κ.τ.λ.*, are of themselves a sufficient explanation, and that nothing further need be said. Strauss, as might be expected, followed on the same lines, and then Renan gave support and popular impulse to the view. In his preliminary remarks to his *Life of Jesus* he finds in the parable of which we speak his first authority for his verdict on St. Luke. “He is an exalted democrat and Ebionite, that is to say, he is very much opposed to property, and is persuaded that a time of re-

¹ *Die kanonischen Evang.*, p. 443, etc.

tribution for the poor (*la revanche des pauvres*) is at hand" (p. xli.). Thus the Ebionite view of the parable gained ground, and that not on the Continent only but in England, until expression has of late been given to it in its most distinct form by a well-known minister of the Church of Scotland, the Rev. Colin Campbell, Dundee. Referring in his "Critical Studies in St. Luke" to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Dr. Campbell says:—

In this one parable, peculiar to Luke, is concentrated, as in a powerful picture, the whole Ebionite doctrine of the Gospel. The contrast; both in this world and the next, in the condition and fate of the two actors in the drama, is complete. The one, a certain rich man, the other a certain beggar; the one "clothed in purple and fine linen," the other "thrown down" at his gate, full of sores and no doubt half naked; the one "living in mirth and splendour every day," the other *desiring* to be fed with what fell from the rich man's table; the neglect of the rich man (a remark to which is added the note, "This is not certain, only probable, judging from what follows"), the other cared for only by dogs that licked his sores—thus adding to his degradation, because they were unclean animals. Not one word is said of the *moral* character of either the rich man or Lazarus. The rich man's neglect of Lazarus is rather implied than expressed; yet even if that neglect be taken at the full score, it is the sole moral delinquency chargeable to him; but that is his whole failure. No one has ever ventured to affirm piety of the beggar, or any claim to favour except his misery (p. 274).

And again, passing to the life beyond the grave—

The human life of both Lazarus and himself (the rich man) is over; his chance of making friends with the poor beggar is lost for ever; and therefore the answer comes, Son, remember that thou *in thy life time receivedst thy good things*, and Lazarus in like manner *evil things*; but *now here he is comforted, and thou art in anguish*. Here again everything is in perfect contrast. The tables are now turned; the balance is readjusted. . . . The rich man had received a full quittance in the past life; the poor man had received only evil which was not his due; therefore he is comforted, and the rich man is in anguish (p. 276).

It is both an interesting and important question, How far are such representations correct? and it is all the more

so, because it can hardly be denied that, in the above extracts, the first impression produced by reading the parable is correctly stated. Multitudes are unable to read it without the feeling that it does contain a condemnation, from the Christian point of view, of riches in themselves, and a commendation of poverty simply as poverty, when at least it is our natural lot in life, and has not been brought upon us by vices of which we are directly conscious. Men are surprised too when they see that there are no words in the parable expressly pointing out either the depraved character of *Dives* or the piety of Lazarus. Finally, the words of ver. 25, "Child, remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things," etc., may readily enough be supposed to mean that, in the eternal world, the balance of earthly wellbeing and earthly misfortune will be redressed, the prosperous here being sufferers there, sufferers here being made happy there. What is to be said?

The aim of this paper, as exegetical, is simply to ask, What is demanded by a fair exegesis of the passage? Were it not so, one might be tempted to dwell upon the palpable absurdity of the supposition that our Lord could mean that His words in ver. 25 were to be understood in the sense attributed to them. There seems to be no foundation for the idea that any sect or any individual of the world has ever really believed that the simple possession of riches here will be followed by unchangeable and everlasting anguish hereafter, or that the simple burden of poverty and want in this life will be rewarded in the life to come with unchangeable and everlasting bliss. Even the Ebionites of the early Christian Church do not appear to have had such a tenet. The most ascetic section of them might unduly magnify the advantages of poverty, and might think that it gained them a higher place in the Divine favour, alike in this world and the next. But that they went the length of holding that the apparently general rule of ver. 25, *minus*

the moral element, was a rule of the Divine Government is an arbitrary and undemonstrated assumption. Yet that rule must be literally, *in all its length and breadth*, understood to be what the words naturally imply, if it is to be regarded as the generalized expression of the principle upon which, without regard to moral considerations, *Dives* is condemned and Lazarus justified. To pass however from this, there are other considerations sufficient to lead to the rejection of the proposed interpretation.

1. Let the reader recall what was said in the former paper upon this subject. Let him mark that the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is one of a group of three parables closely connected with each other; that it is a repetition in another form of the principle of the first of the three which is avowedly moral, and that it leads on to the third which is not less grounded in the central moral root of the Christian dispensation. Lastly, let him bring before him, with any even moderate degree of vividness, the feelings with which the Jews looked upon the poor and the obligations of the rich towards them; and he will find it totally impossible to maintain that He who uttered the parable did not intend, and did not succeed in his intention, to connect moral elements with the characters of the two persons whose lot, both in this life and beyond it, is so strikingly delineated. It is true that the rich man is not expressly said to be godless and selfish, and that no hint is given as to any piety of Lazarus while he lay suffering at the rich man's gate. But some pictures are drawn and coloured with such admirable truthfulness that they do not need to be labelled, and this more particularly when they are hung up to view in the presence of a multitude whose hearts are already full of the lessons which they teach. Such is at least the case with the picture of the rich man here. He is an unfaithful, unrighteous steward. He has lived neither for God nor his fellow creatures, but for ease

and self-indulgence. His character is on the face of the narrative, and it needs no further explanation. When we turn to Lazarus the case is certainly not so clear. But he is obviously painted as in all things a contrast to *Dives*. The contrast is confirmed when we follow the two beyond the grave, and it appears also in the judgment of ver. 25. It may be added too that it is by no means certain that the description of the condition of Lazarus in vers. 20, 21 would not directly suggest to those who heard it the idea of submission to the Divine will, and of patience under the burdens of his lot and the heartlessness of the rich man's conduct. The word used of him is *πτωχός*, and it is to be regretted that, while the word "beggar" is used only four times in the Revised Version, two of these should be found in the present narrative. On the other two occasions when it is employed it is the translation of *προσαίτης* (Mark x. 46, John ix. 8), while in Luke xviii. 35 it translates *ἐπαιτῶν* (in each of the three cases note the later readings of the Greek), and rightly. The *προσαίτης* is one who begs. The *πτωχός* does not necessarily do so. He may have no means of providing for himself by labour of his own, and he may live on alms (Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*), but it does not follow that he thrusts himself forward on the charities of others. On the contrary, in every one of the many times that the word is employed in the New Testament it suggests the thought of one who is indeed poor, but whose poverty is associated with a spirit and disposition that only awaken sympathy and command respect. "Blessed are ye poor"; "To the poor the Gospel is preached"; "This poor widow hath cast in more than they all"; "The poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem"; "If there come into your synagogue a poor man in vile clothing" (Luke vi. 20, vii. 22, xxi. 3, Rom. xv. 26, James ii. 2). In all these cases the word used is *πτωχός*—not a clamorous beggar, but simply one in the depths of poverty.

It may well therefore be a subject of regret that, in the Revised not less than the Authorized Version, Lazarus is brought before us as a "beggar" rather than a poor man, bearing, for aught we know, his poverty with faith and meekness, even when it is in immediate contrast with the rich man's splendour.

And this seems to find further illustration in what we are told of him, that he was "*desiring* to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table." The verb "desire" throws no light upon his getting or failing to get these crumbs. It may be used whatever follows (Luke xvi. 21, Rev. ix. 6, Luke xxii. 15); but this much at least is implied, that there was no clamour in the action of Lazarus, no loud complaint of injustice, no attempt to lay hand on what did not belong to him. The moral element, in short, exists in the view presented to us of what he, not less than the rich man, is. Another important consideration bearing upon the same point will be noticed immediately. Meanwhile it is enough to say that the picture embraces in its delineation of its personages, distinctly moral traits, and that it thus corresponds with the other parables of its group.

2. A second point is worthy of notice,—the precise language of ver. 25, where it is said to *Dives*, "Child, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things" (*ὅτι ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου κ.τ.λ.*). It will not be denied that the simple verb might have been here used, and we must ask, Why then the compound? There are many other instances of a similar nature, and grammarians are very much at one as to the effect upon the simple verb of compounding it with *ἀπό*—*γράφειν* to write, *ἀπογράφειν* to make a copy; *ἀρτίζειν*, to get ready, to perform; *ἀπαρτίζειν*, to complete; *λύειν*, to loose; *ἀπολύειν*, to sever by loosening, to set free; *σπάειν* to draw out, or forth;

ἀποσπᾶν, to succeed in drawing out, to draw over to one's own party, comp. Acts xx. 30; ἔχειν, to have; ἀπέχειν, so to have as to have all that is desired, comp. Philippians iv. 18, ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα; and Matthew vi. 2, 5, 16, ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν, they have so as to feel that they wish nothing more. In like manner here, λαμβάνειν, to receive or accept, ἀπολαμβάνειν, so to accept as to be fully satisfied with what has been given us, so that we behold in it our meet reward (Luke vi. 34, xxiii. 41, 2 John 8). The translation, therefore, "receivedst," although it may be as good as the English language will permit, is in this respect defective, that it fails to convey to the reader the full thought which was in the mind of the speaker. Godet says that there is "in the verb ἀπέλαβες the notion of receiving by appropriating greedily for the purpose of enjoyment" (*in loc.*); and though this may be to put rather too much into the word, the remark will certainly stand the criticism of Hofmann (*in loc.*), who denies that it has this egoistical meaning, because the same word is to be applied to Lazarus. Strange that it did not occur to this eminent critic that the form of the verb depends not so much on the following σου, as upon its compound form, and that, in its most expressive sense, it *does* apply to Lazarus as much as to *Dives*. Each had received his good or evil things, and each was satisfied, —the one because he did not look beyond this world for comfort, the other because he felt that "the light afflictions of this life, which are only for a moment, were not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed." What is now urged is that this sense lies, at least substantially, in the parable itself; that the impression of it would be conveyed to the minds of those who heard the Saviour speak; and that that impression is, therefore, the meaning of the parable.

3. There seems to be truth in the remark of Hofmann (*in loc.*) that Abraham so speaks to the rich man in ver. 25 as

to show his expectation that *Dives* will approve of the principle laid down in that verse; in other words, that Abraham expects an affirmative answer from the rich man's conscience to the conditions beyond the grave in which he and Lazarus respectively find themselves. It is indeed difficult to read the passage without this feeling, and it is confirmed by the fact, that there is no rebellion against his fate on the rich man's part. He only pleads for a particular alleviation of his misery. But, if so, how is it possible to imagine that he thought himself condemned simply because he had been rich? Common sense would have at once protested against any such idea. The rich man was surely not one of the Ebionites of whom it may have been sometimes possible to say that they regarded wealth as a token of the Divine anger, poverty as a token of the Divine approbation. The ground of his condemnation was that he had lived in this world an utterly selfish life, never looking beyond the things of time, never concerned about judgment, satisfied with his own pleasure as his all, content to eat and drink "every day" without thinking of the morrow. The *tone* of Abraham's remark to him in ver. 25 shows that the patriarch knew that he would acknowledge the facts, and would allow that his fate was just. He could only expect this upon moral grounds, and we are thus again entitled to say that there is a moral element before us.

4. Once more we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the part of Abraham's answer found in ver. 31, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, although one rose from the dead," is altogether moral, and at the same time wholly incapable of explanation if we suppose that the ground of the rich man's condemnation is his riches. The discipline which, according to the patriarch, is to teach men the right use of life, and to secure them an entrance, when this world passes from their grasp, into the eternal tabernacles, is neither riches on the one

hand nor poverty on the other: it is God's revelation of Himself,—that revelation which makes its direct appeal to the conscience and the heart. The "five brethren" were probably, like the brother who had gone before them, rich and self-indulgent. They could only be reclaimed from this state, not by terror, but by a change of heart. Fear alone would never make them what they ought to be. Even should they give away all their goods to the poor, the requirements of this part of the parable would not be met. Let us accept the Ebionitish view of the first part, and we are here in an entirely different field of thought. Not in poverty, but in listening to Moses and the prophets do we find our guide to everlasting blessedness.¹ We are thus driven from a fresh point of view to the conclusion, either that the parable is no longer what it was when it was first delivered by our Lord, or that the Ebionitish meaning assigned to it is utterly mistaken. There is not a particle of evidence in favour of the first supposition. We have nothing but the assertions of the Tübingen school to lead to it. The second alternative is the only one which it is possible to accept.

Enough has been said to vindicate the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus from the Ebionitish interpretation which it has been attempted to force upon it, and to show that both the persons who form its subject are thought of as possessed of a certain moral character, and not as merely rich or poor. The warp of the parable is penetrated by an unquestionable strain of regard for character; and, when it is said in the most difficult verse in the narrative, "Child, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art in anguish" (ver. 25), we have the clearest evidence that the words do not and cannot mean that eternity stands to time like the top to the bottom

¹ Comp. Dr. Dods in *EXPOSITORS*, third series, vol i. p. 55.

of a revolving wheel, where what was at the top goes to the bottom, what was at the bottom to the top. More, however, must be said. It is not out of the atmosphere of a code of human morals, however high, that the parable is spoken. It comes from the lips of our Lord Himself; and, like the two which precede and follow it, can only receive its full meaning out of the deepest and most peculiar principles of His kingdom. In this respect ver. 25 seems to contain a truth which, so far from being Ebionitish, can only be understood by the light which the Gospel of Christ throws upon all poverty, suffering, and sorrow when we do not, by our own sin or folly, bring them upon ourselves. By the whole spirit of His teaching, our Lord does tell us that these things are dearer to Him than riches or worldly prosperity or joy; that taken in the main, they draw to them a larger measure of His sympathy; and that they are nearer to His heavenly rewards. Not that the rich man may not often be more precious to Him who has no respect of persons, whether poor or rich, than the poor man. He may have more humility, meekness, and gentleness of spirit; he may have reaped more of the fruits of Divine chastening; he may sit more loosely to his overflowing pounds than the poor man to his few pence. But our Lord does not look only at men individually. He looks at them also in the masses which they constitute; and, impersonal as masses of men may be said to be, He addresses them as masses, and speaks of the relation which He occupies towards them as such. And most appropriately, most beneficially for us is this the case. We not infrequently learn what are our difficulties and temptations, or what our encouragements and hopes, by looking at ourselves less in the light of our own individuality than in the light of the community to which we belong. We see better what the snares are that surround us, what the danger of being entrapped by them, what the degree to which we may even be already involved

in them. When, accordingly, we interpret ver. 25 out of the deepest considerations which mark the kingdom of Him by whom the words are really uttered, may we not say that, thus spiritually interpreted, they are literally true? Is it not the case that the Gospel of Christ does sympathise with the poor more than with the rich? that it sees in the one a soil better prepared for its divine seed than in the other? that it recognises in the discipline through which poverty and neglect have to pass in this life a training to which prosperity and ease are a hindrance (though it may be overcome) rather than a help? And that, therefore, looking at things in their broadest aspect, it may announce it as one of its new if startling truths, that "to the poor" it is preached, and that in the plainest and most direct meaning of the words, the cross is the way to the crown? This much at least may be said that, as there ever and again arise times when some error has so taken hold of the thoughts or life of man that nothing but what is extreme will correct it, so men need to be reminded of the contrasted truth in a way which will arrest their attention, and compel them to ask what it can mean. May it not be so here? Has the Church of the Christ in our land thought of the poor and afflicted, has she sympathised with them and helped them as she ought to have done? Has she not been more interested in the inn at which well-to-do travellers were housed than in the stable in which Christ was born? Has not her daily intercourse, whatever may have been her pulpit or platform oratory, been more lovingly given to *Dives* and his splendid mansion than to Lazarus lying helplessly at his gate? Has she not been willing to see in the rich man the image of Christ more than in the poor man? Has she been determined to lift the beggar from his dung-hill, whatever the amount of opprobrium she might incur in doing so? And has she proclaimed in luxurious drawing-rooms, in a way to convince their

inmates of her own belief of what she was proclaiming, that the wealth which furnished them was an obstacle to an experimental knowledge of the Redeemer, and that, in the words of our Lord, as given by St. Matthew, who must also for the moment have become a democrat, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Matt. xix. 24)? It may be well for us to ask ourselves questions such as these. The more sincerely and honestly we ask them, the more will it appear that there is truth, literal, although not to be mechanically interpreted, in those words which come to us from beyond the grave, "Child, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things, but now here he is comforted, and thou art in anguish."

WM. MILLIGAN.

*PROFESSOR W. R. SMITH ON THE OLD
TESTAMENT.*

ALL readers interested in the subject will welcome the second edition of Prof. Robertson Smith's Lectures on "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." Delivered originally in Edinburgh and Glasgow in the winter of 1881, where they were listened to eagerly by large audiences, they were published in the following spring, and at once took rank in the Biblical literature of this country as the standard introduction to an intelligent study of the Old Testament. Luminous, learned, and logical, addressed not to specialists, but to the educated public generally, these lectures carry the reader back from the Old Testament as we at present know it to the period of its growth, illustrating, with especial reference to its historical and legal sections, the manner in which it was gradually built up, and explaining