

afterwards associate others with himself, as his experience showed him that they might be most usefully placed. But, owing to the danger that the bishop might be tempted by ambition to rule over a larger diocese, and might not consent to the ordination of others, he felt it safer to appoint in the first place bishops (*προϊσταμένους*) to the small towns or villages which were formerly the seats of bishops, and thereafter to select the bishop of the city. We have here a good example of the decay of bishoprics in political troubles, of the revival of disused bishoprics, and of the trouble that might be caused by an ambitious prelate.

Some other examples have struck me where opinions as to the meaning are likely to differ. But when we consider how little care has been devoted to the elucidation of Basil, and contrast it with the voluminous studies that have contributed to the long and difficult growth of the interpretation of Horace, or Virgil, or Sophocles, we can better appreciate the difficulties that Mr. Jackson had to face, and better estimate the gratitude we owe him.

W. M. RAMSAY.

CÆSAR AND GOD.

MARK xii. 13-17.

THE last days of Jesus were distinguished by the persistence and subtlety with which His enemies sought to "catch Him in talk." Their first attempt, in which they challenged the authority by which He acted as He did, was not only foiled, but retorted; they, and not He, were put to shame by the result (ch. xii. 27-32). But they soon returned to the charge, and the forces which they combined against Him—Pharisees and Herodians—show how various and how profound were the antipathies he had evoked. The Pharisees were fanatics in religion, and extreme

nationalists, almost revolutionists in politics; they professed a devotion to God that knew no limits, and a hatred of Rome as intense: the first of these passions seemed to them to involve the other. The Herodians, on the other hand, were a species of opportunists. They too were nationalists, of a kind; but so long as a Herod was on the throne in Galilee or Judæa, though he was only a titular sovereign, and not even a Jew by birth, they would not raise trouble with Rome. Still, as representing national independence, even in a modified form, they could join with the Pharisees in laying a politico-religious trap for Jesus. One only wonders whether the combination did not strike themselves as suspicious. It was unusual enough to put Jesus on His guard.

The last embassy had approached Him with a challenge; this one came with an ostentation of deference. "Master, we know that Thou art true, and carest not for any man, for Thou regardest not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of God." It was true, but for true men it was much overdone. Jesus could not be intimidated or overawed—this they saw clearly; but their elaborate profession of reverence for His character betrays the hope that possibly He may be flattered into some unguarded or compromising speech, and so put Himself in their power. Their *captatio benevolentia* is meant to invite His confidence, to encourage Him to speak without reserve; and when He does so, they are ready to make the most unscrupulous use of anything He says. But all the while they are only exposing their duplicity to the searching eye of Jesus. No formal courtesy, however elaborate, can hide from Him the malignity of the heart. And it is so with all truly good men. The cynicism about the accessibility of all men to flattery is not ultimately true; the flatterer is seen through far oftener than he imagines, and of all objects of contempt he is the most legitimate.

The flattering preamble is followed by a plain question : Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not? Shall we give or shall we not give? The tribute in question was a poll tax : Westcott and Hort have *ἐπικεφάλαιον* in their margin as an alternative reading to *κῆνσον*. It was not the amount that was serious, but the principle. The case that was presented to Jesus was a case of conscience : is it lawful? A modern reader can hardly help wondering how such a question could rise, but it rose directly enough from principles current among the Jews, and especially among the Pharisees. They conceived themselves as constituting a divine kingdom, in which God alone was King. Loyalty to Him, they argued, excludes recognition of any other sovereign power. We ought to die first, as Judas the Galilæan and his followers died, rather than compromise our allegiance to our Divine King by paying taxes which acknowledge the rights of another. But all were not so scrupulous, even in theory. Most people recognised the will of God in some sense in accomplished facts, and paid their poll tax without thinking too much about it, because there was no alternative. Perhaps in an ideal state Israel would be independent of Rome, if not its sovereign, but they took the world as they found it, and had no idea of hurling themselves against the legions. Hence the division of opinion.

Interpreters have differed as to the answer His enemies expected from Jesus. Probably they did not know what to expect ; but while they were prepared to make use of either Yes or No, it seems clear that they invited No rather than Yes. The flattery of His courage and sincerity suggests that they are drawing Him on to say some daring thing, and the daring thing would have been to declare that the payment of tribute to Rome was unlawful : that would have put Him in Pilate's power at once. Besides, Jesus was a Galilæan, pious, a friend of the people, constantly teaching

about the kingdom of God, and identified in some way with the Messianic hope which seemed to the Jews the direct antithesis of any national dependence; the people who questioned Him too, all nationalists themselves, might be supposed to suggest the negative answer as most in accordance with their sympathies, however they might subsequently use it; and for all these reasons it seems pretty obvious that they were trying to make Him say No. But even if He said Yes, it is lawful, they would gain something. They could use that unpatriotic reply to shake His credit with the people. The question was a proper one to ensnare Him, because, whichever way He answered, it would damage Him and advantage His adversaries.

He answered with perfect simplicity, without evasion, yet in a way which at once foiled his questioners, and brought men of narrow and perplexed minds into a large room. With one word of censure on their hypocrisy, and mean attempt to compromise Him, He said, Bring Me a denarius that I may see it. The small silver coin was brought with the Emperor's likeness upon it, surrounded by his name and the magnificent titles of the great magistracies which he engrossed in his person. Like the rupee in India bearing the Queen's head, that was decisive. Cæsar was in point of fact their sovereign. They took his money, and they must give it back (*ἀπόδοτε*, v. 17, not *δώτε*). The circulation of it meant that they enjoyed all the advantages of a settled administration under him, and of course they must pay for them. But to do so does not interfere in the least with perfect loyalty to God and His kingdom. Jesus felt that the question of His tempters proceeded on the assumption (which a negative answer might be held to justify) that there was an irreconcilable antagonism between the two things. Is it to be Cæsar or God? that was the real question in their minds. But the answer of Jesus is, It is to be Cæsar *and* God. He knew in His own

experience—for here, as in many of His most wonderful words, it is His own experience to which we are introduced—that there was no such conflict of duties before the most pious Israelite. He Himself combined, and had no difficulty in combining, absolute loyalty to the kingdom of God with a free recognition of the existing political situation. He had proved by the decisive experiment of His life that there was no necessary contradiction between the two. We may suppose, if we please, that His answer was in a manner distributed between his questioners. Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's—so much is specially appropriate to the fanatic nationalism of the Pharisees; and to God the things that are God's—so much is to be specially taken to heart by the worldly-minded Herodians. But to distribute it thus tends to obscure the principal point: that man's civil and religious duties, what he owes to the earthly government under which he lives and what he owes to the kingdom of God, are alike obligatory, and that there is no natural nor necessary antagonism between them.

It is from the plain broad meaning of this answer of Jesus that we must start in any attempt to apply it to other times and circumstances. That meaning unmistakably is, that God is not the rival of any earthly king, and that the kingdom of God is not one which enters into competition with the kingdoms of this world upon their own ground. When such rivalry or competition emerges, there is misconception somewhere, which needs to be corrected by a return to the words of Christ. He teaches unequivocally that loyalty to the kingdom of God is quite compatible with loyalty to an earthly kingdom. He teaches not only that a man may be, but that he ought to be, a good citizen and a good Christian at the same time. And it does not matter, in principle, what the constitution of the earthly state may be. Under a republic or under a

monarchy, as the member of an imperial or of a subject nation, as bond or free, a man must both discharge the duties of his civil place, and loyally serve God in His kingdom.

It is a strange fortune that has made this word of Jesus play so great a part in the controversies as to the relation between Church and State. To divide life between two unrelated authorities, which have nothing to do with each other, was clearly not His intention. Just as little can we assume that Cæsar and God can be satisfactorily translated, under all conditions, by State and Church. Probably no words in the Bible can simply be lifted in this way, and made to yield mechanical answers to ethical questions. It is misleading, too, if we insist upon a distinction as the main thing in the answer of Jesus, when the main thing really is a compatibility, a joint obligation, of civil and religious duties. But it is certain, nevertheless, that many of the perplexities which have arisen in the relations of Church and State, and many of the conflicts which have agitated both society and the individual conscience, have been due to ignoring something which the words of Jesus suggest. Mistaken ideas as to the nature of God's kingdom, and the demands made upon man by loyalty to it, have constantly appeared in history, and are still widely prevalent; and when the kingdom of God is identified, as it is sure to be to a greater or less extent, with the church or churches which are its peculiar organs, the very situation is created out of which the difficulties of the Jewish zealots emerged. In two cases conspicuously the lesson of our Lord's words is missed.

It is missed in the most glaring way by the Church of Rome. In that communion the visible Church and all that makes its visibility are treated as one with the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God is as much visible and palpable as the kingdom of Italy. There was a time when

the earthly sovereignty of the Church was more lavishly asserted than it is now: when claims were made to all sorts of state functions, and especially to the right of exempting church officials from trial by civil courts even for offences against society, such as fraud, violence, or murder. Exemption from taxation was a small matter in comparison with this. The claim that is still made for a temporal sovereignty of the Pope as essential to his position as head of the Church is the same in kind. It means at bottom that for the Pope to pay taxes to King Humbert is an act of disloyalty to God. But Christ Himself says, No. The kingdom of God is not as one of the kingdoms of this world. It is too great to come into collision with the kingdom of Italy at that point. It is misconceived by any one who thinks otherwise. It is misconceived by the Pope if he imagines that he cannot be a loyal subject of the King of Italy, and at the same time render to God what is God's. But the Pope's Church, which to him is the kingdom of God, is in principle a State, a worldly kingdom, affecting to deal with the kingdoms of this world as they deal with each other. As such it has completely missed the teaching of Jesus in this scene with the Pharisees and Herodians. It is in its inmost nature disloyal, at once to the grandeur in which Christ sets forth His kingdom, and to the earthly States with which it treats: it makes rivalry inevitable where Jesus says it should be impossible. It is the enemy both of true citizenship and of true Christianity.

And the lesson of our Lord's words is missed in another way, at the opposite extreme of thought. Perhaps this is best represented by a school which has had a wide influence in England. Its favourite conception is that the Church is the nation in its religious aspect. As an institution, the Church is the national organ for the religious function of the national life, and every English citizen is *ipso facto* a member of the English Church. This conception has

enjoyed great political favour, and is apparently that which is recognised by the law. Its leading representatives have been men with a broad human interest in the various life of the nation, and a noble longing to see it under the consecration of religion. They have been Christian statesmen, humanists, socialists, who found their vocation in trying to leaven the mass and wealth of national life with Christianity, and could not see what else the Gospel existed for. As far as the nation is concerned, it may not exist for anything else. But the Gospel does not exist solely for the nation; and to fuse the Church, which is the organ of the Gospel, in the nation, is to create a situation in which the Gospel—or in other words, the kingdom of God, of which Jesus speaks—inevitably fails to get its due. It is perhaps possible enough in this situation to render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's; but whenever the religious consciousness is quickened, it is found difficult and ultimately impossible to render to God that which is God's. The conception works fairly well in sleepy Herodian times, or in the hands of latitudinarian men, but a revival immediately strains it. It was strained in last century by Wesleyanism, when thousands of men, loyally rendering to the State all that was its due, were obliged to cut themselves off from the State religion, that they might render to God *His* due. If Christ's conception of the relation between the kingdom of God and earthly kingdoms had then been represented in the civil and religious life of England, no such divorce would have been necessary, for there would have been no such bonds to break. In the same way this conception has been strained, and is being strained at this moment, by the consequences of the Tractarian revival. The heirs of the Oxford movement, men like Canon Gore and the late Canon Liddon, full of religious earnestness, have been compelled to feel that the national mould is unequal to the life, the duty, and the vocation of the New Testament Church.

Under present conditions, it has been frankly avowed, loyal Christians—loyal, I mean, to the kingdom of God—have found it impracticable to do what their loyalty demands. Within the limitations which its fusion with the State imposes the Church cannot assert its spirituality, its catholicity, its own conceptions, derived from the New Testament, of life and duty; it cannot exercise any effective discipline in its care of souls; it cannot insist upon anything like the New Testament standard of conduct among its members. No one has yet expressed, with the frank boldness of Lacordaire, his abhorrence of that monstrosity, that contradiction in terms, a national Church; but the experiences referred to are all working towards the dissolution of that conception on which the existence of national churches depends. There is a union in the minds of many good men of political apprehensiveness, with spiritual willingness that the old relation should cease, and give room for the free life of the Church. I do not think it is open to doubt that the movement in this direction is a movement toward the ideas of our Lord; and that only when it is consummated will it be possible to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, *and* to God the things that are God's. Justice can be done to both only when they are related in the lives of all men as they were in the life and experience of Jesus Himself.

J. DENNEY.

CONCORDANCES TO THE OLD TESTAMENT
IN GREEK.

As the Concordance at present in course of publication by the Clarendon Press, at Oxford, approaches its completion, it is interesting to look back and see what has been done in this field of labour before.

The first to undertake any work of the kind was Conrad