

and only outlet for lives which Jesus Christ has shepherded and inspired. And when their souls prompt them most towards some land that is very far off where their life may have its true combination and full expansion, men have to rise very high and sustain their faith at high levels by strong love and hope, like the birds that migrate which bear up into air above the attractions and currents of the earth, the easier to speed them on their far way.

ARMSTRONG BLACK.

ON THE RELATION OF THE DISCOURSES OF  
OUR LORD RECORDED IN S. JOHN III.  
AND VI. TO THE INSTITUTION OF THE  
TWO SACRAMENTS.

THE place assigned in the doctrine and Liturgy of the Church of England to the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion may be marked by the words of the Catechism, that Christ ordained them as "*generally necessary to salvation.*" To very many, within as well as without that Church, such a place appears out of proportion to the place they fill in the teaching of Christ, and the place He would have assigned them in His Church. And with regard to the Holy Communion in particular, such a place seems disproportionate to the place it fills in the Apostolic writings of the New Testament. Let us for a moment put ourselves in their position. Those of them who study the Acts and Epistles with regard to Holy Baptism—they are lamentably few—turn to the Gospels and say, "Why, S. John does not even record the institution; in S. Matthew there is the order to baptize, we grant; the words in S. Mark xvi. 16 require it too; but there is no positive mention of water as an essential sacramental means; while the teaching of S. John the Baptist, ratified by Christ in Acts i. 5, speaks

of a spiritual baptism ('with the Holy Ghost')." Such a frame of mind subtly breathes a spirit which discounts much of the teaching on and references to Holy Baptism in the Acts and Epistles; or if it does not exactly do this, leads them to regard the use of water as described in Acts as a temporary and non-essential accompaniment of the Baptism of the Spirit, no more essential to that spiritual baptism than, *e.g.*, the anointing with oil of which S. James speaks to prayers for the recovery of the sick. "If Christ," they say, "had contemplated an outward sacramental act as generally essential to the new birth, such a universal order, such a supremely important essential, would have found a more prominent place in His ministerial teaching than in the bare order to baptize in His closing charge." A person so minded dissents emphatically from the teaching of the Catechism that Baptism as therein described is a Sacrament "*generally necessary to salvation.*"

Similarly with regard to the Holy Communion. There are very many who regard the words "*generally necessary to salvation*" as containing teaching out of all proportion to the place that Sacrament fills in the New Testament. They point to the records of the institution and say, "Christ does not use such language of it." They point to the Epistles and say, "Surely if it were of the supreme importance of being '*generally necessary to salvation,*' it would fill in S. Paul a place proportionate to that filled by, *e.g.*, the doctrine of justification by faith." Such a frame of mind once started minimizes unconsciously the significance of the passage in 1 Corinthians xi., and the incidental references to the Holy Communion in the Acts, and is stamped with the general impression that the Sacrament filled no really substantial place in Christ's teaching of the Apostles. This is strengthened by the fact that S. John records the institution of neither Sacrament.

This paper is an attempt to show from S. John's Gospel

that both Sacraments did fill a substantial place in our Lord's mind and teaching of the Apostles throughout the ministry, and that the actual institution was the ordered end of such teaching. I am not indifferent to the support given to the statement that they are "generally necessary to salvation" by Apostolic life, practice, and writing, but I believe that S. John's Gospel shows in a peculiar way that they belong as such to the mind of Christ and His teaching. The strength of the argument depends largely on the character of the Fourth Gospel. I take it for granted that we acknowledge that that Gospel represents a later form of presentation of words and acts of Christ than that presented in the Synoptists; that it is doctrinal and contemplative, while they are historical; that it presupposes such a knowledge of facts as they present, and contains a retrospective selection of incidents and teaching to which, from their own character, they had not done full justice, and yet which must be known to appreciate fully some things they record—incidents and teaching which, on the other hand, require the synoptic knowledge as a preliminary to grasping their significance.

Such an unfolding of the significance and many-sidedness of words and works of Christ was directly contemplated by Him. "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter." "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." "These things have I spoken unto you, while yet abiding with you. But the Comforter . . . He shall . . . bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." A striking illustration is the incident of the feet washing, of which Christ said, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter." At the time He explained it as an acted lesson of humility and service. But surely He did not intend that to be the only lesson. "Hereafter,"—*οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι γνώσῃ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα*—requires a remoter apprecia-

tion. We remember the words *ὁ λελουμένος, κ.τ.λ.*, perhaps little noticed at the time in comparison with the dominant lesson of the moment. The act was a teaching that after the one great bathing from sin—*ὁ λελουμένος . . . καὶ ὑμεῖς καθαροὶ ἐστε ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες*—there is continual cleansing, and that in the journey of life the traveller can again and again wash off the dust of the way from the weary feet.

In any consideration of subject matter of the Fourth Gospel it is essential to bear this in mind. It is this characteristic that gives that subject matter its special importance and weight. The writer looks back on the life of Christ in the light of the further teaching of the Holy Spirit. That teaching has cast fresh light on words and deeds—on aspects and bearings of them little noted at the time: He has called them to remembrance. The writer has noted that in the general current knowledge of the life of Christ they are omitted. Yet knowledge of them is essential in his mind to a right appreciation of the other things. Therefore he writes them down. To know the other things—*e.g.*, those recorded in the Synoptists—without them is to be at the top of a ladder, but not to grasp the strength of the rungs; to hold a treasure, but not fully to appreciate its worth; to know and to use a form, but not to realize its fulness. Robert Browning puts this inimitably. He represents S. John as saying that he—

“Patient stated much of the Lord’s life  
 Forgotten or misdelivered, and let it work  
 Since much that at the first, in deed and word,  
 Lay simply and sufficiently exposed,  
 Had grown—or else my soul was grown to match,  
 Fed through such years, familiar with such light,  
*Guarded and guided still to see and speak—*  
 Of new significance and fresh result;  
 What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars,  
 And named them in the Gospel I have writ.”

Now let us, bearing steadily in mind this general character of S. John's Gospel, turn our attention to the discourse with Nicodemus and the discourses in chapter vi.

The central point of the discourse with Nicodemus in S. John iii. is the conditions of "seeing the kingdom of God." Nicodemus is an enquirer after teaching from God, drawn to seek it from Christ from a sense that His "signs" stamp Him as capable and authorized to give it.

Now we notice that the idea of the phrase "*the kingdom of God*" seems to present no difficulty to Nicodemus. He is evidently familiar with it. And yet to the student of S. John's Gospel it is startling to find it here. It is in this passage only, iii. 3, 5, that it is found in this Gospel. But it evidently filled S. John Baptist's teaching, and it fills the pages of the Synoptists. It was evidently frequently in the mouth of Christ. He expounded fully the nature, laws, character, worth of "*the kingdom of God.*" This was so sufficiently known that it was unnecessary for S. John to repeat it. Evidently Nicodemus knew the term and the interpretation thereof. He knew it as Christ's term for that visible, present Church in which He is king, of which the visible kingdom of Israel was a type under the old dispensation. He certainly takes it as signifying the visible, present Church; this is clear from his difficulty, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Had he taken it to signify only a spiritual body or a future perfected, spiritual body of believers, he would have instinctively treated the term "*be born again*" in a spiritual sense; his further words, "*Can he enter,*" etc., show that he did not. His question shows clearly that he took the term "*kingdom of God*" in the general sense in which we have it presented in the Synoptists, as, e.g., in the parable of the wheat and tares as expounded by our Lord. (Here we may notice in passing a striking example of the way in which in S. John "synoptic" knowledge is pre-

supposed as known. The use of this technical term is like a rivet bolting this discourse on to the teaching of John the Baptist, and the whole body of the teaching of Christ on "*the kingdom of God*," so fully treated in the teaching and knowledge represented by the Synoptists.)

But the discourse is on the conditions of "*seeing*"—nay, "*entering into the kingdom.*" Our Lord states that it is through a birth *ἄνωθεν*, and then explains *ἄνωθεν* by *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*. The two means to the new birth—water and spirit—are so linked together in the phrase, *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*, that the idea is conveyed that both are essential. Now here again, from the rest of our Lord's words, we can judge which part of the term required special treatment at the moment. He goes on to speak of the need of the Spirit's action in the process; and by the simile of the wind, gives an idea of the action of the Spirit as of an unseen force, operating according to laws of its own, imperfectly perceived by human capacities. Evidently Nicodemus understood *ἐξ ὕδατος* as he understood *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*. He needed no explanation of either. The question at once arises, What was that conception of *γεννᾶσθαι ἐξ ὕδατος* which our Lord allowed to pass undisturbed as adequate in this momentous matter?

In answer I quote the Bishop of Durham's note on the passage. "It can scarcely be questioned that as Nicodemus heard the words, *water* carried with it a reference to John's baptism, which was a divinely appointed rite (i. 33), gathering up into itself and investing with a new importance all the lustral baptisms of the Jews; the *Spirit*, on the other hand, marked that inward power which John placed in contrast with his own baptism. Thus the words, taken in their immediate meaning as intelligible to Nicodemus, set forth, as required before entrance into the kingdom of God, the acceptance of the

preliminary rite divinely sanctioned, which was the seal of repentance and so of forgiveness, and following on this the communication of a new life, resulting from the direct action of the Holy Spirit through Christ." Nor can we doubt that in giving this teaching to Nicodemus our Lord's words "look forward to the Christian dispensation when after the resurrection the baptism of water was no longer separated from" (as it was in John's baptism) "but united with the baptism of the Spirit in the 'laver of regeneration' (Titus iii. 5), even as the outward and the inward are united generally in a religion which is sacramental and not only typical."

Thus we see in this discourse that quite early in the ministry Christ contemplated a baptism in water as an outward preliminary to the action of the Spirit in the new birth. And I cannot doubt that in His teaching it recurred, just as it lies beneath the surface in xiii. 10, *ὁ λελουμένος, κ.τ.λ.* By teaching such as this, of which the discourse with Nicodemus forms a representative example, the institution of Holy Baptism had been prepared for. It did not come as a surprise. It fell into its place like a finial on a gable, into a place prepared for it, and to which lines had been converging. If no such Sacrament had been instituted, men would have asked, "How are we to be born—not of the Spirit only, but *ἐξ ὕδατος*?" The whole thing belonged integrally and essentially to the ministerial teaching of Christ. He contemplated it from the first. He instituted it at the right moment. Years afterwards S. John (who speaks of Jesus Christ as *ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος*, 1 John v. 6) notices that in the current accounts of the ministry the lines leading to the institution were falling out of view. They were essential to a full appreciation of the place which it filled in the mind of Christ. The discourse with Nicodemus (perhaps communicated in friendship?) he now perceived to be "a star"

throwing its light forward to it. Thus the section gives us insight into the preparation which led to the institution, and justifies, from the mind and purpose of Christ, the place the Sacrament fills in the Acts and Epistles, and in the life of the Church. We now pass to S. John vi.

Note that the chapter contains no fewer than six clearly marked sections, very clearly seen if the Revised Version is used. It is a grouping of Christ's teaching delivered in different places and times, with its immediate results, focussed by S. John around the one central subject of all—Christ the life of the believer.

These sections are: (i.) *vv.* 1-15; *vv.* 16-21, connecting passage (ii.) *vv.* 22-40. (iii.) *vv.* 41-51; teaching elicited by § ii., place and time unmentioned. (iv.) *vv.* 52-59; teaching elicited by § iii., delivered in a Capernaum synagogue, *v.* 59. (v.) 60-65, immediate effect and teaching elicited thereby. (vi.) subsequent effect of the whole. We are concerned chiefly with §§ i.-iv.

To consider, then, §§ i.-iv. in more detail.

§ i. *vv.* 1-14. The miracle of feeding the multitude. In this Christ gives the idea of Himself as the sustainer of life—that from an apparently altogether inadequate supply of the commonest food (“barley loaves”) He could satisfy the natural hunger of the mass of men. Verse 15, an effect not desired by Christ.

§ ii. *vv.* 22-40. A discourse in which He gradually raises the minds of the hearers from Himself as the Giver of bodily food to Himself as the universal food from heaven. There is a meat which abideth unto eternal life which the Son of man [note the term of His humanity] is authorized to give; the true bread out of heaven; the “bread of God.” This progressive teaching culminates in “*I am the bread of life,*” which affords lasting satisfaction of hunger and thirst.

§ iii. *vv.* 41-51. The discourse represented by these



verses was spoken, I believe, on another occasion and at an unrecorded place. I think the dramatic form of the chapter as a whole suggests it, and it marks such an advance in the instruction that I feel it naturally follows at some interval. As *v.* 52 represents an effect which gradually made itself felt, as we see from *v.* 59, so *v.* 41 seems to give the effect of § ii. as hearers gradually weighed and appreciated its import. The "murmurs" lead to a measured warning, and reiteration (*vv.* 48-50) of the revelation of Himself as "*the bread of life . . . which cometh down out of heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die.*" But then He goes further: this bread has "*life*" as an essential property—"I am the living bread" (*ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, therefore ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς*); and "*the bread which I will give is My flesh.*" Observe how the terms have become increasingly precise. "*Meat,*" "*the true bread out of heaven,*" "*I,*" "*bread of life,*" "*living bread,*" "*My flesh.*" Two points in particular show the advance in precision: (1) the term "*bread out of heaven*" in our Lord's mouth is drawn from the words of His hearers, and "*out of heaven*" is kept by Him only so long as it rightly belongs to the increasing clearness of teaching. "*Out of heaven*" is dropped when "*My flesh*" is used: He does not speak of "*My flesh out of heaven*" or "*which came down out of heaven.*" (2) "*My flesh*" is a more precise term than "*I*" in the mouth of our Lord; it is the "*I*" incarnate. The introduction of the term "*My flesh*" calls for special notice. We can hardly separate it in meaning from the meaning it bears in *i.* 14. It here comes on the lips of Christ for the first time, and His use of it is recorded only in these discourses. It is a highly technical term, which was (*v.* 52), and must have been to His hearers at the time, altogether unintelligible. It needed such light as that of Hebrews *x.* 5, the realization of the value of the humanity of Christ, and of the virtue of that humanity

imparted to His members, to interpret it. It was verily a seed—a kernel. It needed indeed a patient and humble faith to hear this. It was fixed on at once by “*the Jews*” for question.

§ iv. vv. 52–59, delivered in a Capernaum synagogue (59). This teaching was called out by the contentious questioning of His unbelieving opponents, “*the Jews*”—“*How can this man give us His flesh to eat?*” How? How? The point of the question echoes on as we read vv. 53–58, in which Christ deals with the questioners (in the same spirit as that described, e.g., Mark iv. 11, 12; Matt. xiii. 11 sqq.), but does not answer the question. As we read the verses (53–58) we note the continuous advance in precision of teaching. Now we hear of “*eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking His blood.*” As being “*meat indeed and drink indeed*” it brings “*a raising up at the last day.*” Such partaking brings a continuous union of life. “*He . . . abideth in Me and I in him*” (note this). The whole culminates in the law laid down (v. 57) *καθὼς ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ καὶ γὰρ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὁ τρώγων με καὶ ἐνός ζήσεται δι’ ἐμέ.* And v. 58 marks this as the point to which all the teaching previously recorded had converged. But the *πῶς δύναται οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.*, is not given. The exact question stands unanswered, though its importance is more clearly shown. “*My time is not yet come*” is writ on vv. 53–58.

Nor did He forthwith, in the two scenes, evidently separate, portrayed in § v. vv. 60–65, § vi. vv. 66 to end, expound these terms, or the “*πῶς*” to the disciples, weak (§ v.) or strong (§ vi.) in faith. In the very spirit breathed in S. Matthew xiii. 11 sqq. they are left to work like leaven—to grow like seed. It is the principle *ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν* (Rom. i. 17) at work.

But when we remember Mark iv. 34 (N.B.—*πάντα*) and Matthew xiii. 11, “*To you it hath been given to know τὰ*

*μυστήρια*," we can scarcely doubt that He gave subsequently to the Twelve such an exposition of the terms used as was possible for them to receive and assimilate duly before the death on the cross and the gift of the light of the Spirit to lead them into all truth.

Here I wish to note three things :

1. The teaching of Christ given in the chapter forms a very substantial part of S. John's account of our Lord's public ministry. It is one of his few large chapters of it. In mere bulk it forms about one-eighth of his total record of it.

2. This use of terms for "*life*" and its sustenance, borrowed from the terms of sustaining the natural life by Christ, is not limited to this remarkable series of instruction. In S. John iv. we read of His speaking to the woman of *drinking water which springs to eternal life*, but when she asks for it, He turned off the point of the conversation. His time had not then come. Later, He spoke to the disciples of "*meat to eat that they knew not of.*" This in Samaria some time before. Later again, vii. 37, He cried : "*If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink,*" and so be a source of refreshment to others—words evidently, from the note vii. 39, not understood at the time nor explained. Note also that vi. 56 is, as it were, the seed out of which xv. 1-8, xvii. 21 grows. So that it is, I think, clear that all through the ministry Christ used to speak of the sustaining of the spiritual life under the terms of "eating," "drinking" "food," "meat," and the like.

3. This "vocabulary" of our Lord has no place whatever in the synoptic record of His teaching. Just as S. John records southern ministries not fully treated in the Synoptists, and a general style of speaking and vocabulary represented in the Synoptists only by S. Matthew xi. 27, Luke x. 22, so here we have a "particular vocabulary" recorded by S. John, the absence of which, in the Syn-

optists, is the absence of the path of phrase, teaching and idea leading to the institution of the Holy Communion.

We noted that the question: "*How can this man give us His flesh to eat?*" was unanswered at the moment. But now, with our thoughts fresh, let the reader read the record of the institution of the Holy Communion in the Synoptists. The passages we have considered in S. John show that in the institution He used terms not strange to the Apostles, and ideas long broached. When He took bread, gave thanks, brake, and gave—when He said, "*This is My body which is being broken for you,*" "*this is My blood of the covenant which is shed for many,*" surely their thoughts went back to the scene when He took the loaves, gave thanks, brake, distributed, and to the teaching which flowed from the act. They must have felt instinctively that He was then answering the question  $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma, \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$  There was the same use of common means of life; the same significant action; the same idea; terms of the same nature as those then used. Their patient trust had received the answer denied to the impatient and curious. "Tarry thou the LORD'S leisure: . . . and He shall comfort thine heart."

Thus S. John vi. stands in exactly the same relation to the institution of the Holy Communion that chapter iii. stands to the institution of Holy Baptism. To my mind it is recorded and arranged as it is by the writer to justify importance attached to that Sacrament which might seem, perhaps, disproportionate to the place its purpose filled in the mind of Christ to those knowing and using only records of the Synoptic character or the Synoptists, or definitely to interpret the Sacrament. Reading vi. 53, it would be strange if our Lord left the question of v. 52 unanswered. *If* the Holy Communion is not the answer, what is? If it is, with v. 53 before us, the strong words of the Catechism are not too strong. It is ordained by Christ as "*generally*

*necessary to salvation,*" for those who regard "*salvation*" as a sustained life in Christ.

These two passages of S. John's Gospel seem, therefore, to be related to the institution of the two Sacraments thus—they give an account of preliminary training on Christ's part to secure that when the institution came it should fall on minds ready to receive it, and trained to perceive the cardinal importance and purpose of each. They justify the importance attached to them by the Church on the substantial ground of the mind of Christ. And such a view falls in entirely with the general character of the Fourth Gospel.

H. J. C. KNIGHT.

### THE APPEARANCES OF THE RISEN LORD TO INDIVIDUALS.

ST. MARK XVI. 9.—"Now when He was risen early on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene."

I COR. XV. 5, 7, 8.—"He appeared to Cephas . . . then He appeared to James . . . and last of all, as unto one born out of due time, He appeared to me also."

IN Paley's *View of the Evidences of Christianity* that acute reasoner institutes a comparison between the evidence for Christianity that is based on miracles and similar evidence which, he says, "our adversaries may bring into comparison with ours." He divides the distinctions between Christian miracles and other alleged evidential miracles into two kinds: those which relate to the proof, and those which relate to the miracles themselves. Speaking of the latter class, Paley lays down, in the first place, that "it is not necessary to admit as a miracle what can be resolved into a false perception; of this nature was the demon of Socrates, the visions of St. Anthony and of many others.