

is adopting the traditional mode of introducing apocalyptic speech or writing. The Temptations narrative has no tinge of the apocalyptic. In speaking and writing apocalyptically, or ἐν πνεύματι, there was then no need to select a passage from Scripture as the nuclear impulse. Just so, in the narrative of the Temptations, the use of Scripture is wide-awake and foreign to the inducement of ecstasy or hypnotic sleep. 4. Selwyn makes the introductory phrase to the Temptations narrative: "led into the desert ἐπὶ τοῦ πνεύματος" to be indicative of trance. Such an interpretation would be permissible if the first part of the phrase was an established part of the vocabulary of trance experience; but then it would be yoked to a second part that refers to the divine being, if language is meant to convey meanings. Thus it would be strange at least to find that Jesus uses this designation, at the beginning of His public life, as a term for an abnormal form of ecstasy; and somewhere later in His life as a term to describe His own timeless work and being. 5. The interpretation of the statement made to Nicodemus (John iii. 10), that the verb ἐωράκαμεν is used of what is seen in trance, is in keeping with Selwyn's theory, but out of keeping with the Gospel text. That view can terminate only in making Jesus to be *The Cataleptic*. There is no more warrant for finding such a meaning for this verb in the Fourth Gospel than there would be for finding it in 1 John i. 2.

VACHER BURCH.

#### "BABES IN CHRIST" AND FULL-GROWN MEN.

IN the history of Christian thought there are certain great ideas, facts or principles which have emerged into view, and have been progressively grasped and realised as experiences of the human soul, under the operation of the grace of God. Among these great facts and truths which have been so

realised, especially at and since that great upheaval of the sixteenth century known as the Protestant Reformation, there are three that stand out with especial prominence. Emphasised in the New Testament, they are common-places of Christian theology. First, there is "justification," then "sanctification" (or holiness), and lastly, "perfection"—that is to say, Christian adulthood or maturity. Shall we briefly consider these great thoughts, or rather, *realities* of Christian experience as they have been realised by successive generations in the Church, and then, turning to the New Testament itself, see what it has to tell us, especially in reference to the last two of them—the closely-allied concepts of "sanctification" and of "perfection" or Christian maturity?

The fact is so well known as to be a commonplace that in the earlier ages of Christianity attention was chiefly directed to the objective facts of the existence, character and Providential government of the One true God, and to the Divinity and claims of His only-begotten Son. But in the later ages, that is, in what we may term the "modern" era of Christianity, beginning with the rise of the Protestant Reformation—it is with the more subjective aspects of religion that men's minds have been increasingly occupied. The great problems of our modern Christian thought and experience are those which have to do mainly (though not by any means exclusively) with the *application* of salvation, with its appropriation by man; in other words, with the Christian life in its origin, growth, development and maturity; with the successive stages in the appropriation of Divine grace and of building it into Christian life and character.

Now in order to understand this great movement of modern Christian thought and experience from what is technically termed the *soteriological* point of view, it is

necessary that we visualize it upon the background of that mediæval form of religion which preceded it, and out of which it may be said to have taken its rise. It is impossible to understand Luther and the beginnings of the Protestant Reformation apart from that monasticised, asceticised and legalised religion of the Middle Ages which went before. For it must never be forgotten that Martin Luther had been a monk, and a devout monk, before he broke with the Church of Rome. For this reason, religion as interpreted by Luther bears the closest relation to the monasticism of his day and generation. What then, we inquire, was the practical, working idea of religion as presented to the men of the Middle Age? (Perhaps one ought to consider this question apart from religion in its *mystical* forms of development, which, although profoundly spiritual, were by no means free from pantheistic elements. But at any rate we leave the matter of mediæval mysticism out of our view in the present inquiry).

Religion, then, as it was taught to the people, and as it would seem to have been understood by the generality of them, may fairly be said to have been a second-hand and indirect sort of thing, rather than a matter of direct, personal experience. Religion was thought to have been put to the proof and to have justified itself in the lives of certain holy persons—elect ones, exceptional characters—who were known as "the saints." These were the spiritual aristocracy—perhaps it were better to say, the real Church—within the Church. By their good deeds and sacrifices the "saints" had acquired a great store of "merits," a spiritual capital, which was at the disposal of the hierarchy, and was by them dispensed upon conditions which they themselves prescribed. To have an interest in the prayers and intercessions of the saints made a man fairly sure, as it was thought, of ultimate salvation. After the experience of purgatory, one might

fairly hope to win through to heavenly bliss ; but, after all, one could hardly be quite sure as to this matter of personal salvation. It was always conditioned upon obedience, and upon *continued* obedience, to the Church and to her precepts. That is what I meant by saying that, upon such a conception, the Christian life was lived, and Christian experience was realised at *second-hand*. The individual was at best but an appendage, so to speak, to that great and almost omnipotent corporation known as the Church. He was never quite able to say that his soul was his own. His soul belonged to the Church ; she was the guardian of his conscience, and for his salvation the Church was responsible. Religion was just a matter of obedience to the Church and to her priests.

It is hardly necessary to repeat the story of what a tremendous revolution was wrought in the thoughts and practice, nay, in the whole life of men by the Protestant Reformation. The ideas and principles of that Reformation, as first preached by Luther, and then by a multitude of others, are still vital, are still bearing fruit in the lives of men to-day. And the witness is still needed ; for the mediæval type of religion, as I have described it, is by no means dead in the world to-day. It is still powerful ; it yet has its thousands, nay, millions of votaries.

What was it, then, that Luther emphasised ? This, that religion is a *personal* matter, or it is nothing. It is a matter, first of all, between the soul and its God. There must be, first of all, the turning to God in repentance and faith. In this turning and this faith lies the evidence that a man is a child of God ; that his sins are forgiven and that he himself is "justified," accepted as righteous in God's sight. God in Christ is the only object of faith. Christ is the sole Intercessor between God and men, who, by His death on the Cross, has made full atonement for our sins, and has thus

accomplished the reconciliation to God of all those who believe. God thus manifests Himself to believers as their loving Father in Christ. Such was the message of Luther, and a great and Divine message it was. It is, in fact, no other than the Pauline message of Justification by Faith. It is far more than a doctrine; it is the vital and primary experience of salvation. *Subjectively and consciously* it is the starting-point of the individual Christian life and experience. But human nature is very imperfect, and at its best is subject to many a limitation. To no one man is it given at once to grasp the whole counsel of God and to hold all its parts in due proportion and emphasis. Certainly this was not granted to Luther. Luther's tendency and that of those who followed him was to stop short with that experience of salvation which I have just described as though it were the *end*—the all in all—and not rather, as it truly is, the *beginning*. There are other gifts of God, there are other steps or stages in the process of salvation besides this initial and primary one of justification by faith. But it was not given to Luther, or to the theology of Lutheranism, at least in its older form, to develop these, or adequately to work them out in Christian practice. For there are two other great and important steps in the process of salvation, which may fairly be said to be equally vital with justification by faith. Not only are these great factors or *motives* emphasised throughout the New Testament Epistles, but they have been proved and illustrated in the lives of thousands of Christian men and women. These further steps in Christian life and experience, these further gifts of Divine grace and attainments of Christian character have not only found emphasis and illustration in individual lives. They have been stressed by great corporate movements in the history of the Church; they have found expression in creeds and statements of faith; they have been made the basis of

Church organisations. I refer to the two great conceptions of Sanctification and of Perfection, or Christian maturity. The witness to these, as I have said, is found throughout the New Testament Epistles, and particularly the Epistles of St. Paul ; but it is in the Epistle to the Hebrews that they are presented as a characteristic part or element in a theology, and are given pre-eminent emphasis and expression. For, after all, St. Paul's name is, and always will be associated with the great doctrine of Justification by Faith. But there is another very weighty and important New Testament document which is, I believe, the product of an independent mind and brain of the first order, comparable with that of St. Paul himself, and that is, the Epistle to the Hebrews. In this Epistle we find no mention, at least in terms, of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. It is *sanctification* and it is *perfection*—i.e., 'Christian adulthood or maturity—that are here brought to the front, and upon which the emphasis is laid. Now, what of these ideals—namely, of Sanctification (or Holiness) and of Perfection (or Full-growth) ? To what extent have they been consciously recognised, definitely striven after, and, by God's grace, achieved and attained in the generations of Christian men and women who have lived since the Protestant Reformation, and who have inherited and assimilated the results of that great movement ? In the case of Luther, as I have said, the limitations both of the man himself and of the work which he was called upon to do must be fully and frankly recognised. God forbid that I should speak of those limitations in any invidious sense. No one man and no one life-work can be without its limitations. These must, indeed, be recognised as *assets* and not merely as *liabilities*. Each man, in the Divine Providence, is called and sent to do a specific task, for which he is individually responsible. The work, as he lays it down, is taken up and carried on to a

further stage of accomplishment by those who come after him. This great principle is certainly illustrated in the history of Christian thought and practice, and particularly as regards the Christian ideals of *sanctification* and of *perfection*. Not to speak invidiously, then, of Luther's own personal life; despite the fact of Luther's courage and heroism as the champion of Christian liberty, in the personal character and teachings of the leader of the German Reformation one would scarcely say that chief emphasis is laid upon Christian *holiness* or Christian *perfection*. Indeed, there are certain marked and rather glaring defects in Luther's life and teachings, in spite of the fact of his fundamental Christian character and integrity. But of these it is not necessary here to speak. When we turn to the Augsburg Confession—that fundamental expression of Lutheranism—we find in that document no section or chapter devoted to "sanctification" as such; still less is there any development of the idea or thought of "perfection" as among the gifts of Divine grace and the necessary elements of Christian character. (The same thing, by the way, is true of the Thirty-nine Articles—another product of the earlier period of Protestantism; there is no mention in terms of sanctification, or of Christian perfection.) It is hardly too much to say that the grace and high privilege of sanctification has not received adequate recognition or due emphasis at the hands of Lutheran divines or preachers; while as for the idea of *perfection* as something to be bestowed upon or attained by the individual Christian man or woman—it has been practically ruled out as impossible and unthinkable, if not, indeed, as blasphemous, inasmuch as it would infringe upon the sole prerogative of Christ. To Christ alone belongs "perfection"; to claim this as part of the heritage of the individual Christian seems to be an infringement upon the unique holiness and righteousness of the one Mediator

between God and men. Again, perfection or consecration, as set forth and emphasised in the teaching and practice of the Roman Church, especially in connexion with the monastic ideals of celibacy and asceticism, was wholly rejected by Lutheranism. The "merits of the saints" could not for a moment be maintained, in view of the sole merits of Jesus Christ. On the whole, one has a feeling that the idea and the claim of *holiness* as a thing to be attained by the individual believer, not to speak of it as a gift already conferred upon him in union with Christ—that this has received but scant recognition and rather feeble emphasis at the hands of divines of the Lutheran school.

When, on the other hand, we turn to Calvinism, especially as it developed in the form of the older Puritanism, we find that it *did* come to the distinct recognition, yes, to the emphatic affirmation of the necessity of Sanctification, as in addition to the initial stage of Conversion and Justification by Faith. Indeed, the very name Puritanism carries with it this emphasis upon Sanctification, or Holiness of life. Sanctification, in contrast to Justification (the initial act) was understood as a *process*, to be realised only gradually and by degrees in the advancing Christian experience. Sanctification, thus realised, means the progressive victory of righteousness over sin in the life and conduct of the believer. By it we are enabled, in the words of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, "more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness." On the whole, Puritanism, on both sides of the Atlantic, did give a *due* emphasis to the necessity and importance of sanctification; this was indeed its distinct and grand contribution to Christian progress, not only in thought, but more especially in life and practice. Nevertheless, to Calvinism, as to Lutheranism, Justification by Faith still remained as the central and all-important point; inasmuch as upon it hinged the eternal destiny of the



human soul. Justification by Faith still remains as the focus and hinge of the whole system of "evangelical" religion.

(3) With the teaching of Wesley, we enter upon the later form or development of "evangelical" religion. In the older Protestantism, even in its Calvinistic form, the conception of "sanctification" was, after all (I think we may say), practically subordinate to that of "justification." The latter, as an act consummated once for all, was clean-cut and definitive; it was something integral and complete. Sanctification, on the other hand, could only be regarded as inchoate, and as, at best, but partially realised in this present life. One had it only in part; it therefore remained as a more or less indefinite and unsatisfactory possession. One was, indeed, *seeking* sanctification; but one could hardly know whether or not he possessed it.

The practical mind of Wesley was unable to rest in such a conception. Sanctification, as a distinct gift of the Spirit, could not be thought of as a thing unattainable in the present life; if it must ever remain imperfect, God's purpose for His children remained to that extent unachieved. To the idea of "sanctification" must therefore be joined the idea of "perfection"; otherwise, Christian holiness must remain as an ideal for ever unrealised, at least, so far as our experience in this world is concerned. The practical danger in acquiescing in such a conception is that men will remain for ever content with a rudimentary Christian experience—with a childish standard of spiritual living, unworthy of grown-up men and women in Christ. Accordingly, the two great "foci" of early Methodist teaching were, (1) Conversion (practically identified with Regeneration, or New Birth), and (2) Holiness, or Sanctification; the latter being conceived as the second stage in the soul's experience of Divine grace, and, as such, just as necessary and important as the first.

From this teaching of Wesley, conservative Evangelicals of the older type turned away, even as the original Protestants had turned away from the Roman ideal of monastic asceticism. Indeed, to the conservative Calvinists of Wesley's day, his doctrine of "sanctification" and Christian "perfection," with its emphasis upon "good works" and definite rules of life and conduct, seemed to savour strongly of Romanism. For how was it possible or conceivable that a man or woman should be *perfect* in this present life? Was not perfection the sole prerogative of the sinless Son of God? Were we not, by the very conditions of our fallen human nature, condemned throughout life to frailty and imperfection, to a partial and scanty reflection of the image of Christ? Nevertheless, I think we must recognise the fact that Wesley's teaching of "perfection" as an ideal to be laid hold upon in faith and hope, and, by God's grace, to be built into Christian character, did represent a real advance upon Calvinism in its older form, even as Calvinism represented a fuller and stronger moral emphasis than did the teaching of Luther.

As for other "holiness" movements which have arisen in the Church since the days of Wesley and of early Methodism, we can at present hardly do more than barely refer to them. They are, however, very important; they have a vital message and meaning for men and women to-day. It is not too much to say that "holiness" or "wholeness" is perhaps the dominant conception in the minds and hearts of earnest Christians at the present time. Such conferences as those at Keswick (in England) are evidence of this, as was also the work of the late Dr. Simpson in the vicinity of New York City. "Holiness" in the sense of bodily and mental soundness and health is set forth as part of the Christian ideal, as indeed it ought to be. Our Lord in His earthly ministry not only forgave the sins of those who turned to

Him ; He also healed their diseases ; He restored distraught and afflicted minds to serenity and poise, to cheerfulness and hope. His Spirit is "the Spirit of a sound mind," with which a sound body is intimately related. Our Lord came to restore and complete the whole man, in body, soul and spirit. The various "healing" movements of the present day—I need only refer to the work of the Society of the Nazarene and to that of Mr. Hickson—all of these movements, in so far as they are based upon sound principles, are very closely related to the ideal of Christian holiness. Even such movements as those of "mental healing" in its various forms, as Couéism and "Christian Science," are efforts to realise a certain ideal of "wholeness" or "perfection." All these movements are based upon the idea that it is not enough that life remain rudimentary and partially realised, but that *fulness* and *completeness* of life, both in body and soul, is part of the Divine ideal for man. The mistake that is so often made, however—and it is important that we recognise this—lies in ignoring the equally important fact that it is only through *suffering* and *limitation*, gladly and freely accepted as from God, even to the point of death itself—and gladly borne in fellowship with His Son—that the Divine plan for us can be realised. Even as the Captain of our salvation was "made perfect *by the things which he suffered*," so must we be also.

Such, then, in brief outline, is the history of these great facts and ideals of "justification," "sanctification" and "perfection," as they have been progressively grasped and realised in Christian experience, and especially on Protestant soil, since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. From this historical review let us now turn back to the New Testament, and in particular to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and ask ourselves how these great thoughts of Perfection and of Sanctification are there presented. Sanctification

and Perfection are indeed the key-words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, so far as our *appropriation* of salvation is concerned. These two concepts are, in fact, identified, inasmuch as "holiness" and "wholeness" are essentially one and the same. But the significant fact here is, that in the Epistle to the Hebrews both "sanctification" and "perfection" are definitely placed *at the beginning* of the Christian life; they are indicated as characteristic marks of that life from its very inception. In evidence of this, the following quotations may suffice: "By which will we have been sanctified (*ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν*) through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all" (x. 10). "Who counted the blood of the covenant, wherein he was sanctified, an unholy (or 'common') thing" (x. 29).

As for "perfection" or "perfecting," the testimony is no less explicit: "The law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope (did), by the which we draw near unto God" (vii. 19). It is affirmed that the "gifts and sacrifices" of the older Covenant "could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience" (ix. 9), the implication being, that the sacrifice once offered by Christ upon the Cross *has* this perfecting and completing power. Again (in chapter x. verses 1 and 2): "The law . . . can never, with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered?" The implication is, of course, that the sacrifice of Christ (which, having been consummated once for all, has "ceased," so far as the actual immolation is concerned) *has* this very power of "making perfect" those who, through it, draw nigh to worship God. But it is in verse 14, which follows, that the clearest and most explicit statement of this fact is found. It is there definitely stated that Christ "by one offering hath perfected for ever (*τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*)

those who are sanctified." From the standpoint of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he who has entered upon the Christian career, he who has been "enlightened," and has "tasted the heavenly gift," has received the forgiveness of his sins, and has himself been "sanctified." This means, moreover, that he has been "made perfect." Yet this relative "perfection" is realised by us only as we are in union with Christ. "Perfection," in the full and absolute sense of sinlessness, is realised in Christ alone. As Son of Man, Jesus was "made perfect" by the things which He suffered; "being tempted in all points like as we are, (yet) without sin." The "perfection" which we now possess is incipient; it is real, but it is only a beginning. Although already "sanctified" by the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and by the sprinkling of His Blood, we still have to follow on after complete sanctification. Having already been "sanctified" and "made perfect" *in Christ*, yet *in ourselves* we still fall far short both of "perfection" and "sanctification." Yet both of these are necessary if we would see God, and enter into the fulness of our inheritance in His presence. Complete sanctification and perfection await those who, through faith and patience, finally inherit the Divine promises; their full realisation will be found only in the life "beyond the veil."

A question which occurs at this point is, What relation does the crisis of *death* bear to the "holiness" or "perfection" of the Christian soul? In opposition to the Roman conception of Purgatory as a place of continuous discipline and purgation during that period which elapses between the moment of death and the time of resurrection and of final judgment, Protestantism in its extremer form, as represented by the Westminster Shorter Catechism, made the following affirmation: "The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass

into glory, while their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves until the Resurrection." In evidence of this statement, the passage Hebrews xii. 18 ff. was cited. It is there affirmed that we, as Christians, are now "come," not to Mount Sinai, where, of old the Law was given under circumstances which awakened fear and dread, but "unto Mount Zion, and unto the City of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem . . . and to the spirits of just men" (i.e., the saints of the Old Covenant) (now) "*made perfect.*" But surely the real meaning of this passage is not to connect "perfection" inseparably with the moment of death; rather, when considered in its context, it is seen to have quite a different effect. For the writer had already concluded his wonderful review of the deeds of Old Testament heroes, *wrought by faith*, with the statement that "these all, having obtained a good report by faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing with reference to us, that, apart from us, they should not be made perfect." In other words, the "perfecting" of those Old Testament saints, like our own, depended for its consummation upon the finished work of Christ, in His sacrifice upon the Cross. That "perfection," as the distinguishing characteristic of the New Covenant, has now been realised. Not only is it realised here by us, in this present earthly life; it has been experienced in the spirit-world by those who had from days of old been looking and longing for the coming of Messiah, the promised Redeemer. To them was the glad tidings of His finished work proclaimed by that Redeemer Himself, when, having been "put to death in the flesh," but "quickenened in spirit," He went to proclaim the Gospel even in the place of departed spirits.<sup>1</sup> The spirits of those just men, now "made perfect" along with us, are therefore in the immediate presence of God, yet still awaiting

<sup>1</sup> 1 Peter iii. 18-20; cp. *ibid.*, iv. 6.

that final consummation of the Resurrection and of God's eternal Kingdom. The evidence that can be adduced from the Epistle to the Hebrews, taken in connexion with that of St. Peter in his First Epistle, is all in favour of the thought of progressive sanctification and holiness; of the fuller realisation of the meaning and power of our Lord's atoning work in the world beyond the grave. Sanctification need not stop short at death, nor is it at that moment necessarily consummated, as "in the twinkling of an eye." St. Paul's confidence on behalf of the Philippians was, that "he who had (already) begun a good work in them would (continue to) perform it *until the day of Jesus Christ.*" Nevertheless a great truth is contained in the statement of the Presbyterian Catechism, particularly in regard to those who may be termed "the elect"—I mean, in regard to earnest, faithful, devoted Christian men and women. It is beyond question that death, when it is accepted and undergone in the spirit of Jesus Christ, has a very immediate and intimate relation to our "perfecting." Was not this seen in the case of our Lord Himself? Though He were Son of God, yet we are told that He "learned obedience by the things which he suffered," and "having been made perfect" by obedience even to the point of death upon the Cross, He thereby "became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." To the faithful follower of Jesus Christ, death comes as his final "perfecting." Those who have died "according to faith" have thereby graduated from the state of pupillage here below into the estate of fuller maturity beyond the veil. Delivered from "the burden of the flesh" and from the sins and temptations incident thereto, the Christian soul henceforward partakes of the beatific vision of God, and in His light is "glorified."

But what is one to say as to that large number of persons, members of Christ by baptism, who, to all appearance,

depart from this life in what can only be called a very rudimentary state of spiritual development? What are we to say of them? Is there no place for discipline, for cleansing, for correction in that world of the unseen? Are we to think of such persons as being mechanically sanctified and made perfect at or immediately after the moment when the soul leaves the body? Such an idea seems forced and unnatural in the highest degree. Can we presume to shut out the possibility of such souls advancing through penitence and contrition, yes, even through the discipline of pain, to a clearer and deeper faith in the crucified and Risen Lord, and thus to higher and worthier stages of spiritual development prior to the resurrection of the dead and the eternal judgment? While a good and holy death comes as the final "perfecting," completion and crown of the faithful Christian life, we must recognise the fact that the character of one's death is very largely determined by the character of the life that has preceded it. But of this whole subject of the "intermediate state" and of the life beyond the veil we know so very little. One should hesitate to dogmatise overmuch concerning these "deep things of God."

One thought in conclusion. Our "perfection" or "holiness" is no merely negative ideal; it is something positive and constructive. It is only a part of our duty, as Christian priests and shepherds of the flock, to labour with all care and diligence, in the words of the Ordination Office, "to bring all such as are or shall be committed to our charge unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among us either for error in religion or for viciousness in life." Christian perfection consists not merely in the avoidance of heresy and the elimination of vice, important as these are. St. Paul's ideal for his converts, as set before us in the Epistle to the Ephesians, was a far larger



and fuller one: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . And He gave some (to be) apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; *for the perfecting of the saints*, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ." The final goal of this process of sanctification is "that we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, *unto a full-grown man*, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." It is "that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine . . . but *speaking (and doing) truth* in love ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ) may grow up in all things unto him who is the Head, (even) Christ." This is the grand ideal, not of the individual apart from the Church, nor yet of the Church apart from the individual; it is the ideal both of the individual and of the Church in one. It is from Christ, the Head, that "all the body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in (due) measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body, unto the building up of itself in love."

WILLIAM S. BISHOP.

#### NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

##### JOHN II. 4.

MAY I offer a short contribution to the problem raised by Rev. Alexander Soutar (EXPOSITOR, 1924, April, p. 300). In the papyri which I have seen, there are no examples, so far as I know, of the interrogative sentence τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; but I found a line which seems to have an indirect bearing on the interpretation of John ii. 4. In the Berlin Papyrus Nr. 1141, 37 f. (Abusir el mäläq, 17th year of Augustus) a letter-writer says: Ἐύστον δὲ ἐπιτηρῶς δεδευπημέναι ἔσω ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παρὰ Ἐρωτα δις προσελαβόμεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον παρ' ἐμὲ καὶ ἐδίδομεν αὐτῷ διαστολάς