

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THAT there is something not quite right with the end of St. Mark's Gospel is evident to everybody.

It is evident to the reader of the Authorized Version, if he is observant. The ninth verse of the last chapter does not naturally follow the eighth. The translators have tried to run a bridge across by inserting the name *Jesus*. The Greek, however, has simply, 'Now when he was risen early the first day of the week, *he* appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.' But the previous verses have been speaking about the women, not directly about Jesus. The new subject, without even the name, leaves the connexion out of joint. And then to describe Mary Magdalene by the words 'out of whom he had cast seven devils' is apparently to forget that she has been three times mentioned already (15<sup>40</sup>. 47 16<sup>1</sup>), and is looked upon as well known. But if the observant reader of the Authorized Version can see that there is something wrong, the reader of the Revised Version can see it whether observant or not. For between the eighth verse and the ninth a space is left in the printing.

Why does the Revised Version leave a space between the eighth verse and the ninth? Is it because the ninth verse does not run on smoothly after the eighth? The Revisers were not easily

impressed by considerations of that kind. They lacked the feeling for English somewhat singularly. The consideration that impressed them, and it always impressed them powerfully, was the evidence of the Manuscripts. If the Codex Vaticanus omitted a passage, it was very difficult to get the Revisers to insert it. If the Codex Sinaiticus omitted it also, it was scarcely possible. Now in their margin at this place the Revisers say: 'The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from ver. 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel.' That is the meaning of the space.

And thus the Gospel according to St. Mark has three different endings. In the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* the Bishop of Moray calls them the Long, the Short, and the Intermediate. The Short Ending stops at the eighth verse of the chapter. Its last words are 'for they were afraid.' The Long Ending goes on for twelve verses more, the verses which we find in our English Bibles. The Intermediate Ending has never been divided into verses. But if it had been so divided it would likely have been divided into two. For it contains just two sentences. These sentences are, in the Bishop of Moray's translation: 'And they immediately (*or* briefly) made known all things that had been commanded (them) to those about Peter. And after this Jesus Himself [appeared

to them and] sent out by means of them from the East even to the West the holy and incorruptible preaching of the eternal salvation.'

What are we to say then? Should the last chapter of St. Mark contain eight verses, or ten, or twenty? Or are all these endings wrong? The literature is already large. But a discovery has just been made which introduces a new element into the problem, and is sure to add to its literature.

In the autumn of 1906 a dealer in antiquities in Gizeh, of the name of Ali Arabi, showed Dr. Grenfell four bundles of manuscript which he said had come from Akhmîm, the ancient Panopolis. Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt examined them. Akhmîm was a likely enough locality. It had already been the scene of the discovery of large fragments of the Gospel and Revelation of Peter. But the manuscripts themselves were decisive. On the report of Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt, Mr. Hogarth advised the authorities of the British Museum to buy them.

But the authorities of the British Museum did not buy them. In the beginning of 1907 they were bought by an enterprising American, Mr. Charles L. Freer, and taken to Detroit in Michigan. We may be disappointed, but we must not be resentful. American scholars are well able to appreciate what they have won. We speak of the 'Akhnîm Fragments' of the Petrine Gospel and Apocalypse; they have already begun to speak of the 'Detroit Manuscripts' of the Septuagint and New Testament. In the *Biblical World* for March, Professor Goodspeed, of Chicago, congratulates American scholars 'that at last there is in this country one great ancient witness to the Greek Text of the New Testament.' And we may be sure that his is but the first of a long series of learned articles which the American magazines will contain, and through which all that is of importance in the new discovery will become the property of the scholarship of the world.

As yet, however, the only American scholar who has examined the manuscripts is Professor Henry A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan. Professor Sanders has written two articles upon them. He wrote one article in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, which no one out of America seems to have seen yet, but which we shall use for our present Notes. He wrote another in the *Biblical World* for February. This article was read by Professor Harnack, of Berlin, who thereupon contributed an account of the discovery to the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for March 14. Harnack's article attracted the attention of Professor Swete, of Cambridge, who sent a short paper to the *Guardian* of April 1. The only other writing on the subject up to the present moment is an article in the *Biblical World* for March by Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed, of Chicago. Professor Goodspeed has been in communication with Dr. Grenfell about the dates of the manuscripts. Otherwise he also seems to be entirely dependent upon Professor Sanders' article in the *Biblical World*. But the literature will grow, and it will become more independent. For the present we have enough to enable us to see that in one of the manuscripts we have the most important discovery that has been made since Mrs. Lewis found her famous palimpsest on Mount Sinai.

The discovery consists of four manuscripts or batches of manuscript. They are of different sizes, shapes, and ages. But Professor Sanders believes that they once formed volumes of a single Bible. The first is a parchment written in a large upright uncial hand of the fourth or fifth century. It is well preserved, only a little of the first page, which is slightly worm-eaten, being illegible. It contains the whole of the Books of Deuteronomy and Joshua in the Septuagint Version.

The second manuscript contains the Septuagint Version of the entire Psalter. But it is much decayed and worm-eaten. Not a single page is

perfect. This is the more to be regretted that Professor Sanders believes it to be the oldest manuscript of the four, and to present a text which is remarkably clean and accurate. It is written in a large upright uncial hand on parchment like the first manuscript, but the last seven leaves are in a much later hand, showing that the manuscript was repaired about 600 A.D. Professor Sanders has as yet examined its text carefully only in the case of Psalms 146 and 150, but that examination is sufficient to convince him that it is independent of any text in existence, though it inclines most strongly to the Vatican.

The third manuscript is written on parchment in small slightly-sloping uncials. It contains the four Gospels. The Gospels occur in what is known as the Western order—Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. The manuscript is very well preserved. There will apparently be no difficulty in obtaining its text for every chapter of the Gospels. Its scribe has been somewhat careless or incompetent, for Professor Sanders has noted thirty-six clerical errors in the first two chapters of St. Matthew. But clerical errors are of less consequence. Of the text itself which the scribe has copied the highest hopes are entertained. Much depends upon its date. Professor Sanders assigns the writing to the fifth or sixth century. But Dr. Grenfell has informed Professor Goodspeed that it is 'not later than the fifth century, and may even belong to the fourth.'

The fourth manuscript unfortunately need not detain us. It is a blackened, decayed fragment of a parchment manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul. The writing belongs to the fifth century. But only sixty leaves can be separated, and only fractions of these can be read. Professor Sanders has located passages from Ephesians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and Hebrews. He thinks the manuscript originally consisted of twenty-six quires of eight leaves each or thereby, and that it contained the Acts and most of the Catholic Epistles, but that the Book of Revelation was almost certainly absent.

Now of these four manuscripts the most important is the third; and its possessors have not been slow to discover that. 'It is, to begin with,' says Professor Goodspeed, 'the only considerable uncial of the Gospels in America, and it is the first uncial containing the whole of the Gospels that has been discovered in more than twenty years, that is, since Gregory found the Codex Athous on Mount Athos in 1886. More than this, as an uncial manuscript containing the four Gospels complete, it ranks at once with a group of seven manuscripts scattered through the first ten centuries. Were its text not distinctive in itself, this fact of completeness alone would give the Detroit Gospels distinction of the most unusual sort.'

Among its features are the usual cases of omission. The story of the woman taken in adultery (Jn 7<sup>53-811</sup>) is omitted. So also is the passage which speaks of the appearance of an angel from Heaven strengthening Jesus in Gethsemane, and of the bloody sweat (Lk 22<sup>43, 44</sup>). The prayer on the Cross, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' (Lk 23<sup>34</sup>), is omitted, as well as the passage about the troubling of the water from the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda (Jn 5<sup>4</sup>).

More noticeable is the omission of Lk 6<sup>5</sup>, 'And he said unto them, The Son of man is lord of the sabbath.' This verse is omitted also by Codex Bezae (though it occurs later), and in its place is found the most remarkable addition which that 'singular' manuscript contains: 'On the same day, seeing one at work on the sabbath, he said unto him: Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed and a transgressor of the law.' But the surprise of the new manuscript is not an omission. It is a most unexpected insertion. It is the insertion of a passage in the end of St. Mark's Gospel.

We have already seen that there are three

possible endings to St. Mark's Gospel, a short, a long, and an intermediate. But in his treatise against the Pelagians, written in the year 415-16, Jerome mentions that in some copies of the Latin Gospels with which he was acquainted, and still more frequently in Greek codices, the long ending was longer still. For there was an addition after the fourteenth verse. He quotes the addition in Latin. The words are: 'Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes, Saeculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis sub Satana [*v.l.* substantia] est, quae [*lege* qui] non sinit per immundos spiritus ueram Dei apprehendi uirtutem; idcirco iam nunc reuela iustitiam tuam.' This statement of Jerome's has hitherto been without support, and indeed without much credit. No such addition has been found in any manuscript, whether Greek or Latin. Yet Jerome was right. The newly discovered manuscript of the Gospels contains the Greek of the words which Jerome quotes, and a further portion embodying a new Saying of Jesus.

The text is somewhat corrupt, but it is not impossible to mend it. It is then translated by Professor Swete in this way: '14a. And they excused themselves, saying, This world of iniquity and of unbelief is under Satan, who by reason of unclean spirits suffereth not *men* to comprehend the true power of God. Therefore, reveal thy righteousness now. 14b. And Christ answered them, The term of years of the power of Satan is fulfilled, but other dangers are nigh at hand. 14c. And for them that sinned I was delivered unto death, that they might return to the truth, and sin no more; that they might inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven.'

Is this new paragraph, asks Professor Swete, an original part of the long ending? He concludes that it is not. But he also concludes, because it fits so admirably into its place, that it must have been inserted in the ending very soon after the ending itself was written, and that deliberately and carefully. It seems to belong to the same

time and the same place. Professor Goodspeed, however, has a less favourable opinion of its fitness. The excusing of the Apostles agrees well enough with Christ's rebuking of them in the fourteenth verse. But in style and tone the new paragraph seems to him like a new patch on an old garment, and the conclusion which he comes to is, that it may belong to the intermediate, but is entirely out of place in the long ending.

What would he make of it? He would make it part of some Apocryphal Gospel (as was suggested of Jerome's sentence long ago by Richard Simon) which has found its way into the end of St. Mark's Gospel, just as the other endings have, in the vain attempt of some early scribe to find a substitute for the last leaf of that Gospel, so soon and so mysteriously lost.

'I venture to say that the Protestant Reformation itself did not work a greater, though perhaps a more violent, change than the last quarter of a century has marked in religious thought, belief, and life.' These words of President Harris, of Amherst, are taken from the review of a book on another page. They are quoted here to introduce an illustration.

The Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., has published a volume entitled *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea* (Pitman; 3s. 6d. net). It contains the Dissertation which was accepted as sufficient for the degree of Doctor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Now observe the title. When President Harris spoke of a great change that had taken place within the last quarter of a century in religious thought, belief, and life, he had before his mind a definite thing, brought about by a distinct method of study. He meant a change in our whole conception of revelation, and, as a consequence, of all the doctrines of revelation. And he meant that it had been brought about by the study of Comparative Religion. Accordingly, we say that Dr. Oesterley's

book is an illustration. Its title is *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea*. It is further described on the title-page as 'A Study in Comparative Religion.'

The very phrase 'Messianic Idea' has come to us within the last five-and-twenty years. Before that we knew only of the 'Messiah.' But the 'Messianic Idea' is much more than the 'Messiah.' Besides the conception of the Person of the Messiah Himself, it includes the annihilation of the powers of evil, the establishment of the Messianic rule of righteousness, and the consequent happiness of those who sit under it.

But there is more than an increase of content. There is the application of the word 'evolution.' We must have the 'Messianic Idea' before we can apply the word 'evolution.' To speak of the evolution of the Messiah would easily become offensive. How far Dr. Oesterley is from offence we shall see. He applies the word 'evolution' not to the Messiah (for he has no purpose of tracing any process of development through which our Lord Jesus Christ may have passed) but to the Messianic idea. For the conceptions which make up the Messianic idea, even as they are presented to us in the Bible, show distinct signs of having gone through an evolutionary process. This may be seen quite plainly by comparing the Messianic picture of the New Testament with that of the Old. But in the Old Testament itself there are signs which indicate the existence of earlier ideas, and which show that the evolutionary process is not restricted in its working to the Old and New Testaments, but that 'behind the former there is a history, a very long history indeed, of what for the sake of convenience we term Messianism.'

Now it is necessary, in order to understand the doctrine of the Messiah, that we should go back beyond the Bible, and study it, so far as we can, in its earliest beginnings. Did our fathers not find that necessary? We have nothing to do with

our fathers. We find it necessary. It may be that we have not yet taken out of the doctrine of the Messiah, as contained in the Old and New Testaments, all that there is in it. We may be sure that we have not. But the way to take more out of it now is to study it in relation to all other hints of the need and the promise of a Messiah which the world contains. In any case, we cannot confine ourselves to the Old and New Testaments. God has shown us a larger way, and we must take it. In the words of Professor Robertson Smith: 'To understand the ways of God with man, and the whole meaning of His plan of salvation, it is necessary to go back and see His work in its beginnings, examining the rudimentary stages of the process of revelation.'

Dr. Oesterley hesitates for a moment here. There are those who deny that there are 'rudimentary stages' in the process of revelation. The idea of revealed religion, they say, implies something which is in itself complete. The revelation given on Mount Sinai, they urge, did not admit of previous stages; it was full and complete in itself. What does Dr. Oesterley say to that? He simply says that he cannot help himself. The study of Comparative Religion has shown him that such an attitude is untenable. 'A whole world of facts cries out against such a supposed restriction of the Divine activity among men to a particular period of the world's history. The special revelation in the Person of Jesus Christ is the climax of what thinking men from the first dawn of understanding were feeling for, and, however unconsciously, looking forward to.'

Again he hesitates for a moment. For he does not mean to refuse 'a very special place to the Hebrew genius and to the literature of the Old Testament which under God it produced.' But he finds it necessary to say that the divine activity among men cannot nowadays be believed to have been restricted to the nation of Israel; that the testimony of the Old Testament itself is against such a belief, and that, in fact, it is overthrown by

the existence of just this Messianic Idea which is the subject of his book.

Now it cannot be denied that besides these particular obstacles, which some men may never be able to overcome, there is a feeling that the study of Comparative Religion is one which the believer in Christ should never enter upon unless he is driven to it. Dr. Oesterley recognizes the existence of that feeling and its reasonableness. There are two things that have created it.

The first is a misuse of the word 'evolution.' Dr. Illingworth, in his recent volume on *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, warns us all against the misuse of this word. Dr. Oesterley accepts the warning. He quotes some sentences from Dr. Illingworth's book to show the sense in which the word is legitimately used, the sense in which he means to use it. 'All true evolution is the gradual unfolding of a germ, and is characterized by unbroken continuity.' 'Evolution is merely a method, and originates and can originate nothing. Whatever we find existing at the end of an evolutionary process must have existed potentially, that is to say, in germ, at its beginning.' 'We sometimes hear vague thinkers speak as if during the evolution of organic life animal instinct had been developed, *proprio motu*, into human reason; blind giving rise to conscious purpose. But no such thing as blind or unconscious purpose is conceivable; it is only another name for purposeless purpose, a plain contradiction in terms.' 'If instinct ever even appears to pass up into reason, it can only be because it is itself already the product of reason. And the same thing is true of all analogous cases of what is called evolutionary progress.' Again, 'Evolution originates nothing, it invents nothing, it causes nothing. It is only a name for the gradual way in which God's purposes are unfolded in the field of existence; and the gradual way whereby in the field of knowledge they come to be recognized by man.' And when Dr. Oesterley has made these quotations, he says: 'By the phrase "The Evolution of the

Messianic Idea," is therefore meant the method whereby the conception of a Saviour, overcoming all that is harmful to man, and bringing about for man a state of peacefulness, became gradually more and more understood and apprehended by men.'

The other thing that has created mistrust of the study of Comparative Religion is the risk of regarding the topics embraced by it solely as products of man's thinking, and the fact that some of its earlier students did actually so regard them. Take the topic before us. Dr. Oesterley refers to a recent article by Professor H. R. Mackintosh, in which is described the attitude of a certain school of thought in these words: 'There was a vague Messianic idea in the world, the argument runs; there was a kind of redemption-myth current in pious minds scattered over the Roman Empire in a hundred varied forms, and these impalpable, yearning dreams of salvation were deposited, like crystals in a super-saturated solution, on the idealized name of Jesus of Nazareth. It came to be believed that he had done and suffered all things expected of the Christ. You can explain what was thought of Him from the fermenting ideas of the time; Eastern Gnosticism and syncretistic Judaism will virtually cover the whole field. The conception of a Divine Saviour who came down from heaven and returned thither is one whose intellectual antecedents we know exactly, and nothing could have been more natural than its appropriation by adoring believers, eager to deck the object of their faith with all possible names of honour.'

This attitude is utterly unscientific, and must be departed from. It is not that it does not take all the facts into account. Science can never do that, though it is its business to take into account as many of the facts as possible. It is that it deliberately leaves out of account some of the most important facts. It leaves out of account the fact of the absolute uniqueness of Christ. It leaves out of account His unique personality and the unique influence which He has had in the

world. It leaves out of account the attitude towards His Person which is adopted by the majority of the most progressive nations of the world, an attitude which is expressed in the Creeds by the dogma of His Divinity. And it leaves out of account the historical and scarcely questionable fact that, while His followers found in Him the meeting-place and satisfaction of their Messianic hope, much more did they find in Him a revelation of what that hope is to man, its spiritual height, its ethical influence, its world-wide scope. The student of Comparative Religion is quite entitled to deny these things if he can. But being a student of science he is not entitled to ignore them.

The Rev. J. G. Simpson, M.A., Principal of the Leeds Clergy School, has published a volume of sermons, and has given it the title of *Christian Ideals* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is a good title. It describes the author as well as the book. Principal Simpson is a man of Christian ideals. His influence lies in that, and the slowness of his ecclesiastical advancement. And the book is a book of Christian ideals. The first sermon is entitled 'The Idealism of Christ.' But the title of the book does not describe the first sermon only, as is so common. It describes all the sermons in it, and binds them into a book.

The title of the first sermon is 'The Idealism of Christ.' The sermon was preached in the chapel of Trinity College, Oxford. And accordingly Mr. Simpson begins by saying that the word 'idealism' is used in two senses. It sometimes indicates a type of philosophy, 'which we may leave to those interested in the school of *Literae Humaniores* to accept or reject as they please.' But in another sense it represents a spiritual temper which is essential to all the higher and nobler activities of men. It is with idealism as a spiritual temper that Mr. Simpson has to do.

His text is taken from the Gospel according to St. Luke. The words are: 'In that very hour

there came certain Pharisees, saying to him, Get thee out, and go hence: for Herod would fain kill thee. And he said unto them, Go and say to that fox, Behold, I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected. Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the *day* following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem' (Lk 13<sup>81-83</sup>).

That is the translation of the Revised Version. It is not perfect. It is not always so near perfection as it might be. 'In that very hour' is certainly better than 'The same day' of the Authorized Version and all the earlier Versions. For the Greek word which is justly preferred by the textual critics is the word for 'hour,' and not for 'day.' But 'Herod would fain kill thee' does not hit off the meaning well.

The phrase *would fain* appears to have had a fascination for the Revisers. They use it frequently, and sometimes with effect. They use it with some effect in 1 Th 2<sup>18</sup>, and with great effect in Philem<sup>18</sup>, 'Whom I would fain have kept with me.' It is a phrase which they found in the Authorized Version of Lk 15<sup>16</sup>, and they retained it there. But while they retained it there they altered the verb, and at once made it evident that they did not understand the phrase. In the Authorized Version it is, 'he would fain have filled his belly with the husks,' which brings out its keenly personal and active meaning. But 'he would fain have been filled with the husks' is at once passive and impossible. The remaining example is Ac 26<sup>28</sup>, 'With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian.' This passage is the despair of the translator. The Revised Version is not satisfactory. It introduces into the words of Agrippa a softness of tone which the context gives us no encouragement to credit him with.

But the most unfortunate example of the Revisers' use of the phrase 'would fain' is in the

passage before us. Herod had none of the gentle longing which 'would fain' conveys. And if he had, the Pharisees would not have conveyed that feeling to Jesus. The Greek is simply, 'Herod wishes to kill thee' (θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι). That was the simple meaning which the Authorized translation, 'Herod will kill thee,' was meant to express. And in its own day it expressed that meaning. But 'Herod will kill thee' is not enough now, for the verb 'to will' has lost its independent value, and become a mere auxiliary.

Now, it is very likely that the Revisers chose the translation 'Herod would fain kill thee' because it seemed to them to be suitable to the wily motives of a man whom our Lord immediately afterwards describes as 'that fox.' But when translators become interpreters they often go astray. Are we sure that our Lord intended to tell us that Herod was wily? Are we sure that he called Herod 'that fox'? Let us return for a moment to Mr. Simpson.

In the incident which forms his text Mr. Simpson sees 'the diplomacy of worldly opportunism brought into sharp and vivid contrast with the idealism of Jesus.' We shall come to the idealism of Jesus in a little. The diplomacy is unmistakable. Whose is it? It is the diplomacy of the Pharisees, says Mr. Simpson. 'The Lord is travelling through the country of Herod, and the Pharisees, who have made up their mind that he must die, are anxious to get him over the border, so that he may come within reach of the Sanhedrin.' So they approach Him with the warning that He had better go hence, for Herod wants to kill Him. That it is diplomacy on the part of the Pharisees is without a doubt. But how deep is the diplomacy?

That depends upon whether or not they came with a genuine message from Herod. Mr. Simpson thinks the message was genuine. He thinks that Herod, who has already burned his

fingers over the bad business of John, was anxious to be quit of this other dangerous demagogue; that accordingly he tried the game of bluff, and gave out that he wanted to bring Jesus to a like end. This of course is conjecture. If Herod gave out that he wanted to kill Jesus, we do not know what his motive may have been. It is most improbable that he really wanted to kill Jesus. And if he did not, it is just as improbable that he gave it out to the Pharisees that he did.

For Herod had had enough of killing of prophets. He had been trapped into the killing of John by an astute and vindictive woman. And he had not got that death off his conscience yet. For, with all his faults, Herod was a man who made some honest practice of religion. And when the fame of Jesus first reached him, his consciousness of the wrong he had done drove him to the wild, passionate speech, 'This is John whom I beheaded; he is risen from the dead.' That he was anxious to see Jesus at this very time, we know; for when, a little later than this, Jesus was brought before him in Jerusalem, we are told that 'he was of a long time desirous to see him.' But it was not to kill Him. It was to see some miracle done by Him. It was, perhaps, to see some such miracle done by Him as would give him back the hope he had once placed in John and the thrill with which he had heard him. Herod did not want to kill Jesus. He had had enough of killing.

Did he give it out, then, that he wanted to kill Him? It is most unlikely. There was no motive for it that we know of. And it is yet more unlikely that he would have communicated it to the Pharisees. For between Herod and the Pharisees there was no love lost. They would not have gone to him, and he would not have come to them. If it were not that our Lord calls Herod 'that fox,' we should not hesitate to say that the hint of Herod's intention was a pure invention of the Pharisees, a ruse to get

Jesus, to move on. Did Jesus, then, call Herod 'that fox'?

---

Now, in the first place, the epithet is inappropriate. No doubt, if our Lord called Herod 'that fox,' He called him so appropriately. But the epithet is inappropriate to all we otherwise know of him. On another occasion Christ warned His disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the leaven of Herod (Mk 8<sup>15</sup>). Was the leaven of Herod cunning? No commentator has ever suggested cunning. 'The leaven of Herod,' says Professor Swete, 'was doubtless the practical unbelief which springs from love of the world and the immoralities to which in a coarser age it led.' And then he quotes from Bede: 'fermentum Herodis est adulterium, homicidium, temeritas iurandi, simulatio religionis.' It is an ugly list. We may hope it is complete. But the cunning of the fox is not in it.

---

But there is more than that. The grammar is well-nigh insuperable. Long ago Cyril pointed out that Jesus did not say, 'Go and tell that (ἐκεῖνη) fox,' but 'Go and tell this (ταύτη) fox.' And he held that in saying 'this fox' He must have referred to some one nearer the spot than Herod. The commentators rarely notice the difficulty. But Dr. Plummer as usual notices it. He endeavours to meet it by saying that we have here an instance of a common use of 'this' (οὗτος) to signify that which is condemned or despised. But when 'this' is used in a contemptuous way *it always refers to a person who is present*; it never stands for 'that.' Dr. Plummer recalls nine passages in the Gospels. Turn them up one by one, and you will find that not one of them bears the meaning which he puts upon it. Whatever Jesus meant, what He said was, 'Go and tell *this* fox.'

---

It was the opinion of Cyril, and Dr. Plummer reminds us that Theophylact agreed with him, that Jesus referred to the Pharisees themselves.

And when we follow Dr. Plummer, and, in order to bring out the contempt which the words carry, translate them (not 'that fox of yours,' as Dr. Plummer does, but) 'this fox of yours,' then we find that the suggestion of Cyril is worth considering. Jesus did not charge the Pharisees directly with falsehood; He left them to apply the words as they themselves knew they had to be applied. But if the whole thing was an invention of the Pharisees' own, it surely must have made the wily Pharisees wince when He who always 'knew what was in man' answered their stratagem with 'Go and tell this fox of yours.'

---

But now, what is it that they were to tell this fox? His words are: 'Behold, I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected. Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the *day* following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.' The meaning is not quite easy to follow, and the passage has been the occasion of much variety of interpretation.

---

It is clear enough that when He says, 'I cast out devils and perform cures,' He refers to the ordinary doings of every day. But what is the meaning of 'to-day and to-morrow'? And what is the meaning of 'and the third day I am perfected'? The translation 'I am perfected' has been challenged. It is a comparatively new translation. It has been suggested by Heb. 2<sup>10</sup>, 'to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.' This is the only other place in the New Testament in which the verb is used of Christ. But it does not follow that the use in St. Luke is identical with the use in Hebrews. Mr. Simpson prefers to look upon the verb as middle and not passive, and translates it simply, 'I reach an end.' What have we now?

---

We have the assertion of our Lord that He has work which the Father has given Him to do, and that as long as He continues doing that work

no cunning of the wildest fox in the world will prevail to hinder Him. He is doing His work to-day; He will do it to-morrow; and He will go on doing it until the day comes when He is able to look back upon it and say, 'It is finished.' We are told that one of the articles in the creed of General Gordon was the providence of God. General Gordon's belief in God's providence sent him into the thick of the battle without a tremor. Jesus believes in God's providence also. He is absolutely confident that there is no power upon earth that will for one moment hinder Him from carrying on the work which the Father has given Him to do until He has accomplished it.

But the providential care of the Father does not ensure a career of uninterrupted prosperity. 'Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.' No man may look for uninterrupted prosperity. Jesus does not. The only difference is that *He* knows when the sorrow will enter His life, and where. He must go on His way. It is something more than 'continue His journey,' but it includes that. We do not know where

the way is leading us. He does. It is leading Him to Jerusalem. For even apart from His knowledge of all the things that will befall Him, does not history itself declare that Jerusalem is the prophets' cemetery?

But this does not mean that, after all, Herod or the wily Pharisees are to have their way with Him. It means that the sorrow and the suffering are part of the work which the Father has given Him to do. When Pilate said, 'Knowest thou not that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?' He answered, 'Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above.' Pilate was an instrument in the hand of God. And now also neither Herod nor the Pharisees can have any power over Him except as their power over Him is part of God's plan for His life and for the redemption of the world. I continue my work, He says, altogether regardless of this cunning fox of yours, and I will continue it till it is finished; nevertheless, I know that I must go on my way towards Jerusalem, for it is the will of the Father that one day soon I should die there at the hand of the rulers of My people.

## The Self-Consciousness of Jesus and the Servant of the Lord.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., TORONTO.

### II.

#### The Attitude of the New Testament Writers.

LEAVING aside for the moment the evidence afforded by the Evangelists, let us very briefly review the attitude of the New Testament writers towards the conception of the Servant. Assuming that the early chapters of Acts give a substantially accurate account of Peter's preaching, we find him describing Jesus as the Servant (τὸν παῖδα) of God: 'The God of our fathers glorified his

servant Jesus' (3<sup>13</sup>);<sup>1</sup> 'God, having raised up his servant, sent him to bless you' (3<sup>26</sup>). In 4<sup>27</sup> He is called 'thy holy servant Jesus'; and in 3<sup>14</sup> He is spoken of as 'the holy and righteous one.' The epithet 'righteous' marks Him out in 7<sup>52</sup> and 22<sup>14</sup>. There seems to be more than an accidental con-

<sup>1</sup> Is 52<sup>13</sup>: ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου . . . καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα.