in his experience that compelled him to regard Christ as essentially divine. Christ had done for him, and was to him, all that God could be, and what God alone could be. This confession of divinity involved the belief in pre-existence ; as the divine eternally is, and does not come into being in time. That Paul thought of the Son of God as eternally existing in the concrete individuality of the Risen Lord was inevitable ; it did not require any external suggestion. He knew the Risen Lord, and thought of Him as eternally the same. The modification which we have suggested as necessary in Paul's doctrine does not make the pre-existence of the Son of God *ideal* ; for there is eternally in God as the reality of His nature as love this *Kenosis*, which we call Word and Son, and which became incarnate in the Lord Jesus Christ.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

CHRISTUS ÆDIFICATOR:

A COMPARISON BETWEEN ST. JOHN II. 19 AND ZECHARIAH VI. 13.

THERE are three separate reports of our Lord's saying about the rebuilding of the temple. Two of these occur in the evidence given by the false witnesses in the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. And, although the witnesses were false, it by no means follows that the testimony itself was false throughout. It is possible, and indeed probable, that the misleading character of the evidence consisted in the interpretation of the words rather than in the report itself.

Each of the three separate reports differs from the other two, and each contains distinctive points of great interest and importance.

These differences may be accounted for by supposing that our Lord gave utterance to these words on more than one occasion in slightly varying form. Or the two false witnesses may have gained their knowledge of the saying from different informants neither of whom had preserved the authentic form of the saying, or who had both wilfully perverted it.

St. Matthew's account is as follows: "Now the chief priests and the whole Council sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death; and they found it not, though many false witnesses came. But afterward came two and said, This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days" (xxvi. 59–61).

What is specially to be noted here is the extreme importance of this evidence in the eyes of the judges. Until the two false witnesses appeared no testimony was forthcoming on which a capital charge could be founded. St. Matthew, writing for Jewish readers, records with emphasis the precise testimony which would have a fatal significance before a Jewish tribunal.

According to St. Mark's report Jesus is represented as saying, "I will destroy this temple," instead of "I am able to destroy the temple of God." This is probably nearer the truth than the testimony of the witness as it appears in St. Matthew's Gospel, both because it approaches St. John's report more closely, and because in this connexion it is more likely that Jesus used the expression "this temple" than "the temple of God."

The most important point, however, in St. Mark's report is the introduction of the words "made with hands" (χειροποίητον) and "made without hands" (ἀχειροποίητον (xiv. 58). The word ἀχειροποίητος is used of that which is immaterial and spiritual (2 Cor. v. 1 and Col. ii. 11, where see Bishop Lightfoot's note; comp. Acts vii. 48). It is a

phrase which gives the true interpretation of the saying of Jesus, and it is inconceivable that the word could have been invented by the false witness. Either it was an exact reminiscence of the saying, or else the words in question are a late insertion in the Gospel itself—a very improbable hypothesis, as the text is based on undisputed MS. authority.

It is, however, to St. John's Gospel that we must turn for the circumstances in which this memorable saying was first uttered; and it is possible that here only we have an authentic account of the words.

In St. John's narrative the incident of the cleansing of the temple had just taken place. It was an act which implied divine authority; and accordingly "the Jews," probably the temple officials, asked, "What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple (λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον), and in three days I will raise it up" (ii. 18, 19).

Whatever may be thought of the other versions of our Lord's words this must be accepted as an authentic record of what was actually said on this occasion, and of the circumstances which gave rise to the saying. It was essentially a mystic saying and required interpretation. To the Jews who took the words in their bare literal sense Jesus would appear to have vouchsafed no answer, or else one which involved an impossible act on their part and an impossible claim on His. But the Evangelist, with deeper penetration, in one of those "notes," which taken together form the first commentary on the words of Jesus, adds an interpretation. "He spoke," he said, "of the temple of his body." And this interpretation, according to the Evangelist, was accepted by the disciples of Christ after the Resurrection: "When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remem-

bered that he spake thus ; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said."

But if the Master's words were mystic and symbolical, the disciples' interpretation also requires explanation and development. The prophecy was indeed fulfilled by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. The raising of the body of Jesus Christ was a rebuilding of the temple in a profoundly true and spiritual sense. The Jews did literally destroy the temple of the body of Christ. And that body did literally and in reality rise from the dead. But did this explain all ? Was there not a sense in which the temple, and all that was implied by the temple, was destroyed, and with Christ rose again in a purified and enduring form, when Judaism was replaced by the Church of Christ ?

All the best commentators have seen this truth, which is indeed unmistakably exhibited in the writings of the New Testament. "Know ye not," writes St. Paul, "that ye are a temple of God (ναὸς θεοῦ) and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you ?" (1 Cor. iii. 16); and again, "We are a temple of the living God ; even as God said, I will dwell in them and walk in them" (2 Cor. vi. 16). Compare also 1 Peter ii. 5, "Ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house."

The same thought is incorporated in a passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which bears closely on the subject of the present paper, because it deals with the participation of the Gentiles in the privileges of the new Covenant and with the revelation of "the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things" (Eph. iii. 9). The Christian community is there described as "of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone ; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple (εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον) in the

Lord ; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 20–21). Is it too much to infer that this conception of the Christian community as a temple of God built on the foundation of the risen and ascended Christ is derived from the saying which we are discussing as interpreted by St. John ? and that the "other temple" raised by Christ was this new Society, with its attributes of peace and holiness and universality ?

But if our Lord's words in this way receive their interpretation in the future, have they not also a retrospective meaning which would in a true sense make them a sign to the Jews, as, on another occasion, the sign of the prophet Jonah was given in response to a similar demand ?

The object of this paper is to show that there was actually a prophetic conception which must have been vividly recalled by thoughtful students of Messianic prediction, and which we may reverently believe to have been in our Lord's mind when He spoke the words which we are considering.

The conception referred to is expressed in Zechariah vi. 13, and in the context which follows, including the two following chapters.

The external circumstances of that epoch were not in some respects dissimilar to those of the time of Christ's earthly ministry, during the whole of which the temple of Herod remained unfinished. Zechariah was one of the prophets of the Return. He was an eye-witness of the rebuilding of the second temple, now within two years of its completion. At that point of time an incident occurred which gave rise to the prophecy in which the Messiah is described as the Branch—a term which through the LXX rendering by ἀνατολή had come to signify to the Hellenistic Greek the Dayspring or Dawn (Luke i. 78)—a true and beautiful, but inaccurate, interpretation of the original word.

A deputation had arrived from Babylon bearing offerings to the temple in Jerusalem. The prophet was commanded to go to the house of Josiah where these men were lodging, and to take of him silver and gold, and make crowns and set them on the head of Joshua, the son of Josedech the high priest, and to say to him, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying:

> Behold the man whose name is the Branch,
> and he shall grow up out of his place.
> *And he shall build the temple of the Lord;*
> *Even he shall build the temple of the Lord;*
> And he shall bear the glory,
> And shall sit and rule upon his throne,
> And he shall be a priest upon his throne.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> And they that are far off shall come and build
> in the temple of the Lord.[1]

The Messianic significance of the passage is acknowledged, and the completion of the temple by One who should be both Priest and King lifts the conception to a spiritual level far above any hopes which might have centred in the material building then rising from its foundations. The same union of the regal and high priestly office in the Messiah is recalled in Psalm cx., which Christ expressly refers to Himself (Matt. xxii. 41–46), and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which more than any other book of the Bible points to the mystic and preparatory character of the material temple and the priestly ritual.

The royal priesthood of the Messiah, then, was in the past the sign conveyed by our Lord's answer to the Jews, who required a sign in vindication of His authority. Closely allied to that is the glorious vision of the gathering of the

[1] For the purpose of this paper it is not necessary to go into the question of the proposed alteration of text, according to which the crowned one is Zerubbabel, and Joshua the priest on his right hand. According to the text, as it stood in the days of Christ, Joshua is priest and king.

nations to the spiritual temple of the Messianic Priest and King, and of the change from the severe ceremonial of the captivity to the joyous church and kingdom of the Christ (Zech. viii. 19).

To grasp the full significance of the words, "He will build the temple," consider what the temple was to the Jew. It was the centre and symbolism of Judaism; it was representative of the national polity, even of the national existence, so much so that its seeming indestructibility was appealed to by the false prophets as a guarantee of security: "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these" (Jer. vii. 4). To the true Israelite the temple was the abode of Jehovah; his one wish was, "to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of his life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to look with pleasure on his temple" (Ps. xxvii. 4). To be in the temple was to be in the presence of Jehovah, to be taught His secret, and to enjoy His protection.

This it was that the Messiah, prefigured as the mystic Branch, was to rebuild; and in glowing terms the prophet Zechariah describes what that rebuilt temple meant, in other words what the ideal of the future, the golden age of the Messiah priest and king should be.

It is impossible not to see in the prophetic picture of a restored and renovated society those features which the Evangelists of the New Testament rejoice to note as actually existing in the Church of Christ. If in the prophet's words "they that are far off shall come and build in the temple of the Lord" (vi. 15), St. Paul rejoices that "Now ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ" (Eph. ii. 13). If the Evangelist warns them to flee from "the wrath to come," the prophet tells of "a great wrath from the Lord of hosts" (vii. 12). Then the whole passage which follows is explanatory of the spiritual building up

of the house of God, the mode, that is, in which the new spirit will break forth from the old. "There shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts (viii. 19) instead of fasting, for the Lord will return to Jerusalem and dwell in the midst of Jerusalem. "Many people and strong nations will come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem and to pray before the Lord" (viii. 22). There will be a recognition of truth in the revelation to Israel; they will acknowledge that "God is with him" (viii. 23).

The prophet, by his God-given spiritual instinct, was certain that the principles of religion which he had grasped, and the character of Jehovah which had been revealed to him, would in the end prevail; they would reach and convince the religious consciousness of mankind. Those that "were far off" would come to feel that nothing else satisfied their religious sense and yearnings. This was the true building up of the temple of the Lord which would attract men from every land.

If this relation between the saying of Christ and the prophecy of Zechariah can be affirmed and accepted, it was a sign indeed. This Person who had asserted His authority in the temple was "the Branch" of Messianic prediction, the Priest and King, who had foretold that He would rebuild the temple; and the mystic answer had a literal fulfilment.

It is quite in accordance with our Lord's usual method of teaching that the sign should be conveyed by a reference to a Messianic passage in the Old Testament, clear to those only who had eyes to see and hearts to perceive (Matt. xiii. 13). Thus on one occasion to the scribes and Pharisees who sought a sign He answered, "There shall no sign be given, but the sign of Jonah the prophet; on another the disciples of St. John the Baptist are bidden to compare the works of Jesus, which they had witnessed, with the works predicted of the Messiah (Matt. xi. 4, 5). Again the fellow-

citizens of Jesus at Nazareth are taught by an incident in the Old Testament that the rejection of a prophet by his countrymen does not invalidate a prophet's claim (Luke iv. 24 foll.). Other instances are the vision of Jacob (John i. 51), the gift of manna (John vi. 30 foll.), and the serpent lifted up in the wilderness (John iii. 14).

All these examples point to the inference that in the saying under discussion our Lord was also directing the deeper thoughts of His hearers to an Old Testament incident, which would not only indicate His claim to authority, but also open out the significance of the temple itself in the light of prophecy.

More than that, it is one of those words of Christ which help us to understand—and how far are we from fully understanding ?—how "all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man" (Luke xviii. 31). It is a fragment of that lost Gospel according to Christ Himself when, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke xxiv. 27).

ARTHUR CARR.

THE DAVID OF THE BOOK OF SAMUEL AND THE DAVID OF THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES.

IN the book of Chronicles the history proper does not begin until 1 Chronicles x. In that chapter the disastrous battle of Gilboa is narrated (but for a few small changes) in the words of 1 Samuel xxxi., the Chronicler adding his own comment, "So Saul died . . . because of the word of the LORD which he kept not . . . Therefore the LORD slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse." This is the Chronicler's introduction of David