tradition, not a real one; in the first a genitive is put after ἀκούω, in the latter an accusative; now ἀκούω with a genitive means simply to hear, ἀκούω with an accusative means to hear and understand; we may conclude therefore that Paul’s companions heard the sound of the voice, but did not understand the words which were uttered. After careful considerations, I think the above explanation an impossible one.

In the fourth verse of this passage St. Luke says, ‘He heard a voice (φωνή) saying unto him, etc.’ In the other passage St. Paul says of himself, ‘I heard a voice (φωνή) saying unto me.’ In the first passage the men stood speechless, hearing the voice (φωνή). In the other, ‘they heard not the voice (φωνή) of Him that spake unto me.’

Here the usage of genitive or accusative would seem to be quite indifferent (see also Acts xi. 7, ‘I heard also a voice (φωνή) saying unto me, Arise, Peter’).

Is there an explanation of the discrepancy. St. Paul states that a great light shone about him. He does not here state that he himself saw the Lord. But he says so elsewhere (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8), and it must have been on this occasion. St. Luke says the men saw no one; St. Paul says they saw the light. So far we have no contradiction. Did the men hear nothing? St. Paul says, ‘They heard not the voice of Him that spake to me.’ That does not imply they did not hear St. Paul addressing some one. It would rather imply they did. We would therefore translate the verse under consideration, ‘The men stood speechless, hearing the speaking, but seeing no man’ (that is, to whom the speaking could be addressed). Is there warrant for this translation? In John x. 33-38. In it Jesus is on His trial before Pilate, who puts to Him the question: ‘Art thou the King of the Jews.’ Jesus replies: ‘My kingdom is not of this world. . . . Now is My kingdom not from hence;’ Pilate then puts the question: ‘Art thou a king then?’ Jesus replies: ‘Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.’ In this passage Jesus claims to be a spiritual king, and to have a spiritual kingdom. But it is manifest that Jesus uses the word kingdom (κύριος), and Pilate understands it, as the abstract of king (βασιλεύς), not of Lord (κύριος). To show that He uses it in the latter sense in any other passage, equally clear evidence must be adduced.

John Robson.

Christ’s use of the Word ‘Kingdom.’

I do not wish to follow Dr. Jannaris into a discussion of passages, which, as he says, may be influenced by long and stereotyped habit of thought. I will merely quote one in which it seems to me that that has no room for play, in which Christ clearly defines His position, and which may therefore be taken to explain all the rest. I refer to John xviii. 33-38. In it Jesus is on His trial before Pilate, who puts to Him the question: ‘Art thou the King of the Jews.’ Jesus replies: ‘My kingdom is not of this world. . . . Now is My kingdom not from hence.’ Pilate then puts the question: ‘Art thou a king then?’ Jesus replies: ‘Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.’ In this passage Jesus claims to be a spiritual king, and to have a spiritual kingdom. But it is manifest that Jesus uses the word kingdom (βασιλεία), and Pilate understands it, as the abstract of king (βασιλεύς), not of Lord (κύριος). To show that He uses it in the latter sense in any other passage, equally clear evidence must be adduced.