

Here is an early glimpse. The philanthropist can laugh—

It was about this time, too, that his solitary meeting with Ruskin occurred. He rushed into a room where his sister Florence was copying a picture of Turner's, and, not noticing a gentleman who was watching her, ran laughingly up to her with some little joke. 'You had better laugh while you can,' suddenly observed a lugubrious voice behind him, 'for every year you live you will become more and more miserable.'

And the philanthropist can play pranks—

During one of his summer vacations some of the family went to Switzerland, taking Quintin and Charles Nicholson (John's brother) with them. They found their Benjamin anything but a restful companion! On one occasion, having possessed himself of a horn similar to the guard's, he succeeded, to his huge delight, in starting the train, and his joy increased tenfold when the infuriated railway officials attacked the party with much vituperation, declaring that 'ce garçon Anglais c'est un veritable diable.'

And the philanthropist believes in conversion. He had just left Eton when he wrote to a chum still there—

As to the use of the word 'converted,' I must say that I fully believe that there is a time in a man's life when he passes from death unto life; nor do I think it stronger to say that a man is converted than that he is born again. Surely there can be no word too strong to express the saving of an immortal soul. We 'have passed from death unto life,' and, moreover, that very idea of substitution, which is, of course, the foundation of our faith, implies doing something by proxy. God requires *my* death for *my*

sin, and so Jesus steps in and pays the penalty which I should otherwise suffer. So when a man sees this and accepts the Substitute of God's providing, I regard it, as I am sure you do, as the greatest conversion or change which a man can undergo.

And the philanthropist can be touched with a feeling for our infirmities. Let him tell this story himself—

Years ago, when I had a class among the flower-girls at Charing Cross, I succeeded in persuading one of them to promise to lead a new and better life, but she wished to postpone her amendment; she promised to give it all up six weeks later, but not just then. In vain I tried to persuade her, thinking it was but a subterfuge and an excuse to avoid making any immediate decision; but the girl stood as firm as a rock—she would do what I wished in six weeks' time. Seeing I could prevail nothing, I desisted, very discouraged, and feeling almost sure that her excuse was only offered in order to be quit of my impotency. Imagine my feelings when at the promised time the girl came, neatly dressed and ready to carry out her promise. And then it leaked out, bit by bit, that at the time when I spoke to her, the friend with whom she lived was on the verge of being confined. It fell to her lot to support her friend in the hour of her weakness, and repugnant as her life had become to her, she actually carried it on for six weeks, till her friend was up and about again, sacrificing herself and imperilling her chance of a new life, out of loyalty to her friend. You can imagine how humbled I felt when this story came out. I had been judging her as one who was giving excuses, but in very truth she had been making a sacrifice of self, which might well bring into my cheek the blush of inferiority and shame. Verily she loved much: to her the Master could say, 'Go in peace.'

The Theology of St. John.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. GEORGE G. FINDLAY, D.D., HEADINGLEY COLLEGE, LEEDS.

II. Jesus the Son of God.

THE knowledge of God imparted by Jesus Christ was largely new in its contents: 'for the law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.' It was altogether new in its authority, since it came through the person of His Son, the Word who 'was God in the beginning'; it is such knowledge as He alone could give. 'The world hath not known thee'—so spake Jesus to the Father—'but I knew thee.' The specific mark of the Christian revelation is given in the words of our Lord cited by St. Matthew (11²⁷): 'No one knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' But the

revelation of the Father by Christ raised from the first the question of His own status and origin. In making God known, Jesus was compelled to assert Himself. The Christological problem arose immediately out of the theological, as things appear in St. John's Gospel; the two were interwoven. 'The words which thou gavest me,' says Jesus to the Father respecting His disciples, 'I have given unto them'; accordingly, he who 'denies the Son has not the Father either,' while he who 'confesses the Son has also the Father,'—as John puts it in the Epistle (2²³).

In no single instance in the Synoptic Gospels is

Jesus reported to have called Himself outright, and of His own motion, 'the Son of God'; though the Parables of the last period of His ministry imply a unique Sonship and Lordship. He is represented as so named by the Heavenly Voice at the baptism and transfiguration; by Satan, hypothetically, in His great temptation; by demons whom He exorcized; by confessors, in rare moments of exalted faith. He virtually accepts the designation, without discussing or explaining it. Our Lord's reticence in this respect (as indicated in the three other Gospels) makes it the more remarkable that, upon the testimony of the Four, this title formed the gravamen of the charge brought against Jesus on His trial. The crucial issue between Jesus and Judaism came out in the High Priest's question, 'Art thou the Son of God?'—an interrogation which, while associated with the question, 'Art thou the Christ?' went indefinitely beyond this. Though St. Matthew does not quote any express assertion of His divine nature made by Jesus, he tells us how the mockers round the cross flung this taunt at the Sufferer (27⁴⁰⁻⁴³), echoing unawares the challenge of Satan addressed to the consciousness of Jesus at the outset of His ministry: 'He said, I am the Son of God!' This meant on their lips something other than 'the Christ.' Our Lord must at some time have spoken of Himself openly to this effect in a manner which had impressed the public mind, while it shocked the Jewish rulers, and in a sense that was of necessity accounted blasphemous in any mere man however great.

I. JESUS CALLS HIMSELF SON OF GOD.

The Johannine narrative accounts for the situation thus disclosed. In four clear instances Jesus is credited in the Fourth Gospel with speaking of Himself as 'Son of God' before His passion. Two of these belong to private intercourse. The first instance of His public use of the name occurs in the 5th chapter of the Gospel; it was of a startling character: 'The hour cometh, and now is,' He said, 'when the dead shall hear the voice of *the Son of God*, and those that hear shall live.' Throughout the encounter with the Jewish leaders of Jerusalem, which arose out of the healing of the Bethesda cripple on the Sabbath, Jesus has alluded to God as 'the Father,' 'my Father,' in a confidential, appropriative way unexampled amongst religious men and without any

Old Testament precedent, that sounded like a profane familiarity. They reasonably said that He was speaking of God as His own Father—'a Father of his own' (*ἰδιον πατέρα*), as one might speak of his father at home—'making himself equal with God.' Our Lord did not repel the insinuation, as any other reverent Israelite would have been eager to do; He goes on to justify it; the words above-cited form the climax of the discussion occasioned by this reproach. From this date official Judaism could only have one opinion about Jesus; His visits to Jerusalem became brief and perilous. 'After these things Jesus walked in Galilee,' John tells us; 'for he would not walk in Judæa, because the Jews sought to kill him' (7¹). In Galilee our Lord's ministry took another course, and the catastrophe was delayed.

Jesus recalls on His appearance in the temple much later (7^{21ff.}) the 'one work' He had done at which 'all marvel.' Not because the Bethesda miracle stood alone; it was the significance given by Jesus to this sign, the tremendous prerogatives attached to it, the claims He advanced to be as superior to the Sabbath-law in His work as God Himself and to give life and deal forth judgment universally as a Son entrusted with the Father's power, which made the occasion memorable. These enormous pretensions could not be forgotten; they account for the renewed attempts on the life of Jesus. There is no need, therefore, to suppose, as Wendt and others do, that the allusion in the 7th chapter of the Gospel to the miracle of the 5th is irrelevant, and that the paragraph containing it has slipped out of its place.

The conviction about Jesus thus fixed in Jerusalem came out in the attacks made upon our Lord in the city a few months before His passion—at the encounter related in the 10th chapter of (John)—when the assailants said, 'For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because thou, being a man, makest thyself God!' (v. 33). It is noticeable that on this occasion our Lord draws His interlocutors away from the question, 'Art thou the Christ?' to that of His intrinsic relation to God and right to speak for God. The Sonship, not the Messiahship, is the crucial matter. His words then spoken kindled to flame the long-standing prejudice. Jesus assumed once more a filial intimacy with the Most High and a right to dispense God's sovereign gifts, the import of which could not be mistaken. He admits that

He had said, 'I am the Son of God.' The comparison He proceeds to draw between Himself and those 'called gods' in the 82nd Psalm, stayed the flight of the stones already lifted against Him; but that reference was calculated, after a moment's reflexion, to aggravate rather than relieve the offence committed. For Jesus was arguing from the less to the incomparably greater. He separates Himself from those 'to whom the word of God came,' as being the One 'whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world'; He assumes to stand above the highest of God's former people, since He did not, like them, receive the word of God on earth, but has Himself brought it from heaven, being sent on this errand from the Father's side. He challenges the Jews in view of His works to 'recognize that God is in' Him and He 'in God.' We do not wonder that the bystanders, after hearing this, 'again sought to seize him,' and that the trial of the following Passover came near to being anticipated in December.

In all this there was no glorifying of Himself on our Lord's part. 'I honour my Father,' He said to His enemies, 'and you dishonour me.' Jesus stepped forward, when He cleansed the temple at the first Passover of His ministry, as a Son concerned for the honour of His Father's house and in rebuke of unfaithful servants. The question formally addressed to Him by the rulers of the people, as St. Matthew relates, at the second temple-cleansing previously to the last Passover, 'In what authority doest thou these things? who gave thee this authority?' was virtually raised by the first collision of Jesus with the official heads of Judaism. Now the question of authority struck in at once upon the question of the personal standing of the innovator. The initial action of Jesus at the Jewish capital—the temple-cleansing and Bethesda healing—provoked a quarrel which tested the rights of the Nazareth prophet to their foundation; He was compelled to declare Himself, not yet indeed as the Messiah, but in a sense even more momentous, as God's supreme agent and delegate, acting for the Father in the capacity and with the devotion of His Son. So the writer of the Fourth Gospel understood the course of affairs. And he has not predated the struggle at Jerusalem nor lost the historical perspective, in raising thus early in his narrative the debate on our Lord's Sonship. As he looked back to the beginning from the end of the course of Jesus, he saw this issue raised

from the outset in the words of the Baptist heard by himself on the day when he first met his Lord: 'I have seen, and have borne witness, that this is the Son of God.'

It is thought, indeed, that the late acknowledgments of the apostles forbid the probability of Jesus having asserted His higher Sonship in the early stages of His work; the familiar terms on which they lived with their Master seem to forbid any assumption that they regarded Him habitually as more than the greatest and holiest of men. One must remember, however, that the extreme self-assertions we have referred to were drawn from Jesus by a critical emergency; and they were heard, probably, by only a few of the Galilean disciples. Hatred is often keener-sighted than love; and the theologians and legists of Jerusalem drew conclusions which our Lord's disciples arrived at more slowly. Above all, His infinite gentleness and lowliness of heart amongst His own precluded, or dispelled, the oppressive awe towards Him that a quicker sense of the veiled Godhead would have caused. This awe broke out now and then notwithstanding, as their confessions both in the Johannine and Synoptic narratives witness. By degrees, and almost imperceptibly, the higher conception of their Master's being formed itself in the minds of those about Him (the secret of the Nativity being all the while kept close in Mary's pondering heart), until the resurrection brought it to full ripeness and birth, and Thomas confessed for them all, 'My Lord, and my God.' St. John's Gospel is, in effect, a history of the development of faith in the Divine mission and Sonship of Jesus, which began with the Baptist's confession and closed with that of St. Thomas.

2. THE SONSHIP AND THE MISSION OF JESUS.

But let us see in what form the relationship of Jesus to the Father came out. In justifying His right to speak and act for God, as against the representatives of the theocracy, our Lord describes Himself again and again as being 'sent from the Father.' So He is spoken of with emphasis in the Epistle of John: 'The Father sent the Son, to be the Saviour of the world.' Now Jesus does not mean by this simply that He has a mission and is acting under a Divine command, like His forerunner for example, who 'came' as 'a man sent from God.' He is not *made* the Son by being sent; He is *sent because He is the Son.*

Our Lord insists that He has entered the world of men from a higher sphere, from the immediate presence and vision of God, where He dwelt as a Son with the Father. 'I know him,' He said, 'because I am from him, and he sent me.' 'The Father devoted the Son and sent him into the world.' 'You are from beneath,' He cries to the Jews, 'I am from above. You are of this world; I am not of this world. I know whence I came, and whither I go; you know not whence I came, and whither I go.' 'What if you should see the Son of man ascending where he was before?' And to His disciples at the last, in the plainest terms, 'I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go unto the Father.' In His prayer of departure, speaking to God, Jesus asks for the restoration of 'the glory which I had before the world was, by thy side'; He calls to remembrance how 'thou didst love me before the foundation of the world.' These sayings indicate something far more than a difference of vocation and of temper distinguishing Jesus from men of the world, or a destination for His work existing in the eternal thought of God. They are too numerous, and too much of the texture of the Gospel, to be excised by any critical process. They reveal in Jesus the consciousness of a supramundane life, and a superhuman relationship to the Divine, from which His vocation springs,—reminiscences that antedate creation, an intimacy with God that lies behind finite existence and the frame of nature. The gates of birth and death were transparent to Jesus Christ; through both He saw His Father's house, and His seat by the Father's side.

From this relationship to and converse with the Father, the specific knowledge of God which Jesus imparts to men was derived. 'I speak unto you,' He declares, 'the things that I have seen with the Father'; 'not that any one hath seen the Father, except he that is from God; he hath seen the Father.' 'I tell you of the heavenly things,' He said to Nicodemus, as He alone can do 'who descended from heaven,'—whose home and true being are there. In filial loyalty the Lord accepted His mission to mankind, as a Son of one mind with the Father, having no purpose or interest apart from Him: 'I came not to do mine own will,' His word is, 'but the will of him that sent me.' The Father's unseen presence and love

always attend Him, as 'the signs' show: 'He that sent me hath not left me alone'; 'the Father is with me'; 'the Father that dwelleth in me doeth his works.' His deeds of healing Jesus claims to accomplish by insight into the constant operations of God, disclosed to Him as by a master-workman to his son: 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but whatsoever he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also the Son doeth in like manner.' The apostle does no more than sum up the import of the self-revealings of Jesus and the indications that He gives of the source of His being and the basis of His powers, when he says of Him at the outset: 'The Word was with God in the beginning, and the Word was God.' The phrases of the Epistles which describe Jesus Christ as 'come in flesh' or 'coming in flesh,' and 'sent into the world,' rehearse the same belief, which was imparted by Jesus most fully to the disciple whom He loved.

3. THE SON OF GOD AND THE CHILDREN.

Looking backwards, our Lord's glance ranged over a filial fellowship with God outreaching finite existence; looking forward, His thoughts take a flight equally sublime. He sees Himself by the side of the Father as 'a son over his house,' when He assures the sorrowing disciples: 'In my Father's house are many mansions; I go to prepare a place for you.' He asserts prerogatives immeasurably great in making the promise: 'I will ask the Father, and he will give you the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit'; 'in my name the Father will send him'; 'I will send him unto you.' With quiet assumption Jesus puts Himself into the first person plural along with God, telling the men who love Him that they shall be for this reason the beloved of the Father, 'and we will come to him'—to any such man, the Father and I—'and make our abode with him'; He expects to dwell in men's souls as a fellow-guest with God. The Jerusalem critics were right when they said, so long before, 'He maketh himself equal with God.' How one would shudder to hear the greatest of men, or the loftiest angel, thus coupling himself and God! by this time it appeared natural to the disciples that Jesus should do so; and it seems to us a normal thing. The discourse of our Lord at the Last Supper, with the prayer that followed, supply the most complete disclosure of the Divine-human consciousness of Jesus, in its unity,

sublimity, and tenderness, when the Son of God gives His heart in its fulness to those who have received Him and 'makes known' to them 'all things that "He had" heard from the Father.' Jesus there certifies His accomplished revelation of the Father and of the way to Him; He makes provision for His people's imperishable union with Him in the Spirit; He binds them to witness for Him in the midst of an evil but conquered world; and He commits them for this end to His Father's guardian and sanctifying power, asking that they may at last behold His heavenly glory and may be embraced in the love with which the Father eternally regards Himself. Whatever lower applications the title 'Son of God' might previously and otherwise have had, and by whatever degrees the disciples learnt its scope, St. John wrote his Gospel under the conviction that his Master was the Son of God in the most exalted sense. The majestic attributes of deity ascribed to the Lamb in the Apocalypse he had seen already shining through the features of the Son of man.

The transcendent Sonship of Christ is in no way compromised by St. John's doctrine of the Christian's sonship towards God. Every believer in Christ, he teaches, is personally 'begotten of God.' By contrast, he calls Jesus 'the Only-begotten': His filiation is sole and incomparable. It is noticeable that the word son (*viós*) is never used by St. John in relation to God of any but Christ, except in a singular passage in the Apocalypse (21⁷): otherwise, *τέκνον* (*child*). To as 'many as received' the Word of God, the light of men, 'he gave right to become children of God—to those that believe on his name.' Their birth is derived and secondary; His primary, aboriginal. Our Lord compares the ministry of the apostles to His own, and the union between them to that which binds Himself to the Father. But to identify the two relations, to put them on the same footing, how far was this from His mind! When He says, in breathing on the disciples the Holy Spirit, 'As my Father hath sent me, I also send you'; and when in the high-priestly prayer Jesus declares to God, 'As thou didst send me into the world, I also sent them into the world,' this signifies that the Lord gives His servants a commission based upon His own, a mission continuous with His and directed towards the same ends; they set forth from His earthly presence bearing His words and charged with His Spirit, as he set forth from the Father's heavenly

presence. He speaks to the Father of a day when 'all who believe through their word in me,' 'will be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee,' when 'they shall be one as we are one' (*ἐν* = 'one' in disposition and action: so far, the unity of the Father and the Son is imaged in the Church): this complete union amongst religious men, still to be realized on earth, is grounded on the central unity of being—'I in them,' Jesus says, 'and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one,'—'that they also may be in us.' His oneness with God, while Son of man and centre of the race, gives pledge of the final oneness of mankind. Christ in men is the unifying principle of the future; and He can dwell in men everywhere, since God the Father is in Him.

'The Son' and 'the Father' on the lips of the Johannine Christ, we conclude, are correlative terms. They affirm the two opposite sides of a relation that is solitary and mysterious, reaching beyond our Lord's earthly horizon, beyond time and the world, that existed 'in the beginning,' that in fact we can only conceive of as lying within the Godhead. This Son of God was the Only-begotten before creation, and apart from the birth of God's earthly children. He was sent into the world and took human flesh as God's Only Son, disclosing the Divine character and imparting the Divine love to men as such a Son alone could do—an *ἴδιος viós* (to use St. Paul's language) with God for His *ἴδιος πατήρ*. Being with God, yea, and being God eternally, He brings with Him to His saving work the attributes of Deity; all the love of the Father is with Him; all the resources of the Godhead are behind Him.

4. THE SON OF MAN.

The complementary title 'Son of man' occurs eleven times (perhaps twelve) in St. John's Gospel, while St. Matthew cites it three times so often. This is, as every one knows, the name of Jesus for Himself. The designation was then, as it still remains, very much of an enigma. 'Who is this Son of man?' the people asked Him a few days before His death; the expression puzzled and provoked them. Jesus nowhere explains its use; He employs it in an altogether original way, and in the most various connexions. To use it as a substitute for the first personal pronoun would have been a clumsy affectation; and our Lord does not avoid the *ego*. Aramaic philology has been busy

with the problem of late, but it has not brought us much new light. Outside the Gospels the title occurs only in the dying exclamation of Stephen; and twice in the Apocalypse, where it recalls the words of Daniel's prophecy, with a reminiscence, no doubt, of the language of Jesus. The Book of Enoch had already given currency to the expression, taking it up from the Apocalypse of Daniel (which spoke, however, not of the 'Son of man,' but of 'one like a Son of man'—*i.e.* a ruler for the kingdom of God of human guise, in contrast with the beast-figures which represented the earlier kingdoms). The Son of man of the Apocalyptic *Enoch* is identified with the Messiah, and is clothed in that character with supernatural attributes. Some of the occasions on which Jesus names Himself 'Son of man' are Messianic in import; in other instances this significance is not apparent. In the Old Testament, 'son of man,' like our expression 'child of man,' denotes human being, with a touch of pathos; in one form of the Hebrew phrase, 'the sons of men' are the men of distinction, who bear a memorable father's name. The case of Ezekiel affords a contrast, not a parallel, to that of Jesus: the prophet is addressed by God as 'Son of man'—quite another thing from calling himself so. Of Jesus the Heavenly Voice speaks as 'My Son.'

Many subtle associations and delicate shades of meaning attached to this name for Himself, which Jesus appropriated with predilection. But granting the doctrine of the Prologue to be a true interpretation of the consciousness of Jesus disclosed in John's Gospel, its significance is obvious in one chief respect. Our Lord, who was so much more than human, *identifies Himself* under it *with human nature*. He seems to say, 'Whatever else I may be, I am a man amongst men; I count myself one of you.' The designation is meaningless if it be not, in some sense, antithetical. What mere man would think of constantly declaring that he is man! Once or twice the circumstances suggest that Jesus would rather be known as 'Son of man' than 'Son of David.' He avoids the royal title of Messiahship, with its political suggestions. But if the data of the Fourth Gospel, borne out by sufficient indications in the rest, be historical, and Jesus knew from the first that 'He cometh from God and goeth to God,' the name 'Son of man' is naturally construed as the self-designation of One aware of a superhuman origin, but who not-

withstanding claims human alliance and wishes to be approached and dealt with as a man, whose breast is filled with human sympathies, who represents in His person the whole race whose form He wears and 'gives himself for the life of the world.' Our Lord's fondness for this name was in keeping with His whole demeanour, and expressed what St. Paul calls 'the mind that was in Christ Jesus,—who being in the form of God, thought not equality with God a thing for grasping at, but emptied himself,' and who, 'having come in the likeness of men,' was content to be 'found in fashion as a man.' This *usus loquendi* of Jesus became a touching remembrance for His companions, who had come to worship Him as 'Lord and God,' and could not themselves speak of Him otherwise.

In nearly all the instances where the name 'Son of man' appears in the narrative of St. John, there is a characteristic shade of reference. Our Lord in using it speaks representatively; He associates Himself with other men, but exalts them by the association. Twice we read of 'the Son of man' being 'glorified' through His passion, where the thought lies near that this glory of His is communicative, mediatorial. Thrice He speaks of 'the Son of man' being 'lifted up'—in the sight of men, to save them, to draw them to Him. Twice of the 'Son of man ascending to heaven.' Once of His having 'descended out of heaven' (Jn 3¹³)—or rather, 'the Son of man' who confronts Nicodemus is identified with him 'who descended from heaven,' and 'is in heaven' (His proper being and habitat are there); He is 'a teacher sent from God' in a loftier sense than His interlocutor had imagined. He promised His earliest disciples, on the occasion when Nathanael joined the company confessing Him 'Son of God,' that they 'shall see heaven standing open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man': they will find this lowly man amongst them in mysterious and august communion with heaven, and will learn to call Him 'Son of God' on ampler ground and with deeper meaning.

The grand passage in which Jesus declared Himself 'Son of God' before the Jews of Jerusalem, put the predicate 'Son of man' in apposition thereto; the antithesis of the Two Natures, drawn out with such labour by the Church in later centuries, springs from the twofold consciousness thus disclosed by the Lord in Himself. 'The hour

cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of *the Son of God*; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in Himself, even so gave He to the Son to have life in himself, and He gave him authority to execute judgment, because he [the Son of God] is *Son of man!* Christ's human nature qualifies Him to be God's administrator of judgment amongst men; but behind this authority He possesses, through His Divine Sonship and in virtue of His intrinsic life that is one with the Father's life, the power to restore life to mankind, in its whole range of spiritual and physical existence. Being 'Son of man,' Jesus gives the bread which feeds to life eternal; He yields His flesh for food, His blood for drink. Coming down to men as 'the Son of man,' He conveys heavenly gifts and lodges in humanity vital saving powers; as 'Son of man,' in turn going up to God—'to my Father and your Father,' He says, 'to my God and your God'—He does not discard but uplifts humanity in His person; He creates new ties between the world and God, and opens a sure way to the Father. 'The glory' of 'the Son of man' is therefore prophetic; He speaks of it to the Father as that 'which thou hast given to me,' and 'I have given to them,'—my disciples; it is a glory accruing, as St. Paul would say, to the 'firstborn among many brethren'; as the writer of the Hebrews would say—to the 'forerunner, who for us entered within the veil.' In the request of the Greeks to see Him Jesus recognizes 'the hour come when the Son of man should be glorified,' when through His fast-approaching death the solitary grain of wheat, with its external form dissolved, will multiply itself into a world-harvest, and humanity will find its glory in its Prince of Life, lifted to the cross and lifted thence to heavenly power.

5. THE CHRIST.

The designation 'Christ,' or 'the Christ,' is used quite historically in the Gospel of John (otherwise in the Epistles), referring to the Messianic kingship of Jesus as this was agitated among the Jews, especially upon the working of the more notable miracles. In John's narrative, however, the Messiahship falls comparatively into the shade, while the question of the Divine Sonship—prior theologically to the other—comes into the foreground. It is significant that in the first section of his narrative, where Jesus is introduced by

the Forerunner, while the deputation from Jerusalem ask John whether he is *the Christ*, the Baptist is represented speaking of Jesus not as 'the Christ' at all, but by two other names—as 'the Lamb of God, taking away the world's sin,' and as 'the Son of God.' Amongst the four first disciples, Andrew sees in Him 'the Messiah'; Nathanael, 'the Son of God' and 'king of Israel.' At the end of the history, to 'believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,' and to 'have life in his name,' are stated as the sum of faith and the purpose for which every word of the Gospel has been set down.

After all that St. John has told us, 'the Son of God' is seen to be a designation rising infinitely above the Jewish conception of 'the Christ.' But in the usage of the Apostolic Church, the former of these names of Jesus came to reflect increasingly its higher sense upon the latter. 'Christ,' in the developed language of St. Paul, becomes the proper name of the living and exalted Divine-human Saviour, Son both of God and man ('of David's seed,' 'born of a woman'). In the Epistles of John, 'Christ' is relatively an infrequent term, and appears with a connotation widely removed from the Messianism of St. John's early days. Twice it stands out in emphatic predicative use, reminding us of the conclusion of the Gospel just referred to (Jn 20³¹). The man 'who denies that Jesus is the Christ' is branded as the liar of liars; on the other hand, he 'who believes that Jesus is the Christ,' is 'begotten of God.' The faith 'that Jesus is the Christ' and 'that Jesus is the Son of God' are practically tantamount. The *Anti-Christ* 'denies the Father and the Son.' The word *Christ* by this time has been long associated with our Lord's Divinity; it is His humanity that now stands in question. St. John is confronting not Jewish opponents of the Messiahship of Jesus outside of the Church, but Gnostic theosophists who claimed to stand within it, and who severed 'the Christ' as a Divine emanation, or element of being, from 'Jesus,' in whom they found a purely human person. The Christ had descended upon Jesus, investing Him with mysterious powers; but He could not be one with Jesus, since the Eternal cannot mix with flesh and blood; in fact, the Divine companion left Him on the cross. This error, by dissolving the unity of God and man in Jesus Christ, destroyed the essential revelation of God in Him and reduced His salvation to

a docetic show. The Gnostic heresy, in the form in which it is traversed in the First Epistle of John, presupposes the doctrine of the Two Natures in Jesus Christ; it presumes that to the name Christ the connotation of Deity had been finally attached in the recognized vocabulary of the Church. The word 'Christ,' by itself, had come to include 'the Lord' and 'Christ,' 'the Christ, the Son of God' of earlier apostolic speech.

To this transformation of the primitive Messianic idea St. John's teaching had contributed all along. Behind the conception of 'the Lord Jesus Christ,' which fills St. Paul's Epistles and inspired his life, lay the traditions of the life and work of Jesus as they are contained not only in the Synoptic but in the Johannine record. Long antecedent to the written Gospel of John, his oral Gospel had been in vogue, diffused perhaps more privately and intimately, but not less effectively, than that of Peter which gave shape to the Synoptic testimony. John, when Paul met him at Jerusalem in the year 49, was no cipher, but a 'pillar' of the Church; and his influence, though quiet, must have deeply affected Christian thought in the inner circles all through the Apostolic Age.

Once St. John writes of 'confessing *Jesus*' as the crucial point; for the Gnostics, professing to accept the spiritual and supramundane (æonian) Christ of the Church's tradition, denied to Jesus real identity with Him, on the ground that the Infinite cannot coalesce with the finite, nor pure spirit enclose itself in flesh. But this paradox was the essence of John's Gospel and the climax of all revelation; the inconceivability of metaphysics is the attested fact of the apostolic witness: 'The Word became flesh, and we have seen his glory'; 'what we have seen with our eyes and our hands have handled concerning the Word of Life—the eternal Life that was with the Father and was manifested to us—we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us.'

6. THE TWOFOLD NATURE AND THE SAVING WORK.

The various emblems by which our Lord pictures His saving work in the Fourth Gospel have behind them His consciousness of a twofold fellowship, embracing at once the earthly and heavenly spheres, the sense of His derivation from God and kinship with men; they describe

the vocation of One sent into the world on an errand of redemption, to return accomplishing His task only through the experience of a sacrificial death. He gives the 'living water,' which slakes human thirst for ever and becomes in each man a fountain springing from eternal depths and pouring itself out in rivers of spiritual influence. He 'has come as a light into the world,' and is 'the world's light,' banishing darkness from the path of those who follow Him, and bringing the saving knowledge of God for all; He opens the blind man's eyes in Jerusalem in token of this world-office, and 'doing the works' of 'the Father that sent' Him 'while it is day.' He is 'the bread of life coming down from God,' who offers Himself in flesh and blood, that men by this means may eat and drink of Him through faith. He is as the serpent-figure raised by Moses in the sight of the dying Israelites, allaying the fever and destroying the venom of sin in those who look to Him with faith. While that predictive symbol represents Jesus in His sacrifice objectively, as the mark of a saving faith, the opposite figure of the 'corn of wheat' that sinks dying into the earth, represents, subjectively, His experience of the sacrifice in its painful self-inanition. He is 'the resurrection and the life,' as the raising of Lazarus testified, the Son of God giving spiritual life at this hour to those who hear His voice, and destined under the Father's commission at a future hour to summon from their graves the buried multitudes of mankind to receive judgment from His mouth. To 'his own that are in the world' Jesus is, in His own words, 'the Lord and the Teacher,' beside whom they can set no other; He washes their feet before supper with the sublime and joyous condescension of one who 'came from God and goes to God.' He is 'the door' of God's flock, both for sheep and shepherds; and Himself 'the good shepherd,' who owns the sheep and lays down life for them, whose sacrifice for their redemption and guidance of their course will make the flock of men truly one, gathered round Him at last from many folds; 'none can pluck them' from His hand, as 'none can pluck them' from the Father's. He is 'the vine' of God, of which all men who bear true fruit are branches—a vine that the Father tends with unceasing care and prunes with an unsparing hand, since it must yield 'much fruit,' and will thus realize for God and man the purpose with which it was planted in earthly soil.

7. THE LAMB OF GOD.

These saving offices Jesus fulfils because He is, as the Baptist manifested Him to Israel, 'the lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.' This was the earliest title given to our Lord, after that of 'the Word,' in the prologue of St. John's Gospel. Coming in there, as a kind of superscription, it reminds us of the etymology of the name 'Jesus' on the opening page of St. Matthew. The Apostle John's account of the successive days of his introduction to his Master is precise and clear; if anything be historical in the Fourth Gospel, the record of its first chapter is so. A second day the Baptist, as he looks on Jesus, exclaims, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' John and Andrew, hearing this repeated, follow Jesus. The Baptist's preaching of repentance had made them ripe for faith in the Remover of Sin. In this sense they accepted Jesus. The sentence above quoted may be taken as the text of John's conversion. His Gospel, Apocalypse, and First Epistle are linked together by it. On *the Lamb of God*, the world's sin-bearer, the elder John had 'seen the Spirit descending' to abide, that out of his fulness Jesus may baptize all men 'in the Holy Spirit.'

The paschal lamb was surely in the mind both of the speaker and of writer of this passage,—the Lamb whose blood saves those sheltered by it from destruction, whose flesh is the food of the redeemed on their pilgrimage. At the same time, as later interpretation shows, the vicarious sacri-

ficial 'lamb' of Isaiah 53 presented itself under this term,—the innocent Servant of Jehovah, who is stricken for His people's transgression and bears their iniquities, winning thus for them forgiveness and a new life of righteousness. Recalling the Baptist's saying and associating it with the image drawn by the Deutero-Isaiah, John speaks in his Epistle of 'Jesus Christ the righteous' as our 'advocate with the Father,' who has offered 'propitiation for the whole world' and who returned to God, presents a just plea for the remission of human sin. Cleansing from sin and the impartation of the Spirit of God are the two supreme bestowments of Jesus: these were the subjects of the Forerunner's great prophecy (of which the Evangelist John was bound to cherish a faithful remembrance). No merely human servant of God can exercise such powers as these: the apostle's first master, unless his memory has betrayed him, said at the same time concerning the Lamb of God and the Communicator of the Spirit, 'I have seen and have borne witness that this is *the Son of God*.' How much the Baptist realized of the awful meaning of this title, as he looked on Jesus, it may be difficult to say. What the Apostle John learned to understand by it, is surely clear enough. *Son of God, Lamb of God, Giver of the Spirit*—this is the Johannine Christ.

'Now unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father; to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.'

At the Literary Table.

Anglo-Jewish Literature in 5664.

THE revival in Jewish literature that has been noticeable in England as well as in other states during the last decade, has been well exemplified by the literary output in England and the United States during the Jewish year 5664 just closed. Not only have more books on Jewish topics been written and read by Jews of late years, but the study of Jewish literature and Jewish history is being popularized throughout the English-speaking world by organizations created for that specific

purpose. Thus of late years the Union of Jewish Literary Societies, with its forty constituent societies, including the Jewish Historical Society and the Jewish Study Society, has come into being. The Maccabæans also, in whose programme is included the discussion of topics of Jewish interest, is but a decade old. A further move forward has been the adaptation to an English environment of the Jewish Chautauqua movement, and the proposed establishment of a Jewish Historical Museum will be in the same line of progress. In the United States during the same period, great