

infinitely characteristic *heightening* of the O.T. formulation which shines from other beatitudes of our Lord? Not to insist further that, when the Kingdom of God has been promised, an inheritance either of the 'earth' or of the 'land' fades into insignificance.

Passing on, we notice that Christ's second beatitude as well as His first was formulated already in Is 61. And we notice, too, that the Matthean form grows out of the prophetic words, as the Lucan form does not. 'He hath sent me to comfort all that mourn;' 'Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.' Would it really have been worthy of Messiah to make what we may surely call the cheaper announcement, that they laugh best who laugh last?

An argument on the opposite side may possibly be thought to arise out of the fact that Luke's four beatitudes present the aspect of paradox more than those other beatitudes do which stand by their side in the Matthean text. It is a good thing to be poor; to be sad; to be hungry; to be persecuted;—if these sayings stood by themselves, they would ring indeed paradoxically, much more so than the companion sayings: It is good to be merciful; to be pure in heart; to be a peacemaker. But then, the paradox-element is *not* thus emphasized within the Beatitudes. Elsewhere in the Sermon on the Mount it is indeed present, and clamours for recognition. But the promises, following sharp upon the formulation of divinely appointed conditions, dissolve anything of the nature of paradox and suffuse the

future with a blaze of glory. Blessed indeed, manifestly blessed, is it to be an heir of God's Kingdom, to be destined for God's comfort, to be filled with God's fullness.

This introduces us to a final argument in support of our thesis. According to Matthew, Christ twice over promises the Kingdom of heaven—to the poor (or 'poor in spirit'), and to the persecuted; to the latter, obviously, because their constancy has been tested, and because God has carried them through and given them victory. And then follows, *in the second person*, still another reiteration of the same thought—'Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you,' etc. This puts the coping-stone upon the whole edifice. Correspondingly, at this point, the great Speaker feels Himself at liberty to expand out of all proportion to the narrow limits of a Beatitude proper. And Luke's Beatitude (number four) contains the expansion: but *the balancing woe (number four) contains nothing similar*. Does not this circumstance plainly betray the secondary character of the text which has arisen from Lucan or from pre-Lucan manipulation?

Of course, in arguing for the superiority of the general Matthean handling, one makes no claim on its behalf for verbal infallibility. We admit the probability that the smaller Matthean expansions ('in spirit,' 'after righteousness') may be glosses. Still they deserve honourable recognition as helpful glosses, corresponding to the inner mind of Jesus, even if the *ipsissima verba* did not fall from His lips.

Two Johannine Parentheses.

BY THE REVEREND HUBERT M. FOSTON, D.LIT., OF HATHERN (LOUGHBOROUGH).

THAT stormy, outright incident of the expulsion of the traffickers from the Temple, took place, we gather from Mark (11¹⁵), on the second day of the last visit of Jesus to Jerusalem. Matthew (21¹²) and Luke (19⁴⁵), in different ways, seize on it for use in vivid frontispiece to their whole accounts of His controversial relations with the sordid city chiefs. John (2¹⁵) does the same thing. But his account of such matters begins at an earlier point; and the frontispiece falls earlier. We

shall observe that he places it in quite distinct parenthesis.

And once again John shows Jesus coming to Jerusalem in passover-time (12¹). But here, where the three evangelists begin to be concerned with the controversy, he is concerned less with the controversy, more with the intimacy of His parting with His disciples. For this he needs a different frontispiece. He chooses the story of the supper at Bethany—setting it in parenthesis

almost exactly as he set the other. Let us trace his procedure.

I.

John is unlike the other evangelists, in giving us a glimpse of the traffickers in the Temple *twice*. We see them, first (2¹⁴), settled just as they have been for years, without disturbance; and then, just after (2¹⁵), in the comprehensive avalanche that all the evangelists show. It is striking to observe how he has arranged the two glimpses. In his first scene of settlement, he has appropriately set the established objects down in the order of their mass, with the largest and heaviest first—'oxen, and sheep, and doves'—and with the changers of money composedly 'sitting.' In the changed glimpse, he has deliberately arranged them in the order of their various capacity for being put in movement! And the effect of expulsion heaving up, here, there, and all over, and slackening down only with the exhaustion of material, is without parallel, so far as I know, in literature.

First in the cataract that Jesus sets in action, you have things that possess locomotive power of their own—live sheep and oxen; then you have things that Jesus Himself moves—the money and the tables; and last, what He Himself does not set in motion. And if you look closer, this order of movement rules the inner details of the assembled items from the beginning to the end.

The large kine are naturally most conspicuous to sight when all are at rest; and they were first in view when we looked before (with the sheep after). Now (with a flick in the Greek, *τά τε*), the light, scampering sheep are first, breaking forth from the Temple and heading the rout; with the heavy kine appropriately lumbering after. Of the lifeless things which Jesus Himself sets in motion, the small coins are first: pour them out—they come with a gush, springing and ringing on the floor, and then rolling in all directions. The more stolid tables, upset (*ἀν-*), do but heave over, perhaps slide a little, and so remain. And finally, least mobile are the doves, captive and tender. These their owners are ordered to carry out: and the scene is closed. So the movement flows out to the last borders of its scope. Have you not seen the overturning of a barrel of grain, with the current over the edge flowing like water, and the mass sliding down behind—while, as you lift the barrel, the last remaining grains detach them-

selves and fall away? The thing is as complete as that. And as you look, does it not occur to you, that if we would see the rout of blank and eyeless evils that have lurked long and composedly in world and Church—see them going, losing all hold, and leaving behind no provision for their ever coming back again—we must wait on the liberation of the personal energies of Jesus in our midst?

Now trace the parenthesis. This is how John began: '*And the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem; and He found . . .*' Then, through the transparency of the Gospel, we see how what He found was ultimately dealt with (really on the last visit—which the *second* glimpse brings suddenly near in view). Then John simply resumes (2²³) his story of the first visit: '*But when He was in Jerusalem, in the passover, in the feast . . .*' And the story of the traffickers lies between—in parenthesis which, it may be seen, has extended even beyond the resurrection.¹

II.

Mary, very conscious that Jesus is going away, sees Him now in just such a scene of rest as He Himself has often used in imaging forth the fellowship beyond the veil. Martha, indeed, looks earthly enough: hot and busy with her dishes in this hour of impending tragedy (she is construing her opportunities too much after the present manner of what we call 'the church on earth'). But (*δέ*) Lazarus, with the light of life in his eye, reclines with Jesus at table, fit image of those who shall be with Him, where 'they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat.'

But Jesus Himself is *here* yet; with His noble heart under stress. She knows: she seizes what remains of *earth's* unique opportunity of contact with the Master. And in a movement like a little silent poem, she has uttered herself straight to His heart, with a freedom, perhaps, that no prose of spoken words dare have assumed. She has broken her alabaster box, and has pressed upon Him, so soon to depart, in a devotion present and human even to the very hairs of her head. So He has *this* touch, ere He comes to the ache and fever of

¹ A full stop is required after *καθημένους*, *sitting*. See below on *ποιήσας*, *having made*. *δέ*, as resumptive, is exactly translated by our English 'but.' For discussion of Johannine characteristics (2²³⁻²⁵), see appended Note.

the cross: this still reminder of all that He has been, and yet shall be, to men.

Any one might see that a violet is irregular in shape, without being able to look into the little chasm of its unutterable beauty: Mary's action is criticised. But what expansion of sympathy—likely to prove worth more than three hundred pence to needy souls about her—did she gain, when she came so close to the most unselfish Sufferer that earth has ever seen? And—'Me ye have not always': so the story ends.

And what if, as He is so near His going to the Father, the pages of this Gospel are presently suffused with a rare light as when the vaporuous sun gilds valley and clouds into one likeness to the gate of paradise? One thing forget not. Let Mary, from this frontispiece, remind you that the sense of *the strange, but intelligible, glory of His presence on earth* must never be lost sight of, even amid the brightest thoughts of His glory in the unseen world.

But how is this story set? 'So six days before the passover, Jesus came to Bethany, where was Lazarus, whom JESUS raised from the dead'—then the story: then the resumption—'So the ordinary folk of the Jews learned of his being there, and came, not on account of Jesus only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom He raised from the dead.' Across the story of Mary, exactly the same topics are resumed. But note the antithesis. As Jesus comes up to die, the risen Lazarus reminds us, *simply*, of the transcendent dawning force of life in Him—in Jesus, in JESUS (*bis*)—that can never be holden of death. But then the people—is it not exactly John?—come and make *Lazarus raised* a sort of *additional* interest, beside Jesus. The Centre of attraction is effectively there, but not quite allowed the *all-transfiguring* predominance that makes its help most full. (As in Jn 2²³⁻²⁵, there is an interest in Jesus that does not quite free itself from the interferences arising out of His environment¹—a wonderfully subtle touch, after Bethany!)

So at the beginning of the first, and the beginning of the last visit to Jerusalem, you have a story (appearing *elsewhere* in the other Gospels) placed here in vivid introduction to what will follow; and, in each case, a previously visible thread of narrative picks up afresh with perfect

¹ See Note below.

cleanness after it. Such clearly witnessed and parallel parentheses have the marks, not of coincidence, but of method.

At what exact point, in each case, does the parenthesis really part off? The pivot in each case is in the verb *ποιέω*, *make* (2¹⁵ 12²). In each instance something is *made* that may well have taken longer than appears at first sight. 'They therefore made him a supper there' means that the coming of Jesus to Bethany set the idea of the supper going (*ἐποίησαν οὖν*); and, as a probably semi-public affair, it might take a day or two to arrange. In the other instance, Jesus takes note of the abuse in the Temple, 'and having made a whip of small cords,' or of rushes from the floor . . . And does John see but one scourge in the case? Feeble, downtrodden individuals, like rushes from the floor, assembled with one mind in a crowd, and held in some one's hand, may bring home the sting and the shame, of terror to sordid and craven oppressors, who would never yield to truth, but only to fear of force. Such a scourge (for show and shaming, rather than use and smiting) was not yet ready at the opening of the ministry; but it was ready at the end. So the two makings may seem unobtrusively to work out the required intervals for the stories.

NOTE.—As the beginning of Jn 2²³⁻²⁵ forms a pillar of parenthesis, it seems desirable to examine its substance.

When he was in Jerusalem, in, etc.—veils for His freshness—*many believed on his name, beholding the signs, etc.* The phrase means quite vital personal belief. *But Jesus himself was not committing himself to them.* Reserved, (impf.), independent (*αὐτός*), sagacity of a young teacher from the country, even with a section of the metropolis at His feet to offer Him his apparent opportunity! But these 'good Christian people' were really quite too denominationally 'in Jerusalem, etc.,' for Him to present a developed manifestation to the world under their ready-to-hand but disguising auspices; He must not hide His light under their bushel. His knowledge kept a clear, sufficient course of its own. If, in one aspect, it was a comparatively young peasant's knowledge (mark his advance—retirement, village Cana, provincial Capernaum for a moment, *metropolitan Jerusalem*), it was not of a kind that could be supplemented by the experience of men of affairs and wide travel—not the sort that misses the fresh realities of things through *information*. *He was in no need that any should witness to him concerning man: for HIMSELF*—feelingly: His faculty sprang from a rich unspoiled humanity, that could recognize the very heart of what was human—*himself was conscious* (impf.), *of what was in man*.

Who but John could hide so much of life's finer learning under a veil of so much simplicity; or keeping in touch with the human, so suggest the Divine? Of course it is unique;

but hidden uniqueness is John's way: there is no surer way to [miss him than to think you know where to have him. (For a sufficient parallel of reflective manner, take 12^{27ff.})

Mr. Strachan (EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xxvii. p. 233) points out peculiarities which he thinks mark 2²³⁻²⁵ as not Johannine. But, first, I do not see anything here to put the belief outside the range of 1¹². And the uniqueness of πιστεύω as *entrust* is in accordance with its N.T. rarity, and exactly answered by its Lucan uniqueness, 16¹¹. As for the shifting ray of *trust*, *entrust*, you must hardly be surprised at any form of antithesis in John. There is a precisely similar *trust* in expression in 1¹¹, merely smaller in turn—'His own (things, ἰδια). . . His own (people,

ἰδιοι)': and curious word-sensitiveness in the ghastly close characterization of δια-βόλου ἤδη βε-βληκότος, 13². And if μαρτυρέω, in human relation, is just saved from uniqueness by the existence of a *third* (brief) epistle (v. 12), how many more *hapax legomena* might be dissolved by the existence of three hundred? (3²⁸ 7¹ 13²¹ do not seem to hold a *strictly* specialized use in very safe keeping). How far, by the way, would you have to read in John's Epistles to find one of his verbal surprises? (ἐψηλάφησαν).

(The syntactical jut of ἀ πολεῖ, projecting the existent *matter-of-fact*—contrasted with His withholding, 2¹⁸—resembles the positional jut of εἰσὶν, 14²—the same syntactical instinct.)

Entre Nous.

SOME TEXTS.

2 Cor. i. 8.

'We were pressed out of measure.' The Greek means 'worried out of our lives.' 'A curious case, perhaps unique, in which English possesses a colloquialism the exact counterpart of the Greek. It would, however, be a mistranslation for all that, for the reason that having become colloquial it has lost something of the pathos of its Greek original. In a passage of real pathos, to speak of renderings as happy or unhappy would savour perhaps of double entendre. Suffice it to say that Weymouth's is flat; Way's almost maudlin, and Moffatt's ("crushed more than I could stand") frankly barbarous. 20th Cent. renders well: "We were burdened altogether beyond our strength, so much so that we even despaired of life."¹

2 Cor. viii. 2.

'A great trial (δοκιμή) of affliction.' This word δοκιμή 'is evacuated of much spiritual value when it is translated "trial" (e.g. Rutherford—"afflictions which try them sorely"). The word "trial" denotes a testing or ordeal. The Greek for such trial is πειρασμός, always rendered "temptation." It does not carry with it any implication as to the result of the test or ordeal. δοκιμή does not mean a process at all: it describes only the result of a process, and only a favourable result: it means the recognition of that merit which has been proved by the ordeal. When the δοκιμή or approval is

¹ W. H. Isaacs, *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, 42.

obtained the πειρασμός or trial is all over, and happily over. Rom. v. 4, "Patience earns approval, and approval carries with it the happy anticipation of reward." 1 Pet. i. 7, "Your faith has stood the test, and the approval so earned is far more precious than gold."¹

Heb. xi. 1.

The Rev. Alexander Nairne, D.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, is the author of one of the best interpretations of the Epistle to the Hebrews ever written, greatly favoured though that Epistle has been. He was a sure choice for the Revised Version edition of *The Epistle to the Hebrews* in the Cambridge series (Cambridge: at the University Press; 7s. 6d. net). It is a strong book. There is no repetition of comment. He sees the meaning of his author directly and expresses it forcibly. The Introduction also, which fills more than half the volume, is a masterpiece of condensed knowledge. The section in which a comparison is made between the A.V. and R.V. translations is particularly useful, and the more welcome that it is so rare. Of other translations Dr. Nairne prefers Moffatt's earlier translation in his *Historical New Testament*. We may quote his note here on He 11¹.

'Translations into modern English, such as Weymouth's or *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, are less acceptable for Hebrews than for other parts of N.T. Moffatt's earlier translation in his *Historical New Testament* (T. & T. Clark) does preserve something of the peculiar flavour

¹ *Ibid.* 57.