

by means of extraordinary spiritual capacities. And, next, it acknowledges that after His death there occurred to His disciples visions of Himself which were not mere subjective delusions, and which confirm—for them and for us—the fact of His continued life and love for His followers.

Mr. Inge's paper is on the Person of Christ, and he has much to say about the miracles in the Gospels, but we pass him over for a moment. Mr. Wild writes on the Teaching of Christ.

Now in an essay on the Teaching of Christ Mr. Wild need not have touched the question of miracles. It would have been better, perhaps, if he had not touched it. But he cannot help himself. He is under the spell of the spirit of the age. He sees, as all the responsible exponents of the Teaching of Christ now see, that the teaching and the miracles are bound together. And yet he comes as near to separating them and then rejecting the miracles as it is possible for a scholar now to come.

Mr. Wild divides the miracles into classes. He places his different classes 'in a certain perspective.' In the dim background are some isolated actions, like the transference of the devils to the Gadarene swine and the cursing of the barren fig tree, which he cannot explain. Nearer the foreground are acts which seem more consistent with

the character and personality of Christ, such as the raising of Lazarus from the dead, which demand more evidence for certainty than at present we possess. Finally, and in the forefront, the cases of spiritual healing. The last are in no sense inconceivable to modern thought or modern science. Possibly they are the foundation of all the other stories in a wondering age.

Mr. Inge, we have mentioned, has much to say about the miraculous. How could he avoid it in writing on the Person of Christ? And he sees, as the others we have mentioned scarcely see, or partly ignore, that the miracles cannot be separated from the Person of Christ. To separate them from His Teaching may be possible; from His Person, says Mr. Inge, it is not possible to separate them.

Mr. Inge admits that the miracles in the Gospels cannot be established upon historical evidence alone. There is not historical evidence for any past event that will make it impossible to deny that event. But the miracles of the Gospels do not rest upon historical evidence alone. Ultimately they rest upon the Person of Christ. And even as a historical critic Mr. Inge holds that belief in the Person of Christ, such belief as includes the Incarnation,—and the Incarnation includes all we consider miraculous,—is essential to the Christianity of history and of to-day.

## The Priesthood without Pedigree.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. BENJAMIN W. BACON, D.D., YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE author of Hebrews has two Psalms which form the foundation for his (or her?) argument in behalf of the supreme authority of Christ, and which are intermingled in the two preliminary chapters. That first developed is Ps 8, the use of which our author borrows from Paul, along with the doctrine of Christ as the 'appointed Heir of all things through whom God made the

worlds'<sup>1</sup> (1<sup>2</sup>; cf. Gal 4<sup>1-7</sup>, Ro 4<sup>13</sup> 8<sup>16-21</sup>, 1 Co 8<sup>6</sup> 15<sup>24-28</sup>, Col 1<sup>16-19</sup>, Eph 1<sup>22</sup> 3<sup>9</sup>, Ph 2<sup>10</sup>; cf. Rev 21<sup>5-7</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> On the Pauline doctrine of the *κληρονομία* resting on Gn 1<sup>26-28</sup>, Ps 8<sup>6</sup>, and Mk 12<sup>1-12</sup>, identical with the contemporary doctrine of the Pharisees (cf. *Assumpt. Mos.* 1<sup>12-14</sup>, *Apoc. Bar.* 14<sup>18f.</sup> 15<sup>7</sup> 21<sup>24</sup>, 2 Es 6<sup>55. 59</sup> 7<sup>11</sup> 8<sup>1. 44</sup> 9<sup>13</sup>), and transmitted to the earliest Fathers in the form, 'God created the world on behalf of the Church' (Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4. 1; *Mand.* xii. 4; Justin, *Apol.* i. 10; ii. 4. 5, *Dial.* xli.; Irenæus,

It serves him as the basis of his cosmology. That which he develops next, in chap. 5 to 7, is Ps 110, the use of which he derives by oral or written tradition from Jesus (cf. Mt 22<sup>41-45</sup>), in this respect also following the example of Paul, who, in 1 Co 15<sup>25-27</sup>, as well as in Eph 1<sup>20-22</sup>, and throughout the Epistle (cf. 4<sup>7-10</sup>), conjoins the doctrine of creation as the inheritance destined for the 'adoption,' with that of the ascension to the right hand of God, Paul also yoking together Ps 110<sup>1</sup> and Ps 8<sup>6</sup>. This serves our author as the basis of his soteriology (2<sup>17</sup> 4<sup>14</sup> 5<sup>10</sup> 6<sup>20</sup> 7<sup>26</sup> 8<sup>1</sup> 9<sup>24</sup>). It is characteristic of his pre-eminently rhetorical method that, in his exordium (He 1<sup>2-3</sup>), he should link the two together, 'a Son of God whom He appointed Heir of all things, through whom also He made the worlds; who . . . when He had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.'

These two conceptions, Pauline and pre-Pauline, are the most vital and essential of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and are employed by its author, as Paul had employed them, against a superstitious Judaism which treated the law as 'an ordinance of angels,' turning its ceremonial into magic, in a 'gratuitous self-humiliation and worship of the angels' (Col 2<sup>8</sup>. 16<sup>-19</sup>). Its real significance is quite overlooked when we ignore this superstitious tendency of contemporary Judaism, not to say of Christianity as well.<sup>1</sup> But we are concerned at present with only a single feature in our author's exposition of his second fundamental passage, Ps 110, the use of which rests, as we have seen,

*Her.* v. 29. 1, etc.), see my contribution to the Bicentennial volume of the Yale Semitic and Biblical Faculty, *Historical and Critical Contributions*, pp. 242-247.

<sup>1</sup> Von Soden (Holtzmann's *Handkommentar ad loc.* p. 20), is both correct and incorrect in saying, 'Als eine Polemik gegen Engelverehrung ist der . . . Abschnitt, 1<sup>4-14</sup> nicht zu deuten.' It is true that the wrong influence to which the readers are exposed is neo-Judaism, and the superiority everywhere argued for the Christian faith a superiority to the Old Covenant, but the characteristic feature of the author's anti-Judaism is missed unless we recognize his assumption that this Old Covenant is 'an ordinance of angels.' This is a point of departure, as in Stephen's speech, Ac 7<sup>53</sup>, the fragment of *Κεργμα Petri* in Cl. Al. *Strom.* vi. 5. 43, and kindred writings. On Jewish magic and conjuration of angels and demons of this period, see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 322-336, especially the quotation from the supposed letter of Hadrian to Servianus describing the Jews and Christians of Egypt as all 'astrologers, aruspices, and quacksalvers.'

primarily upon Synoptic tradition rather than on Paul. As the point is of some importance, it is well to note that the doctrine of the Ascension must be connected directly with the implied application by Jesus to Himself of the words, 'The Lord said unto my lord, Sit thou on My right hand,' etc.; for the appeal to the pentecostal gifts as evidence of fulfilment of this Messianic promise in the Petrine speech, Ac 2<sup>32-36</sup>, is not derived from the similar argument in Eph 4<sup>7-12</sup>, but both descend by independent lines from the saying of Jesus itself (cf. Ac 2<sup>33-34</sup> and Eph 4<sup>7-12</sup> 1<sup>20</sup>, Col 3<sup>1</sup> with Mt 22<sup>43-45</sup>).

Enhanced as it was in significance to the utmost degree by the enigmatic saying of Jesus, we cannot be surprised at the paramount influence of Ps 110 in the formative period of Christological doctrine. God had 'given Him the name which is above every name' (*i.e.* *Κύριος*, Ph 2<sup>9</sup>; cf. Mt 22<sup>43</sup>, 'David in the Spirit calleth Him "Lord"'); to confess Christ was to declare that 'Jesus is Lord' (1 Co 12<sup>9</sup>). On this name of 'Lord,' therefore, whosoever called should be saved according to promise (Ac 2<sup>21</sup> 4<sup>12</sup>; cf. Ro 10<sup>13</sup>). 'The Name' became a technical term for Christianity (Ac 5<sup>41</sup>). Again, confession of Jesus as standing or sitting 'at the right hand of God' ('Sit Thou at My right hand') was the essence of that 'blasphemy' (Ac 26<sup>11</sup>) which provoked the death of Stephen (Ac 7<sup>55-56</sup>) and the persecution of Saul. No wonder the Church incorporated in its earliest creed the declaration that its Lord had not only risen from the dead, but that 'He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father.'

Our author, accordingly, in devoting so large a part of his Epistle to an exposition of Ps 110, is giving it no disproportionate prominence; especially when we consider the superstitious tendencies he was opposing. With him, as with Paul, the doctrine of the Ascension to the right hand of God is the one sure weapon to be employed against that superstitious and bastard Judaism which used the ordinances of the law as 'a worship of the angels,' a 'philosophy and vain deceit after the *στοιχία τοῦ κόσμου*,' and, accordingly, his necessary resort is to the classic Psalm of the Ascension. Only, as we all know, his conception of Christ's entering into heaven is not so much in the character of King, as in that of High Priest. In other words, in using the Psalm, he makes special development of the 4th verse, 'The

Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek'; for this was part of that accepted description of the Messiah as David in the Spirit had conceived Him, which had the sanction of Jesus' own undisputed example. Our more particular inquiry, however, is this: How did he come to conceive of Melchizedek, or at least the priesthood of Melchizedek, as 'without father, without mother, without a genealogy'?

Let us turn for a moment to Jesus' use of the Psalm, and see both what is implied in the original intent of the Psalmist, and what is the purpose of Jesus, and, finally, what was understood by believers after the Resurrection.

Even before the discovery of the acrostic so clearly set forth by Bickell, Duhm, and others, most recently by Dr. A. Duff in his *Hebrew Grammar* (1901), and which decisively establishes the date of Ps 110 as within the reign of Simon the Maccabee,<sup>1</sup> it was quite obvious that it belonged to the Maccabean period. Then alone since the times of Abraham had Jerusalem a dynasty of priest-kings 'after the order of Melchizedek,' though Zec 6<sup>13</sup> is evidence that some such hope had been cherished even before Simon assumed in his own person the prerogatives of the Davidic monarchy and Zadokite high-priesthood. If by the Pharisees, as we know, this came to be regarded as an unpardonable usurpation, it is equally certain that it was not and could not have been accomplished without the hearty approval of a people who, as a whole, made themselves 'a free-will offering in the day of his power.' It is from one of these that comes the coronation ode wherein the patriotic, and hence unavoidably Messianic, hopes of that age of unparalleled divine deliverance are expressed.<sup>2</sup> If we follow the usual

<sup>1</sup> The four initial letters of the four strophes spell the name Simon (שמון). It is perhaps worth noting that Pss 111 and 112 are also acrostic.

<sup>2</sup> First Maccabees expresses the complete independence of Judea first achieved under Simon by saying, 'The yoke of the Gentiles was taken away from Israel.' Expression was given to the fact by the adoption of a new era dating 'according to the year of Simon as high priest and prince of the Jews' (Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People*, § 7, p. 257). Simon was proclaimed hereditary high priest by a popular decree, 141-140 B.C. (1 Mac 14<sup>25-49</sup>). The terms of the decree, which declared him ἀρχιερεύς, στρατηγός, and ἐθνάρχης, and that 'forever, until there should arise a faithful prophet' were engraved on brazen tablets, and these set up in the court of the temple. On the union of Messianic and

rendering<sup>3</sup> of v.<sup>4</sup>, we must suppose with the author of Hebrews that the Psalmist reverts to a chapter whose insertion in Genesis belongs to the very latest period, though its contents are perhaps in part derived from very ancient Babylonian sources. We must suppose that he compares the royalty of his liege in Jerusalem to that of the priest-king of God Most High who came from Jerusalem to bless Abram, returning from the rescue of Lot (Gn 14). In any event he bids his hero see how Yahweh will make him his vicegerent upon earth; for now, on this day of his enthronement in Jerusalem, Yahweh invites him to ascend to the heavenly throne, sit beside the supreme King, and witness how the nations that oppressed Jerusalem shall be humbled beneath his feet.

So splendid a vision of the heir of the Davidic rule whom God should Himself enthrone, albeit its author's attention was primarily directed only to one of the greatest of the Maccabean heroes, was worthy to be taken by Jesus to counteract the meaner, more servile views of the Pharisees. Doubtless the true origin of the Psalm was then completely lost; but Jesus really enters into the broader spirit of its author when He protests against the idea that the king through whom God will grant His deliverance to Zion must be by demonstrable descent and pedigree a literal Son of David. 'If he be David's lord, how can he be his son?' Jesus would no more have sympathized with the Pharisaic literalists who opposed the assumption of the high-priestly and the royal prerogatives by the Maccabean dynasty, on the ground that their pedigree could be traced neither to David nor to Zadok, than He sympathized with the Pharisees of His own day.<sup>4</sup> His argument does not depend upon, although it of course assumes, the Davidic authorship of the Psalm; for its essence is this, that the Messianic function is

Maccabean hopes in this period, see Wellhausen's note on Ps 110<sup>4</sup> in *S.B.O.T.*, ed. of Haupt, Engl. text.

<sup>3</sup> So Cheyne and Wellhausen.

<sup>4</sup> The actual breaking away of the Pharisees as a distinct political party on the ground of opposition to the assumption of the high-priestly and royal prerogatives by the Maccabean dynasty occurred some ten years later than the popular decree, under John Hyrcanus (entitled on the coinage of his reign, 'John the High Priest, Prince of the Commonwealth of the Jews'). Their opposition, however, must have been latent from the time of the decree itself. From the time of John Hyrcanus they appear as the party of strict constructionists or 'zealots for the law.'

too great a thing to be made a matter of pedigree and genealogy.

And it is upon this essential feature of the argument that the author of Hebrews has wisely fixed in the development of his doctrine of the priestly function of the Messiah. Was there a disposition to cling with mysterious awe to the elaborate ceremonial of the Mosaic law, as of magical value for conjuration of angels and world-elements; a magnifying of 'endless genealogies, Jewish fables, strifes and fightings about the law'; an obscuration of the direct access by one Spirit unto the Father, secured to Jew and Gentile alike by the atoning death of Christ (Eph 2<sup>18</sup>)? Then it was time to fall back upon what Jesus Himself had said as to His Messiahship as not a matter of pedigree, and to point out that just as He had argued from Scripture that His right to the throne of David was not a matter of physical descent, so in the very same Scripture it was implied that He has also a priesthood superseding that of Aaron, and that the characteristic of this priesthood is that it is 'without father, without mother, without genealogy,' a priesthood forever after the order of Melchizedek.

Is it then, as is so universally assumed, because the figure of Melchizedek is introduced in Gn 14 with so little preparation, without mention of his descent, that our author is led to characterize Him in this extraordinary manner as 'without father, without mother, without genealogy'? Not at all! There is nothing exceptional on this score either in

Gn 14 or Ps 110 in the figure of Melchizedek. No one would expect mention of His father or mother or genealogy. If anywhere, we should expect it in the case of Jethro the priest-king of Midian. Our author in thus characterizing the Melchizedekian priesthood, is simply following the example of Jesus in the matter of the Davidic monarchy. Neither His kingly nor His priestly office comes to Him by descent, but by divine appointment. 'For no man taketh the honour unto himself, but when he is called of God, even as was Aaron.<sup>1</sup> So Christ also glorified not Himself to be made a high priest, but He that spake unto Him, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee; as He saith also in another place, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.'

With all the strangeness and subtlety of his reasoning and the limitations of his time, our author is true, as Jesus had been, to the real spirit of the great Messianic Psalm to which he appeals. It *does* mean by its kingship and priesthood 'after the order of Melchizedek,' a kingship and priesthood which are not of descent but of divine appointment, 'without father, without mother, without a genealogy.' It would have been well for the Church if it had listened more attentively to Jesus than to the two evangelists who on this point have placed themselves rather on the side of the Pharisaic legitimists.

<sup>1</sup> He might have added 'and Simon the Maccabee' had he known the real history of Ps 110.

## Requests and Replies.

### Cross-Bearing.

Has any light ever been thrown upon the origin of this phrase? Does it exist anywhere in pre-Christian literature, or was Jesus the first to notice the gruesome custom and to turn it into a picture of the self-denying life? If the phrase first fell from Christ's lips how it must have thrilled His audience with horror! What an image of terror and degradation! and He laid it down as indispensable for all His followers. A higher critic might be inclined to suggest that it was not till Christ Himself had been crucified, and Simon of Cyrene had borne the cross for the fainting Saviour, that the phrase was coined, and such sympathetic conduct required of every member of the Christian brother-

hood. Yet Simon's bearing of the cross was only temporary, and not that he should be crucified upon it, but that Christ should be: whereas the point of the phrase is that cross-bearing is only the prelude to *crucifixion*. Compare Paul's statement, 'I die daily.'—A. G.

THE phrase, 'to bear a cross,' does not, I believe, occur in any shape in Greek literature, outside the New Testament, before Plutarch's essay, *Concerning those whom God is slow to punish* (chap. 9), written probably towards the close of the first century. I am not aware that it occurs even in a Latin form (though crucifixion was, characteristically, a Roman mode of punishment) before New Testament