

to the highly favoured Virgin of Nazareth, and delivers to her his momentous message: 'Thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus.'

And how was that message received? By one humbly uttered question, so holy in its purity and simplicity, so holy in its freedom from every element of implied doubt or disbelief, that an answer was vouchsafed to it. The question was, 'How shall this be?' The answer was that the Holy Ghost, in His adorable personality, shall bring about the transcendent miracle of the Word becoming flesh, and of His entry into the world He had created, along the lowly pathway of purely human development. It is here that we see and feel the connexion between the fundamental doctrine of the personality of the Holy Ghost and the mystery of the Virgin-birth.

We are now able properly to formulate our answer to the broad question, What ought to be the belief of every faithful son of our Mother Church in regard of the Incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? The answer, as we have seen, involves two momentous truths, the union of which cannot perhaps be more simply expressed than as it has been set forth by our Church in the Collect for Christmas, and in the special preface in the administration of the Holy Communion. Using these two forms of careful and well-chosen words, we may now define what ought to be a true belief in the Incarnation. And that belief we may define as—a belief that, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the only-begotten Son of God took our nature upon Him, was made very man

of the substance of His mother, and that that mother was the pure and ever-blessed Virgin, Mary of Galilee.

This is the right belief in the fact of the Incarnation on which the old creed lays the stress to which I alluded in the early part of my sermon. This is the belief on which everything, here and hereafter, does most vitally depend.

In the first place, without a belief in the personality of God the Holy Ghost, the trustful hope and spiritual freshness of our poor mortal life is irreparably lost. Who is there who can comfort and sanctify save He who our Redeemer has promised should come to us, and be to us even as Himself?

In the second place, without the belief that our dear Lord and Master was born into the world as He was born—born of a pure virgin, what assurance can we have that He is verily our *sinless* Redeemer? Of all the arguments for the sinlessness of Jesus Christ this must ever remain as the chief and palmary argument.

The more firmly we maintain the two truths, on which I have said our belief in the Incarnation will ever be found to depend, the more distinctly will our belief be a right belief, and the more completely shall we realize that it is, as in the earliest ages of the Church it was ever deemed to be—the corner stone of our Christian Faith.

In this holy doctrine God give us all His blessed help more heartily to believe, and believing, more completely to realize, in all its fulness, Christmas hope and Christmas joy.

Contributions and Comments.

'Father, forgive them.'

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xi. 423, I asked how the seven words from the Cross are to be arranged in a Harmony of the Passion, and remarked that the strangest order is to be found in the oldest Harmony of the Gospels, in Tatian's *Diatessaron*. There the word, 'Father, forgive them,' is placed as next to last, between 'It is finished,' and 'Father, into Thine hands I commend My spirit.' I asked, What can be the reason of this arrange-

ment? Is the word, 'Father, forgive them,' a later insertion, as it is wanting in the Syriac MS. from Sinai? *Is there any parallel to this order?*

As far as I am aware, no answer has yet been forthcoming. To the last question I can now myself give a partial answer.

In the fifth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is a very interesting chapter about the fasting in Lent, or more exactly in the Passion Week. It is based on the chronology of the Passion. After it has been stated that the condemnation of Jesus

took place in the *third* hour, the Crucifixion in the *sixth*, the account goes on (chap. 14, p. 144, in the edition of Lagarde): 'then there was darkness three hours, from the *sixth* to the *ninth*, and again light towards evening, as it is written, "not day and not night, and at evening there shall be light" (Zec 14⁷). And about the *ninth* hour He, crying aloud, said to the Father: *My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?* And after a short while *He cried with a loud voice, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do, and adding, Into Thy hands I commend My spirit, He gave up breath, and was buried before sunset in a new grave.'*

The Greek words are too important not to be given here: *καὶ περὶ τὴν ἐνάτην ὕραν ἀναβοήσας εἶπε τῷ πατρὶ Θεέ μου Θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες; καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδουσιν ὃ ποιοῦσι, καὶ ἐπαγαγῶν Εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, ὑπέπνευσε, καὶ θάπτεται πρὸ ἡλίου δύσεως ἐν μνημεῖῳ καινῷ.* In the *Didascalia* this passage is not found, but at 2¹⁶ (Lagarde, p. 30), where the word, 'Father, forgive them; for they do not know what they do,' is quoted for the first time, the *Didascalia* has a most interesting variant (p. 20, ed. Lagarde): 'My Father,'—thus we must read instead of 'my brethren,' as given in the Syriac text,—'they do not know what they do nor what they speak; but, if it is possible, forgive them.'

Now this coincidence between the Arabic Tatian and the *Apostolic Constitutions* is of the highest importance, because already Lagarde remarked in his short preface to the *Apostolic Constitutions* that their author seems to have used a *Harmony* of the Gospels; and in a note he called attention to Ephrem's *Commentary on the Gospel Harmony*, which commentary, before the discovery of the Arabic Tatian, was the chief source for the recovery of this lost work. Our passage proves that Lagarde's conjecture was correct. But quite recently another suggestion has been thrown out by a young scholar, E. Lippelt, a pupil of Bousset at Göttingen and of Blass at Halle, that Justin the Martyr had already made use of a *Harmony* of the Gospels of the same probably as was turned into Syriac by his pupil Tatian. For our passage we cannot prove this theory, but other passages render it very likely. The Gospel quotations in the *Constitutions* gain by this theory immensely in importance.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Tortoises.

I HAVE but just noticed in your January number Professor Nestle's question 'whether tortoises were and are found in Palestine.' Certainly they are very common,—both land and water kinds,—and Canon Tristram mentions two varieties of 'Terrapin' as growing to a large size in the lakes.

J. D. CRACE.

Hon. Sec. Pal. Expt. Fund, London.

NOTE (9th February 1903).—The death is announced of our late chairman, Mr. James Glaisher, F.R.S., on the 7th inst., at his residence at Croydon, at the age of 93. The *Times* notice is a full one (p. 4). Quite recently Mr. Glaisher had reduced and revised some tables of meteorological observations for the Palestine Exploration Fund.

J. D. C.

The Book of the Dead.

In the article, 'Recent Biblical and Oriental Archæology,' which appears in the February number, Professor Sayce writes of the late Sir P. Le Page Renouf's translation of the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*: 'Fortunately, the greater part of the text and commentary was already in type, and the remainder of the manuscript was in such an advanced state as to allow Professor Naville to edit it for the Society of Biblical Archæology.'

This needs correction. At the time of his death, Sir P. Renouf had translated so far as to chapter cxxxix., and he *left no manuscript whatever* of the translation of the remaining chapters. The continuation of the translation, which is now in course of publication in the *Proceedings* of this Society, is due solely and entirely to Professor Naville.

WALTER L. NASH.

Sec. Soc. Bibl. Arch.

The Cleansing of the Temple in John ii. 13-22.

PERHAPS the suggestion with which this note concludes has been made already, but I do not remember having seen it, and it has been in my mind for a considerable time. Apart from the record in the Fourth Gospel no one would imagine that there were *two* cleansings of the Temple by our Lord, so much alike in their details, and each of them eliciting a question as to

His authority. Besides, it seems extremely unlikely that our Lord would commence His ministry by an act which was sure to excite the hostility of the representatives of the people to whom He presented Himself for reception. The position of this narrative in the Fourth Gospel has often been urged against its historicity. The most natural place for such a cleansing is certainly where the Synoptists put it. Moreover, in the Gospel, as it stands, it is followed by the statement that many in Jerusalem 'believed on His name, beholding the signs which He did,' of which signs at this period we have no hint in the Synoptists, while the healing of the nobleman's son is said, in chap. 4⁵⁴ of this Gospel, to be 'the second sign that Jesus did, having come out of Judea into Galilee.' The last clause may mean that the evangelist is only recording the signs wrought outside of Judea, in which region he intends us to understand there were many such. But this would be strange, seeing that so much stress has been laid on the importance of the first sign for the disciples' faith—given, it must be remembered, outside of Judea. Again, the narrative is followed also by the account of the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus, which surely implies (unless we are to suppose a great wealth of unrecorded signs and teaching in Judea) a fuller manifestation of Jesus by both word and work, and a completer development of His gospel, than anything as yet given in this Gospel. This narrative also would come in much more naturally at a later point. It is followed, too, by the statement that 'after these things came Jesus and His disciples into the land of Judea' (chap. 3²²); whereas it is implied in what has gone before that He is already in Judea, and no hint is given of His having left it. Of course, the common explanation is that the word rendered 'land' here ($\gamma\eta$, a common word for 'a land') means the country regions as distinguished from Jerusalem. But there is no example of such usage in the New Testament. In Mk 1⁵ and Ac 26²⁰ we have 'the country of Judea' mentioned along with Jerusalem (and in Ac 10³⁹ 'the country of the Jews'), but the word employed is $\chi\acute{o}\rho\alpha$ (commonly so used), and John himself uses the same word for 'the country' in chap. 11⁵⁵. The common explanation is at least open to question, and if we take the phrase in its usual meaning, we have a natural connexion between v. 11 or v. 12 of chap. 2

(where Jesus is said to be in Galilee) and chap. 3²². It is unnecessary, however, to press this point.

Now both of these narratives, *i.e.* the cleansing of the Temple and the conversation with Nicodemus, are placed by Tatian in his *Diatessaron* (which has only one cleansing) at a later period, near to each other. From the early date of the *Diatessaron*, this is an important consideration. Possibly his reason for this may have been a subjective one; but there is another possibility. The Received text of this Gospel, as it has come down to us, bears evidence of imperfection. We need only refer to the insertion of the narrative of the woman taken in adultery (chap. 8¹⁻¹¹, along with the last verse of chap. 7), which all critics declare to be no part of the true text of this Gospel. Is it not possible that a sheet (or more) of the original MS., or of an early copy, had become transposed, so that these two narratives came to stand out of their proper position? In the *Diatessaron* they follow each other as insertions from the Fourth Gospel.

W. L. WALKER.

Laurence Kirk.

A New Theory of Eternal Punishment.

THERE is much that is interesting in Dr. Illingworth's theory concerning the future of the lost; but is it punishment when a man philosophically resigns himself to the infliction of a just penalty? Is not the unabating rage of a bad man at the imprisonment of his evil within himself, the fuel to feed the flame that devours him? Rob the penalty of that sting and it becomes ease. Does not Dr. Illingworth's view turn the convict's sufferings into the songs of Paul and Silas? Nowhere does the New Testament confound the tortures of the lost with that consciousness of punishment deserved which we have in the thief's words, 'and we indeed justly.' Compare Capon-sacchi's picture of the sufferings of Guido and Judas in the 'Ring and the Book' (Robert Browning)—

The cockatrice is with the basilisk.
There let them grapple, denizens o' the dark,
Foes or friends, but indissolubly bound,
In their one spot out of the ken of God
Or care of man, for ever and ever more!

Bradford.

K. LYTH LOFTHOUSE.

Cross-Bearing.

REFERRING to Professor Massie's paper in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1902 (p. 348), may I venture to suggest that our Lord's use of the word 'cross' had no reference whatever to the punishment of death by crucifixion? I think I am right in saying that the word *σταυρός* does not properly mean what we understand by a cross. It has indeed been doubted by some whether the *σταυρός* on which Christ was put to death was anything more than an upright beam or log of wood fixed in the earth. The use of the word 'tree' (*ξύλον*) by Peter (Ac 5³⁰ 10³⁹, 1 P 2²⁴) and Paul (Ac 13²⁰, Gal 3¹³) seems rather to favour this view.

It is, in fact, only in later Greek that the word *σταυρός* is used to denote the Roman instrument for inflicting the death penalty. It generally means an upright palisade or pile. But Josephus, describing the Roman battering-ram, speaks of the beam from which the ram itself was suspended as 'being strongly supported by timbers (*σταυροῖς*) firmly set on either side' (*B.J.* III. vii. 19). As the entire structure was movable, the *σταυροί* in this case cannot have been piles driven into the ground, but must have been strong pieces of timber like joists forming part of the framework.

Should it not seem then that the word in ordinary use denoted merely a beam or log of wood; and may it not be that, when our Lord announced that to be His disciple it was incumbent on a man to take up his cross and follow Him, He meant, and was understood to mean, simply that whoever would be one of His people must accept and bear the load allotted to him of duty and care and, if need be, suffering? The phrase compares with the oft-quoted illustration of the Puritan divine: 'Every man has given to him each day a faggot to carry. But some are not satisfied to carry to-day's faggot only; they must needs carry also to-morrow's in advance; and some even, besides to-day's and to-morrow's, insist on carrying yesterday's faggot over again.'

That there was no allusion to Christ's cross seems to be indicated by the possessive pronouns employed; our Lord did not say 'My cross,' or even 'the cross,' but 'his cross,' and once 'his own cross.' So Paul to the Galatians, 'Each man shall bear his own burden,' which may be an allusion to the utterance reported Lk 14²⁷. And here note that the interpolation in Mk 10²¹ omits the possessive pronoun and substitutes the article. This is a fair illustration of the tendency in later times to see an allusion which I venture to think had no real existence in the authentic passages. (The Lewis palimpsest, however, has in this place 'take up thy cross.')

Our Lord appears to have used the phrase on three occasions. The first was in Galilee (Mt 10³⁸), the second in Cæsarea Philippi (Mt 16²⁴, Mk 8³⁴, Lk 9²³), and the third probably in Peræa in the course of His last journey from Galilee to Judæa (Lk 14²⁷). In each of these regions it is probable that men might frequently be seen carrying heavy pieces of timber to the Lake of Galilee or the Jordan, to be floated down in rafts to other parts of Palestine. In the district of Cæsarea Philippi the spectacle would be especially familiar of men whose 'daily' task it was each to shoulder his *σταυρός*—his timber log—and 'follow' a leader in single file along rough and narrow pathways leading from the forests of Anti-Libanus to the Jordan Valley. (See by way of illustration 1 K 5, noting particularly v. 15.) In such localities would not log-bearing be a figure naturally to suggest itself, and who could fail to understand the parable?

I have not myself the least doubt that these words were spoken by Christ, and also committed to writing (not, however, in Greek, but in Aramaic), at the times they are said to have been uttered. In that case they would not suggest to the minds of those who heard them any idea of the manner of our Lord's death, though such an allusion would naturally be read into them after that event had taken place. It is one of the arguments for the contemporaneous origin of the material of which the Gospels are composed, that in no instance, except in the few sentences which are obviously editorial additions, or in avowed prediction, is there any allusion to any subsequent event. If the passages before us were first written after the crucifixion, they are a singular exception to this rule, as in that case, whether they be regarded as the genuine utterances of our Lord Himself accurately remembered, or as mere imagination, they certainly must at that time have seemed to the writers, as they have ever since seemed to most readers, to bear a very plain allusion to that supreme event of the New Testament history. I submit that all difficulties disappear in the assumption that no allusion to that event was intended, or even to death by crucifixion at all, and that the savings were in each instance reported either at the moment of utterance, or within a very short time thereafter.

JOSEPH PALMER.

Sydney.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.