

Hebrews? We find the answer in considering the ancient Torch-Race or Lampadedromia. There were various forms of this at different times. The one that Pausanias describes was made up of a number of runners, each bearing a lighted torch. The first that reached the goal with his torch alight was the winner. Behind the torch-bearers started a number of young men without torches. Any one of these who caught up one of the torch-bearers took his torch from him and carried it forwards. Regarded as a sport, this is a glorified hare and hounds, where the first hound that catches one of the hares becomes a hare himself. This is a novelty which none of our modern colleges seem to have tried. But there was another Torch-Race which is very clearly described by Dr. Liddell in *Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, ed. 3, vol. ii. 5b. He says: 'We are clearly to understand lines of runners, posted at intervals, the first in each line who receives the torch, or takes it from the altar, running at his best speed and handing it to the second in his own line, and the second to the third, until the last in the line is reached, who runs with it to the appointed spot. Of course, if any torch went out, the line to which it belonged was out of the race. The victory fell to that line of runners whose torch first reached the goal alight.' May we not claim that some such race was in the mind of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews?

The stimulus of such an appeal is plain whether the first readers of the Epistle were Jewish or Gentile Christians. If they were Jews, reproached with lack of patriotism because they would not throw in their lot with their nation in the last great conflict with Rome, they were strengthened by the thought that all that was best and purest in the history and traditions of their own people was inalienably theirs. It was they and not those who

were mustering against Rome who were truly carrying on the torch which had been kindled in the distant past. It was through them, and them alone, that the victory for which Abraham and Moses and the rest of the worthies strove could be achieved. If they were Gentiles, reproached with turning aside from the culture and progressive thought of the time, the stimulus was almost as great. Small and despised as their groups of fellow-Christians might appear, they were yet links in a great succession that began with the dawn of history and would not end till Christ's victory was complete. Moreover, the greatness of the privilege brought a weight of responsibility. If they failed or grew weary the victory of the whole goodly company would be endangered. It is a thought which has obvious applications to the present. It is a temptation to many to speak of the Church as a back-number, and to seek elsewhere for the forces of progress and reconstruction. Yet, whatever our limitations may be, the living Church of Christ is carrying forward the work of those who set out to establish God's Kingdom on earth. It is not for us to let down those who went before us, but rather, with courage and persistence, to fulfil our part of effort and of service, with our eyes fixed, not on our own success, but on the victory of the whole.

Like Wordsworth's Happy Warrior, the runner in this race is:

The Man, who, lifted high,
Conspicuous object in a Nation's eye,
Or left unthought-of in obscurity,—
Who, with a toward or untoward lot,
Prosperous or adverse, to his wish or not—
Plays, in the many games of life, that one
Where what he most doth value must be won.

When he asks what must be valued most, there is but one answer, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God.'

The Rearrangement of John vii. and viii.

BY THE REVEREND G. H. C. MACGREGOR, B.A.(CAMB.), BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

I. THE more obvious cases of dislocation in the text of the Fourth Gospel are now generally accepted, but surprisingly little attention is still given to others. True, one suspects that much

superfluous ingenuity has been expended in 'discovering' dislocation, in order that scope may be obtained for even greater ingenuity in reconstruction. But the scepticism caused by ingenuity run

wild must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the text is much more seriously disarranged than is generally recognized. The very fact that we find a critic as early as Tatian groping after a reconstructed order, and sometimes even forestalling modern conclusions, should go far to prove that these dislocations are not only 'apparent' but real. Did the dislocations exist only in the subtle imagination of a Spitta, the improvement in sequence and consistency brought about by transposition could not possibly be so marked as in fact it is; confusion would but be made worse confounded. The rearrangement of the text has so important a bearing upon the problems of the Gospel, e.g. its relation to the Synoptics and the chronology of the Life of Christ, that it deserves to be regarded as an essential preliminary to the study of the Gospel as a whole.

2. Much attention has been given to chapters 7 and 8; the following conclusions may be regarded as accepted and call for no discussion:

(a) Chapter 5 has fallen out from before 7, the original order being 6. 5. 7.

(b) 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ should follow immediately after 5⁴⁷, 7¹⁻¹⁴ plus 7^{25ff.} forming a continuous section.

(c) 7⁵³⁻⁸¹, the Pericope de adultera, is a later addition with no place in the original Gospel.

The usually accepted order (omitting for the moment 8¹²⁻²⁰) is thus: 7¹⁵⁻²⁴. 1-14. 25-52 8^{21ff.}

3. What, then, is the correct position of 8¹²⁻²⁰? Two alternatives seem possible:

(a) Burton would place it outside the chapters under discussion after 10²¹ (10¹⁹⁻²¹ being transposed to follow immediately after 9⁴¹). This setting appears good, Jesus' proclamation of Himself as the Light of the world following most appropriately after the healing of the man born blind, the Pharisees' question, 'Are we blind also?' (9⁴⁰), and the question of 'others,' 'Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?' (10²¹). 8²⁰ will then be an echo of 9⁵. We may note that chapter 10 already shows many signs of disarrangement, so that 8¹²⁻²⁰ might well have fallen out. Burton would rearrange 10¹⁹⁻²¹ 8¹²⁻²⁰ 10²²⁻²⁹. 1-18. 80ff.

(b) Others (cf. F. Warburton Lewis, *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 17 ff.) would insert 8¹²⁻²⁰ after 7²⁴ (omitting the words, 'then spake Jesus again unto them, saying,' as a link put in later), 7¹⁻¹⁴ following. Though at first sight the connexion does not appear so clear as that suggested by Burton, closer examination shows it

to be even more appropriate. 7²⁴ standing by itself would form a very abrupt conclusion, the transition thence to 7¹ being sudden and harsh. Insert 8¹²⁻²⁰ at this point, and we find that v.²⁰ forms an admirable conclusion to the incidents in Jerusalem during Pentecost narrated in chapters 5 and 7¹⁵⁻²⁴. Jesus finding Himself in an atmosphere of hostility, which, however, has not yet developed into open violence (8²⁰), withdraws to Galilee (7¹). Moreover, the thought of 8¹²⁻²⁰ rounds off that of 7¹⁵⁻²⁰ and contains numerous echoes of chapter 5. The thought of 'witnessing' (5³¹⁻³⁹ 7¹⁸ 8¹²⁻¹⁴. 17-18) and of the resultant verdict (5⁴⁰⁻⁴⁷ 7¹⁷. 24 8¹⁵. 19) runs through all three passages. Testimony is borne to Jesus both by His Father and by His own works (5³²⁻³⁷); but His opponents cannot appreciate the testimony because their powers of judgment are distorted (5⁴²⁻⁴⁴); yet the man who brings this warped mind into line with God's will *can* get true insight (7¹⁷); so Jesus pleads with His opponents not to allow their judgment on things spiritual to be biased by their external prejudices, i.e. formal Sabbath observance, etc. (7²⁴). Note now the connexion at 8¹²: if only they will look to Christ they will find Him 'the light of the world,' needing no external testimony (cf. 5³⁴), but self-evidencing in a far truer sense than John, whose light they did recognize (5³⁵), and able to lead them into true judgments (8^{12b}). Note, too, that 8¹⁵, 'Ye judge after the flesh, I judge no man,' takes up exactly 7²⁴, 'Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgement'; and in 8¹⁶. 19 we have echoes of 5³⁰ and 5³⁷. 38 respectively.

We will rearrange therefore: 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ 8¹²⁻²⁰ 7¹⁻¹⁴ 7^{25ff.}

4. Omitting the Pericope de adultera, is 8^{21ff.} now in correct position immediately after 7⁵²? Spitta would assume that a passage has been omitted at 7⁵², its place being filled up by the Pericope de adultera; but there is no trace of any such section. Others have held (e.g. Lewis, *op. cit.* 22) that no gap need be assumed, and that the transition from 7⁵² to 8²¹ is quite satisfactory. From this one must emphatically dissent. Jesus cannot possibly be thought of as present at the private inquiry of the chief priests and Pharisees, including Nicodemus, into the failure of 'the officers' to arrest Him. Yet at 8²¹ He is suddenly introduced as renewing to this audience a discourse exactly similar to that broken off at 7³⁶, and this in spite of the fact that v.³⁷, marking the transition to a different occasion altogether, has intervened.

We suggest, therefore, that 8^{21ff.} should be inserted at 7³⁶, noting the following points:

(a) 8²¹ admittedly resumes the argument of 7³⁴, 'Then said Jesus *again* unto them.' With the text as it stands the question of the Jews in 7^{35, 36} is left in the air. Now, is this after the evangelist's manner? On the contrary, we note that elsewhere in the Gospel such questions, provoked by some difficult saying of Jesus, are asked only to prepare the way immediately for a second declaration by Him. We may compare 13^{38ff.}, 'Whither I go, ye cannot come' . . . 'Lord, whither goest thou?' . . . 'Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards.' Or compare again 16^{16ff.}, 'A little while, and ye shall not see me,' . . . 'What is this that He saith unto us, A little while . . .?' . . . 'Jesus . . . said unto them, Do ye inquire . . .? . . . Verily I say unto you . . .' Accordingly, after the question of 7^{35, 36}, we expect an immediate rejoinder from Jesus, and this we find in 8²¹.

(b) The passage to be transposed would end at 8⁵⁹; the disorder in the text at that verse suggests that a dislocation may have taken place at this point.

5. Once 8²¹⁻⁵⁹ is inserted before 7³⁷ one more transposition makes the sequence of the two chapters under consideration perfect. Transpose 7⁴⁶⁻⁵² before 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴ (as Burton suggests), so that v. 45 follows immediately on 8⁵⁹. How perfectly natural the train of events! As the text stands at present the officers are sent to arrest Jesus at 7³², and it is not till a new day has dawned at v. 37 that they report to their masters at v. 45. With the suggested rearrangement, at 7³² the officers are sent to arrest Jesus, at 8⁵⁹ they allow Jesus to escape, and in the very next verse, 7⁴⁵, they are called to account for their remissness; moreover, these events can now take place during the course of a single day.

We are now left with 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴ as an impressive climax to the whole section dealing with Jesus' visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles. This, as so often in this Gospel, concludes with a summing up of the impression left by Jesus on the people (7^{43, 44}). Parallels may be found in 6^{66ff.} summing up the results of the early Galilean ministry, and 10^{19ff.} noting the impression left by the healing of the man born blind.

The final order of the two chapters will thus stand: 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ 8¹²⁻²⁰ 7^{1-14, 25-36} 8²¹⁻⁵⁹ 7^{45-52, 37-44}.

6. Can we suggest how these sections, originally

arranged thus, have fallen into their present order? Spitta's theory that the pages of a papyrus roll (each page unit containing about 18½ lines of Westcott and Hort's small Greek text) had got out of order is at least striking; and though one feels that the hypothesis of accidental disarrangement is rather unsatisfactory and certainly incapable of covering every dislocation, and also that Spitta's theory is almost too ingenious to be true, still when it is applied to chapters 7-8 the results are certainly arresting. The following remarks are put forward with some diffidence, for one is conscious that the whole theory is a precarious one on which to work, but they may be of interest to those to whom Spitta's theory appeals, and it may at least be pleaded that the following investigation appears to corroborate the results already arrived at by less precarious methods.

We will take as the page unit of our hypothetical papyrus roll Lewis' modification of Spitta's 'key,' say about 9.5 lines (Lewis takes 9.3) of W.H. small text, remembering always that a certain amount of latitude must be allowed, for even in the most carefully written MS. there would be greater difference between the contents of the pages than in a printed book.

We have noted that chapters 7-8 fall into five sections, which appear to have suffered disarrangement *en bloc*, as follows:

- A. 7¹⁵⁻²⁴.
- B. 8¹²⁻²⁰.
- C. 7¹⁻¹⁴ plus 7²⁵⁻³⁶.
- D. 8²¹⁻⁵⁹.
- E. 7⁴⁵⁻⁵² plus 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴.

In addition we have the Pericope de adultera 7⁶⁸⁻⁸¹, which we may term F.

Spitta has shown (*Zur Geschichte und Literatur d. Urchristentums*, p. 197) that a page of the roll ends with chapter 7. More important for the moment is Lewis' similar proof (*op. cit.* 15) that a page would end with chapter 5, *i.e.* the material of chapter 7 would begin at the top of a page, just as it ends at the foot of one. It will be seen later that the same is true of chapter 8. The whole section, chapters 7-8, thus falls within a series of complete pages, and so may be dealt with as a unit by itself. Again, it has already been observed by the same scholars that sections A, B, and F are multiples of the page unit filling complete pages

and therefore capable of being transposed *en bloc*. We have then the following results :

- A contains $18\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills 2 pages ;
- B contains $18\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills 2 pages ;
- F contains $18\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills 2 pages ;

But so far as I am aware it has not previously been observed that :

(a) C contains $47\frac{1}{2}$ lines and fills exactly 5 pages. This is important, as it makes a page end at 7^{80} , and therefore makes possible our proposed insertion of 8^{21-59} at that point.

(b) D, allowing for gaps in type, etc., contains 77 lines, as nearly as possible filling 8 page units, once again allowing a break at 8^{59} , where we propose to insert section E.

(c) E contains 27-28 lines, and would fill 3 pages. We now have this remarkable result : A fills 2 pages, B 2 pages, C 5 pages, D 8 pages, E 3 pages, F 2 pages. May it not be something more than mere coincidence that each of our six sections begins and ends with a page and is therefore capable of being transposed *en bloc*, exactly what appears to have happened ?

7. To develop the theory further in order to suggest how the present order of the text may have been arrived at is of course pure guess-work, but the following is put forward as a possible hypothesis.

(a) Section C (5 pages) may have fallen out. The gap left was then filled up—

(i.) By transferring section E (3 pages) to stand where C began, that is, immediately after 8^{20} . We may note that there is a superficially appropriate transition from 8^{20} ('no man laid hands on him, for his hour was not yet come') to the question in 7^{45} , the first verse of E, which would now follow immediately ('Why have ye not brought him?'). This apparent connexion would help the insertion of E at this point.

(ii.) The additional gap of 2 pages was filled by inserting section F, the Pericope de adultera, from an external source.

(b) Subsequently section B fell out and was placed between section F and section D. This position would perhaps be chosen because of the apparent link backwards with F (the story of Jesus and the adulteress being regarded as an illustration of the saying in 8^{15} , 'Ye judge after the flesh, I judge no man'), and forwards with D (8^{14} , 'Ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go,'

appearing to look forward to 8^{21} , 'whither I go, ye cannot come').

(c) Finally, section C, now floating loose out of its original position, was attached at the beginning of the whole series of sections.

The resultant order would then be as follows : C (7^{1-14} plus 7^{25-36}), A (7^{15-24}), E (7^{45-52} plus 7^{37-44}), F (7^{53-81}), B (8^{12-20}), D (8^{21-59}).

8. Thus the present order of the text is reached, except that we still have to explain (a) why section A (7^{15-24}) now stands in the middle of section C, and (b) why, in section E, 7^{37-44} now stands before 7^{45-52} . As neither the divided portions of C (7^{1-14} , $25-36$) nor the interchanged portions of E (7^{37-44} , $45-52$) are multiples of the page unit and so liable to accidental dislocation, the transpositions here must be explained otherwise than by Spitta's theory.

(a) 7^{15-24} . After the accidental dislocations suggested in paragraph 7 above had taken place, the position of 7^{15-24} , then lying between 7^{80} and 7^{45} , would be impossible, the transition both at the beginning and at the end of the passage showing no sequence of thought. A subsequent copyist on the look out for a better position may have inserted it after 7^{14} , having noticed the apparent connexion between Jesus' teaching in v.¹⁴ and the Jews' 'marvelling' at his 'letters' in v.¹⁵.

(b) 7^{45-52} plus 7^{37-44} . Once v.⁴⁵ is by the previous dislocation taken out of connexion with 8^{59} , the motive for the question in v.⁴⁵ is lost. The officers have been sent to arrest Jesus at 7^{32} , but, with the removal of 8^{21-59} , we have not yet been told of their failure to do so. By placing 7^{37-44} before 7^{45-52} a motive for the question is once again secured, the question in v.⁴⁵ now following immediately on the statement of v.⁴⁴, 'no man laid hands on him.' The desire to secure this connexion may have been sufficient to cause the transposition. We may note, however, that the connexion thus obtained at 7^{44-45} is at best a makeshift, for in v.⁴⁴ it is the people who let Jesus go, while in v.⁴⁵ it is the officers who are blamed. (There are a number of such artificially secured connexions in the Gospel, apparently appropriate enough, but in reality quite arbitrary. Besides those already noted under paragraphs 7^b and 8^a we may compare $3^{30, 31}$; 'He that cometh from above . . . he that is of the earth . . .' is an apparently obvious reference to John the Baptist whose words, as the text now stands, comprise the passage immediately preceding. But

the connexion is really quite arbitrary, for the section on the Baptist, 3²²⁻³⁰, is out of place and should be placed after 2¹², the real connexion of 3³¹ being with 3²¹.) By adopting the final order suggested in paragraph 5 above, it is the officers who are sent to arrest Jesus in 7³²; they form part of his audience during the whole discourse 7³³⁻³⁶ plus 8²¹⁻⁵⁹; they allow him to escape at 8⁵⁹, and are themselves called to account by their masters at 7⁴⁵.

In conclusion it may, I think, be fairly claimed that the final order suggested above is the best obtainable, while the application to it of Spitta's theory, though admittedly purely tentative, at least serves to corroborate the results previously arrived at from a study of the internal evidence, and, in addition, suggests a possible explanation for the insertion of the much-debated Pericope de adultera.

In the Study.

Virginitibus Puerisque.

God's Lamp.

'The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord.'—Pr 20²⁷.

ARE there any words in the English language you specially like or dislike? I'm sure there are. For most people have words they love and words they hate. Now, if it comes to hating, there's one word I really do hate, and I wonder if any of you hate it too. It is the word 'conscience.' To begin with, it's a horrid word to spell. You get so mixed between 's's' and 'c's.' And then there is a sound of reproof and blame and disagreeableness about it. It always seems to be pointing a long finger at you and saying in a hoarse whisper, 'Oh! oh! who did wrong?'

I know some one who hates the word just as much as I do. She has hated it ever since the first time she heard it, and that was when she was a very small girl indeed. She was a lucky little girl, for her home was in the middle of a large garden. All day long she played in that garden, and James, the gardener, allowed her to help him with his work, and even gave her a little spade and rake and hoe for her very own. One day there was great excitement, for Nancy's father had brought home a wonderful new thermometer for the garden. It was a very delicate kind of thermometer, and instead of standing up like most thermometers it had to be kept lying on its side. It was carefully fixed to a cross board nailed to the top of an upright, and Nancy and her two sisters and the gardener and the gardener's boy were all well warned that they were on no account to touch it, as moving it would put it wrong.

Well, that thermometer fascinated Nancy. She passed it fifty times a day, and every time she passed it she felt she *must* give it ever such a little wiggle just to see what would happen. This went on for about a week, and then one morning Nancy stretched out her hand and was going to give it the little wiggle when she suddenly heard the gardener's step coming round the corner, and the little wiggle changed into a very big wiggle. But what happened Nancy did not stay to see.

That evening father was very angry. 'Some one has been touching that thermometer!' he said to mother. 'Was it any of the children?' Mother walked into the nursery. 'Did any of you children touch the garden thermometer?' she asked. And two surprised little girls said 'No' quickly, and one guilty little girl stammered 'No' slowly. I suppose mother heard the guilt in the stammered 'No,' but all she said was, 'Ah, well! It must have been James. Your father is very angry about it. He will have to speak to him.' Then she shut the nursery door, and Nancy felt as if she had been shut into some horrible torture chamber. A voice inside kept repeating, 'You touched that thermometer, and you told a lie about it, and you are so mean that you are going to let James be blamed—James who is such a friend of yours—and father is so angry, perhaps James will lose his place.' For half an hour that went on, over and over again, till at last Nancy felt she must scream with the agony of it. Instead she flung open the nursery door, rushed through to the sitting-room, and, burying her face in mother's lap, sobbed, 'Oh, mother, *it was me, not James*, who touched that thermometer! And I told a lie about it!' Later in the evening Nancy overheard mother