

Turretin,' whose treatise against Atheism and Deism is commended by our author for its 'liberal spirit'; Abbé Bergier, who, in answer to Rousseau, shows, like Butler, how the logical outcome of rejecting Christianity is disbelief in all Natural Religion; and Abbé Guénéé, whose *Letters of Seven Jews*, seven times republished, expose Voltaire's numerous errors (amid merited commendation of his championship of toleration) with a polite pungency which moved the smarting arch-infidels to write: 'He bites you to the bone while pretending to lick your hand.'

Among Protestant Apologists are Abbadie of Berne, pastor of the Huguenots in London, whose *Truth of Christianity* passed through fifteen editions between 1684 and 1800, was translated into English and German, and includes an able vindication of Christ's Resurrection as necessary to explain apostolic success; Grotteste de la Mothe and Jaquelot, two other refugee pastors, who anticipated modern and moderate views of Inspiration, limiting it to doctrine and duty with exclusion of mere Scripture History, emphasizing the progressiveness of divine revelation, and thus removing many stumbling-blocks to faith, especially in connexion with the Old Testament; Vessière, a convert to Protestantism, whose 'Discourses,' several times re-issued, M. Monod designates the 'masterpiece of internal evidence' during the period; Boullier, who defends Pascal's Apologetic, in answer to Voltaire; and Professor Vernet of Geneva, who earned from the Catholic *Journal de Trévoux* the tribute that although 'he has the misfortune to be a Protestant, his demonstration

of the truth of Christianity equals in clearness the most brilliant sunlight.'

Interesting sections of the book deal with Bayle, Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau, the last of whom is included among Apologists, in so far as he helped to 'restore in the souls (of his countrymen) the essential foundations of faith,' dependence on, submission to, and communion with God; while the fatal absence of any deep sense of sin from his religion is pointed out, and the failure of his theism to reconcile Divine Goodness with human suffering—the reconciliation which the Cross of Christ reveals.

Down to the French Revolution, notwithstanding all apologies, infidelity, as M. Monod shows, increased in France. Whence this triumph? Partly, doubtless, the great literary power of men like Voltaire and Rousseau. But the main cause lay deeper. In the 18th century the dominant Church in France had become closely associated with selfish, despotic, and oppressive national government; and the *malfaisance* of Churchmen was imputed to Christianity and led to the 'eclipse of faith.' The reaction came only when, at the Revolution, triumphant infidelity instead of breeding toleration, purification, and brotherhood, generated worse despotism and deeper corruption. It then became clear that 'morality could not exist without religion, nor religion without social worship.' The revival of Church and Faith was exemplified and promoted by Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme*, which embodied Pascal's plea for Christianity as the religion which alone truly and fully meets the higher needs of mankind.

The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.LITT., HON. M.A.(OXON.), GLASGOW.

III.

THIS absence of the Pauline idea of the Law and the Wrath means that the author does not share the sombre view of the flesh which pervades the Pauline psychology. He has therefore no difficulty in assuming not only that the sinless Jesus shared flesh and blood with men, but that, instead of possessing sinlessness as a messianic prerogative, Jesus had to realize and maintain it in

the days of his flesh by moral conflict. A glance at the primitive Christian literature proves that Hebrews is practically alone in this.

We might expect, as some have argued, that sinlessness was attributed to Jesus as a messianic or ritual inference, because it was vital to his celestial vocation or to the validity of his offering. But the Christology of Hebrews implies features

and characteristics in Jesus which cannot be explained as deductions from messianic postulates, in spite of all that critics like Bousset urge, who resolve the realistic traits into pictorial suggestions from the mystery-cults or from some pre-Christian christology which fortuitously crystallized round the person of Jesus. This is to fly in the very face of evidence. Hebrews does not evolve from any a priori metaphysical notion of the divine Son as a supernatural being who dips into humanity for a brief interval, to rise once more into celestial glory. Hebrews can speak even of the piety of Jesus, of his faith, his prayers, his endurance, and his reverence, of all that he underwent as an exponent and object-lesson of faith under the supreme trial of being tempted to renounce God. The allusions to the historical career of Jesus are not numerous but they are too direct to be explained away as deductions from messianic mythology or O.T. prophecy. The speculative Christology is developed from a religious experience which goes back to the primitive historical tradition, not vice-versa. Take, for example, a touch like this: 'though he was a Son, yet he learned by all he suffered how to obey' (5^b). Paul described the great Obedience of Christ, but he never said anything so daring. For the Greek phrase carried associations which were literally incongruous; it almost invariably implied the discipline of a stupid or wayward character, and had been mostly 'applied to the young and foolish, or to thoughtless offenders who learn by suffering not to repeat a second time what has once caused them suffering.' It is certain, I think, that no one who was merely painting a human face into the messianic categories and speculations of a divine Son, would have ventured upon such a realistic human trait.

If the writer does not discuss the problem of sinlessness in the flesh as that meets our modern psychology, he is equally silent on the question, how the pre-existent Son entered the world. We have no data to fix his view of the incarnation. When he speaks of Melchisedek, the prototype of Jesus, as 'without father and mother,' he is not giving any hint that this was a parallel to the origin of Jesus. We cannot put this casual utterance alongside the later misquotation from the fortieth psalm—'a body hast thou prepared for me'—and infer that the birth of Jesus was conceived as abnormal. The well-known Alexandrian ideas of

the soul could quite well permit the author to combine pre-existence with normal birth.

The object of the incarnation is more definitely stated. Jesus entered the world of men to suffer and die; he suffered and died in order to enter the upper world not simply as the captain of God's chosen company but as their high priest. At what point he became high priest is not quite so clear, but it is clear that the incarnation was for the purpose of his vocation, a purpose which was realized through his personal sufferings. By suffering without giving way to the besetting sin of apostasy, he was enabled to sacrifice himself to God in such a way as to secure the communion of men with God. It is assumed that he did not need to sacrifice on his own behalf. The rationale of his death is that it was inexplicable apart from his relation to men as their representative and high priest, and that in virtue of his *τελείωσις* he was exempt from those shortcomings of service which the O.T. priests incurred, especially from the defective sympathy which attached to them. *Τελείωσις* carries with it not only the idea of adequacy to save but of perfected character, a character or personality so ripened as to be fit for its divine work of purifying the conscience and drawing men into the inner presence of God himself.

As I have already hinted, one factor which helped to determine his outlook on the person of Jesus was the temptation to renounce God which was occasioned by the strain and suffering to which his readers were exposed—to renounce God, or at least to hesitate and retreat, to relax the fibre of loyal faith, as if God were too difficult to follow in the new, hard situation. As in First Peter so here the encouragement is that 'you belong to the community of a messiah who has himself passed through suffering into the glory and presence of God, not as an individual but for your sakes.' The interesting feature of Hebrews, however, is that it seeks the proof of this not in O.T. prophecies but in the historical traditions of the life of Jesus. Hebrews does not argue from the law and the prophets that Jesus had to suffer: it argues, Jesus *did* suffer as part of his vocation.

There is indeed a partial anticipation of this in the Enochic conception of Son of man; for although we must not read too much into the apocalyptic phrases of that book, although the Son of man is the personal x quantity of the age of future bliss, still in Enoch this pre-existent messiah

is Son of man as transcendental and also in some sense as human; we get the two ideas that he must be Man, in order to help men, and he must be superhuman or transcendental, in order to redeem. But Hebrews, like Paul, avoids the term Son of man, and although these two ideas are held together, they are derived from meditation upon the meaning of Christ's earthly life and not from a theological combination of apocalyptic speculations. Hebrews prefers to call Jesus the Son of God. He is present in the history of Israel and present as Son of God in a transcendental sense, but the author's main interest in Jesus as the divine Son gathers round his earthly existence. He shares the primitive point of view which associated the prophecy of the second psalm with the resurrection—the baptismal association is nothing to him. Yet, like Paul, he must believe that the Son was eternal, though he never succeeds in explaining how the eternal Sonship is compatible with the earthly mission, any more than Justin after him. There is a large section of his thought on the Sonship of Jesus which remains indefinite to us, and which probably was indefinite to him. He took over the idea from the primitive church, seized on its ethical value as an interpretation of what Jesus suffered, and linked it on to the idea of the high priesthood, but he never harmonized it with his special gnosis of the eternal Christ as part of the eternal, higher world of reality.

In saying this, I do not mean to suggest that he was conscious of any dualism such as moderns have felt between the metaphysical speculative reconstruction and the Jesus of history. Our attitude starts from a human Jesus. How was he conceived as fulfilling divine functions? The primitive Christian started from a risen and reigning Lord, and his problem was, how did such a Christ ever become man? This is even more true of Hebrews than of Paulinism. The supernatural metaphysical category of Son of God was for the author of Hebrews the form in which he thought out his sense of the absolute religious value of Jesus—not of the historical Jesus but of the Jesus to whose eternal intercession the Church owed her standing before God.

It is from the same angle that we can estimate another outlying feature of the Christology, the connexion of Jesus with the creation of the world. This does not seem to be mediated, as we might suppose, from the Philonic notion that the tran-

scendence of God required some intermediate agent between him and the created cosmos, as if there could be no direct contact between the spiritual and the lower world. It is with Hebrews as with Paul: the creative function of Jesus is connected with the redemptive. The Jesus through whom God carries out his saving purpose for the world must be connected with the creation of the world. That God the creator is God the redeemer forms a postulate of primitive Christianity, and our author voices this intuition, whether or not he was conscious of any incipient gnostic tendency to separate creation from redemption. 'In bringing many sons to glory, it was befitting that he *for whom and by whom the universe exists* should perfect the Pioneer of their salvation by suffering.' Hence from the agency of Christ in redemption as God's work it was natural to infer his agency in relation to creation (*e.g.* 1²). Phrases and categories of later Jewish speculation lay to hand, especially in Alexandrian circles, and the author avails himself of some, occasionally; but the dominant interest which shaped his mind was religious. As Robertson Smith puts it, 'the whole course of nature and grace must find its explanation in God, and not merely in an abstract divine *arbitrium*, but in that which befits the divine nature.' No doubt, it is 'a theological notion—a notion which does not rest on direct religious experience, but on subsequent reflection.' Still, it is one of the inferences which fill out the Christology of Hebrews and which is essential to an adequate view of the relation between the Christian God and the world of men.

At the same time the author makes next to no use of the great Kurios conception which played so vital a rôle in the early Christian theology. Once or twice Jesus is called Kurios, *i.e.* apart from O.T. quotations. But this is not one of the characteristic categories. The divine authority and the divine relation to a people which the Kurios title expressed are stated in another way, in the remarkable idea of the high priest 'after the order of Melchisedek.' The author does not develop his argument from Melchisedek merely to prove that from primitive times a natural or real priesthood existed which was superior to the Levitical and was fulfilled in Jesus. He does imply that the Levitical priesthood was not permanent; it was not original, but anticipated by the mysterious priesthood of Melchisedek, he argues, using the

same kind of chronological proof as Paul employs on rabbinic lines in the third chapter of Galatians to prove that the promise to Abraham involved the inferiority of the later Torah. Priority means superiority, in fact. The argument in neither case sounds convincing to us. Still less convincing is the fanciful suggestion that Abraham's deference to Melchisedek involved a similar deference on the part of the unborn Levi. Here we notice Hebrews going still further than Paul. Behind even Abraham there was a divine anticipation or type of God's perfect will in Christ. Nevertheless, the real reason which led the author to appropriate the mysterious legend of Genesis xiv. was not simply that it enabled him to discredit the Levitical priesthood out of his favourite scripture, the Pentateuch. The Melchisedek priesthood had already been operating in Jewish speculation, even in connexion with the messianic hope. Philo, fastening on the curious episode, had identified Melchisedek outright with the Logos, or possibly even with the messiah. But whether or not the author of Hebrews was contradicting Philo; he took a different view, falling back on his favourite hundred and tenth psalm, which in the Greek version had already expressed the Alexandrian belief in the pre-existence of messiah, and discovering, by his Philonic methods of exegesis, scripture proof for an original priesthood which was not Levitical, not transmissible, and at the same time permanent. 'Jesus entered God's presence for us in advance, when he became high priest for ever with the rank of Melchisedek. For Melchisedek, the priest of Salem, a priest of the Most High God . . . is primarily a king of righteousness (that is the meaning of his name); then, besides that, king of Salem (which means king of peace). He has neither father nor mother, no genealogy, neither a beginning to his days nor an end to his life, but, resembling the Son of God, continues to be priest permanently.'

Now, this seems incongruous enough with the high priesthood of Christ, for Melchisedek does not suffer. But the writer's interest lies in other features of the legend, not in the uncircumcised position of Melchisedek nor in his offering of bread and wine as typical of the atonement or the Lord's Supper—although both of these interpretations were afterwards common in the Church. The principal attraction of the Melchisedek-legend for the author of Hebrews was evidently its combination of sacerdotal and royal privileges. Like Philo,

though less fancifully, he notes the religious significance of the etymology, 'king of righteousness' and 'king of peace.' But the point is that in his development of the priestly office of Christ he is attempting, every now and then, to preserve something of the more primitive view of Jesus as the messianic king, especially as the kingdom of God plays next to no part in his main argument. Sometimes the fusion of metaphors or of ideas is strange, though impressive, as in the sentence—'he offered a single sacrifice for sins and then seated himself at the right hand of God, to wait till his enemies are put under his feet.' The latter touch is a survival of the militant messianic idea which is relevant enough in the first chapter, for example, but out of place in a sketch of the high priest and his offering. I imagine that the reference to seating himself at God's right hand denotes the dogmatic interest of reaffirming the absolute finality of Christ's work, but for the author of Hebrews the metaphor has already faded from its earlier and direct colouring.

This leads me, in conclusion, to notice that the category of high priesthood was not adequate to the writer's full thought. (a) It could not be fitted in to his eschatology, any more than, strictly speaking, the Alexandrian notion of the two spheres could. Both are irrelevant to eschatology. The latter is dovetailed in by the idea of faith as practically equivalent to hope; the world to come already enters our experience in some degree, but the full realization is reserved for the end—and meantime the Christian must hope and hold on to the Christ, who guarantees his final bliss. As for the high priesthood, that could not by any means be adjusted naturally to the eschatology, and adhering to the latter—it is one proof of his primitive theology that he does so—the writer usually drops the notion of Christ as high priest when he has to speak about the future. Thus, the end is heralded by a cataclysm which is to shake both heaven and earth—a feature which corresponds to the primitive eschatology but not to the scheme of the two spheres of existence. Again we note how the latter is not worked out thoroughly. The writer's intense consciousness of living in the last days, on the verge of the imminent end, proves too strong for his speculative theory of the two spheres and also for his gnosis of the Melchisedek priesthood of Jesus.

Then (b) the priestly category was not large enough for his ethics. It did involve ethical

features, e.g. the cleansing of the conscience for a worship of God, which meant devotion to the service of God. But when he wants to speak of Jesus as the example and inspiration of men, he drops the idea of priest for that of pioneer (*ἀρχηγός*), for, unlike the O.T. priest, Jesus does not leave his people outside when he enters the Presence; he carries them with him, not only representing them before God but going where they can and must follow. 'Therefore let us run our race steadily, our eyes fixed on Jesus as the pioneer and perfection of faith'—the perfect embodiment of what faith in God means, the One who shows us how faith should live and move. In the context of both references to *ἀρχηγός* there is an allusion to movement: 'in bringing many sons to glory, it befitted God to perfect their *ἀρχηγός*. . . . Run the race, looking to Jesus the *ἀρχηγός* of faith.' Which tells against the idea that *ἀρχηγός* is to be read in its Hellenistic sense of founder, as we find it used on inscriptions for the divine or official personage who founded a state and managed it. In Hebrews we are justified, I think, in taking the term in its primitive sense of hero-leader and pioneer. There are several other subsidiary elements in the Christology, but while they are interesting they only confirm what I have already said about the danger of an exclusive attention to the high priesthood as

the sole religious category. At the same time, it is at the heart of the writer's argument about Jesus. His ideas were, like the later ideas of the Fourth Gospel, a new theology for the first century. Our conventional and canonical attitude sometimes hides from us the originality and the startling nature of this attempt to reset the person of Christ in the light of a semi-philosophical theory of the universe, as the eternal priest who by his sacrifice opens the higher sphere of reality for men in the lower. But there is nothing startling in his aim. That is central. To our author Jesus has neither rival nor successor. The higher sphere of absolute divine realities, to which he strives to raise his readers, is, 'a world in which everything is dominated by the figure of the great High Priest at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, clothed in our nature, compassionate to our infirmities, able to save to the uttermost, sending timely succour to those who are in peril, pleading our cause. It is this which faith sees, this to which faith clings as the divine reality behind and beyond all that passes, all that tries, daunts, or discourages the soul; it is this in which it finds the *ens realissimum*, the very truth of things, all that is meant by God.' And any discussion of Christology ought to end upon that note, upon the name and thought of God.

Literature.

DREAMS.

THERE is scarcely anything left now of which the sceptic can say sceptically, 'There is nothing in it.' The last rescue is the Dream. Men of scientific eminence have made a study of dreams and have written many great scientific books about dreaming. The ordinary dreamer is not perhaps greatly enlightened or unburdened. But at least the scoffer can no longer say that the interpretation of dreams is the occupation of old women.

The latest scientific book is entitled *Dream Psychology* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It belongs to the Scientific Series entitled 'Oxford Medical Publications.' Its author is Maurice Nicoll, B.A., M.B., B.C.(Camb.), who may be further identified for the present by remembering

that he is the only son of Sir W. Robertson Nicoll. This is not Dr. Nicoll's first book. He has written tales which have 'caught on' under the name of Martin Swayne. He has also written one of the most vivid descriptions of the war in a volume on Mesopotamia, where he served as captain in the R.A.M.C. But this is his first scientific and medical work.

And the surprise of it is that Dr. Nicoll has such versatility. What fellowship hath fiction with medicine, or what communion hath Mesopotamian descriptiveness with dream psychology? One mastery runs through them all and gives them eminence. It is the mastery of the English tongue. That is the wonder of this book. Others have written as learnedly on dreams, few if any have written as lucidly. And it is not clearness that is