plural 'Elohim.' This new name was made known to the people by the emphatic and often repeated declaration of the prophets who laid stress on it that the Lord Sabaoth is His name. So especially Isaiah and Jeremiah (Is 47^4 48^2 51^{15} 54^5, Jer 10^{16} 31^{35} 32^{18} 50^{34} 51^{19}). It is idle to speculate whether that meaning was a vague one or a definite one. It suffices to have shown that the word remained untranslated, that it was undeclined, and was treated as a proper name. It was certainly not meant to be taken 'as *hosts* in a concrete form either of Israelites or heavenly bodies which never occur in the Bible in this form.'

However poetical and suggestive the translation 'Lord of Hosts' may be—which would, moreover, limit the attributes of God and would make Him the Supreme War-Lord—that translation does not seem to correspond with the true meaning of the phrase IHVH Sabaoth. Whatever the original meaning may have been, it was lost when applied to God, when it became a stereotyped name, and just as little as one would think of translating IHVH Elohim the Lord of Gods, so little, do I submit, can we translate IHVH Sabaoth, The Lord of Hosts. It must be either The Lord (The) Host(s) if it is to be translated at all, or the Lord who is Sabaoth, or rather, following the unbroken tradition of the ages and the old versions—The Lord Sabaoth.

The Anointing of Jesus.

By Edward Grubb, M.A., Croydon.

Each of the four Gospels contains a story of the anointing of Jesus by a woman (Mt 26^{6-13}, Mk 14^{3-9}, Lk 7^{36-50}, Jn 12^{1-8}). The details have undergone considerable confusion, not only in the hands of commentators, but apparently in the actual narratives as we have them; and it may be worth while to try to disentangle them.

There appear to me to be two original narratives, referring to quite different events. The earlier is that of Lk 7^{36-50}, where a woman who is a sinner comes into the house of Simon, a Pharisee, while Jesus is reclining at a meal; and, bending over His feet, behind the couch, bedews them with her tears, wipes them with her hair, kisses them passionately, and anoints them with ointment from an 'alabastron' or phial. The latter is that of Mk 14^{3-9}, in which, in the house of Simon the leper at Bethany (two days before the final Passover, if v.[1] belongs to the story), an unnamed woman brings an 'alabastron' of ointment of 'pistic nard,' very costly, and, breaking the flask, pours it over the head of Jesus as He reclines at a meal. Some of the disciples are indignant at the waste of the precious ointment, but Jesus vehemently defends the woman's action.

The story in Matthew (26^{6-13}) is an almost exact reproduction of that in Mark, with slight compression and a few verbal additions.

In John the narrative is similar to that of Mark, but more names are given. The house in Bethany is the residence of Martha and Mary and Lazarus, and the woman is Mary. Only Judas Iscariot is stated to have objected to the waste of the ointment. The date is fixed at *six* days before the Passover instead of two, and Mary is said to have anointed the *feet* of Jesus, and to have wiped them with her hair. Nothing is said about a flask, but Mary is represented as using 'a pound' of the ointment. Here only are we told that 'the house was filled with the odour.'

There are, I think, indications that the names supplied by the Fourth Evangelist are trustworthy, though he does not enable us to identify the host, whom Mark calls Simon the leper. The actions of the two sisters are quite consistent with the indications of their characters contained in the brief passage Lk 10^{38-42}: 'Martha served,' while Mary the dreamer forgot everything but Jesus. But why she should anoint His *feet*, or wipe them with her hair, is hard to understand. Mark's statement, on the other hand, that she poured the ointment over His *head*, as a solemn act of devotion, is quite intelligible. I believe that the Fourth Evangelist has himself confused the two narratives, and has drawn the anointing of the

feet, and the wiping with the hair, from that which appears in Lk 7.

But, turning back to this story in Luke, it also, as it stands, is hardly convincing. The anointing seems quite needless. Jesus tells the Pharisee that he had given Him no water for His feet: if so, it would have been rather a sorry business to anoint dust-stained feet that had only been bedewed with tears and wiped with hair. Has not the anointing here come from Mark's story? and possibly also the name Simon?—though I would not lay any stress on this, since the name appears to have been a common one.

I suggest, then, that to disentangle the narratives we should strike out from Luke's story all mention of the anointing (including, of course, the words ascribed to Jesus in v.[46]); and that in John's story we should, with Mark, substitute 'head' for 'feet,' and eliminate the wiping with the hair. The two stories will then be separately consistent and intelligible. The only objection to this theory that I am aware of is that the precious ointment was an article that a respectable woman would not be likely to possess; but I cannot find evidence that this objection holds. Writing on Luke's narrative, Edersheim says:

'We know that perfumes were much sought after, and very largely in use. Some, such as true balsam, were worth double their weight in silver; others, like the spikenard (whether as juice or unguent, along with other ingredients), though not equally costly, were also "precious." We have evidence that perfumed oils—notably oil of roses, and of the iris plant, but chiefly the mixture known in antiquity as *foliatum*—were largely manufactured and used in Palestine. A flask with this perfume was worn by women round the neck, and hung down below the breast. So common was its use as to be allowed even on the Sabbath. This "flask," not always of glass, but of silver or gold, probably often also of alabaster, was used both to sweeten the breath and perfume the person. Hence it seems not unlikely that the *alabastron* which she brought was none other than the "flask of foliatum" so common among Jewish women.'[1]

There seems nothing here to exclude the idea that the flask of ointment would be just as likely to be in the possession of Mary of Bethany, who evidently belonged to a well-to-do family, as in that of a 'woman who was a sinner.' The theory I have indicated makes quite needless the rather revolting suggestion[2] that Mary of Bethany had herself been a 'sinner' in the technical sense; and it may be added that the common idea that the woman of Luke's narrative was Mary of Magdala is entirely without evidence to support it.

Finally, a few words may be allowed as to the spiritual significance of each of the narratives. That in Luke illustrates powerfully the unconscious influence of the personality of Jesus on the sinful people round about Him. He did not repel them, like one addressed by William Watson:

> But thou, thou passedst on,
> In whiteness clothed of dedicated days,
> Cold like a star; and me in alien ways
> Thou leftest, following life's chance lure, where shone
> The wandering gleam that beckons and betrays.

He drew to Him the publicans and sinners, and made them feel that God loved them. The light of His pure love shone into their dark hearts, quickening them to repentance and faith, arousing a loathing of their sin and a longing for forgiveness. The woman's tears, dropping on the feet of love, and her passionate kisses, outraged the proprieties of the Pharisee's house; but they expressed, as no words could do, the love of one who bitterly repented and had begun to learn the inward joy of forgiveness. She loved much because much was forgiven her, and received new life from the words, 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.'

The other story is of one who had drawn closer to Jesus in spiritual sympathy and understanding than any other of His friends, and who seems to have been the only one that was able in some measure to share His feelings as He trod the pathway to the Cross. On two occasions, when Mary's devotion to Him is criticised by others as sentimental and extravagant, He stands up for her (Lk 10[42], Mk 14[6-9]), in a way that might seem overdone had He not won from her the sympathetic insight into the soreness of His trouble that was denied Him by all the rest. 'She hath anointed my body aforehand for the burying': the words seem to imply not only that *Jesus* could see this significance in the outpouring of the precious ointment, but that Mary herself had in some dim way intended it to be so understood. She could not express her-

[1] *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. pp. 565, 566.

[2] Made, I believe, by David Smith in *The Days of His Flesh*, but I cannot verify the reference.

self in words, but she took this dumb means of showing that 'one heart at least would not faint or fail in devotion to the very end.'[1] She had understood her Master sufficiently to be able to face without flinching even the death He saw before Him. And so, 'Wherever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.'

[1] Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, p. 297.

In the Study.

Literature on Judas Iscariot.

SOME notes will be found on another page dealing with the recent interpretation of the character and career of Judas Iscariot. It may be useful to supplement them here with a few particulars about the literature.

i. Whately and De Quincey.

Modern interpretation begins in this country with the sermon of Archbishop Whately and the essay of De Quincey. Both these writers were no doubt indebted to German speculation, as De Quincey confesses for his part. Whately's sermon seems to be earlier than De Quincey's essay. It was published in 1839, along with two other 'discourses,' as an addendum to a volume entitled *Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith which may arise from the Teaching or the Conduct of its Professors*. A third edition, revised, came out in 1857. De Quincey's essay is to be found in the eighth volume of Masson's (the best) edition of his works. Masson's footnote is: 'Published by De Quincey in 1857 in the seventh volume of his Collective Writings: where printed before, if anywhere, I have not been able to ascertain; neither has the American editor. The speculation which forms the substance of the essay had been previously broached not only by German theologians, as De Quincey informs his readers, but also, I believe, by Archbishop Whately, in one or other of his many writings.'

Whately's argument can be given in a few of his own words: 'Judas believed Jesus to be the promised Messiah, who was about to establish a splendid and powerful kingdom (an expectation which it is plain was entertained by *all* the Apostles); he must have expected that his Master, on being arrested and brought before the Jewish rulers, would be driven to assert his claim, by delivering himself miraculously from the power of his enemies; and would at once accept the temporal kingdom which the people were already eager (and would then have been doubly eager) to offer him.'

'Partaking then in these notions, it was natural for an ambitious and worldly man like Judas Iscariot, to expect that by putting his Master into the hands of his enemies, he should force him to make such a display of power as would at once lead to his being triumphantly seated on the throne of David, as a great and powerful prince. And he probably expected that he should himself be both pardoned and nobly rewarded, for having thus been the means, though in an unauthorized way, of raising his Master to that earthly splendour and dominion, which, to worldly men, is the greatest object of desire.'

De Quincey differs but slightly. He realizes, however, that this view is a thorough reversal of previous judgment, and opens his essay with the challenge: 'Everything connected with our ordinary conceptions of this man, of his real purposes, and of his scriptural doom, apparently is erroneous. Not one thing, but all things, must rank as false which traditionally we accept about him.' We can give the gist of his argument also in a few sentences of his own. 'Believing, as Judas did, and perhaps had reason to do, that Christ contemplated the establishment of a temporal kingdom—the restoration, in fact, of David's throne; believing also that all the conditions towards the realization of such a scheme met and centred in the person of Christ: what was it that, upon any solution intelligible to Judas, neutralized so grand a scheme of promise? Simply and obviously, to a man with the views of Judas, it was the character of Christ himself, sublimely over-gifted for purposes of speculation, but, like Shakspere's great creation of Prince Hamlet, not correspondingly endowed for the business of action and the clamorous emergencies of life. Indecision and doubt (such was the interpretation