

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHO was 'the disciple whom Jesus loved'? The question has been asked by Professor SWETE of Cambridge in the July number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*. Now Professor SWETE is not a young German critic, intent on winning a name for himself by the offer of some new and preposterous theory. When he asks a question like this we may depend upon it that he has something to say which is worth attending to.

The disciple whom Jesus loved is mentioned only in the Fourth Gospel. There the phrase occurs five times, all in the second half of the Gospel (Jn 13²³ 19²⁶ 20² 21⁷⁻²⁰). The first occurrence is the most memorable: 'Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved.' But neither there nor elsewhere is his name given. We have accepted the supposition that his name was John, and that he was one of the sons of Zebedee. But there is nothing to suggest that he bore the name of John beyond the statement, in Jn 21²⁴, that he wrote the Gospel which early tradition has assigned to St. John. What are the facts?

The first is that he was present at the Last Supper, and reclined on the Lord's right hand. Thus he occupied a place at the table inferior to Simon Peter, but above that of any other apostle. Does this make it likely that he was one of the

sons of Zebedee? Dr. SWETE does not think so. 'The sons of Zebedee had already roused the indignation of the Ten by their request that they might sit on the Lord's right and left. It is inconceivable that He should have risked the re-opening of this struggle for precedence by placing John above Andrew, his senior in the Apostolate.'

The next fact to notice is the statement in Jn 18¹⁶, that 'Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple.' If that 'other disciple' of Jn 18¹⁶ is the disciple whom Jesus loved, as he is commonly taken to be, then the disciple whom Jesus loved was an acquaintance of the High Priest, and on such terms of intimacy with him that he could enter the court of the High Priest's official residence himself, and gain admission to it for a friend. Is this likely to have been John the son of Zebedee? Again Dr. SWETE does not think so. 'It is scarcely conceivable,' he says, 'that a Galilean disciple, drawn from the fishermen of the northern lake, could have stood in this relation to the head of the exclusive aristocracy which virtually ruled the Jewish people.'

The next reference to the beloved disciple affects our popular conceptions more seriously. In the notes on one of the Seven Last Words to be found on another page of this number, it is taken for granted that the disciple whom Jesus loved was

John the apostle, and that to him Jesus committed the keeping of His mother. To Dr. SWETE's careful scholarship the evidence points the other way. The disciple whom Jesus loved is seen standing beside the cross, but not as one of the apostles. The apostles were not there. They had not yet rallied after their flight from Gethsemane.

It was with the women that the beloved disciple was standing, and next to Mary, the mother of the Lord. The Lord, seeing them there, commits His mother to the care of this disciple, who forthwith takes her to his own home and keeps her in it. This disciple then, it is reasonable to suppose, had a home either in Jerusalem or in the neighbourhood. What probability is there that John the apostle, the son of Zebedee, had a home there?

The only other fact to which Dr. SWETE directs attention is that in the editorial note appended to the Fourth Gospel (Jn 21^{24, 25}) the disciple whom Jesus loved is identified with the author of the Gospel: 'This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true.'

Are there any facts on the other side? There is one fact which seems to favour the identification of this disciple with the apostle John. He is frequently found in company with Peter (Jn 13²⁴ 18¹⁵ 20² 21²⁰). Now Peter and John are closely associated in the Book of Acts (3^{1, 8} 4^{18, 19} 8¹⁴). This fact must be allowed its weight. But it seems to stand alone. Nothing that is said of John in the Gospels seems to Dr. SWETE to point to him as the beloved disciple. Christ loved him, as He loved all His own, 'to the end' (Jn 13¹), and especially those whom He had chosen to be His apostles (Jn 13^{34, 35} 15¹²). There is no indication that His love distinguished him from the rest. And none of the sayings that are attributed to John (Mk 9³⁸, Lk 9⁵⁴), nor the request which came from the two sons of Zebedee (Mk 10³⁷), indicate any special affinity to the mind of Christ. All the

depth of insight and fervour of love which we connect with the name of John belong to the Beloved Disciple and not, so far as we know, to the son of Zebedee.

Who, then, was the disciple whom Jesus loved?

He had a home in Jerusalem. Was it the house in which the Last Supper was eaten? Was he the master of the house (Mk 14¹⁴), and therefore the host on that occasion? And does this explain his place at the supper?

Again, he was especially beloved of Jesus. Now, only the Bethany family and the rich young ruler are mentioned in the Gospels by name as enjoying this special affection. 'Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus' (Jn 11⁵); and of the young ruler it is said, 'Jesus looking upon him loved him' (Mk 10²¹). Was the disciple whom Jesus loved Lazarus? Lazarus satisfies some of the conditions. He lived within two miles of Jerusalem; his family were in good circumstances (so we may gather from Jn 12¹⁻⁹); it is not impossible that he was acquainted with the High Priest; and his house at Bethany would have formed a suitable home for the mother of Jesus.

But Dr. SWETE does not believe that Lazarus was the disciple whom Jesus loved and who leaned on His breast at supper. 'It is difficult to believe that, if the Beloved Disciple had been the subject of our Lord's greatest miracle, the fact would have been passed by without notice either in the Fourth Gospel or in early Christian tradition. Nor is it easy to conceive of any chain of circumstances which would have converted Lazarus of Bethany into the *theologos*, the leader of Greek Christianity who survived under the name of John to the end of the first century.'

We are left with the rich young ruler. Dr. SWETE is ready to believe that the rich young ruler was the disciple whom Jesus loved and who is said to have written the Gospel according to St. John.

He was rich, even very rich. He was a 'ruler,' that is, probably a member of the Sanhedrin. In A.D. 29 he was still relatively young, though he had passed his first youth. He ran up to our Lord as Jesus started afresh on His journey to Jerusalem, hastening to seize the opportunity of putting to the Master the most vital of all questions. The Lord's answer disappointed him, at least for the moment; he went away with clouded brow, a sadder man. But who shall say that Christ's love did not avail to bring him back? or that on his return he may not have attached himself to Jesus with a fervour and wholeheartedness which justified the Lord's immediate recognition of his worth?

Why does God say, 'Let us make man' (Gn 1²⁶)? The question has often been asked, and often answered. Two answers hold the field: you prefer the one or the other according to your critical or anti-critical tendency. The one is that in the use of the plural there is an interesting anticipation of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The other is that, as a trace of polytheism still remains in the word *elohim* itself, so for once the idea of a council of the gods was allowed to remain in the record. Dr. C. J. BALL supports the polytheistic theory.

Dr. BALL read a paper before the British Academy on June 3, 1915, on *Shumer and Shem*. The paper is now published under that title (Milford; 3s. net). In that paper there were offered philological explanations of many Hebrew words. *Elohim*, the common word for God, was one of them.

Dr. BALL thinks that *elohim* originally meant the 'ghost' or disembodied spirit of a man. Now the soul of man was recognized in primitive religion as composed of three or more elements. These elements were dissociated by death. And when the disembodied spirit was spoken of, it was spoken of in the plural.

But is the word *elohim* ever used for the dis-

embodied spirit of a man in the Old Testament? Dr. BALL believes that it is. It is not often used in that sense. 'The religion of the Old Testament, as a whole, stands upon a far loftier level than mere Animism or the cultus of the departed.' Still it is used. Dr. BALL takes us to the story of the witch of Endor.

In that story (1 Sam 28) the necromancer raises Samuel by her spells. And when she had brought him up, the king said to her, 'Fear not! tell what thou sawest.' And the woman said unto Saul, 'An *elohim* saw I coming up out of the earth.' The *elohim* was manifestly a 'ghost' or spirit of the dead.

'As a detailed historical account of the way the thing was done, this episode,' says Dr. BALL, 'stands alone in the Old Testament.' But in a passage of Isaiah he finds at least a hint of the same idea. 'In the dark hours of Assyrian invasion there were some in Jerusalem who advocated recourse to the art of divining the future by consulting the dead. Should not a people inquire of its *Elohim*?' they said (Is 8¹⁹). Isaiah's quotation of their words is charged with bitter irony: 'Inquire of the dead,' he says, 'on behalf of the living!' He used the word, as they used the word, to mean the spirits of the departed. These politicians who despair of Jehovah have no better *god(s)*, says the prophet, than the *ghosts* of the departed.

Is it possible for us to take our minds off the war and study the doctrine of the Trinity? We are concerned about the religion of the men in the trenches. We are perhaps more concerned about the state of religion in the Churches at home. We are most of all concerned about the prospects of religion when the war is over and the men come home. But in all our concern we have never had it suggested to us that we could help the men or the Churches by studying the doctrine of the Trinity.

And yet it is the deliberate opinion of Dr. L. G.

MYLNE, sometime Bishop of Bombay, that this is the most fruitful study in which we could be engaged. For the doctrine of the Trinity is the doctrine of God. Now it is our doctrine of God that determines all our religious thinking. And on our religious thinking depends our religious life. Dr. MYLNE has written a large book on *The Holy Trinity* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), for he believes that in an understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity lies the hope of the Church both now and when the war is ended.

How are we to approach it? Dr. MYLNE recommends us to begin with a study of the Person of Christ. And surely he is right. It is always safe to begin with Christ. It is true that the Person of Christ has been the chief subject of controversy through the Christian ages, and more theological language has gathered round it than round any other of the great doctrines of the Faith. Yet Dr. MYLNE recommends us to begin with the Person of Christ, and with its theological language.

He recommends us to begin with the theological titles which have been applied to Christ. What are they? They are four in number, and they divide themselves into two classes. In one class stands the title 'Son.' In the other class stand the three titles, 'Logos,' 'Effulgence of the Father's Glory,' 'Express Image of the Father's Person.'

With which of these titles are we to begin our study? We had better begin with the three which form the second class. It is safer. For the first title, Son, emphasizes the distinction of Persons in the Godhead; while the other three titles are the expression of Function rather than of Personality. Now if we begin with Personality, we are likely to throw the emphasis in our thinking upon that individuality in the Godhead which is the chief stumbling-block to the acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity in the present day. But if we begin with the titles which suggest a distinction of Functions rather than of Personalities we are

likely to throw our weight upon the unity of God. And in throwing the weight of our thinking on the unity of God we meet the most plausible heresy of our day, and at the same time appreciate the greatest of all truths about God, the truth which was so painfully won by the great religious thinkers of the past.

This is not the usual order of approach. Men commonly start with the title 'the Son,' and then introduce the others as complements or correctives. But Dr. MYLNE holds to it. For 'I am persuaded,' he says, 'that many shrinkings from adequate belief in the Trinity result from a false persuasion, articulate or unexpressed, that, at the bottom, belief in three gods is what orthodox Christians hold; while, again, there are half-taught believers who afford some justification to such a libel on the Faith.'

When our Lord began His public ministry in Palestime He found the people divided into two classes, the 'righteous' and the 'sinners.' That division determined the form of His ministry. He gave Himself to the sinners; He left the righteous alone. He said he was a physician. The righteous believed that they were right with God. Very well: 'They that are whole need not the physician, but they that are sick; I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.'

But the righteous would not leave *Him* alone, and He often had to speak to them. What did He speak to them about? He spoke to them about the sinners. He spoke about the difference between the sinners and themselves. The 'sinners' were sinners, He did not deny. But were the 'righteous' righteous? Were they quite righteous? If not, if they were not quite right with God, if they had some debt to pay, though it were smaller than the debt the sinners owed, how did they propose to pay it? There was a certain creditor who had two debtors; the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty; and when they had nothing to pay the debt with?

It may actually be better in the end with the sinner than with the righteous person. 'When they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most?' A righteous person and a sinner went up to the temple together to pray; and after they had prayed, 'I tell you, this man (the sinner) went down to his house justified rather than the other.'

But the sinners' advantage was seen when the offer came of the Kingdom. Though they were great sinners, far greater than the righteous, yet, if they entered the Kingdom and the righteous did not, they had all the advantage. And the advantage was enormous. For he that is least in the Kingdom of God is greater than the greatest without it. He is better than the best of the righteous persons who refuse to enter in. That is why 'there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance.'

Now the division of the people into righteous and sinners, and the fact that it determined the method of our Lord's ministry and was never out of His mind, is the simple key that opens the meaning of some very difficult sayings in the Gospels. It is the key that opens the meaning of a saying which has been found so puzzling that, as Professor E. F. SCOTT says, 'Not a few commentators have confessed themselves utterly baffled by it.' The saying is found in Mt 11¹², 'And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent (R.V., men of violence) take it by force.'

The saying does not stand quite alone. There is a parallel to it in St. Luke (16¹⁶), 'The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it.' Is that intended to be the same saying? No doubt it is; though why it differs so greatly in form it is hard to say. Professor SCOTT thinks that 'Luke was

perplexed by the saying, as all interpreters have been since, and gave a paraphrase of what he conceived to be its meaning.' And perhaps Luke was not very far astray with his paraphrase.

In the *Christian World Pulpit* for the 30th of July 1913, a sermon is reported by a minister of the Church of Scotland, the Rev. Charles HENGHAM, M.A., of which this saying is the text. The commentators usually believe that the saying as given by St. Matthew has dropped out of its context. They cannot understand how Jesus could have said, 'from the days of John the Baptist until now,' if John was still alive. Mr. HENGHAM takes it as he finds it. John had just sent a deputation from his prison to Jesus, and after dismissing the deputation Jesus went on to speak about John, and ended by uttering this saying.

But Mr. HENGHAM does not take the words 'from the days of John the Baptist until now' in the ordinary way. He takes 'the days of John the Baptist' to refer to the whole Old Testament dispensation. And the word 'now' refers to the end of that dispensation. Then the meaning is that during the whole of the Old Testament dispensation the Kingdom of Heaven was entered by violence; it had to be stormed. But now all is changed. The law has given place to the gospel. The struggle to reach righteousness has ended; grace and mercy have come. It is no longer, 'This do, and thou shalt live'; it is, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'

Out of that meaning Mr. HENGHAM takes an effective sermon. But it is not the meaning of the text. No one else has doubted, and no one need ever doubt, that the 'now' of St. Matthew and the 'from that time' of St. Luke refer to the New Testament dispensation. The contrast between 'the law and the prophets' and 'the gospel of the kingdom' makes that evident. Let us try another.

Cremer, in his *Biblico-theological Lexicon*, discusses

the meaning of the text. Cremer is greatly impressed with the reluctance of the people to enter the Kingdom. Christ Himself was impressed with it. In the face of 'the profoundly mournful' words of Mt 23³⁷, 'and ye would not,' he cannot believe that Christ could ever have spoken of the people pressing into the Kingdom or capturing the Kingdom by force. It is his belief that 'no unhappier explanation of this much disputed passage could be suggested.' He takes it to refer to the Jews, and especially the Jewish rulers. It was they that caused the Kingdom of Heaven to suffer violence. They were the 'men of violence' who took it by force.

Dr. DALMAN, in his *Words of Jesus*, is of the same opinion. And Archdeacon ALLEN, in his *Commentary on St. Matthew*, one of the volumes of the 'International Critical' series, agrees with CREMER and DALMAN. He says: 'We must translate, "The Kingdom of the heavens is violently treated," that is, in the persons of its messengers and heralds. The editor [of St. Matthew's Gospel] has in mind the death of the Baptist, and the similar ill-treatment meted out to subsequent Christian preachers.'

But there are objections, and some of them are serious. One objection is that the saying ceases to be a saying of Christ. It could have been spoken only after the Resurrection, and some time after. Another objection is that it takes the phrase 'the Kingdom of Heaven' in a sense which it never bears elsewhere. For the 'Kingdom of Heaven' or the 'Kingdom of God' never signifies the persons who have entered into it. The word 'Church' is used in that sense, but not the word 'Kingdom.' And a third objection is that it gives no natural explanation of the words 'the violent take it by force.'

There is, however, a variant of this interpretation which has received a good deal of support. Its most influential advocate has been Professor Johannes WEISS. It has been approved of by the

very latest commentator on the First Gospel, Dr. A. H. MCNEILE. Says Dr. MCNEILE, 'The Kingdom is treated as a "prize" (*ἀπταγμός*) and violently snatched at.' By whom? By 'those who thought of the Messianic blessings as political, and tried to reach them by rebellion and war.'

Dr. James MORISON takes this view. Dr. MORISON'S commentaries are always worth consulting. They are worth consulting even though he sometimes adopts impossible interpretations. For there is an individuality of attitude to Christ and the gospel which is more than curious, it is nearly always instructive. Here his comment is worth quoting. 'Multitudes waited for the appearance of the King. They waited and wearied. They got impatient. The progress of events was too slow to satisfy them. If we compare *the kingdom of heaven* to a walled city, or to a fortress, the people referred to were like persons who were ready to force their way in, as if they were going to take it by storm. They felt as if they could not wait till the gates were thrown open. If, again, we compare the *precious things* of the kingdom to the *precious things* within a city or fortress thrown open, the excited multitudes, who may be regarded as pouring along the streets and ways, feel as if they could not wait till discriminate distribution should take place, till it be ascertained who is worthy to receive much, and who must be contented with little, and who must be rejected altogether. They feel as if they must pounce upon the precious things pell-mell, and seize them like plunder. Such is the picture.'

And it is a plausible picture. But it will not do. For in the first place it throws the saying out of its context. If our Lord is speaking of the capture of the Kingdom by the politically avaricious, He is condemning it. But He represents the movement as having begun just after the preaching of John the Baptist. Now it is impossible that He should throw the blame on John, of whom He has been speaking so approvingly. And there is a greater objection than that.

This interpretation contradicts the teaching of Christ. It contradicts, not isolated sayings merely, but its whole trend and tenor. For when did our Lord commend the man who sits still and waits for the Kingdom to come to him? Does He not always approve of the man who prays, 'Thy Kingdom come'? And the more earnestly he prays, the more shamelessly he urges his importunity, does He not approve of him the more? What is the meaning of the parables of the Unjust Judge and the Friend at Midnight? What is the meaning of the story of the Woman of Syro-Phœnicia?

Professor E. F. SCOTT, writing in the *Biblical World* for December 1907, urges this objection forcibly. He takes this text as one of the most significant and central texts in the New Testament. He says that in all the more recent literature on our Lord's conception of the Kingdom of God, this passage is singled out as one of crucial importance. And until we interpret it aright, he says, 'several of the main issues in the larger problem will remain uncertain.'

For if we interpret this text as Dr. MORISON has interpreted it, we shall regard Jesus as merely foretelling the coming of the Kingdom, not as ushering it in. Wherein, then, will Jesus differ from John? There is a confident school of expositors who interpret so. Jesus was a prophet, as John was. He saw as John saw, only more clearly, that the 'Kingdom of God was coming.' He knew not when. He was not quite sure how, only He thought it would come with a catastrophe. Professor SCOTT rejects the explanation wholly. The Kingdom comes with Jesus. He is Himself the King. And although He could not tell the day or the hour, He encouraged men to hasten its coming. He knew that in some sense men could compel the Divine will, and 'shorten the days.' And His encouragement was always to those who determined that they at least would enter the Kingdom now, though it should mean its capture, as of a citadel, by violence.

Sixteen years ago Canon GORE (he was Canon GORE then) preached a sermon in Westminster Abbey on this text. He was persuaded that Christ meant to say that the Kingdom had been coming by the forcible entrance of people into it. He left on one side, as we may now do, all other interpretations than that. But he was not sure that Jesus expressed His approval of that way of entering. Very likely Canon GORE was under the influence of Hort. For in his *Judaistic Christianity*, which was published in 1894, Hort, cautiously beginning with 'whatever else these difficult words contain,' went on to say, 'at least they express that a new period, that of the kingdom of heaven, had set in after what are called the days of John the Baptist, and that his preaching had led to a violent and impetuous thronging to gather round Jesus and His disciples, a thronging in which our Lord apparently saw as much unhealthy excitement as true conviction.'

Canon GORE, we say, had probably read that. In any case that is just the position he takes up. Our Lord refers to 'the enthusiasm and forcibleness of the children of the new Kingdom.' And He does not altogether disapprove of their enthusiasm. But He notes that there are 'elements of exaggeration and violence in it.' And He disapproves of that. Whereupon Canon GORE proceeds to preach his sermon.

'The element of violence, lawlessness, exaggeration, is a prominent feature in all wide and deep religious movements.' That is the theme. Examples are given: that first Corinthian Church to which St. Paul wrote his Epistles, the witness of the early martyrs in their defiance of the Roman Empire, the departure of the hermits to their life of overstrained asceticism in the desert, the Methodist Revival, the Oxford Movement. In every case 'it is a real spiritual idea that has taken possession of and shaken the hearts and minds of men. But every movement, even the latest, has been tainted by extravagance, lawlessness, the follies of its extreme partisans. Jesus referred to

the first and greatest of these movements. He approved of the movement. But He disapproved of the violence that accompanied it.

That was Canon GORE's interpretation in 1899. Four years passed. Canon GORE had become Bishop of Worcester. He preached again in Westminster Abbey, and he preached from the same text. He had now discovered its meaning.

'As he looks round about Him on the little band of His disciples who were to form the beginning of His new Kingdom, He compares them to robbers or bandits who force their way where they have no right to be by violent action. From the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of Heaven has been suffering violence, and it is violent men who have been taking it by force.

'There was no class of the community which would be less thought of in the matter of religion, which seemed more alien to the very idea of the Kingdom of Heaven, than the publicans. Publicans and harlots are classed together, or heathen men and publicans. Yet who is this Zacchæus close to Jesus? Had he not been so zealous that he had climbed up into the sycamore tree that he might see Jesus as He passed? Had he not been so smitten in conscience that he had taken Him into his own house, and there, before others, at the meal had stood up and with strenuous action asserted that henceforth half of all he gained he would give to the poor, and that whatever wrong he had done in the past in his profession he would restore it fourfold? He was a violent man. He had pressed from outside surprisingly, unexpectedly, into the Kingdom of God. He had laid violent hands on it. He stood there at the centre of that class which had lost the right to be there.

'And Matthew, too, he who had become doubtless gradually acquainted with the claim and

meaning of the message of Jesus; he had heard that call as he sat at his tax-gathering, and there among the crowd, doubtless of those who stood round about him in his business, he had risen up and left all and gone after Jesus. He had forced his way into the Kingdom of God.

'Nay, were not almost all those gathered about Him Galileans, and Galileans were nothing thought of in the matter of religion. It was a saying current among the Jews: If you want to be rich you go to Galilee; if you want to be religious you go to Jerusalem. But it was Galilee, not Jerusalem, that had listened to the call of Jesus and was supplying His disciples. Stranger still, who is this woman foremost amongst those ministering to Jesus? Can it be she who had made so strange, so terrible a name in the streets of the city for her licentious, abandoned life? Can it be she who had made money to buy precious ointment out of the wages of iniquity? Yes, but she had forced her way in. She had come through into the banqueting place; and there in public she had given Him the homage of her love; she had washed His feet with her tears, had wiped them with the hair of her head, and anointed them with precious ointment.

'And we can go further. You remember the Syro-Phœnician woman? Rebuffs were heaped upon her, as it seemed, from the lips of our Lord. "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." But she had seen through these rebuffs; she had understood what was meant, and that behind them there were the words of Life; and so she had forced her way through the doors that seemed closed against her, she had pushed her way in; she had to say, "Nay, Lord, but the dogs under the table eat of the crumbs that fall from the master's table."

'Then our Lord Himself compared God to a judge who, fearing neither God nor man, would yield to no solicitude until the importunity of the

applicant had become such that for his own peace of mind he would be no longer harassed, and he gave what he had grudged to give. Not that God grudges; but that His gifts are intended for those who show themselves eager. "The Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent men take it by force."

That is the introduction to Bishop GORE'S sermon. It is a new sermon, altogether new. There is nothing now about excess or excitement. The mistakes of the violent are all forgotten in the victory of their violence. They have entered the Kingdom, while the prudent and the particular have remained without. That is the great fact to which our Lord draws attention. Bishop GORE sees it now and rejoices in it.

Now when we have ascertained the meaning of this text, let us detach the word 'violence' from it, and let us consider it separately. It is a word that is found with some frequency both in the Old Testament and in the New. And that is not surprising. For much of the Old Testament and some of the New was written under oppression, and under a keen feeling of resentment because of it. It is a proper time to consider such a word, since its modern equivalent is ruthlessness.

There are four moments in the history of the word.

First it is used of the state of the world before the Flood. 'The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence' (Gn 6¹¹). Says Marcus DODS: 'It was a world of men, fierce and energetic, violent and lawless, in perpetual war and turmoil.' That is the first moment in its history.

Then came the law. The law came to restrain this lawlessness. As St. Paul says, 'It was added because of transgressions' (Gal 3¹⁹). We have not to discuss here the question of the priority of the Law or the Prophets. Some law was in exist-

ence before the prophets came. They were always able to appeal to some recognized standard of right and wrong. They came to enforce the law.

But they could not enforce it. Again and again their prophecy is simply a bitter cry of disappointment—disappointment that the law was as much disregarded as ever, and their own voice unheard. Take Habakkuk: 'O Lord, how long shall I cry, and thou wilt not hear? I cry out unto thee of violence, and thou wilt not save. Why dost thou shew me iniquity, and look upon perverseness? for spoiling and violence are before me: and there is strife, and contention riseth up. Therefore the law is slacked, and judgement doth never go forth: for the wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore judgement goeth forth perverted' (1²⁻⁴). That was the second moment in the history of this word. The law had been 'added' to restrain the violence of men, and it had failed. The prophets had been sent to enforce it, and they had been bitterly disappointed.

Then another prophet came. He came with a new idea. Men of violence, he said, were about to surpass themselves in ruthlessness. They were about to commit the most outrageous act of violence that the world had ever seen. They were to put to death one who had done no violence *because* he had done no violence. In his prophetic language, 'They made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth' (Is 53⁹). And that supreme act of violence was to be the world's salvation. That was his message.

It was an extraordinary message. It seemed so illogical and unworkable that men rejected it with ridicule. And when the blameless one came, they had forgotten all about the evangelical prophet's message, and committed the very act which he prophesied they would commit. But the prophet

was right. Where the law failed the gospel succeeded. Men of violence, who could not be reformed by punishment, were regenerated by mercy.

The last moment in the history of this word

came when Jesus stood and spoke to the Pharisees, who were still trying the method of the law, and told them that the publicans and harlots were entering the Kingdom before them. 'The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence,' said He, 'and men of violence take it by force.'

New Light on the Hittite Problem.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES HOPE MOULTON, D.LIT., D.D., D.C.L.

I WONDER whether English scholars have got hold of the *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* for December 1915 (No. 56). My copy came to me from Professor Geissmann some months ago, through a mutual friend in Groningen, Professor de Zwaan. I value it as a token of what will, I trust, survive this fearful strain on friendship, though my friend's eyes are still, I fear, as darkened as the rest.

The fifty-page monograph which I describe is one of first-rate importance for the solution of a very old problem. Boghaz-Keui in Cappadocia is a site the exploration of which we missed by one day—so I was told in Oxford a few years ago—and the Kaiser got his firman and sent Hugo Winckler to work. He dug out an immense number of cuneiform texts, and published many. The most sensational of them was that in which the Vedic gods Indra, Mitra, Varuna, and the Nāsatyau (Dioscuri) appeared: the mystery of their appearance so far away is not yet really cleared up. The rest of the inscriptions were sent to Constantinople to await Winckler's lucid intervals in a distressing and long-continued mental affliction. Their Turkish custodians would allow no one else to get at them, and thoughtfully kept them in a damp cellar. So at least I was told, and one can only feel thankful that fear of German masters preserved the antiquities from more drastic treatment. Winckler died in April 1913, and the Oriental Society made arrangements for a systematic examination of the stones. There are, Dr. Otto Weber tells us in the present number of its *Transactions*, some twenty thousand fragments in the Osman Museum in Constantinople; Berlin has a good many as well. In April 1914 Dr. Figulla from Berlin and Professor Hrozný from Vienna went to Constantinople and

copied inscriptions 'until the war recalled them.' This is, by the way, the only allusion to that event, if I remember rightly: the information may be convenient for any censor into whose hands the pamphlet may fall.

The society promises the following publications, which, I gather, may be out already: (1) Accadian texts, by Weidner and Figulla; (2) other texts, especially those in the 'Ḫatti and Ḫarri dialects,' by Figulla; (3) Ḫatti texts by Dr. Figulla, only half printed. All these are transcribed, so as to be available for those who are not Assyriologists. A special journal called *Boghazköi-Studien* (Hinnichs) is to be devoted to the researches. The bibliographical information is continued with a list of Hugo Winckler's own contributions, which will naturally be known to our specialists. His friends hoped to find among his papers some indications of his conclusions as to the riddle of the 'Ḫatti-Sprache,' but they found none. 'Wahrscheinlich hat er in einer bitteren Stunde, wie so vieles andere, auch diese Aufzeichnungen vernichtet.'

Professor Hrozný takes up the dead savant's work, and in this paper gives a long and careful study with very startling results. He gives us an outline of the phonology and accidence of the Hittite language, as shown by words from the inscriptions presented in roman script. And the result, in a sentence, is that Hittite was an *Indo-European language, and one belonging to the Western half of the family*, the 'centum-languages,' of which Greek, Italic, Keltic, and Germanic are the great representatives.

A dozen pages by Professor Eduard Meyer of Berlin sketch the history of the decipherment of Hittite, by way of adequately introducing Hrozný's