

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE III.

## A LACUNA IN SCHOLARSHIP.

BY H. W. MAGOUN, PH.D.,

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

## IV.

At the beginning of this discussion it was suggested (p. 93) that men do not realize what is involved in the failure to consider all of the facts concerning Jesus. They do not. It was also intimated (p. 100) that modern views on some of these matters would be considered later. They need to be. When men say such things as this, "I do not believe that anybody, in the time of Jesus, thought he raised the dead, or did these other miraculous things," it is impossible to avoid asking one's self whether they know anything whatever of the mentality of Jews either ancient or modern or of the existing evidence concerning such questions. The actual truth is diametrically opposed to their subjective opinions, which disclose a remarkable propensity for jumping at conclusions with little regard for consequences.

The situation is really so grave as to warrant the use of such expressions as, — an astonishing lack of historical perspective, an extraordinary bit of naïveté, and an unaccountable dearth of the most elementary knowledge of Oriental psychology. In fact, the thing itself can only be explained, if one seeks to excuse it, by the assumption that their knowledge is wholly that of books and that it has never been extended beyond the narrow confines of their own little studies, or offices, so as to bring them into direct personal touch with

individuals of the race concerning which they presume to speak. Indeed, it is actually to be doubted whether they have even gone so far as to consult men who have had this experience.

The ancient Semitic mind was, just as the modern Syrian mind is, quite as receptive to the miraculous as the present-day rationalist's is proof against it. Most other Orientals are of a like character. They believe without hesitation and with gladness what any modern materialist would regard as simply preposterous. There are exceptions, where education or influences from the West have destroyed the childlike simplicity of the native character; but the rank and file are as depicted. Moreover, in our Saviour's day even the educated Scribes and Pharisees, as the evidence plainly indicates, did not attempt to gainsay the works of Jesus; for the so-called "Toldoth Jeshu," which is related to the Talmud, never betrays, in spite of its bitter hostility to him, any disposition to deny his works, since it seeks to belittle them by declaring that he did them with the help of Egyptian magic. As he could not possibly have been over eight or ten years of age when he left that country, he must have been a trifle precocious. Comment is unnecessary.

When men have reached this degree of smug self-complacency, it is easy to deny miracles, ignore the evidence of the empty tomb, reject as late accretions the various accounts of the miracles of Jesus together with each and every claim to divinity which he uttered — modern textual criticism has obtained results diametrically opposed to all these notions, — and then insist upon the rationalistic dogmas that Jesus was merely a man, that he never rose from the dead, that there is no such thing as the supernatural (there is not for them, since all spiritual things must be spiritually discerned and the

first requisite for entrance into the Kingdom is humility), that there is no need for miracles and never was, and that, to a living God, "in our day, nothing could be more unnecessary than miracles."

This last item is particularly rich, since God was not the one who ever had any need of miracles. He could not have been. An ignorant and stiff-necked populace in an age when a majority of the adults were no further along in their intellectual and spiritual development than children of twelve are to-day among us did need miracles, and they were vouchsafed unto them. To judge them and their needs and their conditions by modern standards is simply preposterous. Physical miracles are certainly out of date; but those greater works, the miracles of grace which bring to life the spiritually dead, are still with us and must be reckoned with. They are realities, as some of us know beyond a peradventure, and individual instances are more astounding than a physical resurrection could be. Moreover, they cannot be ignored. Such things, however, are not met with in a professor's study.

The miracles of Jesus were "signs." That is what they are called in the Greek. As such they were intended, and without them Jesus would have been left with no adequate means of differentiating him from Buddha or even from Mohammed, since Confucius would always have remained to furnish a connecting link between him and them. He would simply have been the best one in the group, exactly as our modern skeptic would have us believe that he was. To this the miracles oppose an insurmountable obstacle. That is one reason why they were employed. Men needed them as vouchers. Christ was something more than Confucius ever could be, great as he undoubtedly was. From this conclusion there is no way of escape, especially if the matter is

sifted to the bottom. Evidence, however, is of no consequence when men *will* — not to believe. Even though convinced, they still cling to the old position and the old unbelief. It is one of the penalties of being allowed to choose.

What, then, do such teachings involve and where do they lead? To begin with, they involve this. Either the New Testament story is true or else it is false. If a part of it is false, the whole is presumably so; for the witnesses do not change their identity, there is not a scrap of evidence that any part of the Gospel was ever rewritten, textual criticism indicates that the autograph copies were more pointed in their claims concerning the divinity of Jesus than our modern versions are, and no mortal now living is competent to say that certain portions have been fabricated and added to the original story. Furthermore, these are ancient documents and, as such, they have a standing which any court of law would recognize. No tampering with the text would be tolerated, and positive proof to the contrary would have to be produced before any part of them could be rejected.

A court would have to be shown. Any other course would lead to chaos. It would mean the upsetting of every reliable standard at the caprice of an irresponsible judge, and stability would cease to be. That result is approximately what we get in this field when the seed is ripe for the harvest, — if we accept rationalism and follow it with any consistency. As a matter of fact, rationalism is itself irrational, because it ignores a large and important bundle of testimony and seeks to throw it out of court.

It rejects, for example, the story of the birth of Jesus and refuses to entertain any such doctrine on the ground that it is unnatural. That contention may be granted without hesitation; for the story has been a stumbling block from the

start. It is, in fact, impossible to imagine how it could have originated if it was not true. Where did it come from? It cannot be duplicated in heathen literature; for all such virgin births, so-called, admit carnal intercourse as a factor in the result, although they restrict it to a god or a hero. *They* did not count! Even the story of the Saoshyant, or Saviour who was to bring eternal light and life to men, which appears in the Zend Avesta<sup>1</sup> and comes the nearest to being a parallel to what Matthew and Luke have to say, represents Eredat-fedhri as bathing in Lake Kāsava and there conceiving by the seed of Zarathustra, preserved for that very purpose by the angel Nēryōsang. It thus appears that the Bible story — it is foreshadowed in the Old Testament — is absolutely unique in the literature of the world. How did that happen? If it is true, the answer is easy; but if it is false, the story itself is unaccountable.

The Jews, from the start, have had no question on the subject of the birth of Jesus, and they still call him, as they always have, apparently, "Jesus the Bastard." That is what he was if the New Testament narrative is false. No other conclusion is possible on the basis of the evidence. He was not the son of Joseph; for, as already shown, his name counts for nothing, and Jesus Son-of-Joseph or Joseph-son was merely his legal name and that is all. It has not been so understood; but that is not evidence, and a misunderstanding is no basis for argument. Men called him Jesus Barjoseph, if we Anglicize the words, and that has been translated as

<sup>1</sup> The Zend Avesta story has every appearance of being a survival, modified by time, of the original promise to mankind, which the Jews alone, or rather the children of Israel, preserved in all its purity. That story is accordingly a fossil, bearing witness to a former age and to the truth of the Bible account of God's dealings with men.

"Jesus, the son of Joseph." It is really Jesus Joseph-son, as given above, and it was the only possible name for him to have. That was the Jewish custom, and Luke so indicates, although his words, "as the custom was," have been rendered, "as was supposed." That is another lacuna of a mild sort; for *nomisō* has reference to custom or law, and it cannot refer to anything hypothetical. The indications are that the people of his day did not "suppose" anything of the sort.

They knew that Joseph was not his father, and the fact crops out in the Gospel of Mark where it says (vi. 3), "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" The form of the question was hardly an accident, even if Mary was in the royal line; for she is avoided in both genealogies, since women did not count. Moreover, it is becoming more and more apparent that the remark, "We were not born of fornication; we have one Father, *even* God" (John viii. 41), was a typical double-barreled Oriental insult. In a word, — the time for mincing matters is already long past, — the whole thing narrows down to this: Messiah or Bastard — Which? These are the two alternatives, and they are the only alternatives that are possible on the basis of the evidence.

Men do not like evidence. They prefer to make up their minds without it. If it is once admitted, however, in the present instance, and admitted on a legal basis, then the issue is distinctly drawn. If the Jews are right, the whole Christian world has been victimized, the followers of Jesus are the dupes of a monumental fraud, Jesus himself is the most remarkable and the most colossal of impostors, and his influence on the world is a miracle so stupendous that it cannot be put into words.

Do you doubt this? Well, let us look at the matter a little closer. Come down to our own day and postulate a bastard

of the twentieth century. Having done that, try to make a Jesus out of him. For example, imagine him saying, "Come unto me, . . . and I will give you rest." Then add that other remark, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me." Could *you* swallow that — from a bastard, with all that that implies in the matter of heredity? "Oh," you say, "but that last is from John, and I do not accept John!" Naturally. You cannot, with your present tenets concerning Jesus, and escape stultification. The other quotation, however, is synoptic (Matt. xi. 28) and not so easily disposed of. What will you do with that? You believe that it is a late accretion. Very well. How will you explain the fact that untold thousands of men and women, down through the centuries, have taken Jesus at his word, have come unto him for rest, and now unitedly declare that he has never failed to make good? You do not know that this is so from experience, since you are automatically estopped from having any such experience; but some of the rest of us do, and we bear witness to its truth. Do you think that we are deluded? Have these articles, thus far, suggested a type of mind that is prone to accept delusions?

Possibly you still think that you can conceive of Jesus as having been a bastard and yet the greatest of all religious teachers. All right. If you can, it follows that you can put our twentieth-century bastard into his place and conceive of him in the same capacity. Now, let us see you do it! Bitter pill to swallow, isn't it? But you will have to swallow it or stand convicted of intellectual dishonesty, and you cannot squirm out of the dilemma. Are you frank enough to admit it?

Moreover, there is another puzzle awaiting solution. What



will you do with the flawless character and the sinlessness of Jesus? Are they a natural product of bastardy? They are and always have been a source of wonder and amazement even to his foes. Large numbers of Jews now admit this and call him "our brother, Jesus." They might go further, if they understood Isaiah better. Centuries ago he said: — "unto him shall the nations seek" (xi. 10), "he will bring forth justice to the Gentiles" (xlii. 1), "I . . . will . . . give thee . . . for a light of the Gentiles" (*ib.* 6), and "nations shall come to thy light" (lx. 3). These are exactly the things that have been happening the world over; for to-day the Gentiles are trusting in the name of Jesus, and, wherever that is true, justice prevails, *under normal conditions*. If, however, men lose their belief in the divinity of Jesus, they soon open the door to chaos and come to believe that might makes right.

What should deter them, if he was only a bastard? And if that is what he was, how can we account for such amazing effects among the Gentiles? Is it conceivable that an obscure peasant of uncertain parentage on his father's side, could pose as the Messiah and as a divine authority on righteousness, and then make a success of it so colossal as to affect the entire civilized world not only in the centuries immediately following his own but also, with increasing power, in those remote from his own? Are you credulous to the degree required, if one is to believe that sort of thing possible in progressive lands where men are accustomed to weigh evidence and judge accordingly? Those, however, are the lands where this sort of thing is most in evidence; for Christian lands are the most progressive ones on earth.

Now, note another thing. On the cross, in the midst of the tortures which he had to undergo because of his cruci-

fixion, Luke says (xxiii. 34) that he prayed: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." That prayer has always been a source of wonder to men. Would a fraud — for fraud he must have been, if he was merely a man and a bastard at that — have been likely to offer such a petition under such distressing circumstances? To this question there seems to be but one answer. Can you dodge the suspicion that here, again, there is, for some reason or other, a lacuna in scholarship? The incongruity appears, however, wherever men are gullible enough to accept and believe the dogma that Jesus was merely a man and a natural son of Joseph. Until we are ready to subscribe to the Hindu doctrine *māyā* and conclude that all human life is merely an illusion, such a course seems wholly irrational.

In spite of that fact, men take it. They have an intellectual difficulty, due to their pronounced materialism, and they do not stop to consider the matter further. They do have a right to ask that their difficulty be met; but they never seem to suspect that it has been met and fully met in the New Testament account as it stands. All that is really needed is a restatement of the case, in modern terms, so as to bring out what is actually involved. The whole thing then becomes clear. Possibly you doubt this. If so, read on. The ground will be covered before I am done.

Meanwhile, a few other things may be briefly mentioned. One of them has reference to a somewhat remarkable novel which was published not many years ago. The book is remarkable for two things — its powerful beginning and its woefully weak ending. Its author evidently knows religion only from the outside. As a witty Methodist clergyman once remarked, "He should have called his book 'The Outside of the Cup,' since that is as far as he ever got." If the

stricture sounds a trifle severe, it is nevertheless perfectly just; and yet this man is constantly quoted by those who ought to know better as an authority on religion!

Of spiritual insight he seems to have none. He does know the prevalent apostasy of his own day and appears to be in essential harmony with it. As a result he has substituted externals for vital religion, and, to all appearance, would have us believe that care for man's physical well-being constitutes the first tenet of righteousness. Carried to its logical conclusion, his position would inevitably make utilitarianism the only rational guide of life, and human selfishness would thus be left to reign supreme. That is the basic trouble with Germany to-day. Is she the most Christian of all the nations? In a word, what he has really done is this. He has mistaken the fruits of righteousness for righteousness itself and has substituted the outward act for the inner motive. Religion, however, is a matter of the heart and will. It is not a matter of outward observances, even if the said observances do minister to the needs of men. Christianity goes deeper than that.

One of the most selfish, suspicious, and treacherous men that I ever knew, was an ardent socialist who preached exactly that sort of thing. He was "long" on the teaching of brotherly love; but he wanted other people to do the loving and let him be the brother. In some kinds of service, he did go further than most Christians would be willing to go; but his admission to me made it clear that he expected to profit by it in the end and that his motives were thoroughly selfish. One of his followers once came to me in a time of stress, after having visited him first. In going, he remarked: "Well, I have discovered that it is not always those who talk the loudest that do the most."

Unless God is first recognized as supreme and love for him is substituted for love of self, there is no religion in any of these outward observances. Acts, in themselves, are nothing. Motives are everything; for they alone can contain a moral or a religious element. While self remains the center and self-interest the dominating factor in life, religion, or, at least, Christianity, is an impossibility. Love must dominate, and love is unselfish. It can be imitated: but no imitation will answer. It shows itself in outward acts; but to do those outward acts is not love. It may look like it. A tree shows its life in the growing layers beneath the bark, and yet, if that is all that it has, sooner or later the storms of winter will overthrow it and expose its hollow pretensions to the world. The heart must be sound or the tree is worthless. In a similar way, a man must be right with God, and until he is, he is not religious, no matter what he may do. There can be quite as much hypocrisy in social service as there often is in strict conformity to a ritual. It all depends upon the motive. A Christian must *be* right as well as *do* right.

Men judge by appearances. They do not like to think. Consider for a moment. "The star in the east" led the wise men west. Where was it? Where would it have to be to do that? They came, not to the inn (*kataluma*) but to a dwelling house (*oikia*), and not to see a new-born babe (*brephos*) or an infant (*nēphios*) but a "little boy" (*paidion*). A few months after their departure Herod slew the children of that section up to the age of two years. Why? Observe that he had inquired diligently of the *magi* all about the time when the star appeared. He must have based his acts on what he learned.

Now, notice something else. The star had to excite the

wonder of the wise men and cause them to investigate its meaning. A period of deliberation followed, during which they decided to seek out the new king. Preparations were next in order, and they take time. The journey was a seven-months affair, and it must have involved many incidental delays. The stop in Jerusalem is a case in point. Moreover, the East is proverbially slow. With Herod's two-year limit to set over against these considerations, it becomes practically certain that the *magi* did not arrive much before the time when Jesus was approaching his second birthday. The chances are that he was about a year and a half old. One of two things must therefore be wrong,—the accepted date of the birth of Jesus or the accepted date of the death of Herod. Both are now placed in 4 B.C.

It is safe to say that the wise men did not appear until months after the coming of the shepherds and that they worshiped a "young child" rather than an infant. Matthew knew the difference; for he uses *nēpios* in xi. 25 and xxi. 16, and here he distinctly says *paidion*. The implication is plain. Joseph remained in Bethlehem for quite a while and found some sort of a house to live in. He then went to Egypt (that would have been a hard journey for a nursing mother and babe); but how long he stayed there is wholly problematical. All that we know about it is the simple fact that it was after the death of Herod when he took up his residence in Nazareth. The only possible side-light that I can discover which seems to have any bearing on the matter is the implication, found in the "Toldoth Jeshu," that Jesus spent a number of years in Egypt. He may have done so,—it would be desirable to stay away until he was forgotten,—coming back at some time before he was twelve years of age.

If he did do that, we have an explanation for several puz-

zing things in the story of his life. To begin with, he had a curious habit of quoting the Septuagint instead of the Hebrew version of the Old Testament. That fact may be considered as now established beyond reasonable doubt. Egypt was a center of learning, and it would therefore be possible to find schools there, in which he could receive instruction. Greek would be the language taught and used, and the Septuagint would be the textbook for Jews. This is made clear by the modern practice in Rabbinical schools of having the pupils commit to memory the Hebrew Bible, beginning with the Pentateuch.<sup>1</sup> "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" (John vii. 15), would thus be disposed of, and his knowledge of the traditions which now underlie the Talmud would likewise become clear, since they would also be taught, at least in substance, along with the Bible text. This can be inferred from the fact that such is the modern practice in orthodox Jewish schools. These traditions constituted the "Oral Law," and they did much to rob the text itself of its authority. Jesus was therefore right in what he said of them. What would he be likely to say of our modern traditions — that is practically what they amount to — which do the same thing?

Something has already been said concerning them in the second and third papers of this series. The situation, however, is really so curious that a few other points may be noticed. Here are men exhausting every phase of scholarly ingenuity to bolster up a theory which seems to have originated in an aged French physician's wonder, because, forsooth, wherever the names of God were used in Genesis, the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the fact that the loss of the best reciters, in battle, was the thing which led to the practice of writing the Koran, instead of learning it from one of them, after the death of Mohammed himself.

canons of French style were disregarded! Following him and exploiting his idea, a young German, writing at the age of twenty-five or twenty-six, coined the term "higher criticism" and so caught the fancy of speculative scholars.

There was no sound basis of fact to go on, nothing but the subjective conclusions of one-track though brilliant minds; and yet the thing took—in some quarters—like wildfire. The ulterior motive appears to have been a desire to get rid of authority. Various things were seized upon to enforce the speculative conclusions. Among them were certain peculiarities which the traditional origin of the books made imperative, and these were taken to mean something quite different from what they did mean. Moreover, after ignoring simple and well-established rules of textual criticism, the sponsors of the theory devised other explanations that were both unnatural and forced, and then, assuming that their explanations were the only ones possible in the premises, proceeded to erect thereon a structure which they proudly hailed as "established." They seemed to regard their position as one that was impregnable. It was not, in reality, since the whole thing was a "bluff." It may be admitted that it was a royal bluff, but bluff it was just the same, and it has now been "called" so many times that its doom may be regarded as sealed.

Men do like to guess, and in the second century Celsus is supposed to have guessed—the supposition itself looks like a guess—that Luke's genealogy was that of Mary, Matthew's being that of Joseph. Origen is credited with agreeing to that interpretation, and the guess is still in favor. The chances are that both men have been misunderstood. Matthew's genealogy traces a descent from David, giving the royal line and the *legal* one. Nobody disputes

that now. A tradition still extant in Jerusalem places Mary in the royal line and says that she was thus enabled to enter the temple to speak to the boy Jesus, *although Joseph was not allowed to do so*. Impossible as it undoubtedly seems,<sup>1</sup> Matthew's genealogy must therefore be Mary's, Luke's being that of Joseph. The guess is thus exactly reversed; but the facts seem to bear out the contention.

Matthew does indeed say (i. 16) that "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary" (why was that put in?); but he also says (i. 8) that Joram begat Uzziah, who was his great-great-grandson, and that Shealtiel begat Zerubbabel (i. 12), although the latter was the son of Pedaiah, a younger brother of Shealtiel, and therefore his *nephew* (1 Chron. iii. 17-19). He evidently became Shealtiel's heir and successor (he probably married his daughter as well); but, by a legal fiction or some other peculiar Jewish idiom, he was reckoned as his begotten son. Joseph may therefore have been related to Jacob in a similar indirect way. If Mary was Jacob's daughter, as should be the case, everything becomes clear. Joseph, having married her, could be reckoned as a son of Jacob, and if the latter made him his heir or so elected or died without male issue, he would be his *begotten* son. His marriage to and treatment of Mary probably settled that. Tradition makes Joseph and Mary cousins, and Heli would thus be the younger brother of Jacob, even if Joseph was much older than Mary, as is commonly believed. Experience in real life covers that point. Mary, however, in turn, would become a daughter of Heli and would inevitably be so spoken of; for she would take her husband's name, and he was Joseph Heli-son, until he was made a Jacob-son, as Zerubbabel was a Shealtiel-son.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. lxxii. p. 38; vol. lxxiv. p. 327.



Now, Luke's ascending genealogy is plainly, as Godet has said, a private instrument drawn up from the public records. Such records, being official, would be made in the Greek *koinē*, the language used by the Romans in governing the Levant. A poor *Nū*, if made with a long initial stroke, might easily be mistaken for a Tau—I have found two such letters in my own notes—and Luke's Matthat is therefore probably Matthew's Matthan. The relationship of Jacob and Heli can thus be accounted for.

Luke omits the article at the beginning of his list, and much has been made of the fact. The whole argument is certainly wrong, however, since it is based on a misconception. An ancient or rather a medieval blunder—it is in the A.V. but not in the Revisions—has been perpetuated, and no foundation of that sort can stand. There is no union of documents or of different authorities indicated here; for *hōs enomizeto* is idiomatic and means "as the custom was." Luke so intends it to be understood, and the notion that the articles belong with the proper names goes to pieces on the rock of Hellenic usage. When so employed in Greek, the article means "the," "the well-known," "the one and only," "the aforesaid"; but it cannot mean any of these things here. The explanation is very simple. Having used *huios* once, Luke omits it the rest of the way by a well-known Greek idiom, and each *tou* is therefore an abbreviation of the phrase *tou huiou*, or a substitute for *huiou*, each being an appositive of the preceding noun. In other words, he says "the of" instead of "son of" or "the son of" very much as he makes Jesus say (ii. 49), "in the of the Father of me," *en tois tou patros mou*, in place of "in the house of my Father."

It should be remembered that Luke was a Gentile. He acted accordingly. What he says, then, in effect, is this:—

Jesus was enrolled in the regular way, according to custom, even if he was not the son of Joseph; and his full legal name thus became Jesus Joseph-son or *Iēsous Bariōsēph*.<sup>1</sup> His father (foster father) was, in turn, called Joseph Heli-son, while his grandfather was named Heli Matthat(n)-son. Luke's list, therefore, contains the official pedigree of Jesus as a reputed son of Joseph, and the line is unquestionably intended for Joseph's, not Mary's. Her line is given by Matthew. Now, she, being his wife, was instrumental in getting Joseph into her line on a Jewish technicality, since women never counted in the reckoning and it was necessary to put

<sup>1</sup> That was the Hebrew (Aramaic) idiom. The Greek was really similar, although the loss of its patronymics obscured the fact. Thus, *Simōn Iōanou* (John xxi. 16) is an exact equivalent for *Simōn Bariōnā* (Matt. xvi. 17); for the omission of *huiou* is practically akin to the loss of the vowel in English don't. So *huiē Daueid* (Matt. ix. 27, Luke xviii. 38, etc.), or *huios Daueid*, exactly parallels *Bariōnā*; for it stands for *Bardaueid*. (Cf. Acts iv. 36, where Barnabas is explained as meaning "Son of Consolation.") If a statement of fact is involved, an article is used with the proper name, as in *Tou Daueid*, "Of our David" (Matt. xxii. 42), and *ho huios tēs Marias*, "the son of that Mary" (Mark vi. 3). Such forms as *hoi huioi Zebadaiou* (Mark x. 35), *huios Zebadaiou* (Matt. xxvi. 37, Luke v. 10), and *tōi huiōi Daueid* (Matt. xxi. 9, 15) must be taken as essentially equivalent to single proper names, in each instance. In the expression, "the Son of Man," the *tou* with *anthrōpou* is generic. If the *tou* is omitted in the corresponding expression, "the Son of God," and the form becomes *theou huios* (Matt. xiv. 33 and often), or *huios theou*, the usage is appellative. The ordinary form, (*ho*) *huios tou theou* (John x. 36 and often), hardly has the generic article, so-called; for the actual meaning is, "son of the one and only God," God being essentially a proper name. Certain other forms require an article: — *Simōn ho huios Iōanou* (John i. 42) etc. are formal; *Iēsoun huion tou Iosēph ton apo Nazaret* (John i. 45) must mean "Jesus son of the well-known (our) Joseph, the-one from Nazareth"; *su basileus ei tou Israēl* (ib. 49) equals "thou art king of our Israel"; *ton Ioudan Simōnos Iskariōtou* (i.e., vi. 71) means "that Judas son-of-Simon Iscariot"; and *ton Saoul huion Keis* (Acts xiii. 21) equals "that-man Saul son of Cis." If the article is not significant it is out of place. Luke

Joseph forward *in her place*. That was the only means by which she could figure in the genealogy — the Messiah had to be of the royal (her) line, — and it will explain why Joseph is called the husband of Mary. Incidentally, it will also explain why he is so patently a mere figurehead. There were probably other similar cases in Matthew's list, and, as both come together in Matthat(n), Luke's may actually give the real line of descent, as is commonly believed.

What Luke really did, therefore, was this. He differentiated the name of Jesus from those in the rest of the list by using "son" in his case and "the" in theirs. By that

therefore has, — *huios Iōsēph* in iv. 22, *huios Abraam* in xix. 9, and *Dauēid huiōn* in xx. 41. He uses *huios theou* (i. 35), *huios Hupsistou* (i. 32), and *huios eirēnēs* (x. 6) of Jesus as appellatives, in the usual way, while Mark (x. 46) combines the Hebrew (Aramaic) with the Greek idiom in *ho huios Timaiou Bartimaios*, one expression being a translation of the other. Mark also has (ii. 14) *Leuēin ton tou Halphaiou*, "Levi son of our Alphaeus," in which "son" and "our" are both represented by an idiomatic use of "the"; and Matthew duplicates this usage in x. 2 and 3. Over against these facts may be placed another. In the Old Testament even the A. V. has Ben-hadad (1 Kings xv. 18) and Ben-ammi (Gen. xix. 38), — the Hebrew prefix Ben- is the Aramaic prefix Bar-, meaning son; — and both Revisions have now added Ben-abinadab, Bendeke, Ben-geber, Ben-hesed, Ben-hur (1 Kings iv. 8-13), etc., thus recognizing the idiom. This should suffice. Personally, I have not yet recovered from the astonishment occasioned by the discovery that men had not only taken the articles in Luke's list with the proper names — the A. V. does so, as appears from the Italics — but had actually in all seriousness based thereon an elaborate argument. What has become of our *Sprachgefühl*? It may be added that English has over seventy-five (some with several variations) names ending in -son, that other names in -s (such as Simons) are similar, that Scandinavian -sen is the same, that Mac, Mc, M', O' (Irish), Fitz- (Norman), and Ap- (Welsh, as Price for Ap-Rhys) are all prefixes meaning "son of," and that, instead of being a strange solution, Jesus Joseph-son is the only natural solution in the premises. Cf. the Jewish name Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, which contains both forms. It is significant.

means confusion became impossible. Each man was made to stand out by himself; for, while Joseph's name is involved with that of Jesus, he is to be identified, as every one that follows is, unless we except Adam, by a single term so arranged that each individual name can be seen in full on the instant. What the names were has already been indicated. The whole outline, then, is a masterpiece of brevity, lucidity, and completeness, although certain breaks like the one at Zerubbabel must be allowed for.

In brief, Luke plainly intimates that Jesus was named in the ordinary legal way, following Joseph's pedigree, even if he was not his father, while Matthew proceeds to give the royal line, or that of Mary, putting Joseph forward in her place as her husband and representative. He therefore treats Joseph precisely as he does Zerubbabel and recognizes the fact, which was of vital importance to the Jews, that the Messiah was of the royal Davidic line. He took the only way that lay open to him to do this, falling back on Jewish usage and legal technicalities. The entire matter should accordingly be clear. Matthew's line is that of Mary,<sup>1</sup> while Luke's is that of Joseph.

<sup>1</sup> This conclusion explains one additional thing, — the presence of other women in the line. They were put in with a definite purpose, and their names indicate what it was. The first is Tamar. Her story is told in Gen. xxxviii. 12-30. It was a little irregular even for those times; but her son was duly admitted into the royal line. The second is Rahab, the Canaanitish woman from Jericho. This has been doubted; but Matthew and Josephus (*Ant.* V. i. 2, 7) agree in the spelling, and the other transliteration, in Heb. xi. 31 and Jas. ii. 25, which is an exact Greek equivalent for Eng. Rahab, is not sufficient to upset the old identification. One spelling represents *Héth* by Greek *Chi*, the other by an unwritten Rough Breathing. Cf. *Béthlehem* and also *hēmiholon*, in Greek. That is all that it really amounts to, and Matthew's purpose clearly points to the Rahab of Josh. vi. 25. The third is Ruth. She was a lovely

Vol. LXXIV. No. 296. 5

Into such an analysis of the two genealogies every part of the story will fit. It is not even necessary to except the curse pronounced upon Jehoiakim and upon Coniah (Jer. xxii. 30 and xxxvi. 30); for the so-called sons of the latter (Jeconiah or Jehoiachin, 1 Chron. iii. 17-18) were more likely his grandsons, being the children of his daughter. Neri was therefore, in all probability, their father, exactly as Luke indicates; and the curse was fulfilled, *because the succession passed to another line*, that of Nathan. Jewish usage will justify this assumption, and the difficulty concerning Neri will be disposed of. There may be others like it.

We are now brought face to face with the question, Is it rational to believe that Jesus was born of a virgin? In discussing this question, one thing must never be forgotten,—the origin of life is an unfathomed mystery. Spores in interstellar space do not meet the difficulty. They merely obscure the issue. If they brought life to the earth, they had to get Moabites; but her story is a trifle dubious also. Cf. Ruth iii. 6-18. She may have been and probably was quite gullible; but when their loose standards are remembered it becomes extremely easy to regard the matter as doubtful. The last, except Mary herself, is Bathsheba, who is spoken of as *tēs tou Ouriou*, “the of the well-known Uriah,” thus calling attention to her somewhat checkered history as it appears in 2 Sam. xi. 2-5. It is therefore evident that the Jews knew and did not believe the story of Mary. Matthew supplies them with four other women to think about, all accepted as factors in the line of descent, and then categorically denies the gossip that Jesus was a bastard, after indicating that Joseph was Mary’s husband and therefore her sponsor. It was a most clever and effective bit of work on Matthew’s part; for it silenced objections until the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship could be given a fair hearing. These other women were admitted into the line and not condemned. Mary was no worse, whatever her faults may have been. As a matter of fact she was blameless. Joseph’s conduct made that evident. Therefore Jesus must be the Christ. That was Matthew’s implication, and it was unanswerable.

it from somewhere. It is here and no one can deny the fact. We must therefore face it. But to limit the original source of life and say that it, having once set the forces of generation in motion, was thereby estopped from ever producing any variation in the plan, is to assume that, other material substances having been created with certain definite and fixed characteristics, the creator was thereby estopped from ever producing those well-known radium salts, which defy the laws that govern the other substances and exhibit qualities entirely at variance with theirs. If, then, radium can be accepted as a scientific fact, the virgin birth can be; for radium is known only through its salts and what they do, while the virgin birth is attested by phenomena quite as extraordinary and fully as convincing.

If there is a personal God, he must be benevolent. If he is benevolent, he must regard the welfare of men. If he regards the welfare of men, he must in some way reveal himself to them. This he may do directly through the influence of the Holy Spirit; but, when that method fails, as fail it did along with the Mosaic dispensation, he must do something more than that. In short, he must ultimately so reveal himself to men that they must needs face the issue and forsake sin. To do this, he must reach them in the concrete. He is thus practically shut up to the expedient of a Messiah.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>That is the thing for which Socrates longed in a nebulous sort of way. He had his "inner light"; but he wanted to know why things are as they are. He was convinced that there was a supreme God, and he recognized moral obligations; but he could not understand these things and sought in vain for a solution of life's mysteries in that connection. He marks the highest point attained by man without revelation, and he is a standing challenge to those who reject it, whether they do so directly or by implication, which is now the fashionable method. Without it the Bible becomes an amazing anomaly and a miracle that is wholly unaccountable.

But a Messiah involves a virgin birth, since by no possibility can an ordinary generation furnish the necessary basis for such a manifestation. There must be complete freedom of will and yet complete domination by the Holy Spirit, and there must be both trial by temptation and sinlessness. Divinity must therefore be innate in the Messiah.

Now, every man has within him his father's personality, his mother's, and his own. In Jesus the first was lacking. The Holy Spirit's took its place. The boy Jesus was therefore free to choose between his mother's characteristics — the human element — and those of the Spirit, the divine element. Having once chosen the latter, he could come to be completely dominated by it and yet remain free, since that domination would be the result not only of his own deliberate choice or volition but also of *his own inherent nature*, a peculiarity which no mere man or set of men would be likely to take into consideration in seeking to create an imaginary Messiah; for, simple and fundamental as it is, the thing itself seems to have completely escaped all human observation for nearly nineteen centuries. That fact at once makes it clear that the Gospel story cannot be a fabrication. Moreover, philosophically, psychologically, theologically, and biologically, — approach it from what angle you will — that story affords the only rational basis for belief in a Saviour.

Dodge this conclusion you cannot, provided you are able to think clearly. If you are not able to think clearly, your case is hopeless. Your will, also, is free, and no one can compel you to believe that which you are determined not to believe. You may accordingly reject this solution of the problem; but it is sound nevertheless, and the sinless character of Jesus, his amazing words of promise, his yet more amazing influence upon the lives of men, and his fulfillment

of their hopes and aspirations all bear witness to its truth. Those who know him the best love him the most and believe in him the most thoroughly.

The Messiah was to be a great king. Those who rule over men's bodies, however, are never truly great, unless they also rule over their hearts. Jesus is the one sovereign who rules over men's hearts and so dominates their lives in every particular that they delight to do his will. Their one supreme desire is to please him,—provided they have really entered in and become members of the Kingdom of Heaven. By nature men are selfish and wish to do what they please. He changes all that, and self-interest itself is made subject to his will in those who truly serve him. Love dominates, and love is fair to its neighbor.

That in itself is a miracle in this selfish world of ours; but if the nature of Jesus has been correctly interpreted thus far it is an inevitable outcome of his dominion. Moreover, those other miracles with which he is credited become unavoidable; for they would be but ordinary incidents in the life of such a personality, however impossible they might be to men. God knows the secret of the atom or the ion, precisely as he knows that of electricity. He has been in possession of both from the beginning. He made life possible. To limit him to what you and I can do, even when he manifested himself in Jesus, is therefore the height of absurdity. Men do that, however, and then pride themselves on their acumen! The chances are that such an one knows little or nothing of life outside his own narrow circle or the confines of his study; for if he did he would have to recognize the miracles of grace which in our day far outshine those physical miracles of the first century that are now denied.

To his disciples Jesus said: "greater works than these



shall he do, because I go unto my Father." That promise is now being fulfilled as it was then fulfilled in regenerate lives. That the source of life should heal the sick and raise the dead was only natural. To make over a human will is another matter. The spiritually dead are still being made alive again, and that is a miracle indeed. What the miracle doubters need is a little personal experience with the Salvation Army or some active rescue mission where Christ is still at work. They will then begin to realize their own littleness and lack of vision.

The word miracle is an unfortunate one. For an unbelieving and stiff-necked generation Jesus did many works, every one of which was a "sign" — that is what they are ordinarily called — or voucher of his Messiahship. To the men of his day, in simple fairness, he tendered tangible evidence of his divinity, or, as he himself puts it, "the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me" (John v. 36). Those men needed just such a display of power. It was the one thing that they could understand, and he was therefore merely playing fair with his times. To judge *them* by what we need *to-day* is like expecting boys of twelve to behave like men of forty. In reality, the whole position of men who reason on such a basis is so absurd that it is difficult to credit them with ordinary common-sense.

It is true that the miracles, so-called, are not necessary to the Christian religion *now*; but the reason is exactly the thing which these gentlemen overlook, although they ought to be the first to see it because of their evolutionary tendencies. Nineteen centuries of growth in the understanding of the Scriptures certainly counts for something, and if you take that away and education along with it — there was

almost nothing that we would call *education* then, although there was plenty of *instruction*; for, except in rare cases, men did little more, after having learned by heart whatever their teachers told them, than retain it *verbatim*,— you will arrive at a condition of things in which miracles alone will meet the requirements of the situation.

You cannot teach boys Calculus before they understand ordinary Mathematics, as must be clear to all; and yet some men go on a principle quite as unpractical as such an attempt would be, although the inability of Nicodemus to comprehend the simplest fundamental truth of Christianity is a standing challenge to their notions. Doubtless he did come to see what was meant in time; but the modern Jew has the same difficulty, and he often finds it almost impossible to surmount. Subjective views are dangerous, and they sometimes produce amazing lacunas in what passes for scholarship.

The miracles, then, are a vital part of early Christianity. Without them there would have been no Christianity; for, without them, Jesus never could have set up his Kingdom. The thing would have been utterly impossible. Without them he never could have broken the power of the Scribes and Pharisees and won men to discipleship. Any one who knows anything of Jewish conservatism or of the mentality of the Hebrew race must realize the truth of this statement, as soon as he honestly weighs all that was involved in such a revolution as Jesus inaugurated. The miracles were "signs" of divinity and therefore denoted authority, and his hearers acted accordingly when he summoned them to his side and bade them become fishers of men.

But if he was divine, as all his attributes, his words, his ancient miracles, and his modern ones — "Twice-Born Men" is no imaginary picture, it is fact — plainly indicate, then one

other thing inevitably follows. He rose again from the dead. Death could not possibly hold him. He came from the source of life. Nay, he *was* the source of life, and that mysterious power could revivify his temporary human frame<sup>1</sup> even as the electric current can take possession of a bit of wire and make it "alive." His resurrection was therefore the final and the unanswerable evidence of his divine nature, and it thus becomes the very corner stone of Christianity itself. The two stand or fall together. They cannot be divorced. Indeed, the efforts that have been made to discredit or destroy the evidence of the fact itself are either based on a surface view of things or are patently disingenuous. Men will not believe what they say they cannot see or do not understand; but they continue to believe that they have able brains, and they keep right on eating to supply their physical needs.

Writing to the Corinthians, Paul said, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain." He told the truth. That statement, however, has a wider application than he intended, as is shown by another thing; namely, the utter failure of those who reject this belief, in any and every effort they may make, to lead men to Christ and make them Christian in a real sense. Where such men are pastors in charge of a church, the churches either stagnate or become Unitarian; for there is but one means of growth—proselyting. Many of them do not seem to hesitate much about using it!

The issue is now distinctly drawn. The facts of Christ's life and death are the best attested facts in history, and they cannot be denied. His influence in the world is gradually becoming the greatest influence upon earth. That is like-

<sup>1</sup> See "Our Lord's Resurrection-body" by Professor Edward Robinson, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. II. pp. 292-312.

wise clear. But if he was not what he claimed to be, there is no rational explanation of the phenomena which have attended the propagation of his Gospel; for he must have been a bastard by birth and therefore a most remarkable impostor, whose influence in shaping modern history, together with his power over the lives of men, becomes not merely a hopeless anomaly but also a phenomenon that is without adequate cause or reason. Hallucination does not tend to enlightenment; but Christians *are* enlightened—those who put self-interest first and reject the fundamentals of the faith can hardly be considered as entitled to the name—and are constantly helping others to become so. Every real benevolence, moreover, in all the world, springs from some incentive that harks back to Christianity; for emulation of some Christian original is usually the impelling motive even where race consciousness seems to be the source of an effort in that direction.

In the light of these things how is it possible to escape the conviction that to retain the ethical teachings of Jesus while rejecting other parts of the Gospel narrative, is to be guilty of a certain shallowness and superficiality, which it is really charitable to call a lacuna in scholarship? Men who do this, however, seem to feel that they have a monopoly of learning and that wisdom will die with them! They forget that most of their notions can be found in infidel writings either ancient or modern. It may be well to remember that.

Now, no man living can explain sight, or hearing, or digestion, no matter how accurately he can describe the processes, and mystery is still their chief characteristic. We never question them, however,—we accept them. Similarly, men accept the Gospel, in its entirety, and find themselves nourished spiritually. We do not need to know how or why,

here, as we do not in taking food for the body. Men hear and see spiritual things as well, and they accept them also. The result is peace.

Summing it all up, therefore, we must conclude that the real trouble with our scholarship is this. It fails to consider all the facts. It concentrates its attention on the things that support its preconceived theories. It excludes other pertinent matter. It fails to maintain genuine intellectual honesty or lack of bias. And it does not always make the attainment of truth its first consideration. If it did, the faults of which it is guilty, fallacies though they are, would all be unintentional.

On a certain occasion, after a brief discussion, a great musician, seeing that I was right about a certain matter in time relations, suddenly remarked: "Experience has taught me that most men are bluffers; but I see that you are the real thing." For years I pondered his words,—"most men are bluffers." He had traveled extensively and was a man of sound common-sense. Was he right? I am afraid that he was. Reputation is too often based on the ability to maintain a bluff,—sometimes through self-deception, sometimes by sheer audacity. Investigation has repeatedly shown this to be the case, and I have acquired an instinctive distrust of "specialists." In money-making such men are apt to be an unqualified success, regardless of what they do. If learning happens to be the thing exploited, the result is the same,—with a lacuna in scholarship. In case the field chances to be theology, the success is sometimes phenomenal; but the outcome may be altogether deplorable. Is it not time that we took stock of our religious leaders and put them to the test? "By their fruits ye shall know them."