racter of the Bible. The Church has always instinctively claimed for them a universal character, as part of the oracles of God useful for instruction and reproof in all ages. It is only when we interpret these prophecies as *principles of Divine redemptive activity*, that this claim is set in its true light. A prophecy is a Divine message to the Church in Israel, and also to the Church in all similar circumstances. For God's *principles* of action can never change; He is immutable. This vision of Isaiah's, therefore, is not concerned only with Sennacherib or Nebuchadnezzar. Whenever the Church of Christ falls into hardened worldliness and neglect of true religion as a result of long prosperity, we may apply it, and confidently predict that judgment will come to awaken and arouse her. And when the suffering commences, we may just as confidently predict that the Church will not die under it, but leave her stem deep rooted in the earth, and "her stem will be a holy seed." The new shoots after the cutting down will be healthier and better than the old tree. P. THOMSON.

TWO NEW TESTAMENT SYNONYMS,

Υἱὸς AND *Τέκνον.*

THE grace, scholarship, and delicate insight which Archbishop Trench has linked together in his treatment of New Testament synonyms, have all but won this sphere for him as an exclusive domain; and a searcher in the same region may well feel drawn to pause, lest his exploration should bear the semblance of encroachment. But the two words at the head of this article have missed the cunning hand which has so

skilfully dealt with many of their fellows; and at the same time, in the belief of the writer, they claim a place among those "interesting and instructive" synonyms which the Archbishop has perforce "left untouched." It may not be amiss then to attempt something, however slight, towards remedying the unavoidable omission.

Both words are derived from roots signifying, "to bring into existence," *υἱὸς* from the Sanscrit *su-*, connecting it with the Latin *filius*, and the English *son*; and *τέκνον* from the Sanscrit *tak-*, Greek *τεκ-*, to which may be traced our word *get*. Obviously, of course, *υἱός*, *son*, is masculine, while *τέκνον*, like our *child*, expresses no distinction of sex: with this difference they are, broadly speaking, synonyms; *τέκνον*, as our *child*, being often used, in the Septuagint and the New Testament, where *υἱὸς* would pass, and *υἱός*, in the plural at any rate, being as often, to all appearance, equivalent to *τέκνον*. Thus, like all synonyms, they are in many cases undistinguishable. Their identity in sacred usage is established by a comparison of such passages as Malachi iv. 6 and Luke i. 17, where, in the phrase, "to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children," the LXX. has *υἱόν*, and St. Luke, *τέκνα*. Sometimes the inclusive force of *τέκνα* is manifest: as when it is recorded (2 Chron. xxviii. 3) that Ahaz "burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and burnt his *children* in the fire." At other times, for greater exactness or for emphasis, the *τέκνα* is subdivided into *υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες*; as in Jeremiah xxix. 6, *τεκνοποιήσατε υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας*, where the inclusiveness of *τέκνον* appears again in the compound verb. But in the large majority of instances, both in the Old and in the New Testament, the plural *υἱοὶ* stands

sponsor for sons and daughters likewise. When, for example, Pharaoh overtook Israel encamping by the sea, and "the *sons* of Israel lifted up their eyes, and, behold, the Egyptians marched after them" (Exod. xiv. 10), the presence of women is clearly implied; as is invariably the case with *υἱοὶ Ισραὴλ*, by a Hebraistic extension of the common usage which regards *man* as inclusive of *woman:* and, in fact, *υἱοὶ* seems not unfrequently to lose much of the stress of sonship, and to approximate to the force of *men* and *people.* Such an approximation we find in *υἱοὶ δυνατοὶ τοῦ Δαυὶδ* (1 Kings i. 8), the Septuagint translation for "the mighty men of David;" in the *υἱοὶ ἀλλότριοι*, the "foreign sons," the strangers, whom David foresaw should "submit themselves unto him" (2 Sam. xxii. 45); and in the description of David himself as *υἱὸς τριάκοντα ἐτῶν*, "a son of thirty years, when he began to reign" (2 Sam. v. 4) All these are akin to the common Hebrew expression, "sons of men," reproduced in the LXX. by *υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, which is no mere expansion of *ἄνθρωποι*, but a phrase satisfying the claims of Eastern vividness by dramatically exhibiting man's origin and nature. In this connection also is found the usual preference for *υἱοὶ* over *τέκνα*; indeed in the expression, *son of man*, or *sons of men*, *τέκνον* is never met with: but in other Hebraisms of this class the two words often appear without any suggestion of difference. Thus *υἱοὶ τῶν συμμιξέων*, the *sons of treaties* (for *hostages;* 2 Kings xiv. 14), *υἱοὶ ἀνατολῶν*, *sons of the sunrise* (for *men of the east;* Judges vi. 3), and, still more poetically, *υἱοὶ φαρέτρας*, *sons of the quiver* (for *arrows;* Lam. iii. 13, according to the reading that translates the Hebrew), are paralleled by *τέκνα ὑδάτων*, *children of the waters* (for

they that dwell by the western sea; Hosea xi. 11, LXX.). So also in the New Testament, υἱοὶ τῆς διαθήκης, *sons of the covenant* (Acts iii. 25) υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, *sons of the bridechamber* (Matt. ix. 15), and υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, *sons of the kingdom* (Matt. viii. 12), may be paralleled by the τέκνα τῆς σαρκός and τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, *children of the flesh*, and *children of the promise*, of Romans ix. 8.

But, in some of the instances just quoted, we have a savour of the specially Hebrew sense of *moral* sonship: and here also the two words are frequently used without any decided distinction, save that τέκνον in this relation is never found in the singular. Thus, to take certain passages in which the Hebraistic sense is more clearly defined, the υἱοὶ ἀδικίας, *sons of unrighteousness*, of 2 Samuel iii. 34, are answered by the τέκνα ἀδικίας, *children of unrighteousness*, of Hosea x. 9; the υἱὸς θανατώσεως, *son of death*, of 1 Samuel xxvi. 16, the υἱὸς γεέννης, *son of hell*, of Matthew xxiii. 15, and the υἱὸς ἀπωλείας, *son of perdition*, of 2 Thessalonians ii. 3, have their counterpart in the τέκνα ἀπωλείας, *children of destruction*, of Isaiah lvii. 4 (LXX.). Similarly, we meet sometimes with υἱοὶ θεοῦ, *sons of God*, as in Matthew v. 9, and sometimes with τέκνα θεοῦ, *children of God*, as in Romans ix. 8. By this striking metaphor with υἱὸς and τέκνον the warm imagination of the Oriental mind pictured to itself the fact that as children partake of the nature of their parents, so can men partake of the nature of unrighteousness, death, and destruction, on the one side, or, on the other, of the nature of God. And, in all the connections hitherto mentioned, both υἱοὶ and τέκνα supply a translation for the Hebrew *Banim:* so far then the synonyms are alike.

But, like other synonyms, they have their shades of

difference. As the Greek pronounced the word τκέvσr, its kinship with τίκτω ("I bring into being"), and with the root τεκ-, a root in his own language, would naturally affect his conception of its force. The birth, the childhood (past or present), the possession by the parents, their affection, authority and influence in the home life and education, would all unite unconsciously to regulate his use of the term. Some of these remembrances would be strong at one time, some at another. Hecuba seems to invoke them all when she conjures Hector not to risk his life in conflict with Achilles:

> His mother, all in tears, began lament;
> With one hand dropping low her bosom's veil,
> And shewing with the left the mother's breast,
> Weeping she utter'd wingèd words, and cried:
> 'Look on this, Hector! *Son*,[1] have reverence,
> And pity thine own mother! If that e'er
> I gave this breast to still thine infant pains,
> Now, now remember this, and hear my cry.'

So emphatic is the connotation of birth and dependence that τέκνα not unfrequently stands for the young of animals. In the Homeric simile—

> As when a lion prowling toward his lair
> Falls on the *tender fawns* of some swift hind,
> * * * * * *
> Whom, though the hind be nigh, she cannot save,—[2]

"tender fawns" is a translation of νήπια τέκνα. This reminds us of 1 Samuel vi. 10: "They took two milch kine, and tied them to the cart, and shut up their *calves* (τέκνα) at home." But in υἱὸς, where the root must have been less obvious, if it was not quite overgrown, the thought fastened rather on the person himself than on his dependence upon his parents. While the idea of

[1] Τέκνον. The passage is a quotation from Iliad xxii. 79 *seqq.* (Cordery's version).
[2] Iliad xi. 113 *seqq.* (Cordery's version).

descent was present, that of individuality attained a greater force: the passive was more or less dominated by the active. This suggestion is consistent with the dignity, which, in the East, and especially among the expectant Hebrew nation, was accorded to sonship as contrasted with daughterhood: it recalls to us the exclusion of daughters from the family inheritance, and even from the record of the family pedigree. Homer's υἷες Ἀχαιῶν, *sons of the Achæans*, his *Sons of the Lapithæ*, his hero appellations, *Son of Zeus*, *Son of Ares*, and the like, bring out, not so much the thought of descent or possession, as the fact that the sons were worthy of their sires. For example, when Hector is addressed by his brother Helenus,

> O Hector, Priam's *son*, for wisdom peer to Zeus![1]

and when Polypætes and Leontes are declared to be—

> The valiant *sons* of men
> As valiant,[2]

the lines have the ring of noble individuality. The same contrast between υἱὸς and τέκνον may be noticed in the few instances where υἱὸς represents the young of an animal. The τέκνα of 1 Samuel vi. 10, the tender calves which the lowing kine had left at home, stand out in vivid antithesis to the υἱοὶ ταύρων, *sons of bulls*, by which, in Deuteronomy xxxii. 14, the Septuagint translators seek to depict the grandeur of the sacrifice. Even when the ass on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem is called υἱὸς ὑποζυγίου, *son of a beast of burden* (Matt. xxi. 5), the term conveys no sense of humiliation; for the procession was a King's progress, but a progress calling for the type of peace and industry,

[1] Iliad vii. 47. [2] Ibid. xii. 128.

and not for the horse, the type of wasting and of war. The atmosphere of the incident is one of gentle dignity; and, anyhow, the context of the phrase conveys no idea of dependence upon or possession by the parent.

It is possible, I think, without fancifulness, to trace this instinctive preference now for *υἱός*, now for *τέκνον*, both in the Old Testament and in the New. *Τέκνον*, broadly speaking, (and in dealing with synonyms we can seldom speak otherwise than broadly), appears to be selected whenever the children are viewed in passive contrast with the parents. The sins of the parents are visited upon the *children* and the *children's children* (*τέκνα καὶ ἐπὶ τέκνα τέκνων*; Exod. xxxiv. 7), the parentage entailing upon them its unavoidable consequences. The same thought pervades 1 Corinthians vii. 14: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: *else were your children* (*τέκνα*) *unclean; but now they are holy.*" In Matthew x. 21 the father delivers up the *child* to death; and the *children's* rising up against their parents is stated by way of startling paradox. The parable of the vineyard brings before us a man "who had two *τέκνα*," and in giving his orders he is represented as saying, "*τέκνον*, go work to-day in my vineyard." Parents circumcise their *children* (Acts xxi. 21), lay up for their *children* (2 Cor. xii. 14), and are exhorted not to provoke their *children*, who also are to obey them in the Lord (Eph. vi. 1). A bishop, again, is to have his *children* in subjection in all gravity (1 Tim. iii. 4). In Revelation xii. 5—"And she brought forth a *son* who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron; and

her *child* was caught up unto God, and to his throne" —the appropriateness of υἱὸς in the first clause, and of the more passive τέκνον in the second, could be easily defended. This sense of childlike subordination obtains likewise in the less literal context which concerns the relations of disciples to the master who has spiritually or ethically begotten them anew. St. Paul travails in birth again of his *little children* (τεκνία) till Christ be formed in them. To the Corinthians he makes appeal, "As my beloved *children* I warn you. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you in the gospel. Wherefore, I beseech you, be ye *followers of me*. For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved τέκνον" (1 Cor. iv. 14 *seqq.*). Again, of Timothy he says (Phil. ii. 22), "As a τέκνον unto a father, he hath served with me unto the [furtherance of] the gospel." To Philemon he commends Onesimus as his τέκνον, whom he has begotten in his bonds; and in the *children* of 2 Corinthians vi. 13—"I speak as unto my children, be ye also enlarged"—we have a commingling of the teacher's claims and the father's love. Finally, St. Peter also, when he exhorts his readers to be "as obedient children" (τέκνα ὑπακοῆς), bespeaks their submission to the spiritual fatherhood and authority of God.

These considerations make it intelligible why τέκνον is never applied to Christ. When Meyer says, in his note on Romans viii. 16, that "Christ is not called τέκνον simply because υἱὸς was the prophetic and historical designation of the Messiah, consecrated by ancient usage," he does not, of course, mean to imply

that the ancient usage had no ground such as we have above suggested. Even in the connotation of affection which the thought of childhood's dependence naturally brings with it, the word τέκνον nowhere stands associated with Christ. Perhaps this fact may help us to explain how the τέκνα of Hosea xi. 1—"When Israel was a child (νήπιος), then I loved him, and called my son (τέκνα αὐτοῦ, 'his children,' LXX.) out of Egypt"—takes the form of the dignified υἱὸς when the prophet's words are quoted at Matthew ii. 15, where the Evangelist appears to have translated the original for himself. We recognize a similar appropriateness in the "one beloved *son*" (υἱόν) whom the lord of the vineyard sent last to the rebellious husbandmen (Mark xii. 6), and again in the υἱὸς (not τέκνον) ἀγάπης—*the son of his love*—of Colossians i. 13. Elsewhere τέκνον is the common choice when love is implied, whether the fitful love of Saul for David—1 Samuel xxvi. 17 "Is this thy voice, my son (τέκνον) David?"—or the tender yearning of Abraham towards his son Isaac—Genesis xxii. 8, "My son (τέκνον), God will provide himself a lamb;" at which moment the more stately υἱὲ of the Proverbs would have failed to fathom the depth of the father's emotion. The love which pervades the Epistles of St. John finds utterance not merely in ἀγαπητός, "beloved," but also in τέκνα: for example, "I have no greater joy than to hear that my *children* walk in the truth" (3 John 4), is one of the messages in the letter to the "well-beloved Gaius." And here and there we meet with the still more tender τεκνία: "My *little children*, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth."

And the passage last quoted suggests a further

thought which τέκνον often includes, especially in the usage of St. John—namely, that of guilelessness; children being regarded as fenced off from the deceitful world, which is faced, not by them, but by their less trustful parents. The "children of God," who "shall be like him," "purify" themselves "even as he is pure" (1 John iii. 1–3). The guileless, who "do righteousness" (Verse 7), who love "in deed and in truth" (Verse 18), are the "children of God"—inheriting his nature, and therefore, like Him, pure: the guileful, on the contrary, are classed, by a startling paradox, as "children of the devil" (Verse 10); their love, their purity, their whole childlike nature, being, so to say, a mere abortion. It is noticeable, by the way, that while St. John not unfrequently speaks of men as τέκνα θεοῦ, "children of God," he reserves υἱὸς θεοῦ exclusively for Jesus Christ.

Liberty, on the other hand, is the keynote of both υἱὸς and τέκνον in the writings of St. Paul. His gospel was specially a gospel of liberty, just as St. John's was a gospel of guilelessness and love.[1] But the liberty seeks chief expression, after all, through the υἱός, and the Pauline τέκνα can often claim close kinship with the τέκνα of St. John, the idea of affection being foremost in the exhortation—"Be ye followers of God, as *beloved children*, and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us;" and that of guilelessness in the subsequent injunction, "Walk as *children of the light*; for the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth" (Eph. v. 1, 2, 8, 9). In the Pauline υἱός, however, the prevailing tone is one of freedom, an echo of the early dignity of sonship and

[1] Compare Bishop Lightfoot's note on *Galatians* iii. 26.

heirship as opposed to servitude. It is true that Ahaz, King of Israel, makes *υἱὸς* equivalent to *δοῦλος* in his servile message to Tiglath-pileser, King of Assyria: "I am thy slave and thy son" (2 Kings xvi. 7); but this usage, if not a mere exception, need only remind us of the time when the very existence of children depended upon the will of their parents, a time which Ahaz, in the abjectness of his salutation, professes himself ready to recall. Such sycophantic synonymy St. Paul absolutely repudiates, when, after affirming that, in consequence of the redeeming work of the "Son of God," we are freed from bondage and receive the *υἱοθεσία* (the *adoption of sons*), he concludes: "Wherefore thou art no more a slave, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God, through Christ" (Gal. iv. 7). The parallel passage (Rom. viii. 14 *seqq.*) exhibits indeed a sudden change from *υἱοὶ* to the more tender *τέκνα*, but this substitution may surely be accounted for by the intervention of the *Abba, Father*, which may easily have affected the Apostle's train of thought in the one Epistle and not in the other. In Hebrews xii. 5 *seqq.*—"And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto sons, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord," &c.—*υἱὸς* seems, at first sight, to bear a sense of distinct subordination; but a closer study of the context will lead to the conclusion that individuality and the honour of being dealt with by God "as sons," are the prominent ideas of the passage.

It must be emphatically noted that the New Testament expression, *son*, or *sons, of God*, is not to be deteriorated into a mere Hebraism. It is, first of all, real in its application to Jesus Christ. The belief of

the Apostles in his previous, actual, and unique relation to the Father cannot be fairly questioned in the face of such passages as John iii. 16, "For God so loved the world, that he *gave his only-begotten Son*, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" Chap. viii. 58, "Before Abraham was, I am;" Chap. xvi. 28, "*I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again*, I leave the world, and go to the Father;" Chap. xvii. 5, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory *which I had with thee before the world was;*" Matthew xi. 27, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and *no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son is willing to reveal him;*" Romans viii. 3, "God, *sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh*, condemned sin in the flesh." Jesus was the Son of God "before all worlds:" and besides being the μονογενής, "only-begotten," in this special sense, he is likewise the πρωτότοκος, "the firstborn," not only as holding the place of honour (Col. i. 15, "*Firstborn*," *i.e.*, heir and lord, "*of every creature*"), but also as the "firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. viii. 29), and as He who shall "bring many sons unto glory" (Heb. ii. 10), *the* Son through whom we obtain the υἱοθεσία, "the *adoption* of sons" (Gal. iv. 5). Through the Son of God *par excellence*, the family relation, rooted in the act of our creation "after God's image," has been restored, and more than restored, and thus we are, in a sense, actually *sons of God*. And this literal sense carries with it the Hebraistic; Jesus partook of the nature of God: Luke i. 35, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the

power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Accordingly we also, through Him, "partake of the divine nature" (2 Pet. i. 4), not merely because we were created by God, nor merely from fellowship, but because our whole life is ideally derived from and moulded according to Him: He is the starting-point of our characteristics. For example, the "sons of God" are immortal: Luke xx. 36, "Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection." They follow in the footsteps of the "God of peace" (Rom. xv. 33): Matthew v. 9, "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the sons of God." Their sonship involves their purity: 2 Corinthians vi. 17, "Touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters;" that is, involves their likeness to God: 1 John iii. 3, "Every man that hath this hope in himself" (*i.e.*, the hope of carrying his sonship on to perfection, *vide* Verse 2) "purifieth himself, even as he is pure." They are actuated by God's spirit: Romans viii. 14, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God:" and, as God's sons, they shall be God's heirs at the last: Revelation xxi. 7, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things: and I will be his God, and he shall be my son."

It will be seen that τέκνα (as in 1 John iii. 2) subserves this connection as well as *vioí*, though far more rarely. But it seems possible to detect in their signification, when so used, a difference something more than visionary, led up to by a similar difference in the

use which is more strictly Hebraistic. The preference, now for *υἱός*, now for *τέκνον*, appears to be regulated, in many instances at any rate, according as the conception of freedom and choice is either more or less vividly realized. Thus the *τέκνα πορνείας*, *children of whoredoms*, of Hosea ii. 4, are parabolically regarded as the helpless offspring of their mother, the land that had "committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord" (Chap. i. 2): and the prophet is prompted by Jehovah to declare—"I will not have mercy upon her children, for they are the children of whoredoms." For a like reason the Septuagint translators may have preferred *τέκνα* in their *τέκνα ἀπωλείας*, "children of destruction," of Isaiah lvii. 4, looking upon them as doomed to destruction, beyond the chance of choice or relief; children that had ruin, so to say, for the absolute proprietor of their persons and the irresistible fashioner of their lives and destinies. And this too, in all probability, is the *primary* metaphor in the expressions, "children of wrath" (Eph. ii. 3), "children of a curse" (2 Pet. ii. 14), "children of the devil" (1 John iii. 10), children with wrath, a curse, the devil, as their formative parent, transmitting to them a nature which moulds their character, and therefore their fate. Such phrases, moreover, contain that violent paradox which *τέκνα* has been shewn to bring with it in cases like these: where we naturally look for love, benediction and God, thence issue forth, in all their embodied unnaturalness, hatred, cursing and the devil. The conception of choice and freedom may again be, for the moment, in the background even in Galatians iv. 31, the "children of the free" being there regarded from the point of view rather that they are so placed than that they have chosen so to be.

A like attempt may pardonably be made to shew that, in similar phrases, the tone of *υἱὸς* often harmonizes with the thought of individual freedom, and the dignity or responsibility of personal choice. It is quite consistent with the context even of John xvii. 12—which at first sight appears to shake our conclusion—to see in the *υἱὸς ἀπωλείας*, *the son of perdition*, the portrait of one emphatically responsible for his own ruin. The guardianship of Jesus had availed nothing to counteract the wilfulness of Judas—a wilfulness, by the way, rather enforced than weakened by a reference to the wanton treachery of Ahithophel, or, if it be so, of the "companion" of Jeremiah. Wilfulness is again the foremost idea in 2 Thessalonians ii. 3, where is described that "son of perdition who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God;" and in Acts xiii. 10, where Elymas, addressed as the "son of the devil," is further portrayed as "full of subtilty and all mischief, the enemy of all righteousness;" and finally adjured—"Wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" The same element of activity seems to furnish a contrast between the *υἱοὶ ἀπειθείας*, *sons of disobedience*, of Ephesians ii. 2, and the *τέκνα ὀργῆς*, *children of wrath*, of Verse 3—the evil "spirit working in" those who in disobedience have given themselves over to him, and "walk according to him." Its presence is obvious also in John xii. 36, "Believe in the light, that ye may be the sons of light;" and, lastly, in Matthew v. 44, 45, "Love your enemies, that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven." There can be no manner of doubt that the conditions of dignity, freedom, activity, are essential to the interpretation.

May we not therefore infer, without pressing the

inference on every occasion, that *υἱοὶ Θεοῦ* is preferred to *τέκνα Θεοῦ*, and that *υἱὸς* altogether ousts the singular of *τέκνον* in this connection, because *υἱὸς* has a freer, nobler, signification? We have already called attention to the fact that under no circumstances is Jesus called *τέκνον*, either with or without reference to God. In his infancy He is spoken of, and naturally so, as *βρέφος*, "a babe," and *παιδίον*, "a little child" (Luke ii. 16, 17). With the latter word St. John at times intensifies the expression of that affection which usually with him finds utterance in *τέκνα* (1 John ii. 18); and the same word emphasizes the idea of guilelessness and childlikeness when it appears in the story of the "little child" whom Jesus set in the midst of his disciples in order that He might read them the lesson to be "as little children." But *παιδίον* has sometimes the sense *in pejus* when employed metaphorically. St. Paul, for instance, warns his Corinthian converts against childishness, in these words: "Be not children (*παιδία*) in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye babes (*νηπιάζετε*), but in understanding be men" (1 Cor. xiv. 20). Here *νήπιος* (the synonym of *βρέφος*) has a good sense, being clearly defined by *τῇ κακίᾳ* ("in malice"); but elsewhere this also conveys the notion of childishness, as, for example, in 1 Corinthians iii. 1, "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes (*νηπίοις*) in Christ:" and it is distinctly contrasted with *υἱὸς* in Galatians iv. 3–5, "Even so we, when we were babes (*νήπιοι*), were *in bondage* under the elements of the world" (*i.e.*, under the rudimentary lessons of outward things); "but . . . God sent forth his *Son*, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the

adoption of *sons*." (Compare also Heb. ii. 10–14.) Παῖς, which, only a degree less than παιδίον, has a special reference to youth, and therefore to subordination, and which consequently, like the Latin *puer*, is a frequent synonym for *slave* or *servant*, is never applied to Christ except with the theocratic meaning, *servant of Jehovah*. We can see good reason why, in this context, παῖς should be chosen as a substitute for δοῦλος; and in most of the passages (*e.g.*, Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30) where the Authorized Version speaks of the "*child* Jesus," the παῖς should, in all probability, be translated as it is in Matthew xii. 18 ("Behold my *servant* whom I have chosen"), and in the vast majority of the passages where it occurs in the Septuagint Version (*e.g.*, Isa. xlii. 1; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24) as an appellation of Jacob, David, and other typical "servants of Jehovah."

The whole course of this discussion tends to shew that υἱὸς is the only appropriate word out of the whole family wherewith to describe the sonship of our Lord. In Him too it reaches its deepest signification. As *The Son of David* He recalls the royal dignity which descended to Him,[1] and all the promises which He inherited as the aim of Israel's history and the fulfilment of Israel's hopes.[2] As *The Son of man* (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) He presents himself to us not merely as the "seed of the woman," for which τέκνον or σπέρμα would have sufficed, nor merely as human nature in its inmost reality, though this presentation would have a closer claim upon υἱός, but also in the dignity of that unique and absolute relation to all mankind by which, free from all subordination to humanity, He is the aim

[1] Luke i. 32. [2] Matt. xiii. 17.

of *human* history and the fulfilment of *human* hopes: by which also He was constituted the second founder of the race,[1] who should "make all things new," the Lord of the whole world of men,[2] and of each several human soul.[3] That a name so novel and mysterious as applied to the Messiah should seem to have been reserved, by common consent, for the mouth of Christ alone, we cannot wonder. On one occasion only is it recorded to have passed the lips of a disciple: and then, in a moment of ecstatic vision, Stephen found in an utterance of his Lord[4] the fittest description of the exalted glory of Him whom the martyr's murderous adversaries despised as no more than man. Finally, as *The Son of God* (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ), He reveals the ultimate source of the sonship of man; for it was God's "own Son" who had come "in the likeness of sinful flesh;" and without the Sonship of God the Sonship of Man would have been a preposterous claim and a disastrous failure. But to ideal humanity was wedded a superhuman knowledge and a superhuman power. "All things," He could say, "have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son is willing to reveal him."[5] To the world, He could say, God and the Son were a mystery; but they were no mystery to one another. That He deified the Messiah by thus making himself the Son of God, drew forth the accusation of the Jews,[6] the adoration of the disciples,[7] the thoughtful historical research of the early Christians.[8]

[1] Rom. v. 12 *seqq.*; 1 Cor. xv. 47. [2] Matt. xxv. 37 *seqq.*
[3] Matt. xi. 29. [4] Acts vii. 56 compared with Matt. xxvi. 64.
[5] Matt. xi. 27. [6] John xix. 7. [7] Ibid xx. 28. [8] Heb. vii.

Hence we see the worthiness of the phrase to express the dignity of his eternal origin who could declare his oneness with the Father in essential life,[1] in unceasing work,[2] and in the fulness of that Divine nature[3] of which we are made partakers through Him—*sons of God*, with a loving dependence, filial resemblance, free obedience, and glorious expectation, which, not τέκνον, but υἱὸς is all-sufficient to comprehend.

JOHN MASSIE.

BRIEF NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE ANALYTICAL CONCORDANCE TO THE BIBLE, *by Dr. Robert Young* (London: Hodder and Stoughton), is a monument of patient research and industry. To say that it is by far the most complete and serviceable Concordance in the language is to give but a faint conception of its worth. It is also a pronouncing dictionary, and a vast index to "parallel passages" that are really parallel; it is in some sense a Hebrew and a Greek lexicon for English use; and, still further, it is, so far as a Concordance can be, a dictionary of the geography, history, and antiquities of the Bible, though, it must be confessed, these latter subjects are but touched in passing and as with the point of a finger. The main value of the work consists in this: (1) It is an unrivalled Concordance, containing many thousand more references than Cruden, and arranging them on a far better plan; and (2) it not only gives all the passages in which any English word is used in the Authorized Version, but classifies these passages under the several Hebrew or Greek words which it is used to translate, having first defined (hardly as thoroughly as need be, however) the distinctive meanings of these words. Even the different numbers of the Original noun and the tenses of the verb are marked, while the words of the Original are printed in English characters as well as in Greek or Hebrew; so that by a diligent and skilful use of this volume even the English reader, who will take the pains, may recover for himself the meaning of any passage in the Original Scriptures.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to convey a conception of the

[1] John v. 26. [2] Ibid. v. 17. [3] Ibid. x. 30.