genius and power in which they were well content, as all true and reverential thinkers have been content since, to acknowledge a Divine inspiration.

E. H. PLUMPTRE.

[NOTE.—It may be well to state that the Essay which now appears in THE EXPOSITOR, by the kind permission of the Editor, forms part of a forthcoming Commentary on *Ecclesiastes* in the series of the *Cambridge School Bible*. To that Commentary I must refer the readers of these pages for the evidence that has led me to the conclusions which I have here endeavoured to set forth.]

THE VALUE OF THE PATRISTIC WRITINGS FOR THE CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS OF THE BIBLE.

III.—EXEGESIS (*continued*).

THE influence of Origen was immense. He may, indeed, be said to have determined—in part directly, in part indirectly and mediately—the main current of patristic exegesis to the Reformation. It is true that, as we have seen, Origen himself rather summed up in his own person tendencies already existing than created those tendencies. But in his case the law of historical progress received a conspicuous illustration. The personal ascendancy and genius of the individual gave concentration and force to the spirit of the age. They helped to transmit it to posterity with accelerated rather than diminished power. The method of allegorical interpretation, instead of being frittered away in the works of smaller men and superseded by the first master-mind that was opposed to it, itself had possession of the master-mind of early Christianity, and through it dominated succeeding generations.

It will be enough to notice a few of the greater

names in this long procession of Origen's followers. In his own century he stands almost alone. Either the leaders of that century, like Cyprian, were men of action rather than men of thought, or else their exegetical works have not come down to us at all, or only in scanty fragments. At the beginning of the next century comes the next considerable exegete, Eusebius of Cæsarea, the historian. There is hardly a single branch of theological literature that this active and versatile writer did not touch. Of his commentaries, properly so called, which seem originally to have extended over many of the books of the Old and New Testaments, large portions of two have been preserved. These are upon the Psalms and Isaiah. In regard to the former Bishop Lightfoot writes: "This work stands in the first rank of patristic commentaries in point of importance, owing to its superior antiquity and its intrinsic merits. The historical bearing of the several psalms is generally treated sensibly; the theological and mystical interpretations betray the extravagance common to patristic exegesis. The value of the work to ourselves is largely increased by the frequent extracts from the Hexaplaric versions, and by other occasional notices respecting the text and history of the Psalter. The author had this advantage over most patristic commentators, that he possessed some acquaintance with Hebrew, though not sufficient to prevent him from falling into mistakes."[1] Dr. Lightfoot, however, acquits him of one of the worst of those that are usually attributed to him.[2] He adds that Eusebius had been preceded by Origen as a commen-

[1] *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* ii. p. 337.

[2] *E.g.*, by Montfaucon; comp. Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, p. 37.

tator on the Psalms, and that he was doubtless greatly indebted to the work of his predecessor. Delitzsch has a similar estimate, except that he lays rather more stress on the shallowness of the exegesis and the strained and arbitrary character of the allegories. The Commentary on Isaiah, in like manner, though professing to be historical, frequently falls into the allegorical strain of Origen: Jerome, however, who called attention to this, copies from it largely. Eusebius sometimes gives both Jewish and Christian traditions; *e.g.*, that Shebna, Hezekiah's secretary, became high-priest, and that Judas Iscariot was of the tribe of Ephraim.[1] There is no reason to think that these traditions are any more valuable than their date would lead us to suppose.

Not a few other writings of Eusebius, though not belonging strictly to the province of exegesis, yet contain a good deal of exegetical matter. The apologetic treatise, commonly known as the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, contains, according to Delitzsch,[2] "invaluable extracts from lost works illustrating the Book of Genesis." It also seems to contain glimpses at least of a truer conception of history than that which lies behind the allegorizing of Origen. The *Quæstiones ad Stephanum et Marinum*, to which allusion has already been made, discuss some of the apparent discrepancies in the genealogy of our Lord, and in the accounts of the Passion and Resurrection. Though wanting in definiteness and decision of handling, this work also contains valuable extracts from lost writings—notably those of Julius Africanus, and in its turn became a quarry of material for later commentators.

[1] Lightfoot, *l. c.* [2] *Genesis*, p. 62. Compare Lightfoot *ut sup.* p. 331.

Eusebius held, on the whole, a hesitating position; but there can be no doubt that he was a disciple of Origen both for good and for evil. It was from Origen that he derived that wide interest in learning which has been the means of preserving to us so many precious relics of antiquity. It was the critical labours of Origen that he, with his friend Pamphilus, did all in his power to disseminate. And from Origen, too, he inherited that allegorical method which is the weakness of his own exegetical efforts as it had been of his masters. Not content with following Origen, he went back also to Philo, and not only quoted frequently from his writings, but has many coincidences with him in doctrine and interpretation. These are found especially in the two works, *Præparatio* and *Demonstratio Evangelica.*[1]

The fame of Athanasius was won on other fields than that of exegesis. He left a short *Exposition of the Psalms* of no great value, in which the interpretation of Hebrew words and names is said to be wholly taken from Philo. Delitzsch,[2] however, speaks highly of his *Letter to Marcellinus*, also upon the Psalms, containing a classification of their contents, a discussion of their titles, &c. It is not surprising to find that the Old Testament is largely used as supplying proofs of doctrine.

Another conspicuous instance of the influence of Origen is seen in the "Cappadocian triumvirate"—Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, and Basil. Of these the last is, from our present point of view, in every way the most important. His *Hexaemeron*—a series of nine homilies on the Six Days' Work of Creation—had a high reputation throughout antiquity.

[1] See Siegfried, *Philo v. Alexandria*, pp. 362–364.

[2] *Psalmen*, p. 37.

sufferings of David and the Passion of the Son of David. In connection with this last correspondence Theodore uses a striking phrase, which clearly illustrates the nature of his theory. "Here," he says, "the holy David both describes the injury inflicted upon himself, and also delineates beforehand (προδιαγράφει) that which was to fall upon the Lord by the community of their sufferings, priding himself upon it, and all but crying out with St. Paul, '*I bear in my body the branding-marks* (τὰ στίγματα) *of the Lord Jesus.*'" [1] This adaptation of the impassioned utterance of St. Paul to the Galatians (Gal. vi. 17) expresses very happily the idea that it is wished to convey. St. Paul's sufferings repeated those of Christ *after* the fact; those of David were a type or figure of them *before* it.

To a certain extent at least these ulterior references in the Old Testament Scriptures were intimated in those Scriptures themselves. The language used was too large for the historical circumstances by which it was called forth. The inspired writers spoke in "hyperbole" (ὑπερβολικώτερον); and this hyperbole was expressly designed by God to point out that larger fulfilment which in due time it was to receive. The Old Testament is the shadow of the New. The facts of the second explain and satisfy the adumbrations of the first.[2]

When we come to look back over this theory, and to judge it no longer by the relative standard of other theories current at the time, but by the positive standard of the best that is known and thought now, we may well ask whether it is not wonderfully near the truth. It seems to need only the additional

[1] Merx, *Joel*, p. 130.

[2] *Patrum Nova Bibliotheca*, iii. p. 455.

conception of an organic growth to make it very nearly complete. Theodore perhaps thought too much of the Old and New Testaments as containing two parallel series of events, forcibly moulded into conformity to each other by Almighty Power. Think of them as successive rather than parallel, as bound the one to the other by the laws of a gradual development, all foreordained by Him without whom not a sparrow falls to the ground, and we shall perhaps be as near to the purport of the Hebrew prophecy as we are likely to be able to come. God has revealed Himself "in many portions and in many ways," but all his different self-revelations are connected together by the same law. He has ordained, in his inscrutable wisdom, that forgiveness shall be wrought out by suffering—even vicarious suffering; and whether this law is exemplified in a nameless Psalmist, or in the Servant of Jehovah, the ideal Israel, or in the Son of God Himself, it is still the same law. The sublimely pathetic descriptions which psalmist or prophet, deeply moved by the Holy Spirit, consecrated to the one may fitly be transferred to the other. The theocracy which God founded visibly under the Old Covenant is a true type and symbol of that which He founded spiritually under the New. Things which proceed from the same Author, working to the same ends, must needs bear a like impress of their origin. We may safely apply to them the analogies of external nature. The functions and organs that exist in a rudimentary form in the one are seen in a mature and developed form in the other. We do right to look back and to see the end in the beginning. We do right to let the finished work throw light upon the design of its earlier stages. The teleo-

logy which some have thought to banish from belief permeates the whole both of the spiritual and the natural world from one end to the other. One mighty design of infinite wisdom runs through it all. No wonder that the different parts are linked each to each by a multitude of coincidences. The coincidences are far from being accidental. They are the marks of the presence of God. It is his presence and his never-failing direction which called them into being; and when He, through his servants, appeals to them, can we do otherwise than gladly assent to the appeal? Prophecy is at once an expression of things present and a type of things future—not of *any* series of things, but of those which belong to the same Divine scheme. And it is because the prophet is gifted with a peculiar insight into the nature of that scheme, because he is conscious of its grand proportions, because he has obtained a sure grasp of its innermost laws, because he foresees for it a future development far in excess of the circumstances of the moment, that his language rises to such lofty heights and spans over the ages which intervene between the original utterance and its fulfilment. It is truly said that prophecy converges and meets in Christ. He was the perfect and complete embodiment of that which had been hitherto seen as "in a glass darkly." In Him those principles of God's working to which the prophets had been permitted to penetrate received their ultimate satisfaction. The ideal King whom they foreknew took flesh and was born into the world. Like the true Servant of Jehovah, He would not strive or cry, or break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax. Like that ideal person, He too must bear the iniquities of the

people and suffer for their transgressions. Even in minute particulars it behoved Him to be made like to those whom God had sent before his face. He too was to enter into Jerusalem upon an ass, in token of his peaceful dominion. He too was to be sold for the price of a slave. He too was to bear the "stigmata" which, both in the past and in the future, were to derive their significance from his. It was not that prophet or psalmist saw with the mental eye a figure nailed upon a cross in a certain precise place, at a certain precise hour and day and year; but they truly knew that God would raise up to Himself a great Deliverer, and that when that Deliverer came, an inevitable law of God's own making demanded that He should suffer and die, and that this very process of suffering should both "draw all men unto him" and be the means of taking away the load of their sins. Whether this conception of prophecy be a complete one or not I am not prepared positively to affirm; but, at all events, it is not far from that which was held by Theodore of Mopsuestia some 1500 years ago. When prophecy comes to be analyzed into its elements, the most essential of these would seem to be four: Type, Providence, Idealism, and Organic Growth—the typical relation of events in one part of the Divine scheme to events in another part of the same scheme; the providential determination of this inner harmony; the enthusiastic outlook of inspired men to more complete correspondences with the Divine laws in the future than in the present; and the tendency (itself divinely ordained) of an earlier series of events to contain within itself the germs of a later series. If this be so—if these four are really the main elements in prophecy,

then three at least of them Theodore may be said to have distinctly anticipated.

In dealing with the New Testament there was at once less room for originality in broad general views and more room for sagacity in the treatment of detail. Here too Theodore was not subject to the drawback of his ignorance of Hebrew, while his conception of the requirements of Greek philology was much less inadequate. We are therefore prepared to find the positive value of Theodore's work in this field decidedly higher. Nor, in spite of the diminished opening for novelty of idea, does the peculiar "modernness" of Theodore forsake him. If we compare, for instance, Theodore with Origen, we shall see what advance has been made in defining the *form* of a commentary, and how much nearer is the approach to that which obtains in our own day. If we deduct the elaborate learned apparatus which is the result of the accumulation of centuries, and which some of the most eminent of modern commentators themselves dispense with, or at least conceal, the simple outline of the commentary is very similar. Theodore began with an introduction, sometimes longer, sometimes shorter, dealing with the same sort of subjects that an introduction would deal with now. Thus, in his commentaries upon St. Paul's Epistles (ten of which have come down to us in an imperfect Latin translation) he is careful to note the position of affairs in the Church to which the Apostle is writing; he shortly characterizes the letter, occasionally compares it with other Epistles, and gives a brief summary of its contents, and occasionally also (not always) he indicates the date at which it was written. A fair example of Theodore's method may

be seen in the opening sentences of the introduction to the Epistle to the Galatians, of which the following may be taken as a paraphrase. "The blessed Apostle Paul, in the course of his missionary labours, had visited the Galatians, and had so enlightened them by his teaching (through the grace of the Holy Spirit) that they were not only baptized, but also received the gift of the Holy Spirit, like other converts to Christianity. But certain Jews who professed the same faith, moved by a misguided jealousy, were doing all they could to induce them to observe the Mosaic law as well. Indeed, if the arguments of the two Epistles were carefully compared, that to the Galatians would be found to agree in very many respects with the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. . . . These Judaizers then came to the Galatians, denying St. Paul and seeking in every way to enforce the precepts of the law, asserting that faith in Christ would be of no avail unless those precepts were kept, and arguing that the blessings promised in the law were expressly attached to its observance, to neglect which was certainly to incur the judgment of God. They also urged that all the Apostles who had been in immediate attendance upon Christ strongly maintained the due observance of the law." [1]

It will be admitted that this shews a just estimate of the Judaizing party in Galatia, that its radical antagonism to St. Paul is clearly understood and its general character well brought out. Theodore also makes a distinct point in observing the resemblance

[1] *Theod. Episc. Mops. in Epist. B. Pauli Commentarii*, vol. i. pp. 1, 2. I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. H. B. Swete, the editor, and of Mr. C. J. Clay, of the Cambridge University Press, for the privilege of using advanced sheets of this admirable edition, which will no doubt shortly be made public.

between the Epistle to the Galatians and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. In like manner he works out with some elaboration a parallel (which is not altogether imaginary) between Ephesians and Romans, though here he can hardly be said to pursue the subject much below the surface, and though he is misled at the outset by inferring from the fact that St. Paul speaks of having *heard* of the faith of the Ephesian Christians that he had not yet visited them. This of course leads to quite a wrong idea as to the place of the Epistle in the series of St. Paul's letters, though Theodore demolishes effectively and well, on historical grounds, the strange notion which he found current that the Ephesian Church had been founded by St. John. The inference which is wrong in the case of Ephesians is of course right in regard to Colossians. Theodore notes the presence in the Colossian Church of the Judaizing teachers, but he fails to discriminate sufficiently between these and the earlier type that had invaded Galatia. Philippians he rightly assigns to the first Roman imprisonment and to the reign of Nero.

In the commentary proper the most striking feature is a running paraphrase, extending from the beginning of each Epistle to the end, in which the greatest care is taken to trace the links of connection in the thought. In this Theodore shews much logical acumen, a quality which, in the patristic commentaries, is rather too apt to fall into the background. It need hardly be said that he is not always equally successful. The paraphrase is accompanied by notes upon the grammar, to the broken character of which Theodore several times calls attention, occasionally by notes upon the force of particles, and more frequently by examinations, in

which the logical character is again conspicuous, of the meaning of single words.[1]

The fuller illustration of Theodore's style of commenting must be reserved, but a single specimen may be given of what he is when at his best. The following is his note on Philippians i. 1, which runs thus in the Authorized Version: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." There is a question as to whether the phrase, "with the bishops," should not be rather "co-bishops," of which it will be seen that Theodore takes notice. "This," he says, "is the preface of the Epistle. He associated Timothy with himself, because he had once sent him into Macedonia with Erastus, and because he was known to them. It is also to be remarked that he called *bishops* those who are now called presbyters, giving them this name; for it was not the rule that there should be in a single city many of those who are now called bishops, just as, indeed, in ancient times it was not every city in which there were those who fulfilled this function at all. But, speaking of *bishops*, he immediately afterwards made mention of *deacons*. He certainly would not have left out presbyters and spoken of deacons their inferiors. But this will be the better understood by reference to what is written to Titus, where he says: "*That thou shouldest ordain elders (presbyters) in every city, as I appointed thee;* and adding what kind of elders, *a bishop*, he says, *must be blameless*, clearly giving the name 'bishops'

[1] For a complete account of the "style and exegetical worth" of Theodore's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, the reader may be referred to the section with this heading in the Introduction to Mr. Swete's edition above mentioned, pp. lxiii.–lxxi.

to presbyters. It must be noted further that *he says with the bishops* [as if *co-bishops*], not, as some have supposed, in the same way in which we are accustomed to write *co-presbyters*. For he did not use the *with* in reference to himself in the sense *co-bishops of ours*, but in reference to his phrase, *all the saints in Christ Jesus*, that the sense might be *to all the saints which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons there*, not simply mentioning their names, but as if his discourses about humility were especially suited to those whose duty it was to teach others, and as an example to the rest themselves to practise what was right." In other words, the Apostle does not speak of "*co*-bishops" (or presbyters), placing them upon the same level with himself, but he rather merges them with the rest of the Church, in order to set, in their case, an example of that humility which it is a main object of the Epistle to teach. It may be said, perhaps, that this is to put too fine a point upon the text, but it will shew at least how fine and sharp are the distinctions which Theodore is capable of drawing; and his argument as to the meaning of this primitive use of the word "bishop" (an argument in which he is followed substantially by Theodoret) is at once masterly and decisive.

The style of Theodore shews a certain obscurity, which is partly due to his frequent use of parentheses and the length of his periods, which are also somewhat monotonous in their cast and construction. These faults of style, his editor, Mr. Swete,[1] thinks may be "in some measure the result of his restless overproductiveness," and in some measure too, perhaps, of his early training. And "yet," he adds, "I am disposed

[1] *Introduction*, p. lxv.

to look for the principal cause of our author's peculiar manner in the character and genius of the man rather than in his circumstances or education. An ardent and ingenious mind, possessed by a crowd of ideas, which it had hardly strength enough firmly to grasp, or thoroughly to work out; and, in spite of its originality and sincerity, haunted by occasional doubts as to the trustworthiness of its own conclusions, and a hazy uncertainty as to their exact scope and issue,[1] would go far to produce a style of writing such as Theodore's critics have detected in his works. His literary faults were but the reflection of mental imperfections which, to some extent, vitiate his work as well as his style, his theology no less than the form in which it is cast. Yet they will easily be condoned by those who realize the fearless honesty, the prodigious industry, and the unquestionable power by which these defects are more than redeemed." Let me add to this testimony yet one more: "Though much marred by an indifferent Latin translator, this commentary" (that on the Galatians) "is inferior in importance to the works of Jerome and Chrysostom alone among the patristic expositions now extant. Theodore was a leader of religious thought in his day, and as an expositor he has frequently caught the Apostle's meaning where other commentators have failed." [2]

And yet, great as was Theodore's influence and reputation in his own day, he did not leave a permanent mark upon the Church. His writings were thought to countenance the Nestorian heresy, and so fell under suspicion. His one eminent scholar, Theodoret, drew

[1] Is not this a shade too strongly expressed? Is it, for instance, quite consistent with what is said—and rightly said—about the confidence of Theodore's tone on p. lxxvii?

[2] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 226.

back from the advanced positions which his master had taken up. This is especially evident in the way in which he deals with the Messianic prophecies. Even to the allegorists he makes not inconsiderable concessions. In his hands Theodore's system loses its logical consistency.[1] For the rest Theodoret had many of the excellences of an expositor. "His commentaries on St. Paul are superior to his other exegetical writings, and have been assigned the palm over all patristic expositions of Scripture. For appreciation, terseness of expression, and good sense, they are, perhaps, unsurpassed; and if the absence of faults were a just standard of merit, they would deserve the first place; but they have little claim to originality, and he who has read Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia will find scarcely anything in Theodoret which he has not seen before. It is right to add, however, that Theodoret himself modestly disclaims any such merit. In his preface he apologizes for attempting to interpret St. Paul after two such men 'who are luminaries of the world:' and he professes nothing more than to gather his stores 'from the blessed fathers.' In these expressions he, doubtless, alludes to Chrysostom and Theodore."[2] These few words draw in distinct lines the characteristic features of Theodoret. He is the typical "disciple" as compared with the "master," a representative of the generation next to a great man.[3] With

[1] See Specht, *Der exegetische Standpunkt Theodor's von Mopsuestia und Theodoret's.* This clear and interesting little work is a Roman Catholic prize essay.

[2] Lightfoot, *Galatians, l. c.*

[3] Compare Swete (*Theod. Mops.* p. lxxviii.): "His notes are usually good and pointed, but they are notes merely; we desiderate in them the originality, the courage, and in places the fulness and thoroughness of his master. Theodore is less safe than Theodoret, less amenable to the restraints of authority, less terse in style, often less clear; but he is vastly the superior of the latter in genius and in expository power"

him the protest which Theodore had raised against the exegetical tendencies of his time finally dies away. It was an egregious *ignoratio elenchi*. The battle between the two methods was never fairly fought out. The Nestorians appealed to Theodore in support of their doctrine of the two natures; and they and he were condemned together. His genuine merits counted for nothing, and the field was left in possession of the adversaries.

W. SANDAY.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL

IN THE SUPERSCRIPTON OF HIS EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.—NO. 4.

THE Apostle adds, *according to the Spirit of holiness* (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης), an expression which seems to be the correlate of the expression, *according to the flesh*, at the conclusion of the third verse. It would, therefore, appear to be most naturally interpreted as referring to the higher element, the Divine nature in our Lord's complex being as θεάνθρωπος.

The Greek expositors, however—Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Photius, and Theophylact—take a different view. They suppose that it is the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Godhead, who is spoken of; and they interpret the expression as exhibiting, in addition to the Saviour's power of miracles (ἐν δυνάμει), a second item of means divinely employed to mark him off determinately as God's Son. They would understand the entire verse somewhat as follows: *who was proved to be God's Son, firstly, by his miraculous power; secondly, by the Holy Spirit given as a Spirit of sanctification to those who believe; thirdly, by his resurrection from the*