Dr. F. Perles (in the *Oriental. Literaturzeitung* of 15th March) speaks in extremely laudatory terms of Professor König's examination of the originality of the Hebrew Sirach, pointing out how he is possessed of qualifications which specially fit him for solving the difficult problem submitted to him. He thinks him particularly successful from the standpoint of linguistics and the history of Hebrew writing and literature, fields which Dr. König has made specially his own. Perles thinks it has been convincingly shown that the present Hebrew text cannot have emanated from the post-Biblical period, and commends the important and perfectly original argument by which König shows that certain corruptions of the Hebrew text are explicable only if we hold that the earliest form of this text was committed to writing at a time when the employment of the final letters was not yet in vogue. The idea of an influence exercised on the author of H by the Persian language Perles holds to have been disproved both by Bacher and König. Finally, he argues that the character of the marginal notes is very strongly confirmatory of the originality of the Hebrew text.

It will interest our readers to hear that Adler has found some leaves of Sirach which fit in between Schechter's 7^{29} and 12^{2}. These will be published in the next number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. Israel Lévi has also obtained a leaf (or leaves) containing, we believe, a part of ch. 38 or 39, from a fourth MS., which may be expected to appear in the next number of the *Revue des Études Juives*. We shall hope to give a fuller account of both these texts in our next number.

H. P. Smith's 'Samuel.'

This commentary is reviewed by Professor Budde in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 31st March last. After some general remarks on the 'International Critical Commentary' series, and some very laudatory references to Moore's *Judges*, Budde goes on to speak of special points in H. P. Smith's work. He has formed a very high estimate of that part which is taken up with textual criticism. After all that has been done already for the text of *Samuel* by scholars like Thenius, Wellhausen, and Driver (and, we may add, Budde himself), this commentary shows that its author has a standpoint of his own, and critical judgments are frequently reached which Budde believes to be correct and of extreme value. The reviewer is, indeed, disposed to think that the principle is sometimes carried out too rigidly of preferring the shortest of the various readings that claim admission into the text. The same striving after simplicity appears to Budde to be detrimental to some of Smith's results regarding the distinction of 'sources.' But after all possible exceptions have been taken, the judgment passed upon the whole book must be, says Budde, a decidedly favourable one. It is made up of real solid work, on which the exegete may place absolute reliance, and constitutes a notable enrichment of the literature on the subject. Special commendation is bestowed upon the Appendix (pp. 395–410) in which Smith successfully controverts the principles of textual criticism adopted by Löhr.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Did Jesus Pray with His Disciples?

A REPLY TO THE CRITICISMS OF PROFESSOR BRUCE AND DR. STALKER.

By the Rev. D. W. Forrest, D.D., Skelmorlie.

When discussing in my *Kerr Lectures*[1] the uniqueness of the moral self-consciousness of Jesus, I urged as one evidence of it that not only is there no positive proof in the Gospel records that He ever observed 'common prayer,' but that many of the incidents and the entire trend of the narrative decidedly indicate His abstention. The same position has been taken up by others, as by the late Dr. Dale[2] and by Bishop Chadwick;[3] though undoubtedly the opposite view, that our Lord practised 'family prayer' with His disciples,

[1] *The Christ of History and of Experience*, pp. 22–27.

[2] *Christian Doctrine*, p. 106.

[3] *Donnellan Lectures* (1878–79), p. 105.

is the one generally held, and it finds in the late Professor Bruce[1] a resolute exponent.

In the course of my argument I ventured to criticise Dr. Bruce's interpretation that the appeal, 'Lord, teach us to pray,' sprang from the effect produced on the disciples by the 'social prayers' of Jesus; and I went on to say, 'If Jesus practised family prayer as the head of a household, either it contained or it did not contain the element of confession. If it did, it gave the disciples a false impression of *His* character; if it did not, it led to a false idea of *their own*.' Dr. Bruce, in a reply with which he honoured me, says that escape from this 'apparently formidable dilemma' is not impossible. 'The first horn is the weak one. It assumes that Jesus, out of regard to His sinlessness, was under the necessity of shaping His conduct so that no misunderstanding as to His character should arise. If that were indeed so, then with reverence it may be said that He was placed in a very unhappy predicament. Practically it amounted to this, that "sinlessness" doomed Him to an aloofness which meant death to fraternity, . . . to comrade-like relations with persons of evil repute, to crucifixion between two thieves; in one word, death to love, which is the fulfilling of all righteousness. . . . Why should we doubt that Jesus not only acted on the Messianic motto, "In the midst of the Church will I sing *praise* unto Thee," but joined habitually with His friends in prayer also, even in prayer containing confession of sin?'[2]

The consequences which Dr. Bruce declares to be involved in the view from which he dissents are sufficiently alarming, and have the aspect of a conclusive *reductio ad absurdum*. But they are really founded on a confusion. The 'impression' produced by Jesus in those instances when He associated with publicans and sinners was of a radically different character from that which would have been created by His uniting with others in the confession of sin. In the former case the misunderstanding was due to the incapacity of the observers to appreciate His conduct. Misconceptions of this kind are unavoidable in human society, and the higher any soul rises above the common level it is the more exposed to them. It has to defy conventional standards of thought and life in fidelity to its own better vision, and thus at every stage lays itself open to erroneous constructions. But it remains true to itself. Its conduct, however misinterpreted by the ignorant or selfish, is the faithful *expression* of its character; and the misconceptions vanish in proportion as its neighbours approximate to its type. The intercourse of Jesus with His followers is one long illustration of the correction of such impressions.

But if in united prayer He acknowledged sin of which He was not personally conscious, the impression He thus made belongs to another order. A difficulty emerges which did not exist before—the problem of His own veracity. His consorting with the outcast, instead of being a perplexity to us as to the Jews, is one of His titles to our reverence. But will anyone say that he is equally convinced of the beauty and rightness of Christ's taking part in confession along with His disciples? What hinders us? Just the fact that such an act *in itself and inevitably* suggests the consciousness of sin on His part. We feel that, as confession ought to be the most real of all things, He could not have made it unless He had meant it. All that the Church has learned of His spirit and purpose during nineteen centuries has not rendered it easier for us to escape this 'impression' than it would have been for those who heard Him. We ask, *Could* He have acted thus honestly and truthfully?—a question which we never put regarding His conduct towards Zacchæus or 'the woman of the city.' Professor Bruce replies, 'Yes, with perfect honesty. His utterances of confession in united prayer were the expression of His brotherliness, of that heart of love which identified itself with sinners in their need, and which made *that* right for Him as one of a company which was impossible for Him as an individual.' Whether the category of sympathy could thus make veracious what naturally appears otherwise, we shall inquire later. Here we have only to note that the solution is not in any way helped by references to acts which relatively to His own consciousness present no difficulty, and which were merely misunderstood by His contemporaries.

The Baptism of Jesus may be thought to afford a nearer approach to a parallel. For the rite which John administered is described as a 'baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins.'

[1] *The Training of the Twelve*, p. 51.

[2] *Expositor*, March 1898, 'The Baptism of Jesus,' pp. 196, 197.

This was its character as preached by himself, and as observed by the people who came to receive it. But just because it signified for them 'a break with a sinful past,' it implied also a new start in life, the dedication of themselves to a new career of holiness, in view of the kingdom of heaven which was declared to be at hand. It was on this positive side, as symbolizing a fresh committal of oneself for the future, that the rite had its meaning for Jesus. He joined in the popular movement as an act of self-consecration, recognising in John one commissioned by God to inaugurate a new and great epoch in the national life. In the eyes of the bystanders His action might imply that He took His place there as a penitent; but this was a matter in which their ignorance of the *data* led them to misinterpret Him, as they misinterpreted His ministry of compassion for the 'lost.' It would have been a totally different thing had He actually used the language of repentance which was the usual accompaniment[1] of the rite, and thus identified Himself with the ordinance in its negative aspect. The baptism therefore offers no real analogy to that united confession which Dr. Bruce holds that Jesus habitually observed with His friends.

It is necessary to remember that the problem before us is specifically the relation of Christ *to His disciples*. For the great work of His ministry, round which, as time went on, His other activities more and more grouped themselves, was the 'Training of the Twelve.' This small circle of selected spirits was to form the nucleus of His Church. On them He had to stamp His personality in such wise that they would receive His spirit, and represent Him rightly to the world. It is to the ministry, as depicted by those who stood to Him in this intimacy, that we must turn to gain that conception of Him which He Himself desired to have perpetuated. Conjectures, indeed, more or less plausible, may be formed as to the religious exercises in which He took part as a boy or as a man during His silent years, either in the home or in the synagogue. Very probably, for example, the consciousness of His own unique fellowship with the Father was first awakened in Him as he heard or repeated the Psalms, and recognised that in their cries of contrition they were no expression of His personal experience. But on His religious habits during this preparatory period we have no evidence. Nor *even if we had*, would it necessarily guide us in judging His conduct from the time when He began to manifest Himself to Israel. For the baptism was the great dividing line in His life. It altered His relations not only towards those who were bound to Him by the closest earthly ties,[2] but towards all with whom He came in contact. His action in every part was now determined by a new principle, the revelation of Himself as the Messiah in a higher sense than the people conceived or than any prophet had forecast. Many must have found henceforth, as His mother did, something strange and perplexing in His methods, and not less in what He refrained from doing than in what He did.

Dr. Bruce asks, 'In what other instance did Jesus follow this imaginary policy of aloofness with a view to prevent a false impression of His character?'[3] An instance of a very striking kind is not far to seek, one that has been often pointed out,—that He never joins with His followers in a common 'our Father.' He speaks often of 'your Father,' 'the Father,' 'My Father,' and when He wishes, as in one memorable case, to unite His own name with that of another, He employs the double phrase, 'My Father' and 'your Father,'[4] thereby expressing the difference in the most emphatic way. But if Jesus had been so utterly regardless as is supposed of the immediate impression which He made on others, so long as He succeeded in convincing them of His sympathetic love and brotherliness, then His avoidance of the designation 'our Father' is inexplicable. It is the very term we would expect Him to use. For it would have brought out the sonship which in a sense He shared with them; and the peculiar quality in His sonship might have been left for time and experience to reveal. Why did He

[1] 'They were baptized of him in Jordan, *confessing their sins*.' Professor Bruce evidently regards the scruples attributed to the Baptist by Matthew ($3^{14.\ 15}$) as read back by the reflexion of a later time. They have, however, an inherent probability. With Jesus, as with others who presented themselves, John would naturally hold converse, and the absence of confession on the part of the former suggests some such interview between them as that which the first Evangelist alone records. On this point see Dr. Sanday's remarks in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 611.

[2] Jn 2^{4}, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?'

[3] *Expositor*, March 1898, 'The Baptism of Jesus,' pp. 196, 197.

[4] Jn 20^{17}.

abstain? Because He had come into the world to 'manifest Himself,' and His whole mission depended on the accuracy of that manifestation. It was of primary moment that the disciples should realise His separateness and His supremacy, and He would not employ a phrase which seemed to imperil the unshared nature of His sonship. In this point at least he took precautions to 'prevent a false impression.'

Further: Is it not a dangerous theory to regard Jesus as speaking at one time out of His individual, and at another out of His social or representative, consciousness? This was a favourite patristic distinction. Augustine interprets the cry of desolation on the Cross as uttered by Jesus not for Himself, but in the person of His Church. Cyril maintains that the ignorance which our Lord acknowledges regarding the Last Day[1] was only apparent, and was assumed by Him as 'suitable' to the humanity which He wore. 'When His disciples would have learnt what was above them, He pretends for their profit not to know, inasmuch as He is man.'[2] No one has criticised Cyril's view with greater keenness than Dr. Bruce. And no marvel; for it makes any genuine understanding of our Lord's personal experience impossible. Yet is the attribution of confession to Jesus not an example of the very principle which is here condemned? In acknowledging sin, He is speaking not personally, but representatively as a member of the race with which He has in love identified Himself. If His intense brotherliness towards men enabled Him to join in a confession of unworthiness which as an individual He did not feel, why should it not have warranted Him in appearing for their profit to be ignorant of that which as an individual He knew? But if in these solemn matters His words are not to be taken in their direct and obvious sense, a profound uncertainty is cast over His whole self-revelation, and a door opened for all sorts of fantastic interpretation.

It would not be easy to exaggerate the debt which Scotland owes to the late Professor Bruce, who for the last twenty years has been the most influential and suggestive theologian in the Scottish Churches. He has brought out with remarkable power the graciousness and charm of the gospel message, the infinite attractiveness of Christ's humanity and of His self-sacrificing love for men. But this conception tends so much to dominate Dr. Bruce's thought that it may be doubted whether it has not led him to overlook or minimize other aspects of our Lord's character. Sympathy is not more a characteristic of Jesus than aloofness or reserve. However fraternal His relations with others, they were penetrated with this quality of separateness or authority. If His claim to be the one Rabbi and Master,[3] and the indispensable Revealer of the Father,[4] or any other of His imperative assertions of supremacy, did not destroy His brotherliness towards the disciples, it is difficult to see why it should be destroyed or impaired by His abstention from the confessions which they offered. It is the blending of these two opposite categories of fraternity and uniqueness which constitutes the problem of His personality.

Dr. Stalker takes, if I understand him aright, a medial view. In his recent *Cunningham Lectures* he says, 'I am doubtful of the fact,' *i.e.* of Jesus' abstention from common prayer. 'It seems to me that He did pray with others when He gave thanks in their name; and may there not be prayer without confession?'[5] What ground, then, is there for supposing that our Lord took part with His disciples in devotion, but with the confessional element left out? The reference which Dr. Stalker makes to thanksgivings does not carry us very far. There are three occasions when Jesus is represented as giving thanks at a common feast —the Feeding of the Five Thousand,[6] the Feeding of the Four Thousand,[7] and the Last Supper.[8] Two words, practically synonymous,[9] εὐλογεῖν and εὐχαριστεῖν, are used to describe the act, which was simply the observance by our Lord of the immemorial Jewish usage, as exemplified in the solemn thanksgiving at the Passover. The recognized form of blessing was, 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord God, who bringest forth bread from the earth,'[10] which may be compared with the mediæval grace, 'Benedictus benedicat.' That Jesus should have joined with others in the ascription of blessing to God before a meal, as in the singing of the

[1] Mk 13^{32}.

[2] See Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*, pp. 366–372.

[3] Mt $23^{8.\ 10}$.

[4] Mt 11^{27}.

[5] *Christology of Jesus*, p. 81.

[6] Mt 14^{19}, Mk 6^{41}, Lk 9^{16}, Jn 6^{11}.

[7] Mt 15^{36}, Mk $8^{6.\ 7}$.

[8] Mt $26^{26.\ 27}$, Mk $14^{22.\ 23}$, Lk $22^{17.\ 19}$.

[9] See Grimms' *N. T. Lexicon, in loc.*

[10] H. B. Swete, *Commentary on St. Mark*: note on 6^{41}.

Hallel[1] at the Last Supper, was only in accordance with the adherence to Jewish religious practices which led Him to resort to the synagogue on the Sabbath day; but it throws no light on what may be called His *personal* habits as regards common devotion. The prayer which a religious leader offers up with his followers is the lifting up of their life into communion with God, and is coloured by the specific experiences through which they are passing. It brings help and inspiration, because it is the expression of their present joys and sorrows in relation to the Divine holiness and mercy. There is not the slightest indication that the 'common' thanksgivings of Jesus were such acknowledgments of the *particular* bounties of Providence or Grace as the Psalmists so frequently make, or as we offer for ourselves and our brethren. And what of the other elements in prayer — supplication and intercession? The disciples, above most men, were called to a hard task, all the harder for them that they so little realised what was involved in it. Part by part Jesus set before them its conditions, its demands, its hopes and rewards. Did He make these duties and privileges which were the subjects of His instruction to them also the subjects of united supplication? Was He the spokesman day by day of their varied needs at the Throne of Grace, petitioning in their name, and in His own, for guidance, for submission to God's will, for faith and courage amid surrounding peril; and for these and other necessities always *in view of actual circumstances, temptations, and trials*? Did He who interceded with the Father *for* them,[2] unite *with* them in those manifold intercessions for others, which all who cherish His spirit recognize as necessary? This detailed expression of wants and aspirations is what we mean by common prayer; and if in these things He did not constitute Himself their representative, then it is futile to say that in the ordinary sense He 'prayed with' them.

Moreover, by what name is He supposed to have addressed God? The basal fact in His teaching is that He construed the Divine character under the category of Fatherhood; and He laboured by every possible means of exhortation, parable, and example to deepen in His followers the heart of childlike trust. This conception of God, this attitude of humble and assured confidence in God's fatherly care,[3] must have pervaded all the devotional utterances of Jesus. In what other way, then, could He designate God than as 'our Father'? and yet this is the very expression which He uniformly avoids in His conversation and discourses. Dr. Stalker holds that the attempts to break down the distinction in His use of 'your Father' and 'My Father' have been 'totally without avail.'[4] But if the distinction vanished in His prayers, it ceases to have any significance.

On the hypothesis that Jesus identified Himself at all with the disciples in devotion, then Dr. Bruce's theory of a complete identification is the more probable. For the elimination of confession implies much more than at first appears. The consciousness of sin affects our whole approach to God. It blends with all our thanksgiving and intercession; with our remembrance of past benefits; with our sense of present, and our anticipation of future, duty. And if in the common supplications which Jesus offered there was no petition for forgiveness, *nor any illusion to a penitent's experience*, they could not but be a most inadequate expression of the disciples' needs. We are shut up, I think, to the conclusion that either He abstained altogether, or made Himself entirely one with His brethren. It is a case of 'not at all' or 'all in all.'

The difficulties which attach to the latter alternative are, as has been shown, extremely great. Those who advocate it have first and foremost to face the fact that it receives no support from the records. Is the omission capable of any other explanation than that there was nothing to relate? Here are documents which, whatever view be taken of their authorship or of the process whereby they assumed their present form, give a most vivid picture of the personality of Jesus, and of the impression which He made on those most intimately associated with Him. On many aspects of His life, on which an ordinary biographer would dilate, they say little or nothing. The whole emphasis is laid on the spiritual side of His character, on what He was as a religious leader of incomparable insight and authority; but in this respect the representation is full of minute detail. We are told that He frequently withdrew to a solitary place for prayer,[5] and that he also prayed

[1] Mt 26^{30}, Mk 14^{26}. [2] Jn 17.

[3] Mt 6^{25-34} $10^{19.\ 20}$.

[4] *Christology of Jesus*, p. 105.

[5] Lk 4^{42} 5^{16}, Mt 14^{23}; *cf.* Lk $9^{28.\ 29}$.

alone while His disciples were with Him.[1] In the latter case we have sometimes a report of the words He used. When, then, we have not merely no report of a single prayer offered by Him along with others, but no suggestion that He ever offered one (though if it occurred at all, it must have been a habitual practice), the inference surely is irresistible.

One thing at least is clear. The question is not to be settled by *à priori* considerations. It is as illegitimate to argue that He *must* have observed common prayer because He was man, as that He *must* have known the day and hour of the Last Judgment because He was the Son of God. The doctrine of the Incarnation is essentially an induction from facts; and abstract ideas of humanity and divinity afford no help in determining the self-consciousness or the particular actions of the Incarnate One. Our entire conception of Him must be construed, and if necessary reconstrued, in the light of the *data*: and the question of our Lord's prayers is but a small, though by no means an unimportant, part of a vast problem—the unique attitude which He assumed towards men.

[1] Lk 9^{18}; *cf.* 9^{1}, Mt $11^{25.26}$, Jn $11^{41.42}$ 17. As space does not permit here the discussion of special passages, I may be allowed to refer to my *Kerr Lectures*, pp. 22 ff.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GALATIANS.

GALATIANS v. 22, 23.

'But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'The fruit of the Spirit.'—Nine virtues are woven together in this golden chain of the Holy Spirit's fruit. They fall into three groups of three, four, and two respectively—according as they refer primarily to God, *love*, *joy*, *peace*; to one's fellow-men, *longsuffering*, *kindness*, *goodness*, *faith*; and to oneself, *meekness*, *temperance*. But the successive qualities are so closely linked and pass into one another with so little distance, that it is undesirable to emphasize the analysis.—FINDLAY.

ONE 'fruit' in distinction of the many 'works of the flesh,' indicates the unity of the spiritual graces which are comprehended in love. 'The fruit is produced by the grace of God, the works of the flesh spring from ourselves' (Chrysostom). The list differs widely from pagan catalogues of virtues which have no place for love, humility, and meekness, joy and peace, nor any of the more delicate graces of the Spirit of God.—SCHAFF.

'Love.'—At the head of the list, being the most comprehensive and the most active of all graces, and lying at the root of all the rest—love to God, and love to man, leading most directly and efficiently to the discharge of every duty respectively to both.—GWYNNE.

'Joy.'—'Joy in the Holy Ghost' (Ro 14^{17}) manifesting itself in cheerfulness of demeanour, and so recommending the religion of which it is the fruit—not a selfish emotion, but a sun whose rays warm and gladden all within the sphere of its influence.—PEROWNE.

'Peace.'—This is conjoined with 'joy' in Ro 14^{17} 15^{13}, in both of which passages the 'peace' referred to is the serenity of soul arising from the consciousness of being brought home to the favour of God and to obedience to His will. On the other hand, the term, as here introduced, seems likewise to stand in contrast with those sins of strife and malignity noted before among the works of the flesh, and therefore to point to peacefulness in the Christian community.—HUXTABLE.

'Longsuffering.'—Longsuffering is the patient magnanimity of Christian goodness, the broad shoulders on which it 'beareth all things.'—FINDLAY.

'Kindness, goodness.'—The difference between these two words is not very distinctly perceptible. The former appears to denote that kindness of disposition, commonly known as 'goodness of heart'— 'benevolence,'—which disposes a person to wish well to his neighbour, to sympathize with him in his trials, to avoid giving him pain or uneasiness, usually associated with the quality here denominated 'goodness,' namely, an aptitude to do good, which exhibits itself in acts of benevolence and charity, constituting a man a beneficent as well as a benevolent member of society.—GWYNNE.

'Faithfulness.'—Πίστις seems not to be used here in its theological sense, 'belief in God.' Its position points rather to the passive meaning of faith, 'trustworthiness, fidelity, honesty,' as in Mt 23^{23}, Tit 2^{10}, cf. Ro 3^{3}. Possibly, however, it may here signify 'truthfulness, reliance' in one's dealings with others.—LIGHTFOOT.

'Meekness.' — 'Meekness' is something more than 'mildness,' which has been suggested as an alternative translation. Mildness would represent that side of the virtue which is turned towards men; but it has also another side, which is turned towards God—a gentle submissiveness to the divine will.—ELLICOTT.

'Temperance.' — Self-control refers to our conduct towards ourselves, and embraces moral self-government and