
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

that He was up against a world so obsessed with pride and wrong values, that only love at the flashpoint of sacrifice could break through it. As we think of Him there, two things begin to happen.

We see the real nature of sin—the sin of ordinary life on which we look so leniently because we do not realize its deadly power. We see the pride that often stands between us and one another, and in the light of the Cross how deadly it begins to appear! We see our selfishness and how that may thwart the loving will of God. We see our self-will and that road along which it leads us with such obstinate feet, and how it may come to produce Calvary. For Calvary is not merely an incident in the past: it is the revelation of what is happening now in the world in which we live wherever the loving will of God is thwarted. But the true nature of sin flames out there, like the true nature of some innocent-looking germ in the loathsome and deadly disease which it produces.

But we see also the true nature of life at its best. For to live is to love and to give oneself for others. To see Jesus on the Cross and catch His Spirit there, is to see human life at its best, its highest power. A spirit like that breaking in on our world of twisted human relationships, of waspish minds and irritable tempers, reveals a splendour before which selfishness and pride can never be anything else than blotches on the soul. To see Jesus there in the glory of unconquerable love is to see life in its true quality, beside which the seekers after mere material possession are only children playing with toys.

It is not a very happy moment when the light begins to break and we stand for the first time in the world of moral reality which Christ unveils. It is a difficult world to live in, and we feel unequal to it. But this prayer of Christ has comfort for such an hour of awakening. For it reveals a love at the heart of this new world which can enable us to live in it. The true world which Christ reveals is not a cold and pitiless place of moral demand, but the Father's house in which He takes us by the hand, our Friend and Saviour. That is the fact which was immediately illustrated in the incident that follows this prayer—the first victory of the Cross. As the dying thief watched Christ there, and listened to this prayer, he suddenly became aware of this world of spiritual reality, and felt his powerlessness to live in it, even to find a place in it. But he felt, too, the warmth and hope of that forgiving love. And it awoke a prayer. 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' And at once the Hand that had opened the gates of this kingdom, was stretched out with welcome to lead him in.

A Western Gloss in John ii. 3.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

We have from time to time been able to detect in the apocryphal legends which constitute so large a part of the *Acta Sanctorum* references to the text of the New Testament which show an affinity with some of the earliest readings, which are grouped comprehensively under the title of 'Western.' Even if the detection of such readings adds little or nothing of value to the crowd of variants which disfigure the pages of our critical editions, we may often get local colour either for the reading or for the author who is being quoted. I came across a curious instance recently which suggested that Alcuin, or an earlier writer whom he was trying to improve, had a text of the Fourth Gospel which was marked by notable Western readings.

In the second chapter of John we have the account of the miracle at Cana of Galilee, and it is said that 'the wine ran short.' Apparently this abrupt statement (ὑστερήσαντος δὲ οἴνου) seemed to some editor or transcriber to be the description of an effect without the indication of the cause. So he added the explanation of the deficiency in the supply of wine, by saying that it was *due to the crowd of guests who had been invited*, and who had, presumably, all accepted the generous invitation and taken advantage of it. It is well known to the textual critics that the reference to the number of guests as the cause of the failure of the wine is in the oldest Latin tradition of the text (which is commonly, but probably in-

correctly, described as African). For example, it occurs in the very old MS. which is called the Palatine Gospels, and is marked by the sign *e*, as well as elsewhere. We are not discussing the textual tradition of the whole passage, which is interesting enough: our concern is with the additional words:

per (? propter) multam turbam vocitorum (=vocatorum).

Now let us turn to Alcuin's story of the Life of St. Vedast, who is said to be the first bishop of Arras, and the founder of the famous Abbey of St. Vedast, lying a little to the east of Mons. It is probable that Alcuin is re-editing an earlier text, perhaps from the abbey itself. When he comes to the description of the miracles done by the saint, we are regaled by a veritable banquet of marvels, which may, perhaps, be described as gospel miracles, rechauffés and highly spiced. One special case was a reproduction of what happened at Cana of Galilee. The story was something to the following effect:

A noble and religious person came to visit St. Vedast, and to be refreshed by the honey-sweet of his doctrine. He arrived early and stayed late, so captivated was he by the charm of the saint and of his teaching. Midday passed, and the shadows began to lengthen. It was time for the traveller to depart; so Vedast, unwilling that his guest should leave without bodily refreshment to be superadded to the spiritual, sent his servant to see what wine was left in the jug, and bring a cup to speed the parting guest. The boy returned and whispered to his master that the flagon was empty. The explanation, as recorded by Alcuin, was as follows:

> '*Propter hospitum frequentiam*, et viri Dei largam erga omnes munificentiam, non arida patris caritate, aridum invenit vasculum, in quo vinum servari solebat.'

The vessel was dry, on account of the number of the guests and the largesse of the entertainer. The introduction of the crowd of thirsty guests is abrupt. One would have said that it was a personal and private interview of the noble visitor with the saint. The language is certainly that of the glossator of the Fourth Gospel. Let us see what has happened. The saint, overcome with shame at the small dimension of his wine-cellar, turns to prayer, reminding the Lord that he had brought water out of the rock to supply the need of the thirsty Israelites, and *at Cana had produced wine of matchless flavour*:

> 'et in Cana Galileæ aquam in mirabilis vini convertit saporem.'

Then Vedast sent his boy back to draw from the empty vessel what Divine Grace had filled it with. The servant came running back to say that the wine was overflowing, *the very best wine*, too. So the saint made glad thanksgiving and supplied the need of the visitor and of the guests, his companions.

What was this text? The problem becomes increasingly interesting, when we notice that the Vedast text has points of contact not only with the Palatine Gospel, but also with the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Gospel.

First of all, Ephrem knew about the superfluity of the invited guests: he quotes the Gospel in the form:

> 'Every man at the first *sets forth* good wine, after that light wine.'

and then comments on it as follows:

> 'His wealth did not scorn the poverty of those who could not even *set forth light* wine to match the number of the invited guests (*juxta invitatorum numerum*)' Ephr. (ed. Mōs. p. 55).

From the sequence of the argument it seems proper to infer that Ephrem had in his text the same reference that we find in the Vedast story and in the Old Latin MSS (*e* and *l*).

Next we notice that the quality of the miraculous vintage is expressed in similar terms in Vedast and in Ephrem. In the former we are told that the saint prays confidently to Him who *at Cana of Galilee* turned water into wine of matchless flavour (*aquam in mirabilis vini convertit saporem*); with the result that his servant came back to report that the wine-jar was running over with the very best wine. When we turn to Ephrem we find that the wine of the miracle was of such delicacy as to surpass in flavour all other wines (*saporis suavitate omnia vini genera superabat*). He calls it regularly *suave, suavissimum*. This might be only an attempt to express the 'best wine' of the Gospel; but there is more involved than a transplanted adjective. Ephrem goes on to comment on it as upon a continuous Biblical text. 'In the last days,' says he, 'the one who changed water into delicate wine, is able to restore to *all* created things *a flavour of ineffable sweetness*' ('saporem, cujus dulcedo ineffabilis est'). This implies that Ephrem

had in his text a reference in some detail to the quality of the 'best' wine; and this is very nearly the description that we had in Vedast. From which we infer that both writers, Ephrem and Alcuin, had before them a glossed text, in which stress was laid (1) on the number of the guests; (2) on the quality of the miraculous vintage. To what author shall we ascribe the supposed glosses? Is it Tatian again? There does not seem to be any trace of the expansions in the Netherlands Harmony. That, however, does not constitute a final disproof of Tatianic origin.

Literature.

THE SON OF MAN.

This really characteristic title, which occurs some eighty times in the Gospels, has been a constant subject of discussion among scholars. On the ground that Jesus spoke in Aramaic there has been an increasing tendency, during the last twenty years or more, to lay stress on the Aramaic original of the phrase. In the Aramaic equivalent *bar nāsh* (*ā*), the force of 'the son' had been so weakened by time that the whole expression practically meant nothing more than *man* (*homo, Mensch*—not *vir*), and as Jesus described Himself by this title, what meaning could He have intended to convey by it? Twenty years ago Schweitzer, in surveying the course of the discussion, declared that the problem had been solved, but succeeding scholars have differed from him. The problem has now been taken up anew in *Anthropos and Son of Man*, 'a Study in the Religious Syncretism of the Hellenistic Orient,' by Carl H. Kraeling, Ph.D., Instructor at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). Dr. Kraeling has set himself to discover the ultimate origin of the title. In his view it goes back beyond its Aramaic usage, or even its occurrence in Ezekiel and in the vision in Dn 7. From his researches, which have taken him far afield, into Mandean and Manichean religious thought, and into Hellenistic and Gnostic systems, he concludes that the Jewish-Christian 'Son of Man' is but one manifestation of a ubiquitous Oriental figure known in certain syncretistic circles as 'the Anthropos.' Basing his views upon those of Professor R. Reitzenstein of Göttingen, he traces the expression back to the ancient Iranian *gayamaretan*, 'mortal life,' a mythical person originally devoid of a proper name. This Gayomart became known to the people of Mesopotamia probably in pre-Parthian days. By reason of his place in the primordial conflict, he was identified with Marduk and thus transformed into a man-like deity and primordial champion. In this capacity he was received into Judaism in the second pre-Christian century and furnished the inspiration for the 'man-like one' of Daniel and for the Messianic interpretation which the figure received in the Book of Enoch. The idea developed that the Anthropos was to reappear for the salvation of the soul in the guise of a Divine Saviour, and hence we have first the Adamites, then Christ, and finally Buddha, Zarathusthra, and Mani. By adopting the title, Jesus gave expression to the conviction that He was the human messenger in whom the Heavenly Man manifested Himself to save the world. It is doubtful whether these views will be accepted by Biblical scholars, even the most critical. After all, there is little resemblance between the Anthropos to which the author goes back and Jesus' use of the name 'Son of Man.' The former, as admitted, is not a figure of determinative importance, but merely a type of primordial champion and the father-creator of the human race, although Dr. Kraeling holds that elements connecting him with human nature and its redemption became added later on. Jesus' use of the name, on the other hand, seems to be definitely connected with His Ideal Manhood, His Frail Manhood, or His Prophetic Office, and in these aspects it does not appear to have any bearing on Marduk or any other being of anthropogenetic and heroic activities, even though allowances be made for a Judaistic medium. Moreover, we must not overlook the fact that, though Jesus as a rule spoke in Aramaic, it is quite possible that He may sometimes have spoken in Greek, in which case ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου may have been the expression used. The book has been prepared with great thoroughness and with a full knowledge of the literature on the subject; and the author's hypothesis, though it may not contain the solution of the Son of Man problem, cannot fail to stimulate