
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

Faith and Knowledge in Pauline and Johannine Thought.

By the Reverend R. Martin Pope, M.A., University College, Southampton.

When, in his speech before the Council of Areopagus, St. Paul proclaimed that 'God . . . hath made of one blood all nations of men . . . that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him,' he expressed what may be regarded as an axiom of comparative religion. For the science of religion has but elucidated the fact that there is a universal curiosity in the human consciousness which has led men in all ages to seek for the ultimate reality. 'Canst thou by searching find out God?' was the question put by Zophar to Job, and though the emphasis may be on the personal pronoun, the search for God is assumed as a perpetual activity of the soul, and the finding of God its supreme desire.

There is a further fact which emerges in this connexion. Experience tended to invest this greatest of all quests with a halo of mystery: a mystery that, as Otto says, was not merely something to be wondered at, but something that captivated and intoxicated. It called for the exercise of the highest faculties of mind and spirit. It was not really a task for the multitude, but for the trained mind. The great secret was only attainable by the few. It was left for average humanity more or less blindly to accept their findings. Hence it would appear that the idea of an interior and exclusive knowledge of the Divine is of very ancient origin, possibly coincident with the oldest faiths of the world. Here is the germ of gnosis, the higher, deeper insight into spiritual reality professed by masters, who, having as they believed, found God, have claimed the gift of instructing others in their quest of the unseen, and have founded schools for the cultivation of the hidden gnosis. The gnosis was a knowledge of God not attainable by ordinary intellectual processes. It was a vision of truth apprehended by means of a spiritual illumination or ecstasy. The more august the conception of the numinous, the more certain was the development of the esoteric element, and the greater the vogue of magic and occultism in the rites of initiation practised by the priesthoods of gnosis. For apparently it was the rule that supernatural knowledge involved a preliminary ritual, secret and mysterious.

It is difficult to locate the original source of Gnosticism. Babylonia, Persia, and Egypt have each been claimed by the students of gnostic origins as the home of its first exponents. But the fundamental passion for God and the corresponding attraction of esoteric knowledge are features which tend to recur in all Oriental faiths: and as the latter were modified by, and in turn reacted on, Hellenic culture and philosophy, the resulting syncretism or fusion of belief and practice gave birth to a rich, bewildering progeny of strange speculations, purificatory and expiatory rites, and mysteries in which magic and cabbalistic formulæ and cryptic signs played a part. Systems of initiation like Orphism, a general term for all forms of Dionysus-worship, and specific mysteries like the Eleusinian established themselves in classical Greece; and later came those of the Egyptian Isis and Serapis, the Phrygian Cybele and Attis, the Syrian Adonis, and finally the Mithras of Persia. With the conquest of Alexander the mixing of Oriental beliefs with Greek religion had a marked effect in the tendency to identify deities such as Aphrodite and Isis and to deify great men and kings: it acknowledged the rights of the individual soul, brought into play a missionary spirit, created an impulse towards monotheism, and, above all, quickened the tendency to mysticism. For our immediate purpose it is sufficient to note that Judaism, in spite of its rigid exclusiveness, could not escape these influences: its literature, its religious thought, its outlook on humanity were all modified. The vogue of a new phase of faith—the apocalyptic—was only one of many effects of the new order. It was in the second century B.C. that the Hermetic literature of Egypt took its rise. Purporting to be the teaching of the thrice-greatest Hermes, the Greek name for the God Theuth or Thoth, it was a blend of Babylonian astrology and Greek philosophy with the old traditions of Egyptian religion, and became a rival of Judaism. It was a theosophy, but a theosophy that carried with it sacraments of baptism and rebirth. At the time of the birth of Christ, further results of this widespread fusion of belief and ritual are to be noted. On the one hand, we have a Jewish thinker like Philo making an attempt to reconcile with the O.T., and in particular with the Pentateuch, the speculations of Plato and

the Stoics. On the other, we learn on the authority of Philo and Josephus that there existed among the Jews sects which gave a place to Gentile rites and doctrines. The Essenes whom they describe in detail, with their extreme asceticism, their celibacy, their sacramental meals, their system of initiation and secret beliefs which the initiate must swear never to divulge, present all the features of a community of heterodox Jews with tendencies shaped by those Buddhistic influences which affected second-century Gnosticism, so that we may think of them as in effect a Judæo-Gnostic sect. Compare also with them the Therapeutæ of Egypt—a monastic sect of Jews whose tenets and practice also show Buddhistic influence. There is also Mandæan Gnosticism, upon which a large amount of research and critical study has recently been expended, more especially in relation to a possible influence upon the Fourth Gospel. It has been held that Mandaism took its rise in Palestine in a gnostic community based on the cult of John the Baptist. They were opposed probably both to Christians and Jews—so runs the theory—and finally driven into exile. They spread to the lands about the lower Tigris and lower Euphrates, where their descendants are found to-day. Their sacred writings, though they may contain matter of an earlier date, were compiled about the middle of the seventh century. Their only sacrament was baptism. A study of their sacred books reveals a transformation into a medley of beliefs of a Babylonian-Persian nature, in which the tenets of Parsism are conspicuous, and from which it is not easy to draw safe inferences as to the early form of the Mandæan faith. Scholars, however, have emphasized the anti-gnostic and anti-Baptist teaching of the Fourth Gospel in order to uphold the theory that there was a strong Mandæan influence in Ephesus at the end of the first century when the Gospel took its final form.

Such in brief summary are some of the phases of religious beliefs which we ought to keep in mind as we open the New Testament and begin to study in particular the writings of St. Paul. His world was that of the Eastern Mediterranean and, like the Athens of his day, obviously 'religious,' using that epithet to include the God-fearing who were honestly attracted by the theism of the Jew, a select class who regarded the knowledge of the unseen power as a secret worth having, but cultivated the mysteries of Isis and Cybele rather as stimulants of their emotions than as guides to a new morality, and the crowd who, without any sense of moral defect, had a vague interest in ritual which could influence the Divine powers for their worldly benefit, or were moved by custom to honour a local deity or by curiosity to listen to a new teacher. Clearly St. Paul was familiar with every aspect of current religious thought and practice: in particular he was acquainted with the technical sense of gnosis; but it is significant of the new light which came to him through Christ that the basic conception of his teaching is 'faith' rather than 'knowledge.' In one sense, his use of the term is remarkable, because in the Old Testament the words indicating trust or belief suggest the quality of faithfulness or trustworthiness, as in the famous statement of Habakkuk 'the just shall live by faith,' that is, by faithfulness or constancy. On the other hand, the idea of reliance on Yahweh as Lord and God of His people underlies all Hebrew theology: it was, of course, linked with fidelity to the Law, but none the less expresses a conviction of experience, and the Jew never lost his confidence in a personal God.

In this respect Jesus was a Son of Israel: dependence upon God was the foundation of His earthly life; only by virtue of such trust can either His own disciples or the Pharisees fulfil the weightier matters of the Law; only by such faith can man live fearlessly and accomplish impossible things. It is the secret of effective prayer, of healing the body, and of moral salvation. When He required faith in Himself as a condition of discipleship or of moral cure, this did not mean that He superseded God: it was not so much faith in His person as in the power of which He was the channel. It also implied loyalty to the principles He taught and for which He was ready to die. It is true that He claimed to be Messiah; but it was not till He passed into the unseen that an intellectual conviction attached to the confession 'Jesus is Lord.' Nor can faith during His visible earthly career have acquired any element of mysticism. The latter was to find expression in that fellowship with the spiritual Christ which in the teaching of St. Paul was the very essence of the Christian life.

If the confession of Jesus as Messiah or Lord implies intellectual conviction—this is involved in the expression 'the word of faith' which is the substance of his preaching—nevertheless this aspect is subordinated to the conception of faith as a gift of God, a Divine endowment varying in degree with individuals; but whatever be its measure, the vital condition of salvation, the holy life, moral resurrection (or rebirth), and finally of mystic fellowship with Christ. Christians are 'the believers' or 'they who believe,' and to be a

Christian is to be 'in Christ.' The spiritual Christ is, so to speak, the atmosphere in which the Christian lives and moves and has his being. The believer is not identified with Christ in the sense that his personality is absorbed into Christ: it is rather 'Christ that liveth in him.'

Now it is this conception of 'faith' which may be regarded as indicating the powerful influence of Hellenistic theology upon his thought. We may say in effect that his interpretation of faith amounts to a kind of Christian gnosis, and that his use of both terms 'faith' and 'knowledge' indicates closely related aspects of the same ecstatic experience. The *mystica unio* is the result of 'vision' or 'revelation.' Thus it was attained by himself, and presumably it might be the normal experience of any believer. Was, then, the Christian experience a new 'mystery'? Are we to conclude that St. Paul's interpretation of Christianity as union with Christ is closely modelled on the type of current mystery cults?

No one can deny his acquaintance with and adoption of the mystery terms, *e.g.* 'initiated,' 'pneumatic,' 'psychic,' 'perfect,' 'illumination,' 'gnosis,' and others. When he speaks—it is sufficient to quote one example—of the new light, he describes its function as an illumination (*photismos*), or 'a lighting-up of the knowledge (*gnosis*) of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' On the other hand, his use of the term 'mystery' never implies a ritual act or sacrament: it is a comprehensive term for the Divine purpose once hidden, now revealed, to include the Gentile world within the covenant of grace. It looks as if he used current terms which had been popularized by common usage, although in course of time their original technical significance had been smoothed away. Other terms and conceptions, such as Soter (Saviour) with the corresponding *soteria* (salvation), Kyrios (Lord), Spirit, Son of God, Logos, are current coin and cannot with certainty be ascribed to a particular source. But one thing is clear, that St. Paul's phrases, *e.g.* 'to live is Christ,' 'in Christ,' 'crucified with Christ,' stand apart from the attainment of divinity which in the mystery cults was achieved by magic or initiatory rite. Reitzenstein quotes from *Poimandres*: 'this is the blessed issue for those who have attained gnosis, to be deified.' This attainment of deity is a concept no one can read into the language of the Apostle: he never suggests absorption into the Divine Being: only fellowship with a particular Saviour, and that—we may add—not limited to a given ecstatic experience, but continuous with life itself.

But, it will be argued—is it not closely allied with sacramental acts such as baptism and the Eucharist? We can only briefly indicate what appears to be the relation between 'faith' and 'sacrament' in his teaching. Both baptisms—lustral washings—and sacramental meals, the eating of a god or what represented a god are rites easily paralleled by pagan ritual; but to St. Paul baptism, though it symbolized entrance into the Christian community and the forgiveness of sins, really implied a dying and a rising with and in Christ. It is not definitely connected with a new birth—that is a later development—but as a symbolic representation of the death and rising of Christ it implies that a new life in Him has begun but is not yet full grown. It is not a 'closed' experience, but initiates a continuous spiritual growth.

The Lord's Supper also sets forth in dramatic form the death of Christ and the benefits thereby assured to the believer, reminding him that by virtue of his own death or self-surrender after the similitude of Christ he has a place in the New Covenant and a share in its promises. There is one very difficult passage, 1 Co 10^{14-22}, which contrasts 'the cup of the Lord' and 'the cup of *dæmonia*,' 'the table of the Lord' and 'the table of *dæmonia*.' This seems to suggest something more than a parallel with the pagan idea that the spirit of the god adheres to the sacrificed flesh and passes into him who eats it. But St. Paul mentions the pagan practice to reprobate it. The Christian cannot share in both meals; and as Mr. A. D. Nock notes,[1] while he uses the phrase 'sharers in demons' (whatever that may mean), he has no corresponding phrase 'sharers in the Lord.'

Again, common meals in memory of a founder, or common meals to which guests are invited by a devotee to meet at the table of a god (as, for example, the god Serapis—an actually authenticated example) who becomes the real host, or the rending of the flesh of bulls or pigs by votaries of Dionysus—a sort of theophagy—to represent the eating of the god, are ritual parallels; but the Eucharist stands apart as not in the first instance involving a communion, but an actual participation in the dying of Christ. The Christian brings to this observance the faith which makes real to him his own self-surrender or inner dying to an old life. We conclude, therefore, that while Christianity has its place within the circle of religious concepts and practice that prevailed in the Hellenistic world, it stands apart and is distinctive: it is never esoteric, but universal in its appeal to the human consciousness, it pro-

[1] *Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation*, p. 134.

claims an historical Person, not a mythical god, a living Saviour, not a dead founder of a cult, one who is not the deity of a coterie, but the Saviour of all who believe; and finally its sacraments do not *ex opere operato* or automatically make men *pneumatikoi*, nor give by a mere act of reminiscence a salvation for ever guaranteed. For St. Paul the supper of the Lord is far removed from pagan initiation, which often had little relation to morality. The sacramental grace of which the Christian is recipient has to be renewed perpetually in order to the deepening and enriching of the spiritual life. Hence the receiving of the Sacrament is secondary in importance as compared with the actual conduct of a Christian, who, according to St. Paul, can throw away the sacramental blessing by failing to live according to the Spirit or to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.

Are we, then, to exclude what we may call the rational and intellectual apprehension of Christianity from his interpretation of its truths? Does he reduce it to a mystic experience symbolized by the sacramental acts and expressed in a new ethic? When he regards gnosis as a spiritual endowment and links it with 'revelation' and speaks of 'the surpassing worth of knowing Christ and the power of his resurrection,' he indicates a religious condition which is a mystic experience rather than an intellectual process. But he is nevertheless a thinker and has a mind trained in Rabbinic method and lore. He is by no means ignorant of Stoic and other speculative ideas; and he is capable of expounding, as in the Epistle to the Colossians, a conception of the Person of Christ 'than which no better example of Christian gnosis can be given,' and this in reply to a set of doctrines of a gnostic colour, though their groundwork is Judaic. Nevertheless his dialectic touches us less profoundly than his mystic intensity and his whole-hearted passion for the new ethic of Christ. This leads him to place Love above such gifts as prophecy and gnosis (or, in a less abstract sense, *epignosis*). The latter is transitory and partial: all intellectual processes being imperfect when compared with the absolute value of love and the love of Christ 'which surpasses knowledge,' or with that inward peace 'which is above all comprehension.' It has been often noted that even the statement of a great truth, as in the *locus classicus* of Ph 2^{5-11}, is used to point an ethical duty, and this is a common feature in his letters.

On the other hand, when we turn to the Pastoral Epistles, which incorporate genuine Pauline matter while presenting a post-Pauline church development (*e.g.* baptism is now 'a bath of regeneration'), we are met with an intellectualized Christianity in such expressions as 'sound doctrine,' 'rightly dividing the word of truth,' and the phrase 'the contradictions of gnosis falsely so called.' Already a party of simple faith, clinging to tradition, found itself opposed by a party of knowledge. At least, this is on the face of it a probable inference. For Christianity was essentially a missionary religion. It was no longer a Jewish sect: it had awakened to self-consciousness as the exponent of a new view of God and a new way of life, in its contact with the eager, restless, inquiring Græco-Roman world. We need not go beyond the New Testament itself to find evidence of this broadening vision. The Epistle to the Hebrews, *e.g.*, sets forth a kind of Christian Platonism by proclaiming a faith that was the assurance of an unseen order beyond and yet adumbrated by a transitory phenomenal world—a 'better country' for which the loyal witness of Christian heroes and heroines was a preparation and a passport.

But the chief evidence of intellectual advance is seen in the body of writings called Johannine. Whatever may be our critical standpoint in the much-debated questions of authorship, date, and content, all are agreed that they represent an advance on Paulinism, and commend Christianity to the intellect as well as to the faith of a later generation, now keenly alive to, and threatened by, the speculations of heretical teachers, particularly in Asia Minor. Gnosticism had now fastened itself on Christianity, and we are at the beginnings of the fierce struggle which in the second and third century was waged between the Church and the Christian gnostics. That gnosticism was regarded as the chief foe of the truths of the Incarnation and the orthodox doctrine of the Person of Christ is shown by the fact that the earlier Fathers—Irenæus, Justin, Hippolytus, Clement, Tertullian, and others constitute our chief authorities for that system of theosophy which was aroused to amazing activity by the advent and rapid advance of Christianity. It became a rival system of redemption, not ethical as Christianity was, but promising deliverance from a material world regarded as the seat of evil. By means of sacraments and initiations the soul was equipped to pass through planetary systems from the grip of world-powers into the *Pleroma* or sphere of the Divine Being, where it was reunited with God. The work is accomplished by a Soter (or Christus) of supreme rank who is not to be regarded as an historical person, though Jesus as a person of supreme spiritual distinction may be

united for a given period with this Divine Redeemer. The system therefore is essentially dualistic: the gnostic Soter who is essentially an abstraction, could not be identified with the Jesus of History. Jesus, indeed, might be regarded as one of the masters of gnosis; but the redemption was effected by a mythological Redeemer, who had to undo the work of an inferior emanation or god called *Sophia*, whose son Demiourgos made the world. The fallen *Sophia* had to be released by the Soter from the prison-house of matter along with the elect 'spirituals' who had fitted themselves for the ascent to God. As the world was essentially immoral, the great aim was to be delivered from it, yet morality did not count: you could rise above matter by being a self-mortifying ascetic, or you could show your independence of matter by being an unbridled libertine. We know that there were sects like the Nicolaitans and Cainites who inverted moral values.

Now the First Epistle of St. John combats the teaching of Cerinthus, who may be regarded as the first Christian gnostic. He taught that Christ (or the Holy Spirit) descended on Jesus at baptism, revealed to him the Fatherhood of God, worked miracles through Him and finally left Him, so that the man Jesus alone suffered and died—an issue which the gnostic would ascribe to the hostility of the world-powers. Christ could not suffer and had returned (to use the expression of Irenæus) to His own *pleroma*. Advanced critics like Loisy have similarly held that the Gospel in a greater degree than St. Paul's Epistles is related to pagan gnosis and is really a Christian-gnostic document, upholding Christ as a sacramental and gnostic Saviour. Probably the view of Dr. E. F. Scott holds the field: he regards it not so much a deliberate polemic, but rather as a defence of the Christian faith, while drawing on gnostic thought as in such antitheses as 'light' and 'darkness' and revealing a certain sympathy with it. The basis is the conception of Christ as the Logos—not the Messiah of a given nation, but 'the Light that lighteth every man,' revealing God with an absoluteness and finality to which no other faith or theosophy could attain in the sense that the mind of Christ is capable of ever-new interpretation as His immanent Spirit reveals Him to succeeding generations. And yet, though clothed with a sort of metaphysical halo, His Person is invested with a real humanity far removed from the phantasmal or docetic humanity of the gnostics. The author is clearly responsive to the influences of gnostic speculation in that he appeals to the reason and intellect more markedly than St. Paul. What place, then, does faith hold in his thought, and how is it related to knowledge?

It is remarkable that he avoids technical terms like 'faith' and 'knowledge' and only uses the corresponding verbs which, as Dean Inge has noted, really agree with the essentially dynamic character of faith and knowledge in his teaching. A man may believe 'in the name of Christ': this is the attitude of confession as a catechumen: he may believe 'on Christ' Himself, and thereby has reached the stage of personal devotion to Christ. This faith is the condition of 'eternal life.' It is a stage on the journey—not a goal. The goal is eternal life defined in the words 'to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' Hence faith and knowledge are interrelated with knowledge as the crowning achievement of the soul. Knowledge, nevertheless, is not to be regarded as the gnostic stage where moral endeavour ceases. It is still a process: it is a coming to know by a way of illumination: it is not absolute knowledge; it is 'a quality of living which is evolutionary.'[1] Now we have seen that the Pauline conception of faith did not involve the complete suppression of the reasoning faculty, though its essential justification was the ethical life after the pattern of Christ. With St. John knowledge is a greater thing than faith. For him it is not either a mystic state or an esoteric possession open to a few privileged people, the *pneumatikoi*: it is a process of illumination open to all believers whereby the soul has freedom under that spirit who guides into all truth. It implies, of course (*e.g.* 'if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed'), a moral liberation from the powers of evil and darkness, but it is positively a walking 'in the light,' so that the light grows from more to more for the Spirit-controlled life. The universalism of Christian thought by itself lifts the new faith far beyond the exclusiveness of gnostic and other contemporary cults.

Now, as in the case of St. Paul, we must inquire into the Johannine view of the sacraments. That the gospel is full of symbolism even when the narratives may be held to have a real historical basis is undoubted, but St. John's treatment of the sacraments is remarkable. He omits all reference to the Lord's Supper in the narrative of the Passion, though he introduces a new feature in the sacramental act of the feet-washing. The baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist is omitted, and we are told that Jesus did not baptize, only His disciples.

[1] Ely, *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought*, p. 144.

John himself is not the great reformer of the Synoptics: he is a herald of One mightier than himself: 'He must increase, I must decrease.' Was this interpretation of John the Baptist, as in effect a preparatory teacher, a reply to the claims of the Mandæan gnostics that John the Baptist was an incarnation of the Supreme Being? We cannot enter into this subject; but it may well be that he had in view the subversive tenets of a contemporary Gnostic-Baptist sect. It has been argued that his silence in relation to the historical foundation of the Lord's Supper may be due to a quasi-materialistic view of the sacraments, to which the members of Asiatic churches had become prone under the influences of their surroundings. But as against this view, there is the fact that the discourses in the third and sixth chapter express a profoundly spiritual conception of the sacraments which show an advance on the Pauline view, and incidentally suggests that the author regarded the origin of the Lord's Supper as a familiar fact. In the conversation with Nicodemus he announces the conception of a new birth (already prepared for by the new birth of the Pastorals) as a vital condition of 'seeing' or spiritually appropriating the Kingdom: and as if it might be thought that there were any magical virtue in the rite of baptism *per se*, he adds the words, 'Except a man be born of water *and the Spirit*, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven.' But even more striking are the Eucharistic illusions on the sixth chapter: 'The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I give for the life of the world'; 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you'; 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' And the conclusion is: 'It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing.' The Last Supper was as yet a future event when these words were uttered: but the discourse is clearly the production of a mind to whom the Eucharist was now a familiar rite, charged with a spiritual significance of great intensity. As they stand, the words are far removed from the material and sensuous theophagy of a pagan or mystery sacramental meal. They suggest that every Christian incorporates or assimilates in some measure the life not of a mythical god or hero, but of a Spiritual Being, conceived to be for ever living, and for ever self-imparting. They suggest this truth as involved in the actual participation in a common meal which has a sacramental significance. In other words, he gives to the Eucharist the idea of communion which St. Paul's dramatic re-enactment of the death of Jesus does not explicitly convey. His keynote is not the death but the life of Jesus. Parallelism with current conceptions and ritual may be granted, but the approach to the sacraments is from an entirely new standpoint.

To sum up, the Johannine writings by their conception of the knowledge of God as equated with 'eternal life' and their profoundly spiritualized setting of the sacraments are an advance upon, or rather a rich complement of, St. Paul's views. St. Paul's 'faith' is a mystic experience which is in a sense almost one with his concept of gnosis: both faith and knowledge tend to merge into one another as gifts of God and as the product of inspiration: and his interpretation stands apart from all Hellenistic parallels by its emphasis on the ethical issues which alone establish the reality of the mystic fellowship with Christ. St. John, on the other hand, leaves room for the exercise of intellect and reason. The whole setting of his Christology is philosophical and has a metaphysical basis lacking in St. Paul. Faith is devotion to a Divine Christ, who is also the 'Logos of life,' as a life-giving personality: its issue is a mystic experience called 'eternal life,' a possession which is not static, but dynamic, and involves an ever-advancing development of all the faculties of the soul. While both have felt the influences of current Hellenistic religious belief and praxis, its mysteries, its gnosis, its dualism, its sacramental systems, both have transcended these influences by making a mystical union with Christ, not a mechanically secured privilege, but an inward reality open to all: and, further, by their absolute conviction that He is an historical personality 'of one substance with the Father.' The Fourth Gospel goes further by reconciling faith and reason in a full-orbed Christian experience.

The true successor of St. John is Clement of Alexandria, who saved the Church from the robust but too rigid obscurantism of Tertullian by proclaiming that faith and knowledge are not mutually opposed, agreeing with Plato in believing that faith takes its rise in wonder or admiration and leads up to knowledge, which is

> 'a sure and firm demonstration of the things received through faith being itself built up by the Lord's teaching on the foundation of the faith and carrying us on to unshaken conviction and scientific certainty' (Strom. vii. 10–57).

When gnosticism with its subtle speculations and specious theosophy had aroused the critical spirit of the leaders of the Church to an examination of

the first principles of their faith, then, as to-day, Fundamentalism was leagued against the point of view popularly known as Modernism. According to Tertullian ('I believe in the impossible just because it is impossible'), simple faith was sufficient to counteract the deadly intellectualism of the gnostics. Clement succeeded in keeping the door open to intellectual inquiry and the rights of reason, thereby more truly upholding—as he clearly does in his portrait of the *gnostikos*, or enlightened Christian—the spirit and teaching of both St. Paul and St. John. But chiefly of St. John, whose doctrine of the immanent Spirit—for ever guiding and illuminating the believer—is the foundation of his thought. He teaches us to look for the seat of authority not in tradition, however venerable and august, but in the perpetual testimony of the Spirit of Truth which keeps both soul and intellect alive to the inspiration of all new light, and in the inevitable flux of dogmas, forms, and institutions is for ever drawing on what is Christ's and disclosing it to us.

The Words from the Cross.

VII. 'And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Luke xxiii. 46).

By the Reverend Thomas Yates, D.D., Bournemouth.

There is no embroidery in the narratives of the Passion and the Cross in the Gospels. They are direct and even laconic, without trace of dramatization, and with no comment. When St. Luke has to tell of the worst thing ever told about human nature, and of the classic example of corporate guilt, there is only the curt, bald statement, 'There they crucified him.' Yet this same Evangelist is not able to set down with the same simple bluntness, 'He died.' Nor can any of the others, when they wrote their own accounts. There was more in it than could be told by the simplicity of 'He died.' The impression left by that tragic moment was not simply of one who could bear no more, and gave up the struggle. It was the impression of One who, with powers of will and choice still in His possession, rallied them all, and *gave Himself*. There was a conscious self-giving in the very article of death. It was not the sob of a thinned and ebbing tide the onlookers heard, but the full note of a life-choice, flooding forth in the face of death. 'He yielded up His spirit,' is St. Matthew's revealing account, and the illuminating comment upon this is the heart of the allegory of the Good Shepherd in the Fourth Gospel, 'This is why my Father loves me, because I lay down my life to take it again. No one taketh it from me, I lay it down of my own accord. I have my Father's command for this.' When the sense of His Father's presence had been the surest thing in His daily experience, His Father's command had been His one guide. When in the darkest hour the sense of that presence was for a moment lost and gone, the command remains. In the absence of His consciousness of the Father's nearness, it is still His meat and drink to do the Father's will. The faith that stands in experience is a victory that overcometh the world, but the faith that can stand in the absence of experience overcometh more than the world. It is the victory of the spirit over the powers beyond the world. It is the overcoming of the last enemy.

The three Synoptics all tell that it was with a loud cry that Jesus made His final self-committal to God. Everything must have been in the tone and accent of that cry. The thing that He said as He thus loudly cried are words which can be uttered so diversely. They may sound like the expression of a dim hope which is half a despair. They can be imagined as the half-strangled gasp of some one confronting with dismay the last necessity, and hardly knowing what is said. They can be read as if they came from a soul nearly drowned in the cold flood, and grasping with desperate grip some broken piece, in hope that somehow and somewhere he will be floated ashore.

But there is something here of a wholly different order, and if we can catch the right accent we may be able to understand the victory. Twice did Jesus loudly cry upon the Cross. Once it was a cry of horror, and once it was a cry of joy. When He knew the abyss of desolation, 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?' He cried