

pl. 44
Dict.

A

Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

JOHN A. SELBIE, D.D.

AND (IN THE READING OF THE PROOFS) OF

JOHN C. LAMBERT, D.D.

Paper 4131-10
1908

VOLUME II

LABOUR—ZION

WITH

APPENDIX AND INDEXES

86165
17/3/08

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK

1908

$\tau\acute{o}$ σωτήριον is found twice—Lk 2³⁰ 3⁶. Of the instances of this use of the verb $\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ relate to the deliverance from disease or demoniacal possession—Mt 9^{21, 22} bis, Mk 5^{23, 28, 34} 6⁵⁶ 10³², Lk 8^{36, 48, 50} 17¹⁹ 18⁴², Jn 11¹²; in 20 instances the reference is to the rescue of physical life from some impending peril or instant death—Mt 8²⁵ 14³⁰ 16²⁵ 27^{40, 42} bis, 49, Mk 3⁴ 8³⁵ 15^{30, 31} bis, Lk 6⁹ 9^{24, 56} 23³⁵ bis, 37, 39, Jn 12²⁷; in the remainder of cases, 20 times, the reference is to religious salvation technically so called—Mt 1²¹ 10²² 19²⁵ 24^{13, 22}, Mk 8³⁵ 10³⁵ 13^{13, 20} 16¹⁶, Lk 7⁵⁰ 8¹² 9²⁴ 13²⁸ 18²⁶ 19¹⁰, Jn 3¹⁷ 5³⁴ 10⁹ 12⁴⁷. The noun $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$ is used twice in the OT sense of deliverance from the enemies of Israel—Lk 1^{69, 71}; and 3 times in the more specifically religious sense—Lk 1⁷⁷ 19⁹, Jn 4²². $\tau\acute{o}$ σωτήριον in Lk 2³⁰ has the same distinctly religious associations; in 3⁶ it stands in a quotation from Is 40⁵, where the meaning is eschatological from the OT point of view.

1. First we examine the passages relating to the deliverance from diseases or demoniacal possession. The question is whether the import of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ here is exhausted by the notion of 'healing.' The Greek word has this meaning, being connected with $\sigma\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ($\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$), 'whole,' 'sound,' therefore $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ = 'to render whole, sound.' The AV accordingly renders in most of these cases 'to make whole' or 'be whole,' in two 'to heal' (Mk 5²³, Lk 8³⁶), in one 'to do well' (Jn 11¹²), and only once 'to save' (Lk 18⁴²). In one instance it offers 'to save' as a marginal reading for 'to make whole' (Mk 10³²). RV everywhere follows the rendering of AV except that it makes the two passages where the latter has 'to heal' and the one passage where it has 'to save' uniform with the others; further, that it renders in Jn 11¹² 'to recover,' and that it offers in all passages except Mk 6⁵⁶ the marginal alternative 'to save.' It should be noticed that on other occasions the Evangelists use, and make Jesus use, different words, whose import is restricted to 'healing' in the medical sense, and that not only where the object is some disease or disability, but also with a personal object; so $\theta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$ (Mt 4^{23, 24} 8^{7, 16} 9³⁵ 10^{1, 8} 12^{10, 15} 14¹⁴ 15³⁰ 17^{16, 18} 19²¹, Mk 13³⁴ 32^{10, 15} 6^{5, 13}, Lk 4^{23, 40} 5¹⁵ 6^{7, 18} 7²¹ 8^{2, 43} 9^{1, 6} 10⁹ 13¹⁴ 14², Jn 5¹⁰) and $\iota\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (Lk 6¹⁹ 9^{2, 11, 42} 14⁴ 22⁵¹, Jn 4⁴⁷). The question is not, of course, whether the element of 'healing' as a connoted idea should be entirely eliminated from $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$. Not only would this have been impossible to a Greek speaker or writer in cases where the saving act as a matter of fact consisted in or involved healing, but it is also excluded by the observation that Jesus more than once referred to His saving work as the work of a physician, and in the instruction to His disciples spoke also of it as 'healing' (Mt 9¹² 10^{1, 8} 13¹⁵, Mk 2¹⁷, Lk 4¹⁸ 5³¹ 9^{1, 2} 10⁹). The only point at issue is whether the Evangelists are aware of a difference between statements where 'healing' is designated as such, and other statements where 'healing' is implied, but where for a certain purpose it is characterized as 'saving.'

The data above cited show that this last question must be answered in the affirmative. In view of the fact that Aramaic lies behind the Greek form of the words of Jesus or the Evangelists, we shall also have to assume a clearly marked difference between the two sets of cases. The additional element which the use of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ introduces into the situation is that of deliverance from the sphere or power of death. In Mk 3⁴, Lk 6⁹, while speaking of His healing work, our Lord contrasts $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ with $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\tau\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$, which implies that He regarded it as the opposite of 'killing,' i.e. as rescuing from death and restoring to life. According to Mk 5²³, the purpose of 'being saved' is 'to live.' In Lk 7² $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$, the use of

the preposition marks the process as a transition from death to life. It is true that in some instances the disease or infirmity from which Jesus saves is not fatal in itself, e.g. the withered hand (Mk 3⁴), the issue of blood (5²⁸), certainly some of the diseases of 6⁵⁶, blindness (10⁵²). Still even here the act of saving is viewed not from a medical point of view, but from the religious point of view, according to which all disease and infirmity lie on the side of death, so that it belongs to the function of one who delivers from death to work deliverance from these consequences of sin and precursors of death likewise.

This is further confirmed by the general interpretation Jesus puts upon His healing miracles as prophecies and pledges of the approaching Kingdom, in which all sin and death shall be done away with. With regard to the casting out of demons, the correctness of this view is vouched for by the explicit statement (Mt 12²⁸ = Lk 11²⁰). But it applies equally well to the other miracles of healing. Jesus did not look upon these as works of philanthropy merely, or as signs authenticating His mission primarily. While the latter was one of the purposes for which they were intended—and this is brought out prominently in the Fourth Gospel—in the Synoptics, where Jesus' teaching is centred in the Kingdom-idea, the miracles are before all else signs of the actual approach of the Kingdom,—proofs that the saving power of God, which calls the Kingdom into being, is already in motion, and therefore so many instances of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$. Jesus' saving power is simply the Kingdom-power applied to the individual under the influence of sin and death. Thus only can we naturally explain the fact that, where 'salvation' has a direct religious reference, both in our Lord's own and in the later Apostolic teaching, the close connexion between it and the ideas of death and life is unmistakable. If this religious usage is at all dependent on the physical aspect of our Lord's saving activity, it can be only through the common element of victory over sin and death. Jesus Himself has sufficiently indicated the connexion between the two, both in the Synoptical sayings and in the Johannine discourses. In the former the physical evils, which the saving Kingdom-power removes, have a moral and spiritual background. Hence Jesus makes such physical salvation the occasion for suggesting and working the profounder change by which the bonds of sin are loosed, and the rule of God set up in the inner life of man. The external and the internal are significantly placed side by side as co-ordinated halves of an identical work (Mk 2⁹). And in the Fourth Gospel we are explicitly told that the physical acts are intended to point to corresponding spiritual transactions; the healing of the blind, the raising of the dead, are symbolic of Jesus' saving work in the spiritual sphere (5^{14, 19-29} 9^{3, 39} 12^{25, 26}). On three occasions our Lord has brought out the spiritual significance of the physical salvation by calling special attention to its dependence on the exercise of faith: the woman with the issue of blood (Mk 5³⁴ = Mt 9²² = Lk 8⁴⁸), the blind man near Jericho (Mk 10⁵² = Lk 18⁴²), one of the lepers (Lk 17¹⁹). The words 'thy faith has saved thee' are on these occasions the same as were used in such a case of purely spiritual salvation as is recorded Lk 7⁵⁰. They were intended as a suggestion that faith, which had yielded such results in the physical sphere, could be made equally fruitful in the sphere of spiritual salvation. Thus the external and internal are linked together by the common factor of faith.

That $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ has to do with the contrast of life and death becomes plain also from those instances of its natural use where deliverance from evil

other than disease or demon-possession is referred to, for here everywhere the evil is that of physical death (Mt 8²⁵ 14³⁰ 16²⁵ 27⁴⁰, 42, 49, Mk 8³⁵ 15³⁰, 31, Lk 9²⁴, 56 23³⁵, 37, 39, Jn 12²⁷).

2. In connexion with the *directly religious use* in the Gospels several questions emerge. (1) Is the saving act, when belonging to the spiritual sphere, still viewed as a translation from death into life, and what is the meaning of death and life as related to salvation in this sphere? (2) Is the deliverance conceived eschatologically, as something to be experienced in the Last Day, or is it treated as an experience already attainable in this present life? (3) Is the conception negative or positive, or both negative and positive, *i.e.* does it express merely the removal of spiritual evil, or also the bestowal of positive spiritual blessings, especially the gift of life in a positive, pregnant sense?

(1) The answer to the first question is that spiritual salvation still revolves around the contrast between life and death, and that in a twofold sense. Both as subjective and as objective states, death and life come under consideration here. In other words: Jesus saves from spiritual death as a condition of the soul, and He saves from eternal death as a punishment awaiting the sinner. As the object of His saving activity, our Lord names τὸ ἀπολωλός 'that which has become lost and now is lost' (Mt 10⁶ 15²⁴ 18¹²⁻¹⁴, Lk 15⁴, 6, 8, 24 19¹⁰). From the figures used it appears that the Gr. ἀπώλυσθαι has in this connexion the sense 'miss,' 'be missing,' not primarily the sense 'destroy,' 'be destroyed.' The 'lost' are like sheep gone astray upon the mountains, like the coin slipped out of the hand of its owner, like the prodigal who has left the father's home. A lost condition means estrangement from God, a missing of all the religious and moral relations man is designed to sustain towards his Maker. But this lost condition is further identified by Jesus with spiritual death, for of the prodigal the father declares: 'This thy brother was dead and is alive again, and was lost and is found' (Lk 15²⁴, 32). Elsewhere also the state of sin is described as a state of death (Mt 8²², Lk 20³⁸). Salvation of 'the lost,' therefore, is salvation from spiritual death. As such it includes both forgiveness of sin and moral-religious renewal. To the woman who had anointed Him Jesus said: 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace,' and this obviously repeats in another form the preceding statement, 'Thy sins are forgiven' (Lk 7⁴⁸, 50). In the case of Zacchaeus also assurance of pardon is undoubtedly implied when Jesus declares 'salvation' to have come to his house (19⁹). Here, however, the salvation manifests itself also in the moral transformation of the publican, issuing directly into repentance and good works. The prodigal is pardoned and restored to the privileges of sonship. But salvation is not confined to deliverance from this subjective spiritual death, just as the conception of being 'lost' is not exhausted by estrangement from God. ἀπώλυσθαι is used in a retributive sense in connexion with the judgment of God to which the sinner is subject; it involves exposure to objective death as a result of condemnation. With reference to this the two senses of the verb, 'to be missing' and 'to be destroyed,' are used side by side. From the point of view of man the judgment may bring a 'losing' or a 'finding,' 'keeping' of the soul or life (Mt 10³⁹ 16²⁵, Mk 8³⁵, Lk 9²⁴, 25 17³³, Jn 12²⁵). From the point of view of God as Judge it may bring 'destruction.' This is the ἀπώλεια, which is spoken of in Mt 5³⁰ 7¹³ 10²⁸ 18¹⁴, Lk 13³, 5, Jn 3¹⁵, 16 6³⁹ 10²⁸ 17¹² 18⁹. The two aspects of ἀπώλυσθαι—the subjective spiritual 'being lost' and the objective retributive 'being lost' or 'perishing'—are joined together in Mt

18¹⁰⁻¹⁴, where first the sinning one is compared to a sheep gone astray and to be sought, and then, to give the motive for this search after the subjectively lost, Jesus adds: 'Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish' (ἀπολλῆται); that which is already lost in the one sense must be diligently sought, lest it should be lost in the deeper, absolute sense. And the deliverance from this final ἀπώλεια, as well as the deliverance from the other lost condition, is σώζεσθαι, σωτηρία. Thus in Mk 16¹⁶ 'to be saved' is the opposite of 'to be condemned'; in Jn 3¹⁶, 17 of 'to be judged' and 'to perish,' in 10⁹, 10 of 'to be destroyed,' in 12⁴⁷ of 'to be judged.' This ἀπώλεια, however, not less than the other 'being lost,' is equivalent to death. It is a losing of the *life* (ψυχή, Mt 10³⁹ 16²⁵, Mk 8³⁵, Lk 9²⁴, 25, Jn 12²⁵); its opposite is 'to have eternal life' (Jn 3¹⁶ 10²⁸), or 'to be raised up at the last day' (6³⁹). Thus it appears that salvation in its specific religious sense is still viewed throughout as a deliverance from death and an introduction into the sphere of life.

(2) The second question was whether 'salvation' is conceived eschatologically or as something experienced already in this present life. It has been answered in principle by the above, for present salvation coincides with deliverance from subjective spiritual death; eschatological salvation coincides with deliverance from objective death in the Judgment. In a number of the passages already considered the reference to the present is very plain. To the woman who anointed Him Jesus addressed the words, 'Thy faith has saved thee.' Of Zacchaeus He declared: 'To-day is salvation come to this house'; and in the following statement—'The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost,'—the 'saving' must belong to the same time as the 'seeking,' *i.e.* to the present time of our Lord's earthly ministry. In Jn 12⁴⁷ the saving of the world for which Jesus has come is a present thing as distinct from the judging of the world for which He has not come, but which is reserved for the future. In Mt 1²¹ the sins of the people being the evil from which Jesus saves, the salvation is viewed as a present one. In other passages the eschatological reference is equally obvious. 'He that endures to the end shall be saved' (Mt 10²² 24¹³). Mt 16²⁵, Mk 8³⁵, Lk 9²⁴ speak of the finding or saving of life in the future Judgment as conditioned by the willingness to sacrifice one's life here. This is clear from the context (v. 38 in Mk., v. 27 in Mt. = v. 26 in Lk).

The point of the saying is not, as often interpreted, that for one *kind* of life, physical life, given up, another *kind* of life, spiritual life, will be received in return; in which case the future tenses might be purely logical, and no eschatological reference implied. The meaning is that for life, in its general sense, sacrificed by accepting physical death, life in the same general sense will be received in reward through the escape from death, when Jesus comes to judge and to render every man according to his deeds. As Zahn observes, the distinction between two kinds of 'life' or 'soul' is scarcely in harmony with the Hebrew point of view, according to which the 'life' or the 'soul' is frequently called 'the only one' (Com. on Matthew, *in loco*).

Eschatological is also the reference in the question of the disciples recorded in Mt 19²⁵, Mk 10²⁵, Lk 18²⁶ 'Then who can be saved?' The question was called forth by Jesus' declaration, that the rich would with great difficulty enter into the Kingdom of God, which was in turn called forth by the question of the rich young man, 'What shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?' Here 'to be saved' = 'to enter the Kingdom' = 'to inherit eternal life,' and the qualification of life as *eternal*, as well as the further context,—St. Peter's question about future rewards, and our Lord's answer to this,—prove that the whole discussion is eschatological in its scope. Mt 24²² || Mk 13²⁰ 'Except

these days had been shortened, no flesh would have been saved,' is best understood as follows: The temptation in these last times will be so severe, that, if their duration had not been kept within certain limits, all men, even the elect, would have fallen away, and so no flesh would have been ultimately saved in the Day of Judgment.

This interpretation seems to be required by the fact that the shortening of the days is for the sake of the elect. The mere preservation of physical life could have no special bearing upon the destiny of the elect, since, even when killed in the body, they would be sure to inherit the Kingdom; the whole representation concerning the possibility of none being saved, and the elect falling away and the shortening of the days, is, of course, conceived from the human point of view (cf. Zahn, *Com. on Matthew, in loco*).

In the remainder of the passages there are no means of determining whether 'salvation' be future or present. For Mt 18¹¹ (TR only) the reference to the present is supported by Lk 19¹⁰. In Lk 8¹² 'that they may not believe and be saved,' the eschatological sense would be quite plausible, but the other view is slightly favoured by the general import of the parables dealing with the present invisible aspect of the Kingdom. In general, the representation of the Kingdom as both present and future creates a presumption in favour of the view that our Lord regarded salvation as both a present and an eschatological experience. The form *σῳζόμενοι*, 'those who are being saved,' in Lk 13²³, probably reflects the two-sidedness of the process, as belonging to both present and future, and therefore unfinished in this life. In the case of the Johannine sayings (Jn 3^{16, 17} 4²² 5³⁴ 10⁹) we shall have to assume, in harmony with the generalization of the conception of 'life,' 'eternal life,' in the discourses of this Gospel—which makes out of it a conception indifferent to the distinction between present and future—that the same will be true of the synonymous conception of salvation. The future in 10⁹ is purely logical in its force.

(3) The third question concerned what may be gathered from the Gospels in regard to the positive or negative context of the idea of religious salvation. The negative aspect—escape from death—stands in the foreground in Mt 24²², Mk 13²⁰: if the days had not been shortened, not even the elect would have escaped the fate of death in the Judgment; similarly in Mt 16²⁵, Mk 8³⁵, Lk 9²⁴: he who will sacrifice his life here shall escape the loss of life in the Judgment. Probably Mt 10²² and 24¹³ should be interpreted on the same principle: the enduring now will save from greater calamity in the Last Day. On the other hand, in Mt 19²⁵, Mk 10²⁵, Lk 18³⁵, where 'salvation' is equivalent to entrance of the Kingdom and inheriting of eternal life, the emphasis rests on the positive side. In the Johannine passages the positive content of the idea is very marked. According to Jn 3^{16, 17}, 'to have eternal life' and 'to be saved' are synonymous. In Jn 5³⁴ also the preceding context revolves around the idea of life (vv. 21-29), and in the sequel the same idea is again brought forward (v. 39). Again, in 10^{9, 10} 'salvation' and 'life' appear in close conjunction; 12⁴⁷ receives its interpretation from 3¹⁷. The same difference as is observable with reference to eschatological salvation may be observed where present salvation is spoken of. Sometimes the conception is negative (Mt 12¹, Lk 7⁵⁰), sometimes positive as well as negative (Lk 19¹⁰); the salvation which came to Zacchaeus' house certainly included more than pardon, since it issued in renewal of life. The facts, therefore, do not bear out the contention of B. Weiss, who maintains that *σῶσθαι* has everywhere a purely negative meaning.

In the saying of Lk 19¹⁰ Jesus declares 'saving' to be the highest category under which His Messianic activity is to be subsumed. He *came* to save,

i.e. His entrance into the world was for this specific purpose (cf. Mk 10⁴⁵). The connexion between Him and salvation consists not merely in this, that as a preacher of the gospel He proclaims it. Everywhere the supposition is that salvation is in some way bound to His Person. For the Johannine discourses this needs no proof. But it is no less true for the Synoptics. Because He lodged with Zacchaeus, salvation entered the latter's house. The rich young man was not saved, because he refused to follow Jesus. The saving acts in the physical sphere are suspended on faith, and this faith involves trust in Jesus,—in Jesus, to be sure, as the instrument of God, but none the less so that on Jesus' Person together with God the act of faith terminates. It is psychologically inconceivable that in those who were helped by the miracles of Jesus, faith should not have assumed the form of personal trust in Him. Faith in God and faith in Jesus here inevitably coalesce. On the occasion of the storm, Jesus rebukes the disciples for their lack of confidence in His presence with them as a guarantee of absolute safety (Mt 8²⁶). Similarly Peter, when walking upon the water, calls upon Jesus to perform the saving act. From the close connexion in which these transactions stand to the specific religious salvation, it may be safely inferred that in the latter also Jesus occupies a necessary place. This is confirmed by Lk 7⁵⁰, where the woman's faith, which is declared to have saved her, consists in the attitude of trust she had assumed towards Jesus; the love shown the Lord is here the result of the forgiveness of sins (v. 47), and inasmuch as this love terminated on Jesus, the faith which conditioned the forgiveness must likewise have had Him for its object. Similarly in the discourse at Caesarea Philippi, 'salvation' in the Last Day is made dependent on following of Jesus and sacrifice of life for Jesus' sake and the gospel's sake, and the corresponding acknowledgment by Jesus in the Judgment (Mk 8^{34, 35, 38} || Mt. and Lk.).

It is not true, as is being frequently asserted of late, that in the gospel preached by Jesus there is no place for His own Person, it being merely a gospel about God. Though not frequently in so many words, yet in acts we find our Lord seeking to cultivate a relationship of faith between the disciple and Himself and, in Himself, with God. If only once in the Synoptics we read explicitly of faith in Jesus (Mt 8¹⁰), and that in a passage where the authenticity of the words *εἰς ἐμὲ* is doubtful, this is counterbalanced by the fact that not more than once God Himself is specified as the object of faith (Mk 11²²). Jesus, conscious of being the Messiah, the Judge at the Last Day, who would finally dispose of the destiny of all mankind, could not help ascribing a central soteriological position to Himself. Such a figure as He was in His own view, could not be kept outside of the saving transaction, which in a certain sense forestalls the Last Judgment. The absence of more direct affirmations of this principle is simply the result of Jesus' method of not directly proclaiming at first His Messianic dignity, but rather allowing it to be gradually inferred from the impression made by His Person and the witness of His works. On the basis of our present Gospels, apart from critical reconstructions of the teaching of Jesus, no other view is possible than that our Lord represented salvation as in some way bound to and wrapped up in His Person. He did not represent salvation as something unconditioned, flowing simply from the love of God, which would overleap every necessity of mediation. The parable of the Prodigal Son, so often quoted to the contrary, furnishes, when rightly read, the clearest demonstration of this, for it was spoken to describe not God's attitude towards sinners in the abstract, but the historic approach of God to lost men in the appearance of His Son Jesus. It was the attitude of Jesus towards publicans and sinners that drew forth the parable, and therefore it describes God's attitude towards them as bound to that assumed by Jesus (cf. Ernst Cramer, 'Die Gleichnisse Lukas 15 und das Kreuz' in *Beitr. z. Forderung Christi. Theol.* 1904, Heft 4). The gospel is not a mere announcement of the love of God unpreceded and unattended by any action on His part; it is the glad message of the love of God in action, of what God does in Jesus to give His love effect in actual, substantial salvation. The unfolding of what the Person of Jesus as the bearer and worker of salvation contains could not be fully given by our Lord before His saving work had actually transpired, but had to be left to Apostolic teaching.

3. Humanly considered, *salvation is dependent on faith*. This is not merely explicitly announced

(Mk 16¹⁶, Lk 8¹², Jn 3¹⁶⁻¹⁷), it is likewise presupposed or expressed in connexion with the healing acts of Jesus. It is a striking fact that in the Synoptics nearly the whole of our Lord's teaching on faith attaches itself to the performance of miracles. This is because miracles embody that saving aspect of the Kingdom to which faith is the subjective counterpart. The miracles, almost without exception, have two features in common. *Firstly*, they are transactions in which the result depends absolutely on the forth-putting of the Divine supernatural powers, where no human effort could possibly contribute anything towards its accomplishment. And, *secondly*, the miracles are healing miracles, in which the gracious love of God approaches man for his salvation. Faith is the spiritual attitude called for by this twofold element in God's saving work. It is the recognition of the Divine power and grace,—not, of course, in a purely intellectual way, but practically so as to carry with it the movement of the whole inner life. How faith stands related to the saving power of God is most clearly illustrated in the narrative of Mk 9¹⁷⁻²⁴. When the disciples could not heal the child with the dumb spirit, Jesus exclaimed, 'O unbelieving generation!' The father says, after describing the severity of the case: 'But if thou canst do anything, have compassion on us and help us.' To this Jesus replies: 'What, if thou canst! all things are possible to him that believeth.' Faith is omnipotent. To speak, with reference to it, of an 'if thou canst' is an absurdity. Thus to faith is ascribed what can be affirmed of God alone. And elsewhere also this same principle is emphasized by our Lord (Mt 21²¹⁻²², Mk 11²²⁻²³, Lk 17⁶). The explanation lies in this, that faith is nothing else than that act whereby man lays hold of, appropriates, the endless power of God. This line of reasoning, however, is not applicable to the miracles only. The miracles, as has been shown, illustrate the saving work of God in general. All salvation partakes, humanly speaking, of the nature of the impossible: it can be accomplished by God alone (Mt 19²⁵⁻²⁶, Mk 10²⁶⁻²⁷, Lk 18²⁶⁻²⁷). All genuine saving faith is as profoundly conscious of its utter dependence on God for deliverance from sin and death as the recipients of our Lord's miraculous cures were convinced that God alone could heal their bodies from disease. Faith, however, is more than belief, more than a conviction regarding the necessity and sufficiency of the Divine power. It also involves trust, the reliance upon God's willingness and readiness to save. Jesus never encouraged the exercise of faith as a mere theoretical belief in supernatural power. The performance of a sign from heaven, such as men might have witnessed without trust in God or Himself, He persistently refused. He who truly believes, realizes that God is loving, merciful, forgiving, glad to receive sinners. Faith transfers to God in the matter of salvation what human parents experience in themselves with reference to their own children, the desire to help and supply (Mt 7⁷⁻¹¹). This reliance of faith is not confined to the critical moments of life; it is to be the abiding, characteristic disposition of the disciple with reference to his salvation as a whole. Faith, in those on whom the wonderful cures were wrought, may have manifested itself at first as a momentary act, but, as shown above, Jesus frequently called the attention of such people to what faith had done for them, thus suggesting that it was permanently available as an instrument of salvation.

4. In proper names, the conception of 'saving' occurs twice in the Gospels, namely, in the name *Jesus*, and in the exclamation *Hosanna*. A reflexion upon the meaning of the name *Joshua* is found also in Sir 46¹, and in Philo, who explains it

by σωτηρία κυρίου (*de Mut. Nom.* 21). The meaning of Mt 12¹ is not that Jesus will bear this name symbolically in illustration of the fact that 'Jehovah is salvation,' but rather that in Him Jehovah saves, or even, He is Jehovah who saves; for thus only can we satisfactorily explain the joining together of the two statements, 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus,' and 'for it is he that shall save his people from their sins.' It has been held that in the cry 'Hosanna,' raised by the people at Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem, and by the children in the Temple (Mt 21⁹⁻¹⁵), the original idea of a 'saving' inherent in this word as an appeal to God to bestow salvation (Ps 118²⁵ 'Save now, we beseech thee, Jehovah'), was no longer felt by the Evangelists, and the word meant with them simply a general shout of applause to the Messianic King, equivalent to 'Vivat' or the German 'Hoch.' Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu*, i. 180), who takes this view, couples with it the inference that the writer of the First Gospel was not a Hebraist, consequently not the Apostle Matthew, because no Hebraist could have thus misinterpreted a familiar form. He finds the same misunderstanding in Mk. Both Evangelists, according to him, make the people use the shout in the sense which it bore to the early Church, ignorant of the Hebrew meaning. Dalman therefore assumes that what the people actually exclaimed was the simple 'Hosanna,' and that both 'to the Son of David' and 'in the highest' are unhistorical embellishments dependent on the Greek misinterpretation of the word. Zahn, on the other hand (Com. on Matthew, *in loco*), takes the view that to the common people of Jesus' time already the old meaning of the Hebrew form may have become obliterated, so that they already used it as a shout of applause for Jesus, in which case the Evangelists would be accurate in their report of the occurrence. But Zahn does not explain what meaning, on this view, the people could have attached to the words *in τοῖς ὑψίστοις*, which in a shout addressed to Jesus would remain meaningless. In view of this, only two explanations seem possible. Either we may adhere to the older opinion that *σωσεν* is consciously addressed to God, 'save now,' and that *τὸν υἱὸν Δαυὶδ* introduces Jesus as the object of the salvation invoked from God (צִדְקָה, as Dalman himself observes, being sometimes construed with *ל* of the object—Ps 72 116⁶), and that *in τοῖς ὑψίστοις* designates heaven as the place from which God is called upon to bless the Son of David. That for the expression of the latter idea *ἐν ὑψίστοις* would have been absolutely necessary can hardly be maintained. Or we may make a distinction between the two hosannas, assuming that the former is addressed to the Son of David, the latter to God, and both not as invocations, but as ascriptions of praise. This is suggested by Lk's version (19³⁸), which resolves the *σωσεν* *in τοῖς ὑψίστοις* into the paraphrase *in οὐρανῷ εὐφραν, καὶ δοῦν ἐν ὑψίστοις*. This would be a modification of Zahn's view, preferable because it does not leave the *in ὑψίστοις* unexplained.

5. To the foregoing may be added a rapid survey of the usage of *σῶζειν* and *σωτηρία* in the remainder of the NT. 'Salvation' in connexion with healing, but at the same time projected into the specific religious sphere, reappears in Ac 4⁹⁻¹² 14⁹. That the idea in the Apostolic teaching largely revolves around the contrast between life and death, is made abundantly plain by the following passages: Ac 3¹⁵ 5³⁰ 13⁴⁶⁻⁴⁷, Ro 16¹⁷, 1 Co 5⁵, 2 Co 2¹⁵ 7¹⁰, Ph 3²⁰, 2 Ti 1¹⁰, Tit 3⁵, He 5⁷, Ja 5¹⁵⁻²⁰, 1 P 3²⁰⁻²¹. Where the saving act is referred to a definite point of time, this is most frequently the eschatological future (Ro 13¹¹, 1 Co 3¹⁵ 5⁵, Ph 1²⁸, 1 Th 5⁸, 2 Th 2¹³, He 1¹⁴ 2¹⁰ 9²⁸, Ja 5²⁰, 1 P 1⁵⁻⁹ 9¹⁰ 4¹⁸). Instances where salvation is made a matter of the past or present are Eph 2⁵⁻⁸, 1 Ti 2⁴, 2 Ti 1⁹, Tit 3⁵, Ja 1²¹ (?), 1 P 3²¹, Jude 2¹. In many connexions, however, it is not possible to determine whether the usage is eschatological or not (Ro 1¹⁶ 10¹, 2 Co 7¹⁰, Eph 1¹³, He 2³, Ja 2¹⁶). For this peculiar indetermination of the idea the following passages are of interest: Ac 2⁴⁷, 1 Co 1¹⁸ 15², 2 Co 2¹⁵, in all of which the present participle *σωζόμενοι*, 'those who are being saved,' is found (cf. with the past participle *σεσωσμένοι*, 'those who have been and are saved,' Eph 2⁵). The negative aspect of the deliverance is on the whole not more prominent than the positive: Ac 2⁴⁰ (from this crooked generation, *i.e.* from the judgment which will befall it), Ro 5⁹ (from the eschatological wrath of God), Ja 5²⁰ (from death), Jude 2³ (from the fire); and, on the other hand, Ac 13⁴⁶⁻⁴⁷ (eternal life), 2 Co 2¹⁵ (unto life), Ph 3²⁰ (Saviour through the resurrection), Tit 3⁵ (palingenesis), He 1⁴ (inherit salvation), 2³ (so great a salvation), 5⁹ (eternal salvation), 1 P 1⁴⁻⁵ (inheritance=salvation), Rev 12¹⁰ (salvation parallel with power and Kingdom), 19¹ (salvation parallel with glory and power). In 2 Ti 1¹⁰ the negative

and the positive side are named together: 'our Saviour, who abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.' Salvation from sin specifically appears in Ro 11²⁵ in a quotation from the LXX of Is 59²⁰.

6. It ought to be observed that *σωτηρία* in the NT relates to what is dogmatically called 'the application of redemption' in distinction from 'the imputation of redemption,' or the objective work of Christ. This is the natural result of its original eschatological significance, for what takes place in the end lies on the line of the subjective transformation of the believer.

The view has recently been advocated by Wendland (ZNTW v. [1904] 351) that the original background of the conception of *σωτηρία* is the rule and influence of evil spirits, of which death and disease would be only the peripheral manifestations. The facts cited above do not bear out this hypothesis, or even favour it. In the Gospels there is only one passage which applies *σωτηρίαν* to the casting out of a demon (Lk 8³⁶). In all other cases of deliverance from demoniacal possession other expressions are used. It would be far more correct to say that sin and death lie at the centre, demoniacal influence in the periphery of the conception. On the other hand, it creates an equally wrong distribution of the emphasis to conceive of our Lord's *σωτηρίαν* as in its primary aspect a species of 'healing,' and of Jesus Himself as chiefly a spiritual physician. Against Harnack, who in his work, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, goes too far in this direction, Wagner (ZNTW vi. [1905] 234, 235) well observes, that the NT writers do not, like the later Church Fathers, who stood under the influence of the Stoic philosophy, view sin as a disease of the soul, but as a species of death, and that Jesus is to them far more than a physician, viz. One who leads from death to life.

LITERATURE.—Cremer, *Lex. syn. ὁδῶν* and *σωτηρία*; the various handbooks on OT and NT Theology; Klaiber, *Die NT Lehre von der Sünde und Erlösung*, 1836; Titius, *Die NT Lehre von der Seligkeit*, 4 parts, 1895-1900; Klöpper, *Der Brief d. Ap. Paul. a. d. Philipper*, on 119. 28 (note) and 320, *Der Brief d. Ap. Epheser* on 25 and 523; Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, 1894, p. 47 ff.; Wobbermin, *Religionsgesch. Studien*, 105 ff.; Harnack, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 1899, 1900, i. pp. 301-311; Soltan, *Die Geburtsgesch. Jesu Christi*, 1902; Wendland, *Σωτήρις*: Eine religionsgesch. Untersuchung in ZNTW v. [1904] p. 335 ff.; Wagner, 'Ueber ὁδῶν und seine Derivate im NT,' *ib.* vi. [1905] p. 205 ff.; Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, 1905, pp. 27-46.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

SAMARIA, SAMARITANS.—1. Description.—'Samaria,' originally the name of the city built by Omri (1 K 16²⁴), became in a very short time a common name for the Northern kingdom (Am 3⁹, Jer 31⁵, 2 Ch 25¹³); but during the Greek period it became limited to the province of Samaria, and so in NT times it is the designation of the district that lies between Galilee and Judaea (Jn 4⁴). The limits and extent of the Samaritan territory varied from time to time (Jos. *Ant.* XII. iv. 1; 1 Mac 11³⁴), and it is impossible to define with absolute certainty the boundaries in Gospel days. These, however, may be known generally. We learn that Ginea—the modern *Jenin*—on the south edge of the plain of Esdraelon, was its northern boundary (*Ant.* XX. vi. 1); and this is confirmed by the fact that Caphar Outheni—now *Kefr Adan*—4 miles distant, was in Galilee (M. *Gittin* i. 5). The southern boundary is stated as 'the Acrabene toparchy' (*BJ* III. iii. 4), and a village named Annath or Borkeas was on the border (*ib.*). As these have been identified with the modern villages of 'Akrabe and *Berikin*, we conclude that this boundary ran westward to the Shephelah along Wady Ish'ar. In that case it would then naturally run eastward to the Jordan down Wady Zamar. There seems, however, good reason to fix it farther north at this point, as Karn Sartabel seems to have been in the hands of the Jews (M. *Rosh.* ii. 4), unless, indeed, it was a border hill accessible alike to Jews and Samaritans. This seems the more likely, as it was the only signalling station in the neighbourhood of Samaritan territory where false lights could be kindled to deceive the Jews on the occasion of the new moons, and this the Samaritans are accused of having done (Bab. *Rosh.* 22b and margin). The eastern boundary was, of course, the

Jordan, while the hill slopes towards the Shephelah constituted the western—the plain between Caphar Outheni and Antipatris being regarded as a heathen district (Bab. *Gittin* 76a). This gives us a territory of about 20 miles from north to south, and 30 from east to west.

The region consists of scattered mountain groups and rounded hills with plains between, the chief of these being Merj el-Mahna, to the east of Nâblus, Merj el-Ghurnk or the plain of Sanur (a lake in the winter and spring), and the plain of Dothan, which last opens into the plain of Esdraelon. Samaria presents a striking and beautiful contrast to Judaea with its barren hills. Here they are for the most part covered with fruit trees of every kind, chief among which are the olive, the fig, the mulberry, the orange, the apricot, and the pomegranate. On the Samaritan hills great flocks of sheep and goats find pasture. The whole country is studded with villages, and the fertile plains and valleys produce rich crops of grain. Only to the east, extending along the Jordan boundary, is the country rough and broken, and the mountains, which descend precipitously to the river, naked and barren; and this they have always been (*BJ* IV. viii. 2). The rest of the country is well watered everywhere, and in many places it is extremely beautiful. In the early centuries the gardens of Samaria (פרדסה סככסי, M. *Erakhin* iii. 2) were famous, and to-day the fruit orchards and beautiful gardens of Jenin are equally well known, while all must agree with Thomson (*LB* ii. 110) when he says: 'One may be excused for becoming somewhat enthusiastic over this pretty vale of Nâblus, sparkling with fountains and streams, verdant with olive groves and fig orchards, interspersed with walnut, apple, apricot, orange, quince, pomegranate, and other trees and shrubs.' But, notwithstanding its superiority in richness and beauty to the south country, the Jews of the 1st cent. were very unwilling to admit that Samaria was part of the Holy Land. When they spoke of it they reckoned only the *three lands*,—Judaea, Galilee, and Perea (M. *Shebhiith* ix. 2),—always omitting Samaria, as not being Jewish soil. But even the district we have described is not to be regarded as having been at any time fully occupied by the people we call Samaritans. The name was strictly limited to the religious sect, the metropolis of which was Shechem (*Ant.* XI. viii. 6). There, and in many of the towns and villages, they were numerous and strong, but almost everywhere there were also Grecian settlers, and with the city of Samaria itself the Samaritans had little or nothing to do.

2. History of the Samaritans in their relationship to the Jews.—Although the Samaritans claim descent from the patriarchs (Jn 4¹²), and present us with an unbroken history, and although it is to some extent true that they represent the spirit of the tribe of Ephraim (Renan, *Lang. Semit.* p. 230), we must date their characteristic existence as a people only from the time of their conflicts with Ezra and Nehemiah. We regard the Samaritan statement (*el-Tolidoth*), that 300,000 men besides women and children were brought back from captivity in the days of Sanballat, as baseless; but, on the other hand, when Israel was carried away captive, a remnant must have been left; and that such was the case we have abundant evidence (2 K 23¹⁷⁻²⁰, Jer 41⁵). Their appearance as a community dates only from the time of their mingling with the Assyrian colonists settled in the land, and it is from the leading party amongst these that they are frequently designated Cuthaeans (2 K 17²⁴). There can be no question of the accuracy of the OT narrative of the originally mixed origin of the Samaritans, but repeated accessions from Judaism (Neh 13^{28, 29}; *Ant.* XI. viii. 2 and 6), probably ulti-