

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
1895

VOLUME II

LABOUR—ZION

WITH

APPENDIX AND INDEXES

86/65
17/3/08

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK

1908

To these examples from the Synoptic Gospels must be added the very emphatic testimony of the discourses of Christ according to the Fourth Gospel. The darkness under whose dominion, according to the introductory verses, the world is held, the dead weight, the *vis inertiae* of human insensibility to the Divine light, is no negative thing, but itself a power, a kingdom in deadly opposition to the Kingdom of Christ, and under the rule of Satan. Jesus directly attributes the opposition of His antagonists to the malice of the devil. So He says to the Jews, 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do' (Jn 8⁴⁴). The false accusations of Scribe and Pharisee, and the untiring malignity of their persecuting zeal, show the spirit and are the work of him who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning. Again, He speaks of Satan as the Prince of this world, and represents as the aim and the certain result of His own work, the judgment and the casting out of Satan and his kingdom (12³¹; cf. 14³⁰ 16¹¹).

3. The other portions of the NT confirm but do not materially add to the testimony of the Gospels on the subject of the personality and the power of the Evil One. Thus St. James (4⁷) merely counsels his readers to resist the devil, assuring them that he will flee from them; while in another passage (2¹⁹) he speaks of 'the demons' (*τὰ δαιμόνια*), evidently meaning by the term the subordinate agents of Satanic power, as believing that there is one God—a belief which fills them with terror. St. Peter assures us that Satan, whom he describes as *ἀντίδικος* ('adversary,' a technical or official word), and compares to a roaring lion, may be successfully resisted by the power of steadfast faith (1 P 5⁸⁻⁹). St. John in his First Epistle repeats the teaching of his Gospel, and in the Apocalypse identifies Satan with the serpent of Eden, and seemingly also with the accuser of Job and of Joshua (Rev 12^{9, 10}), and foretells his coming doom. St. Paul accepts the current doctrine; but though in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians he seems to add to the teaching of Christ in the Gospels other elements from the demonology of the Pharisaic schools and from other sources (Eph 2² 6¹¹, Col 2¹⁵), and in his Epistles to the Corinthians and to Timothy (1 Co 5⁵, 1 Ti 1²⁰) ascribes to Satan a certain power of discipline as a minister of Divine judgment, really contributes to this branch of Christian doctrine no essential element additional to that which is furnished in the Gospels. See, further, articles ACCOMMODATION and DEMON.

LITERATURE.—Cremier, *Bibl. Theol. Lexicon*, s.v.; Commentaries of Meyer, Alford, etc.; Cheyne, *The Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 159, 270 ff., 281; A. B. Davidson, *The Book of Job* (Cambridge Bible), pp. 7-13, also *Theol. of OT*, p. 300 ff.; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. of NT*, p. 187; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* p. 93; Reuss, *Christian Theol. of the Apostolic Age*, i. pp. 162, 420; Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 47; Gtrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, p. 368; Wright, *Zachariah and his Prophecies*, p. 46 ff.; art. 'Satan' in Hastings' *DB* (Whitehouse), and in the *Encyc. Bibl.* (G. B. Gray and J. Massie); art. 'Teufel' in *PRE³* (A. Wünsche); H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol.* i. pp. 53, 226.

H. H. CURRIE.

SAVIOUR.—'Saviour,' like 'to save' and 'salvation,' is a word of frequent occurrence in the OT.

It occurs mostly in the form of the ptepl. Hiph. of יָצַח = יָצַח. For the specific meaning of 'to save' in distinction from other cognate Heb. verbs, cf. art. SALVATION. Most commonly God is called the Saviour of Israel or individuals. A standing combination is 'God the Saviour' often with a possessive genitive (1 Ch 16²⁵, Ps 24⁵ 27^{1, 9} 62² 9 65⁵ 79⁹ 95¹, Is 12² 17¹⁰, Mic 7⁷, Hab 3¹⁸). To be a Saviour is God's exclusive prerogative (Ps 60¹¹ 103¹², Is 43¹¹ 45²²). As instruments of God, however, human deliverers likewise receive the title (Jg 3^{9, 15}, Neh 9²⁷). There is no passage in the OT where the Messiah is called 'Saviour.' Wherever the Messiah is connected with the idea of salvation, He is not the subject but the object of it (Ps 28⁸ 144¹⁰, Zec 9⁹). This is different in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature, for here it is not merely declared that

in the name of the Son of Man the people are saved, and that He is the Goel of their life (En 48⁷), or that the righteous in connexion with Him shall be satisfied with salvation (4 Ezr 45⁶), but also that *Christus liberabit creaturam* (4 Ezr 12³⁴ 13²⁶), and that from Judah and Levi the Lord will raise a Saviour for Israel (Test. Gad 8). God, however, here also is more frequently called Saviour (παντων σωτήρ, Ps-Sol 16⁷; αἰώνιος σωτήρ, Bar 4²²; ἅγιος σωτήρ, 3 Mac 6²⁹ 7¹⁶). Use of God, σωτήρ is synonymous with such terms as שָׁמַיָּא, ὁ βύσσους, ὁ λυτρώμενος (En 48⁷, 1 Mac 4¹¹, 3 Mac 7²³).

1. In the Gospels σωτήρ occurs but three times—Lk 1⁷ 2¹ and Jn 4⁴². In the Song of Mary, the words 'My spirit has rejoiced in God my Saviour' are a reproduction of the common OT usage. In Lk 2¹¹ σωτήρ is not a formal title, but a descriptive designation of the Messiah, 'a Saviour who is Christ the Lord.' But the word evidently has a deeper meaning to the angels than the noun σωτηρία and the participle ἠσθέντας have to Zacharias in Lk 1^{71, 74}; for in the two latter passages the conception moves entirely within the OT limits. The doxology of Lk 2¹⁴ associates Jesus' saving work with the production of peace on earth among mankind as the objects of God's good pleasure. Here σωτήρ undoubtedly covers the Lord's Messianic work in the most universalistic sense. And it will be noticed that σωτήρ is synonymous with χριστός κύριος, so that the reference cannot be confined to our Lord's earthly ministry, but extends to His activity as the glorified Messiah. As 'peace' and 'good pleasure' indicate, not the giving of life but the bestowal of reconciliation with God stands in the foreground (for the connexion between σωτήρ and εὐδοκία, cf. Ps-Sol 8³⁹). In Jn 4⁴² ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου receives its import from the rich and pregnant meaning σώζειν and σωτηρία acquire in the discourses of the Fourth Gospel. As Jesus had represented Himself to the woman not as a mere revealer (vv. 19, 26), but as the giver of 'living water,' and 'water unto eternal life' (vv. 10, 14), so the Samaritans, in acknowledging Him as σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, prove to have attained a deeper conception of Messiahship than was commonly current among them, both as to the nature and extent of the Messiah's calling (cf., however, for σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, 4 Ezr 13²⁶).

2. The fact has not escaped observation, that St. Luke, who alone of the Synoptists introduces into his record the word σωτήρ, also employs it twice in Acts, where it occurs once in a speech of St. Peter (5³¹), and once in a speech of St. Paul (13²³). In 5³¹ we have the combination ἀρχηγός καὶ σωτήρ: Christ was made both by the Resurrection and by the Ascension. ἀρχηγός is found also in Ac 3¹⁵, another speech of St. Peter, and is here combined with ζωή; the Jews asked for a murderer to be granted them and killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead. It is plain that the meaning of σωτήρ in 5³¹ is determined by that of ἀρχηγός, and 3¹⁵ proves that ἀρχηγός has specifically to do with Jesus' life-giving power, whence also in both passages the Resurrection is emphasized. Besides Lk., Hebrews is the only NT writing which employs ἀρχηγός (2¹⁰ 12²). The former of these two passages confirms the close connexion already found between σωτήρ and ἀρχηγός, for it calls Jesus ἀρχηγός σωτηρίας; in the other passage He is called ἀρχηγός καὶ τελειωτής πίστεως, 'the leader and perfecter of faith.' (For a thorough discussion of ἀρχηγός, cf. Bleek, *Der Brief a. d. Hebräer*, ii. pp. 301-303). The use of the word in combination with σωτήρ is interesting, because both are employed in the LXX of the 'judges' sent by God to deliver Israel (Jg 3⁹⁻¹⁵ 11⁶ 11¹² [σωτήρ = יָצַח, ἀρχηγός = יָצַח]). In Hebrews, however, the rendering 'captain,' which brings out the idea of military leadership, and the general rendering 'author,' are inadequate; the word plainly has the connotation of 'model,' 'example,' 'fore-runner,' the leader first experiencing in Himself

and receiving in Himself that to which he leads others. Thus Jesus is ἀρχηγὸς σωτηρίας in 2¹⁰, because He Himself is conducted to glory by God, and in His attainment to glory draws with Him all the other sons of God. In 12² Jesus' career of faith is represented as exemplary for believers; by preceding in the exercise of an ideal faith He enables others to follow in the same ἀγών of faith. He 5⁹ proves that where the author does not wish to emphasize this peculiar idea of precession, but merely to express the causal relationship between His work and the salvation of believers, he uses the general term αἰτίος: 'He became author of eternal salvation.' The reference to the Resurrection in both Petrine passages renders it probable that the word ἀρχηγός is here used in the same pregnant sense: Jesus is in virtue of the Resurrection a leader of life, one who has Himself attained unto life, and now makes others partakers of the same. As the murderer in Ac 3¹⁴ inflicts death, so the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς bestows life. σωτήρ, then, is identical with ἀρχηγός so far as the impartation of life is concerned, but leaves the exemplification of the life-content of the σωτηρία in Jesus' own Person unexpressed. In the speech of St. Paul (13²³) the use of σωτήρ clearly attaches itself to the LXX of the Book of Judges, if the reading ἤγειρε of the TR be followed, for this is the verb by which the LXX in Jg 3⁹⁻¹⁵ renders the Heb. עָרָא. If, on the other hand, we read with WH ἤγαγε, the more immediate reference seems to be to Zec 3⁸; but even then the word σωτήρ itself points back to the Book of Judges.

3. In St. Paul's writings, apart from the Pastoral Epistles, σωτήρ is found only twice—Eph 5²³ and Ph 3²⁰. The interpretation of the former passage is much disputed. The husband's relation as head to the wife and Christ's relation as Head to the Church are compared, and in this connexion Christ is called σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος (of the Church). This last statement seems to imply that Christ's headship over the Church is based on His being the Saviour of the Church-body. The question is whether this must be understood in the sense which will likewise be applicable to the relation between husband and wife. In the ordinary sense the husband could hardly be called the saviour of the wife's body. But Wagner (ZNTW vi. [1905] p. 220) has called attention to a passage in Clement (*Paed.* ii. 5) where it is stated that the Creator provides man with meat and drink τοῦ σώζεσθαι χάριν, 'for the sake of keeping alive.' Applying this to our passage, he obtains the very congruous sense: As the husband is σωτήρ of the wife, by supplying the sustenance of her physical life, so Christ is σωτήρ of the Church, inasmuch as He endows her with eternal life; and for this reason both hold the position of head. This secures for σώζω the sense of 'endowing with eternal life.' The peculiarity of the passage, thus understood, would lie in this, that the ordinary religious use of σώζω is illustrated by analogy with a natural use of the verb which seems to be without precedent in earlier Biblical Greek. In Ph 3²⁰ the word σωτήρ has a specific eschatological reference: Christ is σωτήρ, because at the resurrection He will transform the body of believers into the likeness of His own glorious body. σώζω therefore here also is equivalent to the bestowal of life.

4. With sudden and remarkable frequency σωτήρ emerges in the Pastoral Epistles (10 times) and in 2 Peter (5 times). In the Pastorals there is further the peculiarity that the name is applied to both God and Christ: to God, in 1 Ti 1²³ 4¹⁰, Tit 1³ 2¹⁰ 3⁴; to Christ, in 2 Ti 1¹⁰, Tit 1⁴ 2¹³ 3⁶. In 2 Peter the reference is always to Christ. In Jude also God is once called 'our Saviour through Jesus Christ' (v. 25). The designation of God as Saviour

can appear strange only on the basis of our established custom to reserve this title for Christ; on the basis of the OT it was a perfectly natural usage, for here always God, never the Messiah, is called γῶν, σωτήρ. And in the NT itself the act of saving is, where a subject is indicated, as naturally ascribed to God as to Christ (comparatively few passages reflect on the subject). Except perhaps for the one passage, 1 Ti 4¹⁰, it cannot be said that the meaning of σωτήρ in the Pastorals and 2 Peter differs from its ordinary import, or that of σώζω in the NT elsewhere. Christ is Saviour, because He abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (2 Ti 1¹⁰); as Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ has an eternal Kingdom into which believers receive entrance (2 P 1¹¹). He is called 'the great God and Saviour,' in so far as believers look for the blessed hope and appearing of His glory (Tit 2¹³). The hope of eternal life comes from God our Saviour (Tit 1² 2¹⁴). Eschatological also is the reference in 'the commandment of the Lord and Saviour' (2 P 3²). In Tit 2¹⁰ the thought is implied that God is Saviour in the ethical sphere, whence 'the doctrine of God our Saviour' becomes an incentive to holy living. But peculiar is 1 Ti 4¹⁰ where God is called 'the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe.' Wagner proposes to apply here the same sense given to σωτήρ in Eph 5²³: God is Saviour of all men, inasmuch as He supplies them with natural life; Saviour especially of believers, because He supplies these with the higher life of the Spirit (*l.c.* p. 222, where Philo [*de Mundi Opif.* 60: God = εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ] is quoted). This might seem to be favoured by 1 Ti 6¹³ 'God who keepeth all things alive,' or 'who giveth life to all things' (cf. the alternative reading ζωογονήσει for σώσει in Lk 17³³). But it is less in keeping with Tit 2¹¹ where a similar universalism of God's σώζω is affirmed, and yet this is a matter of redemption, not of nature. Wagner is quite correct, however, in urging against von Soden that 'God σωτήρ of all men' cannot mean 'God is willing to be σωτήρ of all men'; and against B. Weiss, that it cannot mean 'God has made salvation objectively possible for all men, while subjectively He realizes it in believers only.' The solution of the difficulty must be sought elsewhere, viz. in connexion with the pronounced universalism of the Pastoral Epistles in general. The emphasis and frequency with which this principle is brought forward render it probable that something specific in the historical situation to which the Pastorals address themselves lies at its basis, and at the basis also of the frequency with which the words σώζω, σωτηρία, σωτήριος, σωτήρ are employed. There is absolutely no reason to suspect the writer of any intention to weaken or neutralize the doctrine of predestination. Besides involving denial of the Pauline origin of the Epistles, this would leave unexplained why, in other passages, the principle of predestination is enunciated with all desirable distinctness. The only plausible view is that the passages under review contain a warning against the dualistic trend of that incipient Gnosticism to whose early presence in the Apostolic period the Epistles of the First Captivity also bear witness. In a twofold sense it might become of importance to vindicate, over against this theory, the universalism of saving grace: on the one hand, in so far as Gnosticism on principle excluded from salvation those who lacked the pneumatic character; and, on the other hand, in so far as those belonging to the *pneumatici* might be considered to carry the power of salvation by nature in themselves. In other words, it might become necessary to emphasize that God saves all men, not merely one class of men, and that no man is by his subjective condition either sunk beneath the possibility or raised above the

need of salvation. Perhaps also the emphasis upon the fact that God as well as Christ is Saviour, though perfectly natural from the OT point of view, is specially directed against a system which tended to separate between the Creator-God of the old dispensation and the Saviour-God, Christ, of the new. The recent investigations of Friedländer have shown that there existed long before the 2nd cent. of our era a Jewish type of Gnosticism, so that it can no longer be asserted that an anti-Gnostic polemic of this type *per se* militates against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.

In recent times attempts have been made to explain the rise and development of the NT conception of *σωτήρ* and *σωτηρία* from extra-Biblical sources. Anrich (*Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, 1894) pointed out how in the cult of the 'Mysteries' the promise of *σωτηρία*, in the sense of immortality, plays a large role. Similarly Wobbermin (*Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 1896), who asserts that especially in the cult of the subterranean gods the word *σωτήρ* was common as a name for the Deity. In two articles published in the *Christliche Welt* for 1899 and 1900, entitled 'Als die Zeit erfüllt war' and 'Der Heiland', Harnack calls attention to certain inscriptions discovered in Asia Minor, at Priene and Halicarnassus, dating probably from the year B.C. 9, in which the Emperor Augustus is invested with Divine predicates, and called *σωτήρ*, the one who has been filled for the good of mankind with gifts, a god whose birthday has brought to the world the evangel connected with his person, the Zeus of the fatherland and the *σωτήρ* of the human race. Harnack assumes that St. Luke in calling Jesus *σωτήρ* was influenced by these and similar pagan forms of expression current in the cult of the Emperors, and that the same influence may be seen at work in the frequency with which the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Peter employ the title. He further suggests that St. Paul purposely avoided its use, because of the eudemonistic, political favour it had acquired from these pagan associations. St. Luke, in the 'Gospel of the Infancy,' the writer of the Pastorals, the writer of 2 Peter, and the Fourth Evangelist, meant to represent Christ as the true *σωτήρ* in whom lay the reality of what paganism falsely ascribed to its rulers, dead or living.—Soltan (*Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*, 1902) reaches the same conclusions, independently of Harnack, on the basis of the same and other classical material, and also asserts derivation of the story of the virgin birth from the same pagan circle of ideas.—Wendland (ZNTW v. [1904], p. 335 ff.) investigates the use of *σωτήρ* in antiquity with reference to both gods and deified men—a usage dating back from before the production of the LXX. Up to the time of Alexander the Great, *σωτήρ* was not applied to men, because it was still felt to be a cult-name reserved for the gods. The first trace of its application to men appears in Thucydides, where it is given to Brasidas, and in Polybius, where Philip of Macedon is called *σωτήρ*. After that, the custom became quite common among the Ptolemies and the Seleucids: first the dead, then also the living rulers were honoured with this title. It was also combined with the Oriental idea of the incarnation of the godhead, whence such a term as *εἰς σωτήρ* was applied to rulers. A feast celebrated on the day of such a *σωτήρ* was called *σωτηρία*. From the Greek dynasties the custom passed over to the representatives of the Roman power, especially to the Emperors. Examples are adduced from Cicero, whose rhetorical exaggerations in speaking of great Romans are believed to have sprung from his knowledge of the Oriental forms of speech. Even a philosopher like Epicurus could be called *σωτήρ* after a semi-Divine fashion, and that in his lifetime. Finally, in connexion with the recent trend towards explaining Biblical conceptions from Babylonian sources, it has been proposed to find in the NT idea of *σωτήρ* an embodiment of the Oriental myth of a Saviour-King (*Erlöser-König*); cf. A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT* (1905), pp. 27–46.

It is not proposed here to subject the above hypotheses to an exhaustive criticism. To some extent the later forms have effectually criticised the earlier ones. Thus Wendland disposes of much in Anrich, Wobbermin, and Soltan. Wagner (ZNTW vi. [1905]) skillfully attacks the position of Wendland. A few remarks must here suffice. The derivation of the whole idea of *σωτήρ* and *σωτηρία* from the Oriental expectation of the Saviour-King is impossible, because OT prophecy not at all, and Jewish theology very rarely, applies the name מִשְׁחָה, *σωτήρ*, to the Messiah, and yet in eschatological Messianism it would be natural to look first of all for the evidence of such Oriental importation. As to the alleged connexion between the Greek mysteries and Christianity, it should be observed that the cult of the mysteries flourished in the 2nd cent. of the Christian era, and that none of the authorities quoted by Anrich in support of his view dates further back than this. The Asian inscriptions, of which Harnack and Soltan make so much, offer at the best some striking analogies to the NT mode of representation; but a real literary dependence cannot be made out, as even Wendland admits. In his second article, 'Der Heiland,' Harnack expresses himself much more guardedly than in the first, after this fashion: 'On the Jewish and on the Grecian line numerous religious conceptions existed, which covered each other and so simply could pass over into each other.' *σωτήρ* in the cult of the Emperors has quite a different sense from what it has in the NT: in Hellenism it never means 'the one who translates from death into life.' It is also exceedingly doubtful whether St. Paul consciously and

purposely avoids the use of *σωτήρ* with reference to Christ, because of its pagan, idolatrous associations. Why did not St. Paul avoid κύριος for the same reasons? Why not *σῶζεν* and *σωτηρία* themselves as well as *σωτήρ*? A far more simple explanation is that the non-use of מִשְׁחָה in the OT with reference to the Messiah continued to exert its influence in the usage of St. Paul. An allusion to the Emperor-cult and the rôle played in it by *σωτήρ* in Ph 3²⁰ is not impossible, for in the words 'our πολιτεύμα is in heaven' the pronoun is emphatic. Where, apart from St. Paul, the conception of *σῶζεν* is first joined to the Person of Christ, this is done in dependence on the Hebrew meaning of the name 'Jesus,' i.e. in dependence on the OT (Mt 1²¹). *A priori* there would be no objection to the hypothesis that in Luke and the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Peter and the Fourth Gospel there is a conscious appropriation of, and at the same time a protest against, the pagan use of the word, and that the sudden frequency of its occurrence in the Pastorals and 2 Peter is to be explained from this. As a matter of fact, however, this involves, according to Harnack, the unhistorical character of at least the present form of the *Magnificat* and of the message of the angels to the shepherds (Lk 1⁴⁷ and 2¹¹); further, the unhistorical character of at least the present form of the speeches of St. Peter and St. Paul (Ac 5³¹ 13²⁵); and, finally, the unhistorical character of at least the form of the discourse of our Lord in Jn 4⁴². It has been shown above, that the Lukan record can be readily explained from the historical situation which it reports. For Jn 4⁴² (and 1 Jn 4¹⁴) *πρωτον του κοσμου*, a comparison with 4 Ezr 13²⁶, where the same phrase occurs, proves that even here we do not necessarily move in Greek trains of thought, but are still in the Jewish sphere. All that remains of Wendland's contention is, that possibly in the Pastoral Epistles there is some adjustment in the use of *σωτήρ* to the manner of its handling in pagan quarters, for an apologetic purpose. But even here considerable weeding of Wendland's assertions will be necessary. Thus he brings the *χαρις*, which is named as the motive of the Divine act of *σῶζεν*, into connexion with the *benignitas* and *elementia* of the Roman emperors. But Eph 2⁵⁻⁹ shows how all this can be readily explained without resorting to such far-fetched analogies. Similarly the *πρωτον αἰωνιον* of Tit 1² and 2 Ti 1⁹ is treated by Wendland as an allusion to the eternity of the Roman Emperors, which takes no account of the fact that the latter was an eternity of post- not of pre-existence. In Tit 3⁷, where he would find the same analogy, the eternity is not that of the *σωτήρ*, but of believers. Most, perhaps, could be said in favour of the Hellenistic association of such terms as *εὐεργεσία*, *μείγας θεός*, and *εὐανθρωπία* in their joint use with *σωτήρ* (cf. Wagner, p. 232). But, taken as a whole, *σωτήρ* is shown to be a thoroughly OT conception by its dependence on *σῶζεν* and *σωτηρία*, about whose OT provenience there can be no reasonable doubt.

See also art. SALVATION, and the Literature there cited. GEERHARDUS VOS.

SAYING AND DOING.—The contrast between 'saying' and 'doing' is based on an axiomatic principle of the moral and spiritual life, which, notwithstanding its simplicity and obviousness, is apt to be overlooked, viz. the importance of character as distinguished from profession, the supreme value of ethical ideals and practice above ritual observance, the vital connexion between creed and conduct. The distinction thus suggested necessarily finds a large place in the teaching of our Lord, who, as the Founder of a religion of inward reality, frequently emphasized the importance of 'doing' rather than 'saying.' 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven' (Mt 7²¹). Not that Jesus by any means underrated the importance of 'saying'; He made confession of His name one of the most solemn obligations of discipleship (Mt 10^{32, 33}, cf. Lk 8^{38, 39}). But a profession must rest upon a solid foundation of character. The recurrence, in various forms, of the phrase 'to do the will of God,' and the prominent place given to this conception, is a marked feature of Christ's teaching; see Mt 12⁵⁰; cf. 7²⁴⁻²⁷ 16²⁷ 25^{30, 45}, Lk 10³⁰⁻³⁷ 11²⁸ 13⁶⁻⁹ etc. 'Doing' is the testing quality of the Christian life (Mt 5^{19, 47}), and the sure and only way to spiritual enlightenment (Jn 7¹⁷). Of this doing of God's will Jesus Himself set the supreme and inspiring example (Jn 4³⁴ 5³⁰ 6³⁸). In contrast with this ideal of 'doing,' Jesus warned men against the subtle dangers of mere 'saying.' Even when sincerely meant, He checked the impulsiveness of a hasty and ill-considered profession (Mt 8^{18, 20}; cf. 26^{33, 34}, Lk 14²⁸); but His severest rebukes were