

Dictionary of the Apostolic Church

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.
///

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

JOHN A. SELBIE, D.D.

AND

JOHN C. LAMBERT, D.D.

VOLUME I

AARON—LYSTRA

138997
—
3/7/16

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, FIFTH AVENUE, AT 48TH STREET

1915

BS
440
H55
v.1

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

can possibly demand is met in Christ, in whom it is met not in idea merely but in reality. In every part of His life He shows a power of love. He offers Himself through its force unreservedly to God. Equally He offers Himself through its force unreservedly to men, for the purpose of drawing them to God and uniting them among themselves and with God. He is a centre of love, Divine and human, intensely interwoven with power to embrace the whole of humanity and to influence it without exhaustion of His fullness. Such an exhibition has never been paralleled or approached. There is no room to think higher than this. It cannot be transcended.

LITERATURE.—There is neither a good history of the doctrine nor a comprehensive discussion of the problems it raises. There are excellent articles in *PRE*³ and *CE*, giving full statements of modern Protestant and Romanist ideas. The older books of Faber, Alex. Knox, Newman, simply confuse the issues. A thoroughly live investigation of the apostolic doctrine will be found in A. C. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897;

and of St. Paul's in Sanday-Headlam, *Com. on Romans*⁶ (ICC, do. 1902). Interesting expositions are those of C. Gore, *Romans*, London, 1899-1900; A. E. Garvie, *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, do. 1911; W. P. DuBoise, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, New York, 1907. Of older books still worth study: Andreas Osiander, *De justificatione*, 1550, and *De unico mediatore Jesu Christo et justificatione fidei*, 1551; Erskine of Linlathen, *The Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel*, Edinburgh, 1831. The Cunningham Lectures for 1886 by Jas. Buchanan furnish a full exposition of the 'Forensic Theory.' The few brochures of the immediate present show the tendency of thought to be that argued for in the article—that justification meets two needs—the sense of alienation from God and the sense of weakness to do right—by substituting a loyal disposition for the performance of a legal code. On the more general problems of Pauline thought to which justification is related, the following are worth study: E. von Dobschütz, *Probleme des apostolischen Zeitalters*, Leipzig, 1904; M. Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1904; A. Haus-rath, *NTZG*², Leipzig, 1873-71, and *Jesus und die neuest. Schriftsteller*, Berlin, 1908-09; H. J. Holtzmann, *Die Apostel-geschichte*³, Tübingen, 1901, and *Neutest. Theologie*, do. 1911; C. Piepenbring, *Jésus et les Apôtres*, Paris, 1911.

A. S. MARTIN.

JUSTUS.—See JESUS, JOSEPH, TITUS JUSTUS.

K

KEEPER.—See GUARD.

KEY.—It is remarkable that 'key' in the concrete form does not occur in the apostolic writings. The four occurrences in Rev. are symbolical. There are certain passages in Acts where we should expect mention of a key, but the circumstances are exceptional, and 'key' is omitted (Ac 12¹⁰ 16²⁶, 27). When a porter was in attendance, admittance was given from the inside, and a key to open was not necessary (cf. Ac 12¹⁴ 15). From the fact that city gates were guarded, the need for a key was in this case also absent. It may be noted that the chains by which prisoners were secured, and the stocks in which their feet were made fast, were in all likelihood secured by the equivalent of a key (Ac 12⁵ 7 16²⁴ etc.).

We remark the difference between the Hebrew word (מפתח), 'that which opens,' and the Greek and Latin (κλεῖς, *clavis*), 'that which shuts.' This seems to correspond with actual usage. Among the Hebrews the lock was arranged in such a manner that the key was requisitioned only for opening (see illust. in *HDB* ii. 836). The bar was shot, and the lock acted of itself, but it could be withdrawn only by aid of a key or opener. This advanced mode of making fast a door was doubtless preceded and attended by a simpler process, whereby the bolt or bar could be moved forwards and backwards by means of a hook passing through a slit in the door. This served to shut the door, but did not make it absolutely secure as in the other case. For the age with which we have to deal we must think of the key as a device by which one outside held command over the closed door. Having shut it in the first instance, one had power to open it by applying the key.

The imagery of Rev., so far as 'key' is concerned, implies power and authority on the part of one standing outside and having possession of the key. This power is in the hands of angelic beings, who are above earth, and chiefly in the hands of the Risen Christ. Their dominion is manifested upon earth and in the under world, over living and dead.

(1) Christ has the keys of death and of Hades (Rev 1⁸, RV). This power is Imperial, exercised from without and from above. There are interesting parallels to this, apart from Scripture, in

literature, both earlier and later. When Ištar descended to the land of no-return she called imperiously to the porter to open the door, and threatened in case of refusal to shatter the door and break the bolt. Here the power is primitively conceived, and remains largely with the one within. For later and more advanced conceptions see Dante, *Purg.* ix. 65 ff., and Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ii. 774 ff., 850 ff. In both these instances the power, although great, is still limited.

(2) Angelic authority is evident in Rev 9¹ 20¹, where the key of the 'pit' or 'well' of the abyss, or of the abyss simply, is spoken of. This power was delegated ('was given,' 9¹). That some symbol of power was bestowed seems clear from 20¹, where the key and a great chain for binding are seen in the angel's hand (or attached to his person). The figure of the key here directs our thought to the pits or wells of ancient times, whose opening was safeguarded against illegitimate use by a covering of some kind. The primitive setting of such coverings would naturally be horizontal, but here the imagery, extending to key, points rather to a door set upright and secured by bolt or lock. The stone doors of tombs may be compared.

(3) Upon earth itself Christ's unlimited authority is exercised over the churches, including that in Philadelphia (Rev 3⁷). The 'key of David' here mentioned is reminiscent of Is 22²², where some sort of investiture is in the writer's mind (*HDB* v. 172). In this instance power is exhibited in the most absolute form, and made over to the Church in the sense of a 'door opened,' for the enjoyment rather than for the extension of the gospel (see R. W. Pounder, *Hist. Notes on the Book of Revelation*, 1912, p. 140). It is not surprising that the reading of this verse should have been attracted to 1³, as appears in some inferior MSS (ἀδων for ἀπελδ).

See further *DUG*, art. 'Keys.' For specimens of actual keys discovered in the course of excavation see R. A. S. Macalister, *The Excavation of Gezer*, 1912, i. 187 and ii. 271. Further illustrations in A. Rich, *Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiquities*², 1873, s.v. 'Clavis.'

W. CRICKSHANK.

KINDNESS.—In its substantival, adjectival, verbal, and adverbial form this term occurs in the

English NT in the following passages: Lk 6³⁵, Ac 27³ 28², 1 Co 13⁴, 2 Co 6⁹, Gal 5²² (RV only), Eph 2⁷ 4³², Col 3¹², Tit 2³ (RV only), 3⁴, 2 P 1⁷ (AV only; RV 'love of the brethren'). In all these passages (except Ac 27³ 28², where it renders *φιλανθρώπως*, *φιλανθρωπία*, Tit 2³, where it renders *ἀγαθός*, and 2 P 1⁷, where 'brotherly kindness' renders *φιλadelphία*) the original has *χρηστός*, *χρηστότης*, *χρηστεύειν*. These Greek words, however, occur in several other places, where the English NT does not employ the term 'kindness,' viz. Mt 11³⁰ ('easy'), Lk 5³⁰ (AV *χρηστώτερος*, 'better,' RV *χρηστός*, 'good'), Ro 2⁴ ^{vis} ('goodness'), 3¹² ('good'), 11²² ('goodness'), 1 Co 15³³ ('good'), Gal 5²² (AV 'gentleness,' RV 'kindness'), 1 P 2³ ('gracious'). These passages will have to be taken into account in determining the precise meaning of the conception.

χρηστός is the verbal adjective of *χράω*, 'use.' Its primary meaning, therefore, is 'usable,' 'serviceable,' 'good,' 'adequate,' 'efficient' (of persons as well as of things). This utilitarian sense of 'goodness' passes over into the ethical sense in which it becomes the opposite to such words as *πονηρός*, *μοχλοῦρός*, *ἀλχρῶς*. It further passes over into the more specialized ethical meaning of 'kind,' 'mild.' The process of the latter transition may perhaps still be observed in the phrase *τὰ χρηστά* = 'good services,' 'benefits,' 'kindnesses.'

In the NT there is only one instance where it has the sub-ethical meaning 'good for use,' viz. Lk 5³⁰; here the old wine is said to be 'good' or 'better.' According to Trench (*Synonyms of the NT*, 1901, p. 233), even here the thought is coloured by the ethical employment of the word in other connexions, *χρηστός* = 'mellowed with age.' This is certainly true of Mt 11³⁰, where Christ's yoke is called *χρηστός* because it is a figure for demands that are kind and mild. In all other instances the ethical application is explicit. The precise shade of meaning, however, attaching to the word in this sense is not easy to determine. In certain instances it may designate moral goodness in general. This seems to be the case in Ro 3¹² (*ποῶν χρηστότητα*, a quotation from Ps 14², where *χρηστόν* is the LXX rendering for *צַדִּיק*). In 1 Co 15³³ the proverbial saying *φθέρουσιν ἡβη χρηστὰ ὁμιλῶντες κακὰ*, 'evil companionships corrupt good morals' (or 'characters'), has *χρηστός* in the same general sense, the opposite here being *κακός*. In all other cases there are indications that some specific quality of moral goodness is intended. Most clearly this is apparent in Gal 5²², for here *χρηστότης* stands among a number of Christian graces and is even distinguished from *ἀγαθωσύνη*, 'goodness.' A similar co-ordination is found in Col 3¹², where *χρηστότης* occurs side by side with *πραῦτης*. Various attempts have been made at defining that conception. Jerome in his exposition of Gal 5²² renders *χρηστότης* by *benignitas* (cf. the rendering by Wyclif and in the Rheims Version), and quotes the Stoic definition: 'benignitas est virtus sponte ad benefaciendum exposita.' The difference between *χρηστότης* and *ἀγαθωσύνη* he finds in this, that the latter can go together with a degree of severity, whilst it is inherent in *χρηστότης* to be sweet and inviting in its association with others. This, however, does not quite hit the centre of the biblical idea. Most shrewdly, it seems to us, the latter has been pointed out by Tittmann (*de Synonymis in NT*, 1829-32, i. 141) as consisting in the trait of beneficence towards those who are evil and ungrateful: '*χρηστός* bene cupit, neque bonis tantum sed etiam malis.'

A closer inspection of the several passages will bear this out, at least as the actual implication of the NT usage, if not as the inherent etymological force of the word. In Lk 6³⁵ God is said to be

χρηστός towards the unthankful and evil, and the statement serves to urge the preceding exhortation: 'love your enemies, do them good, and lend, never despairing.' The passages in Romans point to the same conclusion. In 2⁴ the *χρηστότης* is associated with 'forbearance' and 'longsuffering'; it is that attitude of God by which doing good in the face of evil He leads men to repentance. In the second clause of this verse the word occurs in the form *τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*, which probably means the embodiment of the *χρηστότης* in acts. On the same principle in 11²² *χρηστότης* is the opposite of *ἀποτομία*, 'severity'; 'to continue in the *χρηστότης* of God' means to continue in conscious dependence on this undeserved favour of God (cf. v. 21, 'be not highminded, but fear'). In 1 Co 13⁴ we read of love that it 'suffereth long (*χρηστεύεται*), envieth not,' which indicates that a kindness is meant which overcomes obstacles. In 2 Co 6⁹, again, *χρηστότης* is found in conjunction with 'longsuffering,' and in a context which emphasizes the patient, forbearing character of the Apostle's loving ministration to his converts. In Gal 5²² we meet with the same conjunction between 'longsuffering' and *χρηστότης*, and here, by distinction from *ἀγαθωσύνη*, 'benevolence,' and *πραῦτης*, 'meekness,' the sense is narrowed down to a benevolence which asserts itself either with a peculiar cheerfulness or in the face of peculiar difficulties. According to Eph 2⁷ the Divine grace is shown in kindness; no matter whether *χρηστότης* is here taken as *abstractum pro concreto* = the embodiment of God's kind procedure in the work of salvation, or whether 'grace' be given an objective concrete sense; in either case the association of the two shows that the Divine *χρηστότης* is conceived as having for its object the sinful and unworthy. The context of Col 3¹² likewise emphasizes the forbearing and forgiving disposition required of the Christian in view of the forgiveness received from God, and the terms with which *χρηστότης* is here associated ('lowliness,' 'meekness,' 'longsuffering') are again terms that describe benevolence over against faults observed in fellow-Christians. The *χρηστότης* of Tit 3⁴ is shown by the context to be God's kindness towards sinful, undeserving man, and held up as an example for the Christian of abstinence from evil-speaking, contentiousness, and pride. It came to such as were 'foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another.' Finally, in 1 P 2²³ (a quotation from Ps 34⁹) the general meaning 'gracious' seems to be indicated by the fact that the Divine *χρηστότης* is set in contrast to the wickedness and guile and hypocrisies and envies and evil-speakings, which the readers must put aside as new-born men (cf. 1²³ and the 'therefore' in 2¹), and the putting aside of which is invited by their vivid experience in the new life that the Lord Himself is gracious.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

KING.—The title is applied to rulers of various degrees of sovereignty. We find it employed to designate the tetrarch Agrippa II. (Ac 25¹³); Aretas of Arabia (2 Co 11³²); Agrippa I., whose territory was co-extensive with that of Herod the Great, and who seems to have received the royal title (Ac 12¹); and the Roman Emperor, whom it appears to have been the custom for Greeks and Orientals so to designate (1 Ti 2², 1 P 2^{13, 17}). An instance of the elasticity of the term is provided in Rev 17, where the seven kings in v. 10 are Roman Emperors, while the ten kings in v. 12 are vassal kings.

1. Christ as King.—(1) *The nature of Christ's Kingship.*—It was made an accusation against St. Paul and Silas at Thessalonica (Ac 17⁷) that they were guilty of treason, inasmuch as they pro-