



The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1915

THE CONTINUITY OF THE KYRIOS-TITLE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In one sense or another the title *Kyrios* is applied to Christ throughout the New Testament. It occurs in all the documents with the exception of the Epistle to Titus.¹ And this literary phenomenon means to be expressive of a true historical continuity. It claims to exist not merely in the minds of the various writers, but to reflect the actual usage of the successive periods of our Lord's life and of New Testament history. It has been commonly assumed that this claim is in accord with the facts, that from the beginning onward and uninterruptedly ever after Jesus called Himself or was called *Kyrios*. Besides this it has also been commonly believed that the continuity observable was more than a mere chronological one. The usage in the days of our Lord's flesh was taken to have prepared the way for the usage in the mother-church after the resurrection, and this again to have given rise to the Pauline usage. An unbroken line of development according to the generally accepted view connects the earliest with the latest use made of the title within the New Testament period.

Bousset in his recent book entitled *Kyrios Christos* calls this continuity in question.² Though not the first one to take this view,³ Bousset for the first time has made the

¹ Its absence here seems to be due to the pointed preference for *Soter* as a title of Christ, i. 4; ii. 13; iii. 6.

² Cp. the notice of Bousset's book in this *Review*, 1914 (xii), pp. 636-645.

³ Predecessors of Bousset in this assumption were Heitmüller, *Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus* in ZNTW, 1912 (xiii), pp. 320-327, and Böhlig, *Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus* in ZNTW, 1913 (xiv), pp. 23-37; cp. also the review of Bousset's work by Brückner in *Theol. Rundschau*, 1914 (xvii), pp. 169-182.

attempt to carry it through consistently as the basis for a broad construction of the origin and development of New Testament Christology and the early Christian faith in general. According to him the title is pre-Pauline. But it did not originate in the Palestinian mother-church, much less during the historical life of Jesus. It is one of the products of that intermediate Hellenistic stage of development, which he and others would insert between the earliest Palestinian Christianity and Paul, and which is believed to have had its center at Antioch. From this development Paul derived several important elements in his teaching, which formerly were considered either specifically Pauline or primitively Palestinian in their origin.

Paul after his conversion simply accepted the type of Christianity that had grown up in this Hellenistic *milieu*. The Hellenistic element in his teaching is to a far smaller extent than was once believed the result of the Apostle's own Hellenizing tendency. Much of it was taken over from the circle of Christians with whom he first associated. Chief among the elements thus adopted was the Kyrios-title. The early Syrian Christians came to give this title to Jesus because in the pagan cults of Syria with which they were familiar the deity or cult-heros was so designated, as was also the custom in Asia Minor and Egypt. It was in analogy with this that the Christians in that region spoke of Jesus, their cult-heros, as "the Lord". He was to them what the Dea Syria, Atargatis and other divinities or semi-divinities were to their worshippers. The elevation of Jesus to this rank did not, however, take place as a conscious deliberate act, but as a result of unconscious assimilation to a paganistic custom on the part of the church. Paul found it existing, made it his own and further developed it in harmony with his own peculiar (pneumatic) Christology.

This hypothesis carries with it certain important assumptions as to the occurrence of Kyrios in the Gospels and in the earlier chapters of Acts. With regard to Acts Bousset's

position is comparatively simple and plain. It is one of unhesitating denial of the historicity of the accounts in question. When Luke makes the early Palestinian Christians speak of Jesus as Kyrios or address Him as Kyrios, this is nothing else but an anachronism, a dating back into the first days of the Church of what later originated at Antioch. In fact in an article published subsequently to the appearance of *Kyrios Christos* Bousset endeavors to show that Kyrios occurs in Acts in such contexts as are non-Palestinian in origin, or in Palestinian contexts only where the author has worked over the material and through his redaction introduced it.⁴ He even thinks that on this principle the absence or presence of Kyrios in a piece can be used as a secondary, confirmatory test for the conclusions of the source-criticism of Acts.

In this Bousset treats the sources of Acts not as giving information relative to the time with which they deal, but as reflecting conditions and usages in existence at the time when they (the sources) were produced. The straightforward principle of hearing a document as a historical witness for the facts it professes to report, entirely gives way to the indirect procedure of making a document betray information involuntarily and as it were unconsciously. Bousset applies the same method to the Gospels. He examines and cross-examines them not to ascertain what took place during the life of Jesus on earth, but in order to elicit what were the practice and belief of the church at the time when the shaping or production of the Gospel-tradition was going on. As Acts becomes a source of knowledge not for the early-Palestinian period, but for the later Hellenistic days, so the Gospels become a mine of information not for the Gospel-history, but for the early-Palestinian development. Believing that the older portions of the Gospel-material in Mark (Ur-Markus) and the Logia are of early-Palestinian

⁴ *Der Gebrauch des Kyriostitels als Kriterium für die Quellenscheidung in der ersten Hälfte der Apostelgeschichte*, ZNTW, 1914 (xv), pp. 141-163.

provenience, he proceeds to point out that in them the title Kyrios for Jesus does not occur. Thus in Mark there is only one instance of Kyrie in the vocative and only one case of Kyrios objectively used. In the Logia the address Kyrie occurs only once, and the objective Kyrios nowhere. These three isolated cases of occurrence afford no actual instance against the hypothesis, because in Bousset's opinion they can be accounted for on special grounds, apart from any prevailing usage of Kyrios as a title for Jesus. To this argument from the practical absence of the title in the older tradition is added next the argument from its increasing intrusion into what are believed to be elements in the Gospels of later origin. Matthew, to be sure, has the objective Kyrios only once, but he introduces the vocative Kyrie quite a number of times. In Luke both Kyrie and Kyrios stream in quite freely, and therefore with Luke the period of the later usage must be supposed to begin. The history of the tradition, therefore, shows that the mother-church in Palestine did not at first call Jesus Kyrios. But on the same principle that this oldest material can be made to disclose what the first disciples did *not* call Jesus, it can be also positively made to disclose what they *did* call Him. Although Bousset believes that in our present Gospels the title Son-of-Man was subsequently introduced in numerous places, where originally the tradition did not contain it, nevertheless he believes that in a number of passages it is old enough and of sufficiently secure position to afford a reliable index of its prevalence as a name for Jesus when the earliest tradition circulated. This then, Son-of-Man, and not Kyrios, was what the mother-church called Jesus. Here again, it will be observed, the Gospel record is not used as a source of knowledge for the actual life of Jesus, but only as a source of information concerning the belief of the primitive Palestinian Christians. In regard to the question whether Jesus actually employed Son-of-Man as a self-designation Bousset is quite non-committal in harmony with his general sceptical attitude regarding the facts

of the life of Jesus, although he is not prepared to call in doubt the historicity of Jesus as such.

Besides the argument derived from the increasing frequency of the title in the growth of the Gospel tradition, Bousset adduces a linguistic argument in support of his view that Jesus during His lifetime was not addressed as Kyrios. It has been suggested that the Aramaeic word *Mar*, "Lord", was used as an honorific title of Rabbis, and that as a synonym of *Rab* it may have been applied to Jesus, which would furnish a substantial foundation for the Kyrios of the Greek Gospels in distinction from the other titles there found. Particularly Jno. xiii. 13 has been quoted in favor of this, inasmuch as here κύριος and διδάσκαλος seem to be used as synonyms. Bousset denies that such a usage ever existed. If it had been known to Jesus or the tradition, then in Matt. xxiii. 8 ff., where the possible honorific titles addressed by disciples to teachers are enumerated, *Mar* ought to have been given as distinct from *Rab* and "father". Also the absolute Kyrie, Kyrios, without suffix, in the Gospel-literature creates difficulty to this view. The Aramaeic *Mar* could never have been used without a suffix. If Jesus had been addressed or designated by means of it, the form would have been *Mari* or *Maran* "my Lord" or "our Lord", not "Lord" or "the Lord" absolutely. As to Jno. xiii. 13 ff., Bousset takes issue with the interpretation of κύριος and διδάσκαλος as synonyms. The passage according to him implies that the two titles have different import, and he seeks to prove this from its dependence on Matt. x. 24 where the correlate of διδάσκαλος is given as μαθητής, that of κύριος as δούλος.⁵

It is evidently not Bousset's opinion that Kyrie and Kyrios in the Gospels are wherever they occur pure additions by the tradition or the Evangelists. His real view, although not stated in so many words, seems to be, that Kyrie and Kyrios are later unwarranted renderings of an original *Rab*, *Rabbi*, *Rabbian*. To the mind of the tradition or the

⁵ *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 79, 98.

Evangelist Kyrie and Kyrios possessed the higher meaning with which they were familiar from the usage in their own time, and which anachronistically they carry back into the time of Jesus. They do not mean that the disciples and others used *Mari* as a variation of *Rabbi*, but ascribe to them a higher conception of Jesus to express which they felt *Rabbi* to be inadequate. Kyrios in the Gospels has the full pregnant sense of the later period, but for this very reason it cannot be historical.⁶

We wish to enquire whether Bousset's arguments have actually endangered the older view of a pre-Hellenistic use of the title "Lord" with reference to Jesus. Let us begin with the alleged absence of Kyrios from the Logia. Bousset declares: "In the Logia the title *ὁ κύριος* occurs nowhere. The address *κύριε* Lk. vi. 46, "Why call ye me, Lord (= Master) and do not what I say?", which fully explains itself from the context, has no evidential value whatever. Whether *κύριε* in Matt. viii. 8 = Lk. vii. 6, can

* There would seem to be some inconsistency between Bousset's statement on p. 95 in regard to the distinction between the vocative *κύριε*, and the full title *ὁ κύριος*, and his interpretation of the Gospel-phenomena on the next page. On p. 95 he observes that in regard to the vocative a wider and looser usage can be traced in the New Testament, since not only God and Christ, but other heavenly beings and men of superior position receive the title from inferiors. Consequently in the investigation he proposes to leave the vocative out of account. On p. 96 on the other hand he appeals not merely to the increasing frequency of *ὁ κύριος* but also to the increasing vocative usage in Matthew and Luke as evidence for the influence exerted by the later custom to call Christ Kyrios in a specific and unique sense. If a wider and looser usage existed, then the vocative cases should not have been quoted as symptomatic of the feeling of the later period. It would have been more consistent to stake the whole argument on the objective use of the title. Bousset also leaves us in uncertainty as to whether the wider, looser, untechnical usage recognized by him for the vocative existed only on Greek soil or could have existed also on Palestinian, Aramaeic soil, either during the life of Jesus or in the mother-church. What he positively rejects as unhistorical is the employment of *Mar* as a Rabbinical title. But this leaves undecided the question whether with an un-Rabbinical connotation the address by means of *Mar* may not have been Palestinian or even existent and applied to Jesus in His own time.

be traced back to the Logia must remain in doubt, since the derivation of the entire pericope (the centurion of Capernaum) from the Logia continues a disputed point."⁷

The first of these statements "that the title *κύριος* occurs nowhere in the Logia" is correct only, if the technical meaning of "title" is unduly insisted upon. Of a strictly titular use of Kyrios the Logia furnishes no instance. But this is not pertinent to the question at issue. Bousset's position involves that the *conception* of Jesus as Lord was unfamiliar to the early Palestinian circles, and that it is this unfamiliarity which reflects itself in the absence of the *title* from the Logia. The absence of the title in order to be exponential of a Christological stage of development must rest on the background of the absence of the conception which pointedly expresses itself in the titular usage. If the conception appears to have been present, the absence of the title need not be anything more than pure accident. The rule cannot be laid down *á priori*, that, if the title was known in a certain circle, it must of necessity have entered into a document proceeding from that circle. Perhaps good reasons can be assigned why, in passages where it might have been employed, other ways of speaking were preferred. But, even though this should not be so, mere absence of the title in the face of familiarity with the conception proves nothing. Now as a matter of fact the Logia plainly show that the idea of the Lordship of Jesus was current where the Logia are supposed to have been collected and to have circulated. In Matt. xxiv. 43-51 = Lk. xii. 39, 40, 42-46 we meet with the representation of Jesus as *οἰκοδεσπότης* and as *κύριος* with reference to the disciples.⁸ That the representation is parabolic does not in the least detract from its significance. The householder and the slave in the parable illustrate a corresponding spiritual relationship between Jesus and the disciple and it would be difficult to say how

⁷ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 96.

⁸ See Harnack's reconstruction of the Logia in *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, pp. 26-28, 98, 187.

this could possibly have been conceived in any form different from that of lordship. One need not unduly allegorize the parable to see that this conception shines through at every point. Its meaning is not adequately rendered by saying that, in view of the absence and expected return of Jesus, watchfulness and faithfulness must be practised by the disciple in like manner as watchfulness and faithfulness are demanded of a house servant under similar circumstances with reference to the master of the house. It is distinctly implied that in both cases the duty springs from the relation of lordship. Especially towards the close the parabolic form of speaking perceptibly glides over into a semi-direct description of the spiritual reality, "the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth."⁹ Here there can be no doubt but the returning one is Jesus and He is called "Lord", and that certainly not merely in virtue of the parabolic setting in what precedes but also because of His possessing the dignity on His own account. It may even be questioned whether in verse 45 of Matthew = verse 42 of Luke in the absolute *ὁ κύριος* we have not a reflex of the full titular use itself. The question, "who then is the faithful and wise servant whom *the lord* has set over his household, etc.?" certainly sounds as if "the Lord" as a title of Jesus was familiar to the mind that so phrased it.

A similar case of the parabolic designation of Jesus as Kyrios is found in Matt. x. 24, 25: "A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house (*οἶκο-*

⁹The reference to "the weeping and gnashing of teeth" as well as the term "hypocrites" fall outside of the frame of the parable, and in so far also favor the direct reference of "lord" to Jesus. But "the weeping and gnashing of teeth" does not occur in Luke and for "hypocrites" Luke has "unfaithful" which remains true to the parable. Harnack thinks that the Logia had "hypocrites".

δεσπότην) Beelzebub, how much more them of his household?" Here again what starts out as a mere comparison of Jesus to a teacher or owner of slaves in his relation to the disciples ends with a direct formal designation of Him as "the master of the house", so as to imply familiarity with Jesus' lordship as a current conception. It is true Luke here (vi. 40) has only the figure of teacher and disciple; that of the lord and servant is lacking both in verse 40_a and verse 40_b, and also the question of verse 25_c in Matthew. But, if we may believe Harnack, the fuller form of the double comparison was original in the Logia, and the case is a case of conscious omission on the part of Luke. We may, therefore, put this passage by the side of the other as evidence that the lordship of Jesus, at least as a conception, was known in the Palestinian environment where the Logia first were handed down.¹⁰

And not merely in regard to the objective use of Kyrios, but also in regard to its vocative use Bousset's appeal to the Logia fails to convince. There is but one instance of this, he claims, and it lacks all evidential value because explainable from the context. This is Lk. vi. 46 "And why call ye me, Lord, and do not what I say?" He assumes that this saying belonged to the Logia in its Lucan form, and that the version in which it occurs in Matthew represents a subsequent stage of development. It is the later invocation of the Kyrios-name in the cult which Matt. vii. 21 carries back into the mouth of Jesus.¹¹ This assumption is evidently the reason why from the Lucan form the second Kyrie is dropped, although the text, without variants, gives Kyrie, Kyrie. Evidently the duplication of the name appears to Bousset reminiscent of the cult, and carries with it the technical high sense of Kyrios, and therefore in his opinion cannot have been original in the Logia. This, however, is a mere assumption. We may fairly insist upon

¹⁰*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 58: "In Matt. x. 24, f. Luke seems to me to have omitted the lord and the slave because by the side of teacher and disciple they sounded superfluous and almost trivial."

¹¹*Kyrios Christos*, p. 103, note 5.

it that the Lucan version, if it be assigned to the Logia, shall be put there in the form which it actually bears, i.e., with the double Kyrie. And if this be done, it will be seen that the appeal to the connection as sufficiently explaining the case without recourse to a Kyrios-title is unavailing. The contrast between calling Jesus "Lord, Lord", and doing the things he says cannot mean a contrast between the recognition of Jesus as a teacher and the putting of his teaching into practice. The solemnly repeated "Lord" shows that the pretended reverence with which the practical disobedience conflicts is the reverence for Jesus as sovereign lawgiver and not as a mere teacher. For "the things which I say", the "I say unto you" of the earlier part of the discourse may be compared. Now, if such is the actual import of the saying, and if bearing this import it had its place in the Logia, then this proves at least that the *milieu* in which the Logia were first collected was not unacquainted with the conception of the sovereign lordship of Jesus as the basis of his legislative authority and as recognized in the address by means of Kyrie. When Matthew in verse 22 makes Jesus add that the same words "Kyrie, Kyrie" will be addressed to him by many in the day of judgment, there is really no great difference between this and the "Kyrie, Kyrie" he puts upon the lips of some of His followers during His lifetime. It goes without saying that the address to which people will resort in the day of judgment takes "Kyrie" in a very specific sense. Although verse 22 does not occur in Luke and for this reason is not included in the Logia, there is nothing to indicate that, so far as the sense of Kyrie is concerned, it goes beyond Lk. vi. 46.¹²

¹² Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, pp. 52, 177, feels doubtful about the appurtenance of the saying to the Logia, and surmises that the common source from which Matthew and Luke drew it lies farther back. If, however, a reconstruction of Q be attempted, he would prefer the λέγων μοι κύριε of Matthew to the τί δέ με καλεῖτε κύριε of Luke, and also gives preference to the words "he who does the will of my Father in heaven" in the second clause above the Lucan "and do not

In the story about the centurion of Capernaum Matt. viii. 5-10, 13 = Lk. vii. 1-10 Kyrie occurs in Matthew verse 8 = Lk. verse 6: "Lord I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof." Matthew alone has it also in verse 6: "Lord my servant lies in the house sick."¹³ It is usually assumed that the text of Matthew reproduces the account of the Logia in a more original form than that of Luke.¹⁴ As we have seen Bousset sets aside the evidence in this case on the ground that the inclusion of the story in the Logia remains in dispute. Probably this has reference to the view of Wernle who considers the pericope a later addition to Q because in the high opinion expressed about the faith of the centurion it conflicts with the Judaistic character of Q.¹⁵ But the Judaistic character of Q in such a sense as would preclude the recognition of exceptional faith in a Gentile, is not an accepted conclusion in Gospel-criticism. Harnack denies its existence with a reference to the saying (also contained in the Logia) that God can out of stones raise up children to Abraham Matt. iii. 9=Lk. iii. 8, and to the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman contained in Mark, in which the same judgment is expressed concerning Gentile

what I say". His preference in the former respect we do not understand. Perhaps it is due to the feeling that *καλεῖν* implies a formal invocation. The preference for "the will of my Father in heaven" seems to rest on a disinclination to believe that Jesus proclaimed His own word as law. In our view the mention of the Father in heaven does not exclude but rather includes the authoritative, sovereign position of Jesus in virtue of which he is addressed "Kyrie, Kyrie". The implication in Matthew is that Jesus represents God, so that His commands are the commands of God. And He represents God not as a teacher, but as Son, hence: "The will of my Father which is in heaven". It will be noted that Harnack retains the double Kyrie as original.

¹³The omission of *κύριε* in Luke verse 4 is due to the indirect discourse and the condensed character of the statement.

¹⁴Cp. Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 56: "That Matthew has altered the text transmitted in Q cannot be shown." This does not apply to verse 13, which Harnack does not believe stood in Q because he thinks that not the healing of the servant but the saying about the centurion's faith formed the point of the original story (p. 147).

¹⁵*Synoptische Frage*, p. 232.

faith.¹⁶ We may therefore confidently count this another instance of the use of Kyrie in the Logia.

That no more than these two instances of the vocative Kyrie occur can create no wonder. The Logia, as most of the critics conceive of this document, is made up of sayings or discourses of Jesus. It offered little occasion, therefore, for describing a meeting with or an approach of people to Jesus such as would call for any formula of address. Where the character of the contents changes to the narrative or the parabolic form, the Kyrie, as we have seen, immediately emerges. If Kyrie is rare, other forms of address such as *διδάσκαλε* or *ῥαββεί* or *ἐπιστάτα* are entirely absent. This shows how little reliance can be placed on the non-occurrence of Kyrie, as a proof of the unfamiliarity of the time and circle in question with its use as a title of Christ. Nor could one expect to meet with Kyrios objectively in reflections or statements of Jesus with reference to Himself. While passages of this character are by no means wanting in the Logia, the title Kyrios would have been out of place, for the twofold reason that from its very nature it does not lend itself for use as a self-designation, and because none of the passages particularly calls for the expression of that aspect of Jesus' position or function, which the Kyrios-name connotes.¹⁷

The character of the Logia as a collection of sayings and not a narrative of events, will have to be kept in mind also in noting the absence of *ὁ κύριος* as a designation of Jesus by the author or collector of the documents. Such designation could occur only where, by way of exception, the narrative style is adopted. This happens in the account of the temptation, in the centurion pericope, in the episode of the inquiry sent by the Baptist.¹⁸ In these cases, so far as the

¹⁶ *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 147.

¹⁷ Cp. "Son-of-Man" Matt. viii. 20 = Lk. viii. 58; Matt. x. 32 = Lk. xii. 8; Matt. xii. 32 = Lk. xii. 10; Matt. xi. 19 = Lk. vii. 34; Matt. xii. 39 = Lk. xi. 30; Matt. xxiv. 27 = Lk. xvii. 24.

¹⁸ Cp. also Matt. xii. 22 ff. = Lk. xi. 14 ff. and Matt. xii. 38 ff. = Lk. xi. 16 ff.

simple pronoun is not employed, the name Jesus (temptation) or the title Christ (John's inquiry)¹⁹ are brought into use. This, however, is entirely in keeping with the preponderant Gospel usage throughout and proves, of course, nothing as to existence or non-existence of the conception of Jesus' lordship. In none of these cases has Matthew or Luke found occasion to introduce *ὁ κύριος* into the corresponding sections. The preference of the Gospel-narrative for the simple "Jesus" is a phenomenon remarkable enough in itself, but one which has nothing to do with the currency of *ὁ κύριος* in other connections.

We pass on to Mark which, like the Logia, Bousset thinks it possible to place, so far as its traditional material is concerned, within the pre-Kyrios stage of the Christological development. Here the situation is in so far different from the Logia as we are on narrative ground, and occasions for the introduction of either the vocative Kyrie or the objective Kyrios cannot be said to have been wanting. In fact Mark makes various people address Jesus no less than ten times by means of *διδάσκαλε*²⁰ and three times with a transliterated *ῥαββεί*.²¹ Besides there is one instance of *ῥαββουνί* with *κύριε ῥαββεί* and *ῥαββεί* as variants.²² Twice *ὁ διδάσκαλος* is used of Jesus in the third person.²³ In a number of these cases Kyrie and Kyrios would have seemed quite appropriate, although in some the use of *διδάσκαλε* explains itself and *κύριε* would have been out of place. Here therefore Bousset's contention that the absence of Kyrie and Kyrios from Mark is historically significant can be urged with a far greater semblance of plausibility than in connection with the Logia, because the absence is offset by the rather frequent introduction of other terms in connections where Kyrios or Kyrie might have been expected.²⁴

¹⁹ In Matt. xi. 2 D al read *Ἰησοῦ* instead of *Χριστοῦ*.

²⁰ iv. 38; ix. 17, 38; x. 17, 20, 35; xii. 14, 19, 32; xiii. 1.

²¹ ix. 5; xi. 21; xiv. 45.

²² x. 51.

²³ v. 35; xiv. 14.

²⁴ In view of the above statistics it is not clear what Dalman means

Nevertheless we think that even here the conclusion which Bousset would draw from the phenomena is unwarranted. First of all it should be observed that there is in Mark the same parabolic evidence of familiarity with the Kyrios conception that we found in the Logia. In Mk. xiii. 35 the man in the parable is called the *κύριος τῆς οἰκίας*. Here again it matters little that in the figure this *κύριος* is a common enough designation of a house-owner or house-ruler and has nothing specific about it. The specific character of the word is none the less implied because the house of which Christ is owner and ruler is the circle of disciples, the church or whatever name be given to it. One who owns and rules over this sphere is *κύριος* in a peculiar religious sense. The same conception of lordship meets us in a direct unparabolic form in ii. 28 where Jesus declares that the Son-of-Man is Kyrios *καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου*. This involves the right to make sovereign disposal of the institution of the Sabbath. No matter whether the *καί* be rendered "even" or "also", in either case the implication is that besides the Sabbath many other things fall under the jurisdiction of the Son-of-Man. A comprehensive Messianic lordship is implied from which the highest is not exempt. This *καί* also forbids the un-Messianic, generic interpretation of Son-of-Man, as if to man as such the right of disposing of the Sabbath were accorded. To say that man is lord *also* or *even* of the Sabbath yields no sense, whereas it yields excellent sense when meant to emphasize the wide range of the lordship of the Messianic Son-of-Man.²⁵ Still another instance

when (*Die Worte Jesu*, p. 269) he seeks to explain the uniqueness of Kyrie in Mark vii. 28 with the observation that Mark "in general is sparing with the recording of such terms of address". Mark has *διδάσκαλε* ten times, *ῥαββεί* 3 times, *ῥαββονί* once, *κύριε* once. This makes 15 instances in all. Matthew has a total of 25 and Luke a total of 19 not taking into account the parabolic cases. This disproportion is not great, and it disappears entirely, if the material which Matthew and Luke have beyond Mark is taken into account.

²⁵ If for Mark the generic sense of "Son-of-Man" cannot be defended, then there is, of course, no plausibility in ascribing it to Matthew, although his text does not contain the *καί*. Luke's text has *καί*.

of the formal ascription of lordship to the Christ (and to Jesus indirectly) is furnished by our Lord's reasoning against the Scribes concerning the question whether the Messiah be David's son or lord (Mk. xii. 35-37). Bousset is more eager here to call attention to the restricted scope of the idea, the Messiah being represented not as lord in general, but only as David's lord, than he appears to be in connection with the Sabbath-passage to do justice to the generalizing touch introduced by *καί*. We fail to see what force can be allowed to this consideration. The import of the argument is surely not this alone, that the Messiah is superior to David in rank, but that he rules over David as sovereign lord, and that such lordship could not belong to him in the capacity of a descendant and heir of David. Now lordship over David cannot be conceived except against the larger background of a general wide-reaching Messianic sovereignty. Instead of saying with Bousset: "lord over David only," it is much more pertinent to say: "lord even over David, and therefore lord over all that ranks lower than David." The question may even be raised whether the thought of lordship over David can be carried through without including in it authority over the dead as well as the living, for at the time of the Messiah's rule David no longer lives. But this is not essential to the argument. Bousset considers the entire episode unhistorical and explains it as the precipitate of the dogmatizing of the early church.²⁶ The question now before us is not, however, affected by this. Adjusting ourselves to Bousset's line of reasoning, we are examining Mark not as a direct historical witness to the life of Jesus but as an indirect reflector of the belief that prevailed in the early Palestinian Church. Though we may discount the episode in the former respect, yet the fact remains that when this story was pre-

It is fortunate that the *καί* stands in Mark; if it were lacking in Mark and found in both Matthew and Luke, the charge could be brought with far greater show of reason that the later two Evangelists had changed a generic into a Messianic "Son-of-Man."

²⁶ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 51.

precipitated there must have been a belief in the lordship of Jesus capable of precipitating it. And still another inference may be drawn from the episode, no matter whether interpreted as historical or as dogmatic precipitate. Bousset suggests that it not merely reflects the church's belief, but also reflects the controversies waged in regard to this belief between the Jewish Scribes and the Christians. Now it ought not to be overlooked that the point at issue either between Jesus and the Scribes or between the early Christians and the Scribes is not whether the Messiah is lord of David. The recognition of this, on the basis of the Psalm, furnishes the common ground on which the real point at issue is argued. The real point at issue is, whether being by common consent David's lord, the Messiah can be at the same time David's son.²⁷ And this issue presupposes that the attribute of lordship was associated by the Scribes with the character of the Messiah no less than by the Christians with the Person of Jesus. If this was so at the time when the controversies about the divine sonship of Jesus were going on, it would be rash to assume that the conception of the Messiah as Lord was unknown to the Judaism of the slightly earlier period.

The only actual instance of the designation of Jesus as

²⁷ Bousset thinks the argument implies that in the circle where the episode originated the descent of Jesus from David was denied (*Kyrios Christos*, p. 5). This view of the matter is perhaps more easily reconcilable with the uniform affirmation of the Davidic descent, than the same interpretation of the pericope where the latter is accepted as historical. If Jesus had explicitly denied His Davidic descent, then the later persistent belief in it becomes difficult to account for. If only the early church had made the denial the opposite belief could perhaps assert and maintain itself. In our opinion no denial of bodily descent is implied in the argument. "David's son" is equivalent to "David's heir". The question is not whether lordship over David and descent from David can go together, but whether inheritance of the lordship from David and exercise of lordship over David are compatible. All this, however, and also the further question, whether a higher sonship than the Davidic one, viz., sonship from God, stands in the background of the argumentation, as seems to be the case in Matthew ("What think ye concerning the Christ? Whose Son is he?"), can be left to one side as irrelevant to the present argument.

Kyrios in a technical sense acknowledged by Bousset in Mark is that of xi. 3, where the disciples are instructed to reply with reference to the colt used for the entry into Jerusalem "the Kyrios has need of him." Referring to Heitmüller's attempt to strip the term even here of its sacred technical meaning, Bousset observes that for this secondary passage an exception may safely be made.²⁸ Of course, if good reasons could be given for declaring the passage secondary, we should have to regard this a safe concession on Bousset's part. In reality the two reasons adduced are such as ought to be ruled out in any fair court of criticism. The one is based on the ascription of supernatural knowledge to Jesus.²⁹ From such as do not *à priori* deny the supernatural in the consciousness of Jesus this argument can claim no consideration, even where the historicity of the account is the direct point at issue. But it appears altogether irrelevant even from Bousset's own anti-supernaturalistic standpoint, because the supernaturalism involved may with absolute certainty be declared to have been attainable by the earliest stage in the formation of the Gospel-tradition. There surely never was a time in the early Church when the faith of its members in regard to the Person of Jesus fell short of the power of investing Him with such a moderate degree of supernaturalism as is here described. As a criterion for the original or secondary character of a passage in Mark, and more particularly as a criterion for judging of the antiquity of the Kyrios-title contained in that passage, the feature is wholly worthless. The second reason why Bousset considers the passage secondary need not detain us because it rests on the occurrence in it of the Kyrios-title itself³⁰ To argue first from the Kyrios-title that the account is secondary, and then from the secondary character of the account, that the Kyrios-title is not early-Palestinian would be a *petitio principii*, with which we do not mean to charge Bousset.

²⁸ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 96, note 1.

²⁹ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 71, note 1. The same judgment is applied to Mk. xiv. 13 ff.

³⁰ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 52.

A feature to be carefully noticed in connection with this last passage is the absolute form in which it employs the conception of *ὁ κύριος* without any qualifying genitive. In this an indication might be found of the presence of the later usage which designated the exalted Christ as *ὁ κύριος* absolutely. We do not think that suspicion against it on this score would be well-grounded. In order to avert it, however, it is not necessary to supply the qualifying genitive and take *ὁ κύριος* in the sense of the owner, viz., of the colt, as some have proposed. Of course the right to the use of the animal is implied, but it is implied in the whole situation, not in the term *Kyrios* as such. That this is so can be best perceived by comparing the case with the analogous case Mk. xiv. 14. Here the disciples are told to say to the goodman of the house: "The Master says, where is my guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?" If here *ὁ κύριος* were read, instead of *ὁ διδάσκαλος* the inference would lie near that Jesus was called "lord" on account of his sovereign right to claim the use of the guest-chamber, and the words "my guest-chamber" might seem to favor this. As it is, the title *ὁ διδάσκαλος* cannot have been intended to justify the claim in question. Neither then will *ὁ κύριος* in the closely parallel passage have any such associations. In both cases we plainly have before us evidences of the passing over into a formal objective title of what had before been a mode of addressing Jesus in the vocative. The persons to whom the message is sent will know who is meant by *ὁ κύριος* and *ὁ διδάσκαλος* because in the circle of the disciples the custom of speaking to Jesus by means of *κύριε* and *διδάσκαλε* had already given rise to such objectivation of the terms. *Ὁ κύριος* in the first instance meant the one whom we are accustomed to address as *κύριε*, just as *ὁ διδάσκαλος* meant, the one whom we are wont to address as *διδάσκαλε*. It is not necessary to assume that a formal objective usage of *ὁ κύριος*, either in the later sense or as a standing title of the Messiah underlies the passage. The non-titular concept of the lordship of the

Messiah would reflect itself in the vocative usage and this would of itself unconsciously and inevitably give rise to the designation of Jesus as *ὁ κύριος* just as we find it here.³¹

If this is actually the background of the absolute *ὁ κύριος* it proves at the same time that the vocative Kyrie is not so utterly unknown to the Marcan tradition as Bousset would have us believe. The occurrence of it in the case of the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk. vii. 28) he seeks to explain from the nationality of the woman in such a way as to avoid the assumption of a similar usage among the disciples. From the point of view of the tradition this would involve that the term *κύριε* was felt either as a pagan-Syrian or at least as a Syrian-Christian way of addressing Jesus, something that appeared to the early-Palestinian bearers or receivers of the tradition as an exotic custom. And the same construction might be put upon the fact that in the Logia also the one person who addresses Jesus by means of Kyrie is the non-Jewish centurion. Both the uniqueness of the case in each of the two documents and the coincidence of the Gentile nationality of the speakers lend a degree of plausibility to this hypothesis. It should be observed, however, that the two cases are not strictly analogous, for the centurion is only Gentile by descent; religiously he appears closely associated with Judaism. It therefore seems doubtful whether pur-

³¹ Mk. v. 19 is a doubtful instance of *ὁ κύριος* for Jesus. Jesus instructs the Gerasene demoniac, "Go to thy house unto thy friends, and tell them how great things *ὁ κύριος* has done for thee". It must remain uncertain whether *ὁ κύριος* here refers to God or to Jesus. The only other passage in Mark, outside of Old Testament quotations, where God is so designated is xiii. 20. In xi. 10 *κύριος* is lacking in the best manuscripts and seems to be a duplication from the preceding verse where it occurs in a quotation. Perhaps the statement to the demoniac might be considered a quotation or at least a reminiscence from Psa. cxxvi. 3. The parallel passage in Luke (viii. 39) has *ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός* and therefore takes the *ὁ κύριος* found in Mark as equivalent to *ὁ θεός*. On the other hand, if Mark be interpreted by itself, the recurrence of the same form of statement in verse 20, "he began to publish how great things Jesus had done for him" favors the reference of *ὁ κύριος* to Jesus." Cp. Sven Herner, *Die Anwendung des Wortes Kyrios im Neuen Testament*, pp. 7, 8.

poseful assimilation to a heathen mode of speech can be made responsible for the Kyrie in his case. But there is another feature in regard to which the two pericopes are strictly parallel and with which the simultaneous appearance of Kyrie in each may therefore be much more plausibly connected. Both accounts emphasize the astounding greatness of faith in the person who appealed to Jesus for help, and the declaration of Jesus appended shows how in the case of the centurion the pagan character is reflected upon only insofar as it brings out in strong relief this marvellous faith. It will be further observed that in the narrative of the centurion his extraordinary faith is brought into close connection with the lordship over the powers of healing which he ascribes to Jesus and which he compares to his own relation to the powers above and under him. Thus the story itself leads us to explain the singular mode of address by means of Kyrie from the vivid and strong conviction as to the supernatural power of Jesus implied in the faith of him who used it. And this explanation can be applied with equal plausibility to the account of Jesus' encounter with the Syro-Phoenician woman. It does not favor the assumption that by addressing Jesus as Kyrie the woman classified Him from a specifically pagan or non-Jewish-Christian point of view. The Kyrie introduces a sentence in which the possibility of receiving help from Jesus is suspended on association with Jesus' ministry for Israel: "Yea, Lord: even the little dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs."³² This points distinctly to the Messianic interpretation of the Kyrie. Matthew certainly has so understood it for he introduces Kyrie not only in verse 25 in the appeal "Lord, help me" but as early as in the woman's first cry: "Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David", verse 22. The title Lord which she applies to Jesus belongs to Him as the Son

³² The *vaí* which precedes Kyrie is neither confirmation of Jesus' preceding statement, nor protest against it, but confirms the last word of the woman herself, verse 26 in Mk., verse 22 in Matthew (xv).

of David, the Messiah.³³ The favorite homiletical motif—as if the woman had first appealed to the Son of David, that is to Jesus in his Messianic capacity, and only after the fruitlessness of this became apparent from Jesus' answer, had appealed to Him in His higher capacity as Kyrios in the universalistic sense—is not warranted by the account even of Matthew, and certainly in Mark cannot find the least semblance of support. There is no reason to interpret this Kyrie on such a high plane as would make it practically equivalent to the Kyrie of the post-resurrection period. The Messianic reference is made probable also by further comparison with the centurion-pericope. Our Lord's declaration in regard to the centurion "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel", implies that what rendered this man's faith unique was the ability to believe what God was doing for Israel without the support derived from Israel's long preparation for such faith in the past.

In a class by themselves stand the passages i. 3; xvi. 19, 20. They are cases of the application of the title *κύριος* to Jesus not by speakers within the frame of the Gospel-history, but by the writer of the Gospel. They reflect plainly the later well-established usage. The two verses in Chapter xvi can remain out of consideration here because they occur in what is regarded by many as the later unauthentic conclusion to the Gospel. The other passage, however, is important for our purpose. It occurs in a quotation from Isa. xl. 3, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." In the prophet the *κύριος* for whom the way is to be prepared is Jehovah. But there can be no doubt that, so far as the writer of the Gospel is concerned, we have here a case of the substitution of the *κύριος*-Jesus for the *κύριος*-Jehovah, of which there are so many other instances in the New Testament. For in the immediately preceding quotation from Mal. iii. 1, which also in the original represents Jehovah as the coming one,

³³ The mere non-repetition of *υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ* in verse 25 of Matthew cannot, of course, prove that Kyrie is the second time meant in a higher sense than the first time.

the form has been so changed as to make it refer to Jesus, "I send my messenger before *thy face*, who shall prepare *thy way*" being substituted for "I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." The question whether this substitution was possible on the basis of the Hebrew or Aramaeic idiom can be neglected for the present since the Gospel was written in Greek and the possibilities in the matter were determined not by the Hebrew but by the Greek Old Testament. The writer of i. 3, therefore, is familiar with the designation of Jesus as *ὁ κύριος* in a sense sufficiently high and unique as not to preclude the transfer to Him of what the Old Testament affirms of the *κύριος*-Jehovah. Bousset finds in verse 2 evidence of the progressive embellishment of the history of Jesus with traits supplied by Old Testament prophecy.³⁴ On this principle the equation of Jesus with *ὁ κύριος* would afford no proof of the existence of the *κύριος*-title during the earlier stage of the tradition in Palestinian circles. We shall not, therefore, press it as an argument in the present connection. But the discounting of it by Bousset on the plea that it belongs to a later stratum of the tradition raises the interesting question, what bearing Bousset's view on this whole subject of the gradual growth of the Gospel-tradition and the evidence he discovers of it in Mark has on the argument derived from the almost total absence of the *κύριος*-title from the Marcan material. Bousset believes that in our present Mark much later material has gathered around the nucleus of actual primitive tradition. The single story and the single logion constituted the first form in which the tradition was handed down. The next stage was the stage of agglutination of the single pieces into groups from the point of view of similarity of content. Of such groups he counts at least eight in Mark. But to this original body were added in course of time a number of secondary pieces. All this applies to the oral tradition. On the question whether the literary composition of Mark passed through several stages

³⁴ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 85.

Bousset does not commit himself.³⁵ In the main he places the process of agglutination and accretion within the thirty years of oral tradition that preceded the fixing of the Gospel in written form. Now the observation can be made that in this body of later material the Kyrios-title is scarcely more in evidence than in the tradition-stratum assumed to be of earlier origin. Many instances are specified by Bousset of such later increment or of the touching up in a later spirit of older pieces.³⁶ In connection with three of these the conception of Jesus' lordship appears viz., the Sabbath-controversy, in the account of the entry into Jerusalem, and in the polemic against the Scribes about the Messiah's being David's son or Lord. Over against these we may place the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman and the parable of the lord of the house, possibly also the story of the Gerasene demoniac. Why is it that the introduction of this later material or the working over of the earlier tradition in a later spirit has not resulted in a far greater frequency of the Kyrios-conception or the Kyrios-title? Are we to assume that all this secondary growth was made in Palestinian circles before the Kyrios-title had had time to work its way from the Syrian-Hellenistic Church

³⁵ An exception, in regard to the mode of origin, is made for the passion-narrative. This existed, so far as its origin can be traced back, in coherent form and possibly assumed literary shape at an earlier point than the other material. This original passion-narrative, however, is not identical with the present passion-story in Mark. In the latter also later elements are discovered. *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 42-44.

³⁶ *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 47-57; 65-82. Bousset brings under this head, the authority claimed for the Son-of-Man to forgive sin, the parable of the bridegroom concerning fasting, the Sabbath-controversy connected with the plucking of ears of corn, the parable of the binding of the strong one; the logion about the gaining and losing of life, the *ὄνομα*-passages (ix. 37-41), the parable of the wicked husbandmen, the Son- or Lord-of-David pericope, the saying about the passing away of earth and heaven before Jesus' words pass away, the story of the entry into Jerusalem, of the passover-meal, of the trial of Jesus, the inscription on the cross, the accounts of the baptism and the temptation. It is not, of course, assumed that in each of these cases the material as a body is of late origin, but in all cases at least later ideas have been introduced into it.

into the Jewish-Christian community and gain a firm hold upon the tradition there? There would be two difficulties in the way of assuming this. In the first place Bousset himself locates much of this development on Greek soil, as appears from the fact that he regards the title Son-of-God and the dominating rôle it plays in Mark as a Hellenistic product.³⁷ And in the second place, although the time of a whole generation may be allowed for the growth of the tradition before it became fixed in literary form, this entire period cannot be supposed to have elapsed before the Kyrios-title found an entrance into the Palestinian Church. For at the time of the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians Paul already characterizes the Christians (1. Cor. 1. 2) as οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν and in view of the added words ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν this cannot possibly be restricted to the Greek Churches, but must include the Palestinian Christians as well.³⁸ At that time, therefore, from 50 to 58 A. D., according to the chronology adopted, the custom of the invocation of Jesus as Lord was already firmly established among the Christians in Palestine. And since it will be necessary to go back several years of this date, to allow for a required period of gradual adoption of the custom, it seems safe to affirm that not a little of the tradition-material in Mark must on Bousset's own hypothesis have received its present form while the Kyrios-title was generally current in the circle where this took place. In the face of this it becomes precarious to make of the uniform absence of the title from Mark an argument for the non-acquaintance of the early church with this designation. If the later currency of the title could leave the

³⁷ *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 65-70. Bousset now retracts his earlier view (*Religion des Judenthums*², pp. 261 ff.) and accepts Dalman's conclusion (*Worte Jesu*, I, p. 219), that in the apocalyptic literature "Son-of-God" does not occur as a Messianic title. The passages in 4 Ezra originally had not υἱὸς θεοῦ but παῖς θεοῦ.

³⁸ Bousset (p. 100 note 1) does not share the suspicion of Joh. Weiss against this statement of Paul. He suggests that the words καὶ ἡμῶν might be removed from the text. This does not affect the force of the remaining words ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ αὐτῶν.

subsequent development of the tradition unaffected, then the quiescence of the title in the earlier stage need not be in any way indicative of its non-currency at that time. The fact also that the Gospel of Mark as such is a Greek product and that it embodies all the tradition that has flowed into it, the alleged earlier no less than the alleged later elements, in Greek form should give us pause before drawing over-hasty conclusions in this matter. However much respect the writer of the Gospel may have had for the tradition as he found it, he can hardly have confined his task to that of a mere collector. No punctilious regard for the literal retention of the transmitted form need have prevented him from introducing where he speaks in his own person the designation of Jesus as *ὁ κύριος*. This was sufficiently familiar to him, as we have seen, to induce the application of Isa. xl. 3 to Jesus. And yet, apart from the "unauthentic" conclusion of the Gospel, he nowhere refers to Jesus objectively as *ὁ κύριος*. The same applies, with one exception, to the author of the First Gospel. The difference between them and Luke, who on his own account speaks no less than sixteen times of *ὁ κύριος*, is not due to a difference in familiarity with the usage. Why then should such an explanation be given where the similar phenomenon of relative absence or avoidance of the *κύριος*-title within the frame of the narrative comes under consideration?

Before dismissing the subject of the relative infrequency of *κύριος* or *κύριε* in Mark attention may be called to the parallel phenomenon of the rare occurrence of *ὁ κύριος* as a name for God in the same document. Apart from Old Testament quotations, where the use of *ὁ κύριος* could not be avoided,³⁹ there is but a single passage, xiii. 20, "except the Lord shortened the days," where God is so designated. No one would care to suggest that there is anything significant in this; it must be purely accidental. If it occurred in a later document, where *ὁ κύριος* was the standing title of

³⁹ Cp. xi. 9; xii. 11, 29, 30, 36; for v. 19 and xi. 10, see note 31.

Christ, it might be attributed to the extrusion of the former by the latter. But in Mark this is not to be thought of. And yet if Mark be compared with Matthew and Luke we find that there appears in the two last-named Gospels a very frequent use of *ὁ κύριος* for God outside of Old Testament quotations.⁴⁰ The facts, therefore, run strikingly parallel to those observable in connection with the Kyrios-designation of Jesus. And yet it is absolutely excluded in this case that the infrequency in Mark should reflect any unfamiliarity with the name *ὁ κύριος* for God or rather with the circumlocutions such as *Shema* and *Hasshem* of which *ὁ κύριος* was the substitute from the Greek Bible.

A similar observation can be made with reference to the title "The Christ". Bousset himself tells us that in the Logia this nowhere occurs as a self-designation of Jesus and in Mark only four times altogether, viz., viii. 29; ix. 41; xiv. 61; xv. 32. Of these four passages ix. 41 appears to him suspicious on account of Matt. x. 42, where instead of *ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἔστε* is read *εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ*. Nevertheless there can be no doubt that Jesus was currently designated "the Christ" in early Palestinian circles. This follows not merely from the abundant testimony in Acts, which Bousset suggests might perhaps be set down as a literary peculiarity of the writer of that book, but it follows also from the fact that the few passages where it does occur in Mark belong to the best accredited parts of the Gospel-tradition (the episode of Caesarea-Philippi and the trial of Jesus). Bousset admits that the latter circumstance speaks in favor of the credibility of the representation in Acts according to which *ὁ Χριστός* was current, not as a proper name but as an appellative title, in the earliest church. If this be so the fact results that there is a great disproportion

⁴⁰ For Matthew Cp. i. 20, 22, 24; ii. 13, 15, 19; ix. 38; xi. 25; xxviii. 2; for Luke i. 6, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 25, 28, 32, 38, 45, 58, 66; ii. 9, 15, 22, 23, 24, (26), (38); iv. 8, 12; x. 2, 21; xx. 37. The remarkable increase in both Gospels, as compared with Mark, may be due to the peculiar complexion of the accounts of the nativity, in which most of the instances occur.

between the frequency in actual use and the rareness of introduction of the title in the Marcan tradition. How then can we feel sure that the rareness of Kyrios or Kyrie in Mark is an accurate gauge of the familiarity or unfamiliarity of the earliest disciples with these terms?

We now come to the examination of the evidence from Matthew and Luke. It cannot be denied that a great increase in the use of *κύριος* for Jesus along certain lines is perceptible in these Gospels. The vocative *κύριε* as addressed to Jesus occurs twenty-five times in Matthew, not counting the four times of parabolic use with probable indirect reference to Jesus. In Luke it is found nineteen times directly and four times parabolically. This relation of preponderance of the direct over the parabolic use is reversed in regard to the objective *ὁ κύριος* for Jesus within the frame of the Gospel-history. Here Matthew and Luke have each four cases of direct reference, whereas the more or less plain allusions to Jesus as *ὁ κύριος* in parabolic contexts are twelve in Matthew and seven in Luke. As to the use of *ὁ κύριος* by the Evangelists, of this there is but one instance in Matthew, whereas in Luke there are no less than fourteen. In weighing this evidence it ought to be observed that it depends for its force as confirming Bousset's hypothesis on the correctness of his findings in regard to the Logia and Mark. The salient point of the hypothesis is that to the early Palestinian Church Jesus was not yet *ὁ κύριος*. The proof of this cannot be furnished by pointing to a relative increase however great in Matthew over the Logia and Mark; it must from the nature of the case consist in this, that over against *the total absence of the conception and the terms* in the Logia and Mark, a frequent use can be observed in Matthew and Luke. Now we have already shown that on a basis of objective criticism the presence of the conception and the terms in the earliest accessible strata of tradition both in the Logia and Mark must be admitted. It follows, therefore, that the relative increase in Matthew and Luke cannot be utilized to demonstrate the origin of the Kyrios-title in the interval

that lies between the crystallizing of the Logia-Marcan form of the tradition and its Matthaean-Lucan form. It would be possible, of course, so to modify the hypothesis as to place the introduction of the Kyrios-title into Palestinian circles before the definite fixing of the tradition in the Logia and Mark and to maintain that it had originated previously in the Hellenistic Church. In that case the increasing entrance of it into the Gospels would become significant of the growing popularity of a term in principle known from the beginning. But on such a view the extra-Palestinian, Hellenistic origin could only be assumed, no longer proven by induction from the Gospel phenomena. If the title lies back even of the Logia and Mark, there is no telling how old it may be nor what may have been its origin. It may well have come down from the earliest days of the mother-church or for that matter from the time of the ministry of Jesus.

Though, therefore, the examination of this part of the evidence cannot essentially modify our judgment as to Bousset's hypothesis, yet it need not on that account be without value for our further purpose. So far we have confined ourselves strictly to the question what light the Gospel-tradition throws on the existence or non-existence of the Kyrios-title for Jesus in the early Palestinian Church. But back of this lies the more fundamental question, how in view of the Gospel-data we are to judge of the currency or non-currency and further of the possible import of such a title as applied to Jesus during the Gospel-ministry itself. Bousset's denial of the usage in the early church, of course, includes the denial of everything corresponding to it or preparatory for it during the lifetime of Jesus. It is in view of this reaching back of the problem into the life and teaching of Jesus that the phenomena in Matthew and Luke become important. For it will be remembered that, according to Bousset, both Matthew and Luke, the former more sparingly, the latter with great freedom, introduced or substituted Kyrie and Kyrios where

historically there was no basis for this or where some other title of a different kind was given in the original tradition. The change was made under the influence of the later custom to call Jesus "the Lord" in the technical sense and address Him as such.

The question before us is not directly how the increasing use of Kyrios and Kyrie in Matthew and Luke⁴¹ can be explained, but whether it furnishes evidence of a desire or tendency to carry the later technical sense of these terms back into the life of Jesus. In seeking to answer this question we obviously must distinguish between the cases where Matthew and Luke present material not contained in the Logia and Mark and the cases in which they are assumed to have taken their material from the Logia and Mark. It is plain that in cases of the latter kind the introduction of Kyrios and Kyrie or its substitution for another title will be more significant than the emergence of Kyrios and Kyrie in new material. Where the title is added or substituted a definite cause will have to be assumed for this procedure on the part of the later Evangelists; and it may appear possible, perhaps even at first sight plausible, to find this in their familiarity with the technical designation of Christ as Kyrios in their own day. On the other hand where the new material comes under consideration no such definite cause for the appearance of the terms need be looked for, since the possibility exists that in these cases the tradition as it came to the Evangelists already contained them and may even have contained them from the beginning.

With this distinction in mind we shall be prepared to consider in detail the facts presented by Matthew and Luke in a subsequent article.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

⁴¹For convenience' sake we say Matthew and Luke. It is not, of course, necessary *ex hypothesi* to assume that the Evangelists effected the change described. It may have preëxisted in the later form of the tradition incorporated by them in their Gospels.