

Bibl. Diet.

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.

VOLUME I
AARON — KNOWLEDGE

81693

10/4/07

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK
1906

COPYRIGHT, 1906, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

The above copyright notice is for the protection of articles copyrighted in the United States.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, have the sole right of publication of this
DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS in the United States and Canada.

the value and importance He attached to little children themselves. The little one He called to Him and so lovingly embraced (St. Mark's special touch again), was held up to the disciples as an example and guide to greatness. To be great in the kingdom of heaven (Mt 18⁴) it was necessary to have a spirit of simplicity and humility such as was seen in the child in whom self-regard and self-seeking had as yet no place. It is one of our Lord's great paradoxes. To be childlike is to be truly great. The same truth is emphasized in a saying which in varying form is found twice over in each of the Synoptics—the man who wishes to be first shall be last; the man willing to be least shall be great. We here learn further how Jesus regards little children as in a real sense belonging to Him. To receive a little child as belonging to Him, bestowing loving care upon it, is a high service rendered to Him and to God by whom He was sent. In Mt 10⁴⁰⁻⁴² the importance attached to such service is strikingly expressed in the progressive series in which Jesus promises a reward to those who thus receive His messengers—a prophet, a good man, 'one of these little ones.' It is most natural to understand that in using such an expression as the last our Lord actually referred to some children who were hard by when He was speaking. And as here, so in the more extended sayings in Mt 18, whatever the reference to childlike and lowly-minded disciples in general, the words of Jesus must apply to children themselves. The terrible warning of Mt 18⁶ applies to those who hinder such little ones in relation to the kingdom. Though it is not expressly so stated, what is said about receiving children suggests that such a wrong done to any child is as a wrong done to Christ Himself. The preciousness of a little child in the sight of 'our Father in heaven' is emphatically asserted by Jesus in Mt 18¹⁰⁻¹⁴. The children's angels, He says, are ever in the presence of God (v. 10). Whether this remarkable saying be understood as referring to guardian angels or to representative angels (in some way corresponding to the Zoroastrian *fravashis* or 'spiritual counterparts'—see art. by Dr. J. H. Moulton in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July 1902), it clearly declares that no little one is an object of indifference with God, no wrong inflicted upon a child can escape His notice. The closing saying of this group (vv. 12-14) embodies the illustration of the one stray sheep, found in another connexion in Lk 15, and teaches that, whatever ruin may befall 'one of these little ones,' it is not a matter of the Divine pleasure and ordination that even one such should be 'cast as rubbish to the void.' See also art. CHILDREN, which is written from a different standpoint.

LITERATURE.—The various Lives of Christ (Edersheim, Keim, Didon, Farrar, Andrews, D. Smith, etc.); art. BOYHOOD, and EDUCATION; cf. art. 'Education' in Hastings' *DB* and the *Encyc. Biblica*; Brough, *Childhood and Youth of our Lord*; G. A. Coe, *Education in Religion and Morals*, 1904; S. B. Haslett, *Pedagogical Bible School*, 1905; R. Rainy, *Sjourning with God* (1902), p. 151; Doneho, *Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ*; Ramsay, *Education of Christ*; Schäfer, *IJJ*; Wendi, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 48 ff.; G. B. Stevens, *Theology of the NT*, pp. 81, 93.

J. S. CLEMENS.

CHILDREN.—In the regeneration of society which has been wrought by the forces brought into the world by Christianity, the family, of course, has had its part. Or rather, since to Jesus also the family was the social unit, this regeneration began with the family and spread outwards from it. The emphasis laid by our Lord on the institution of the family deserves even to be called extraordinary. Not only did He habitually exhibit sympathy with domestic life in all its phases, and particularly reverence for women and tenderness for children: and not only did He adopt the vocabulary of the family to express the relations

subsisting between Himself and His followers, and even as His choicest vehicle for conveying to them a vitalizing conception of their relations to God, 'from whom,' as that one of His servants who best represents His teaching in this aspect of it declares, 'every family in heaven and on earth is named' (Eph 3¹⁵); but, deserting His customary reserve in dealing with social institutions, in the case of this one alone did He advance beyond general principles to specific legislation. (Cf. F. G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 145 ff.).

This specific legislation does not directly concern children. It is true that childhood owes as much to the gospel as womanhood itself (cf. e.g. Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, p. 182). And the causes of the great revolution which was wrought by the gospel in the condition of children and the estimate placed on childhood, are undoubtedly rooted in the life and teaching of our Lord, and are spread on the pages of the Gospels. But we shall search in vain in the recorded teaching of Jesus for either direct legislation, or even enunciation of general principles regulating the relations of parents and children, or establishing the position of children in the social organism. He has left us no commandments, no declarations, not even exhortations on the subject. He simply moves onward in His course, touching in life, act, word on the domestic relations that were prevalent about Him, and elevating and glorifying everything that He touched. Thus He has handed down to us a new ideal of the family, and lifted to a new plane our whole conception of childhood. (Cf. Shailer Mathews, *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, p. 101 ff.).

The domestic economy which forms the background of Jesus' life, and is assumed in all His dealings with children and in all His allusions to them and their ways, is, of course, the wholesome home-life which had grown up in Israel under the moulding influence of the revelation of the Old Covenant. Its basis was the passionately affectionate Semitic nature, and no doubt certain modifications had come to it from contact with other civilizations; but its form was determined by the tutelage which Jehovah had granted His people. (Cf. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*, chs. vi.-ix., and *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, bk. II. chs. ix. and x.; also Hastings' *DB*, articles 'Child,' 'Family.' For later Jewish child-life see Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, xii.; and, above all, L. Löw, *Die Lebensalter*. Cf. also Ploss, *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Völker*.)

The tender love which the Hebrew parent bore to his child, and the absorbing interest with which he watched and guided its development, doubtless find partial expression in the multiplicity of designations by which the several stages of childhood are marked in that pictorial language. Besides the general terms for 'son' (*ben*) and 'daughter' (*bath*), eight of these have been noted tracing the child from its birth to its maturity: *yeled* (em. *yaldûk*), the 'birthling'; *yônék*, the 'suckling'; *ôlél*, the suckling of a larger growth, perhaps the 'worrier'; *gāmûl*, the 'weanling'; *taph*, the 'toddler'; *elem*, the 'fat one'; *nd'ar*, the 'free one'; *bâhûr*, the 'ripe one.' (So Ham-burger, *RE* i. 642, after whom Edersheim, *Opp. critt.* p. 103 f. and i. p. 221, note 3).

This series of designations may, of course, be more than matched out of the richness of Greek speech. Here the general term of relation, 'child' (**τίτνον*, dimin. **τενονος*), parts into the more specific 'son' (**υἱός*, dimin. *υἱάκιον*, *υἱίδιον*) and 'daughter' (**θυγάτηρ*, dimin. **θυγατρίον*); while the multitude of terms describing stages of growth quite baffles discrimination. The grammarians have handed down to us each his several list, among which that of Alexion (*Enst.* 1788, 22), for instance, enumerates ten stages between the newborn infant and the mature young man: **βριός*; **παιδιον*; **παιδάριον*; *παιδίσκος*; **παῖς*; *παλλὰξ*, or *βουταῖς*, or *ἀντιταῖς*, or *μυλίσταβος*; *ἰσχυβος*; *μειράκιον* or *μειράξ*; **νεανίσκος*; **νεκνίσις*. Needless to say, the sequences of such lists cannot be taken too strictly. And equally needless to say, they by no means exhaust the synonymy.

* Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.

arms (Mk 10¹⁶, cf. 9³⁶). His allusions to children in His teaching reflect the closeness of His observation of them. He celebrates the delight of the mother in her baby, obliterating even the pangs of birth (Jn 16²¹): the fostering love of the father who cuddles his children up with him in bed (Lk 11⁷); the parental affection which listens eagerly to the child's every request, and knows how to grant it only things that are good (Mt 7⁹, Lk 11¹¹⁻¹³). He notes the wayward impulses of children at play (Mt 11¹⁶, Lk 7³²). He feels the weight of woe that is added to calamities in which the children also are involved (Mt 18²⁵); and places among the supremest tests of loyalty to Him, the preference of Him even to one's children (Mt 19²³, Lk 14²⁶ 18²⁰; cf. Mk 10²⁹).

A number of His miracles, worked for the benefit of the young, illustrate His compassion for their sufferings and ills. The nobleman's son at Capernaum, whose healing Jesus wrought as a second sign when He came out of Judaea into Galilee (Jn 4⁴⁶⁻⁵⁴), was at least a 'child' (παῖς, 4⁵¹), for so the servants call him in cold sobriety; and probably was a 'little child' (4⁴⁹), although it is, of course, possible that on the lips of the father the diminutive expresses tenderness of affection rather than of age. The possessed 'boy' (παῖς, Mt 17¹⁸, Lk 9⁴²)—the only son of his father (Lk 9²⁸)—whom Jesus healed as He came down from the Mount of Transfiguration (Mt 17¹⁴⁻²¹, Mk 9¹⁴⁻²⁹, Lk 9³⁷⁻⁴³), and whose affliction had dated from his earliest infancy (ἐκ παιδῶθεν, Mk 9²¹), was more certainly distinctively a 'little child' (Mk 9²⁴). Jairus' 'little daughter' (θυγάτριον, Mk 5²³)—also an only one—whom Jesus raised from the dead in such dramatic circumstances (Mt 9¹⁸⁻²⁶, Mk 5²²⁻⁴³, Lk 8⁴¹⁻⁵⁶) and who is spoken of in the narratives indifferently as 'child' (παῖς, Lk 8⁵¹⁻⁵⁴), 'little child' (παιδίον, Mk 5³⁰⁻⁴¹) and 'maiden' or 'girl' (κοράσιον, Mt 9²⁴⁻²⁵, Mk 5⁴¹; ταλιθά, Mk 5⁴¹), we know to have been about twelve years old (Lk 8⁴²). We are not told the exact age of the 'little daughter' (θυγάτριον, Mk 7²⁵)—here probably the word is the diminutive of age, not of affection, as it occurs in the narrative, not the conversation) of the Syrophenician woman; but we note that St. Mark calls her also distinctively a 'little child' (παιδίον, 7³⁰). The only son of the widow of Nain (Lk 7¹¹⁻¹⁵), the desolate state of whose bereft mother roused so deeply the pity of our Lord (7¹³), is addressed indeed as a 'young man' (νεανίσκος, 7¹⁴), a term so broad that it need imply no more than that he was in his prime; but the suggestion of the narrative certainly seems to be that he was in his youthful prime (7¹⁵). Thus is rounded out a series of miracles in which our Lord shows His pity to the growing youth of every stage of development.

When on that great day on the shores of Genesaret Jesus appeared to His disciples and gave to His repentant Apostle His last exhortation, He commanded him not merely 'Feed my sheep,' but also 'Feed my lambs.' Though the language, doubtless, rather expresses His love for His flock than distributes it into constituent classes, we may be permitted to see in it also the richness of our Lord's sympathy for the literal lambs of His fold. Certainly He provided in His kingdom a place for every age, and met the spiritual needs of each. Touching illustrations of this are offered us at the two end stages of youthful development (Lk 18¹⁵ βρέφος; Mt 19²⁰ νεανίσκος), in the blessing of little children and the probing of the rich young ruler's heart, which are brought into immediate contiguity in all three of the Synoptics as if they were intended to be taken together as a picture of our Lord's dealing with youth as a whole, perhaps even as together illustrating the great truth that in the kingdom of God the question is not of the

hour of entrance,—first or eleventh,—but of the will of the Master, who doeth what He will with His own (Mt 20¹²).

What is particularly to be borne in mind with respect to the blessing of the little children (Mt 19¹³⁻¹⁵, Mk 10¹³⁻¹⁶, Lk 18¹⁵⁻¹⁷), is that these 'little children' (παιδιά, Mt 19¹³⁻¹⁴, Mk 10¹³⁻¹⁴, Lk 18¹⁶) were distinctively 'babies' (βρέφη, Lk 18¹⁵). Therefore they needed to be received by Jesus 'in his arms' (Mk 10¹⁶); and only from this circumstance, indeed, can all the details of the narrative be understood. It is from this, for example, that the interference of the disciples, which called out the Master's rebuke, 'Let the little children come to me; forbid them not,' receives its explanation. The disciples, to speak briefly, had misapprehended the nature of the Lord's mission: they were regarding Him fundamentally as a teacher sent from God, who also healed the afflicted; and they conceived it to be their duty in the overstrain to which He was subjected to protect Him from needless drafts on His time and strength by the intrusion of those needing no healing and incapable of instruction. It seemed to them out of the question that 'even the babies' (Lk 18¹⁵) should be thrust upon His jaded attention. They should have known better; and Jesus was indignant that they did not know better (Mk 10¹⁴), and took this occasion to manifest Himself as the Saviour of infants also. Taking them in His arms and fervently invoking a blessing upon them (Mk 10¹⁶ *κατελόγει*), He not only asserted for them a part in His mission, but even constituted them the type of the children of the kingdom. 'Let the little children come unto me,' He says; 'forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.' And then proceeding with the solemn 'Verily'—'Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein' (Mk 10¹⁴⁻¹⁵, Lk 18¹⁶⁻¹⁷; cf. Mt 19¹⁴).

Wherein this childlikeness, in which alone the kingdom of God can be received, consists, lies on the face of the narrative. Certainly not in the innocence of childhood, as if the purpose were to announce that only the specially innocent can enter the kingdom of God. Our Lord was accustomed to declare, on the contrary, that He came to call not the righteous but sinners, to seek and save that which was lost: and the contradiction with the lesson of the publican and the Pharisee praying in the temple, which immediately precedes this narrative in Luke, would be too glaring. But neither can it consist in the humility of childhood, if, indeed, we can venture to speak of the most egoistic age of human life as characteristically humble; nor yet in its simplicity, its artlessness, ingenuousness, directness, as beautiful as these qualities are, and as highly esteemed as they certainly must be in the kingdom of God. We cannot even suppose it to consist in the trustfulness of childhood, although we assuredly come much nearer to it in this, and no image of the children of the kingdom could be truer than that afforded by the infant lying trustfully upon its mother's breast. But, in truth, it is in no disposition of mind, but rather in a condition of nature, that we must seek the characterizing peculiarity of these infants whom Jesus sets forth as types of the children of the kingdom. Infants of days (βρέφη, Lk 18¹⁵) have no characteristic disposition of mind; and we must accordingly leave the subjective sphere and find the childlikeness which Jesus presents as the condition of the reception (not acquisition) of the kingdom in an objective state; in a word, in the helplessness, or, if you will, the absolute dependence of infancy. What our Lord would seem to say, therefore, when He declares, 'Of such is the kingdom of God,' is, briefly, that

those of whom the kingdom of God is made up are, relatively to it, as helplessly dependent as babies are in their mothers' arms. The children of the kingdom enter it as children enter the world, stripped and naked,—infants, for whom all must be done, not who are capable of doing.

There was another occasion on which even more formally Jesus proclaimed to His disciples childlikeness as the essential characteristic of the children of the kingdom (Mt 18¹⁻⁴, Mk 9³³⁻³⁷, Lk 9⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸). The disciples had been disputing among themselves who of them should be greatest. Jesus, calling to Him a little child, placed it in their midst and said, 'Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.' There could not have been uttered a more pointed intimation that the kingdom of heaven is given, not acquired; that men receive it, not deserve it. As children enter the world, so men enter the kingdom, with no contributions in their hands. We are not, indeed, told in this narrative, in express words, that the child thus made the type of the children of God was a 'newborn baby' (βρέφος): it is called only a 'little child' (παιδίον). But its extreme infancy is implied: Jesus took it in His arms (Mk 9³⁶) when He presented it to the observation of His disciples; and we must accordingly think of it as a baby in a baby's helplessness and dependence.

We do, to be sure, find in our Lord's further words a requisition of humility (Mt 18⁴): 'Whoever then shall humble himself like this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.' To become like a little child may certainly involve humility in one who is not a child; and it is very comprehensible that our Lord should therefore tell those whom He was exhorting to approach the kingdom of heaven like little children, that they could do so only by humbling themselves. But this is not the same as declaring humility to be the characteristic virtue of childhood, or as intimating that humility may ground a claim upon the kingdom of heaven. What our Lord seems to tell His followers is that they cannot enter the kingdom He came to found except they turn and become like little children; and that they can become like little children only by humbling themselves; and that therefore when they were quarrelling about their relative greatness, they were far from the disposition which belongs to children of the kingdom. Humility seems to be represented, in a word, not as the characterizing quality of childhood or of childlikeness, but rather as the attitude of heart in which alone we can realize in our consciousness that quality which characterizes childhood. That quality is conceived here also as helplessness, while childlikeness consists in the reproduction in the consciousness of the objective state of utter dependence on God which is the real condition of every sinner.

From the point of view thus revealed in object-lesson and discourse, it was natural for our Lord to speak of His disciples as 'babes.' 'I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth,' He cries on one momentous occasion (Mt 11²⁵, Lk 10²¹), 'that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes' (νηπίους, the implication of which is precisely weakness and neediness). And then He proceeds with a great declaration the very point of which is to contrast His sovereign power with the neediness of those whom He calls to His service. Similarly as the end approached and the children (παιδες) in the temple were greeting Him with hosannas, He met the indignant challenge of the Jews with the words of the Psalmist: 'Yea, did ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou

hast ordained praise?' (Mt 21¹⁶). The meaning is that these childish hosannas were typical of the praises rising from the hearts of those childlike ones from whose helplessness (because they owed much to Him) His true praise should spring.

From the more general view-point of affection our Lord derived the terms by which He expressed His personal relations to His followers, and a large part of the vocabulary of His proclamation of the kingdom of God is drawn from the relationships of the family. His disciples are His 'children' (τέκνα, Mk 10²⁴), or with increasing tenderness of expression, His 'little children' (τεκνία, Jn 13³³), His 'babies' (παιδιά, Jn 21⁵), and perhaps with even more tenderness still, simply His 'little ones' (οἱ μικροί, Mt 10⁴² etc., but see art. LITTLE ONES). Similarly the great King, whose kingdom He came to establish, is the Father of His people; and they may therefore be free from all fear, because, naturally, it is the good pleasure of their Father to give the kingdom to them (Lk 12³²). Every turn of expression is freely employed to carry home to the hearts of His followers the sense of the Fatherly love for them by Him who is their King indeed, but also their Father which is in heaven (Mt 5^{16, 45, 48}, 6^{1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18}, 6³², 7¹¹ 10^{20, 29}, 13⁴³, 23⁹, Mk 11²⁵, Lk 6³⁵, 11¹³, 12^{30, 32}, Jn 20¹⁷); and they accordingly His sons (Mt 5^{9, 45}, Lk 20³⁶), His children (Jn 1¹², 11⁵²), and therefore heirs of His kingdom. In this representation, which finds its most striking expression in such parables as that of the Prodigal Son (Lk 15¹¹), it is, to be sure, rather the relationship of father and child that is emphasized than the tenderness of the age of childhood. Neither is it a novelty introduced by our Lord; it finds its root in Old Testament usage. But it is so characteristic of our Lord's teaching that it may fairly be said that the family was to His mind the nearest of human analogues to the order that obtains in the kingdom of God, and the picture which He draws of the relations that exist between God and His people is largely only a 'transfiguration of the family.'

Such an employment of the relationships in the family to figure forth those that exist between God and His people could not fail to react on the conceptions which men formed of the family relationships themselves. By His constant emphasis on the Fatherhood of God, and by His employment of the helplessness of infancy and the dependence of childhood as the most vivid emblems provided by human society to image the dependence of God's people on His loving protection and fostering care, our Lord has thrown a halo over the condition of childhood which has communicated to it an emotional value and a preciousness, in the strictest sense, new in the world. In the ancient world, children, though by their innocence eliciting the affection, and by their weakness appealing to the sympathy, of their elders, were thought of chiefly as types of immaturity and unripeness. The Christian world, taught by its Lord, reverences their very helplessness as the emblem of its own condition in the presence of God, and recognizes in their dependence an appeal to its unselfish devotion, that it may be an imitator of God. This salutary respect and consideration for childhood has no doubt been exaggerated at times to something very much like worship of the childlike; and this tendency has been powerfully fostered by the prevalence in sections of Christendom, since the 14th cent., of an actual cult of the infant Saviour (cf. E. Martinengo-Carresco in *The Contemporary Review*, lxxvii. 117, etc.), and the early rise and immense development in the same quarters of a cult of the Madonna, to the tender sentiments underlying which all the resources of the most passionate devotion, the most elevated literature, and the most

perfect art have been invoked to give widespread influence (see especially Zöckler, art. *Maria die Mutter des Herrn* in *PRE*³, xii. 309, etc., who gives an extensive classified bibliography. Cf. in general H. E. Scudder, *Childhood in Art*, also in *The Atlantic Monthly*, lv. and lvi.). Such exaggerations cannot, however, obscure the main fact that it is only from Jesus that the world has learned properly to appreciate and wholesomely to deal with childhood and all that childhood stands for. Cf. art. CHILDHOOD.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

CHILDREN OF GOD.—The teaching of Jesus Christ about the children of God cannot be understood apart from His teaching about the Fatherhood of God: indeed, it is from the latter standpoint that it must be approached. In such an approach the main positions seem to be as follows:—

(1) Jesus asserts absolutely the fatherly nature of God. His use of the name 'Father' implies that the fatherly nature is eternal in God. God does not become Father; He is 'the Father.' All knowledge of God is deficient which does not 'know the Father' (Mt 11²⁷, Jn 14⁶⁻¹¹). This fatherly nature of God necessarily manifests itself in all God's dealings. He cannot be other than Father, and 'he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust' (Mt 5⁴⁵).

(2) This eternal Fatherhood in God is complemented by an eternal Sonship in God. Jesus used habitually the name 'My Father.' It implied a special relationship between the Father and Himself, which is summed up by John, 'The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father' (Jn 1¹⁸).

(3) The fatherly heart of God does not rest satisfied in the eternal Sonship in God. He desires the response of filial love from all who are capable of giving it (cf. esp. Lk 15¹⁻³², Jn 4²⁵). Jesus assumed that the filial attitude is expected from all men. This is implied in His method of teaching. The Divine Fatherhood is woven into its texture. Therefore the picture of God the Father is offered to everybody, with its necessary appeal to the hearer to enjoy the filial relationship. Since the outlook of the gospel is universal, the sonship may be universal. Even 'publicans and sinners' may enjoy the filial feeling.

(4) But Jesus taught plainly that this filial attitude is not general amongst men. He told the Jews that they were of their father the devil (Jn 8⁴⁴), and distinguished 'the good seed, the sons of the kingdom,' from 'the tares, the sons of the evil one' (Mt 13³⁸); cf. also Mt 23¹³⁻³³.

(5) Certain conditions are laid down as essential to the enjoyment of the filial relationship to God. These conditions are usually described by Jesus in terms of character. The children of God are 'peacemakers,' are those who love their enemies, and who do the will of the Father (cf. Mt 5⁹⁻⁴⁴ 12⁵⁰); they 'do good and lend, never despairing,' and are 'merciful' (Lk 6^{35, 36}). But in the discourses in John's Gospel, Jesus Himself is offered as a touchstone for the filial relationship (cf. Jn 8⁴²⁻⁴⁷). In this connexion the demand for the new birth must be noticed. Jesus connected entrance into that Kingdom which He came to found, with being 'born anew' (Jn 3³); He demanded that His disciples should be converted and become as little children if they would enter the Kingdom (Mt 18³ ||). It may fairly be said that in the mind of Jesus there is an intimate connexion between these two modes of teaching. The moral character befitting the children of God is secured by the new birth 'of water and of the Spirit' (Jn 3⁵).

From these propositions we can gather the teach-

ing of Jesus about the children of God. The relationship is apprehended by Jesus ethically, not physically. To identify Divine sonship with human birth brings the relationship down to the physical sphere. Jesus kept it in the religious sphere. The Fatherhood of God is an ethical attitude eternally present in the Godhead; man's Divine sonship is his ethical response to this Divine Fatherhood. God is ever waiting to welcome men as sons, and to give them the position of sons at home (Lk 15). But their assumption of this filial position depends upon their adoption of the filial attitude, 'I will arise and go to my father.' As Wendt says, 'God does not become the Father, but is the heavenly Father, even of those who become His sons. . . . Man is a true son of God . . . from the fact of his comporting himself as a son of God' (*Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 193).

This religious attitude which betokens Divine sonship, includes four elements. (a) Children of God love their heavenly Father. Love is the golden bond in all home relationships. Jesus declares it to be the sovereign law in the true relationship between man and God. For He taught that the greatest commandment is to love the Lord our God with all our heart and soul and mind and strength (Mt 22³⁷, Lk 10²⁷). When claiming to have come forth from God, He said to the Jews: 'If God were your father ye would love me,' where love of Himself is identified with love of the Father whom He revealed.

(b) Children of God obey their heavenly Father. This is implied in all Jesus' exhortations to men to do the will of God. It is clearly stated in these sentences: 'Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother' (Mt 12⁵⁰); '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); cf. also Mt 21³¹ 24⁴⁵ ||.

(c) Children of God trust their heavenly Father. This mark of Divine sonship is emphasized in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus exhorts His disciples not to be as the Gentiles, but to rely upon their heavenly Father's knowledge of their needs and His desire to help them. Anxiety must be banished from the hearts of God's children, who are fed and clothed by their Father (Mt 6²⁵⁻³⁴, Lk 6²²⁻³⁴).

(d) Children of God try to be like their heavenly Father. They are to be perfect, even as their heavenly Father is perfect (Mt 5⁴⁸). This must not be interpreted, as it often is, 'Be as perfect as your Father.' Its exhortation is to take the fatherly character of God as the standard of perfection. 'Be ye perfect, even as He is perfect.' The Father loves all men: let His children do likewise. By thus taking the fatherly character of God as the standard, His children will fulfil the second great law, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Mt 22³⁹). The natural man adopts other ideals of perfection; but the children of God try to be like their Father.

Jesus gave immortal expression to the desires characteristic of the children of God, in 'the Lord's Prayer.' That prayer is put into the lips of those who can say 'Our Father which art in heaven.' It includes all the marks of God's children that have been found elsewhere in the teaching of Jesus. The hallowing of the Father's name implies the sanctification of His children after His likeness. The prayer 'Thy will be done' lifts us to the loftiest level of obedience. Only those who trust God can pray 'Give us our daily bread,' and can limit their desires for material good to such humble bounds. The prayer breathes throughout the spirit of love: that spirit is the warp into which the weft of the petition is woven.