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HERE is a striking change of phrase in the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew. The Lord employs two different modes of expression to describe His Parousia or "Coming." In one instance, it is said: "They shall see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; and He shall send forth His angels with the great voice of a trumpet; and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds." ¹ In all the other instances—five in number—nothing is said about this attendant feature of "glory," nothing about "the angels" or their assembling of the elect, but simply that "the Son of Man cometh," ² "the Lord shall come," ³ or "so shall be the coming of the Son of Man." ⁴

Has the word "come" the same unchanging sense in these three forms of expression? Is there no difference between the picture of the Son of Man gloriously coming to gather all the elect and the picture of the Lord's return to His individual servants singly? Is the insertion of "glory" in one instance, and its omission in all the others, a literary accident of passing moment? When the "coming of the Son of Man" was divided off from the "coming of the Son of Man in glory with His angels"—did this halving of the quotation mean nothing particular in the mind of a writer who took such literary liberties as this, with a sacred phrase of prophecy? Or—was the difference in phrasing purposely designed to report the Lord as speaking, not of one event only, but of two, perhaps even three? Questions these, which no scholar may rightfully object to raising, so great is their bearing on the whole course of New Testament interpretation, whichever way the answer may eventually be found to run.

It is usual with Biblical scholars to take these varying

¹ Matt. xxiv. 30, 31.  ² Matt. xxiv. 44.  ³ Matt. xxiv. 42, 46, 50.  ⁴ Matt. xxiv. 27, 37, 39.
forms of expression as referring to one and the same event—the Second Advent, the Final Return; and much of the baffling mystery with which the whole Gospel is made to fill comes for the most part from their having been so taken. But what if this interpretation should prove itself ill-founded? What if the Return be not the meaning either intended or conveyed by the shorter expression: "The coming of the Son of Man?" What if we should find that its point of reference is history, not eschatology; the public inauguration of the New Kingdom on the ruins of the Old, not the consummation of both together at the time commonly expected? What if it be textually and critically capable of proof, that nothing was further from the mind of St. Matthew when he employed this expression, than the thought or expectation of the Lord's personal Return?

It must be confessed that this exegetical possibility has but little at first sight to commend its entertaining. A writer who declares, to all appearances at least, that the Son of Man will come in glory immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, can hardly be presumed to have drawn much distinction, if any, between the inaugurated and the consummated Kingdom. But is the twenty-fourth chapter of the First Gospel self-interpreting? May not the discourse with which it is taken up have the key to its thought and language in the chapters that precede? And in any event, would it not be safer to make a special study of these two phrases in the other portions of the First Gospel before presuming upon our ability to understand them at sight in the twenty-fourth chapter? St. Matthew, interpreted by himself, is a safer guide to follow than our own subjective impressions, or the whole host of contemporaries whose opinion he is supposed to share. Twice already has he told us, through the contexts which surround his borrowed phrasing, that surface indications are likely to lead astray. Somewhere, we feel sure, in the course of his theme's unfolding, he will also give us to understand whether two quite separate events were in his mind, or one only, when he wrote of "the coming of the Son of Man" and "the coming of the Son of Man in glory," with the angels in His train.

It is a most engaging quest, this study of the language of

---

8 Matt. xxiv. 29.
9 St. Matthew and the Parousia. The Catholic World, February and March, 1918.
St. Matthew and the thought which it shadows forth. Nothing pertinent greets us in the first nine chapters of his Gospel. Not till the tenth is reached do we find the "coming" mentioned; and the circumstances of its first mentioning are so strange that many think it out of place—a dislocated document. The Lord is warning His disciples to expect suffering and persecution when they go forth to give testimony to His name; and at the end of the admonition, He disbosoms Himself of this solemn assurance: "Amen. I say to you, you shall not finish the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man come."

What does it mean? That the Lord shall visibly return to earth in glory, before His disciples shall have had time to go through Israel, with His name upon their lips? There is not the slightest indication from the context that such is, or is not, the meaning, though many so interpret it, on the ground that the obvious tenor of the words will bear no other reading. But may not words, and these words in particular, have a meaning the very reverse of obvious? Is it not well within the bounds of the possible, if not of the likely, from what we have already found in the two immediately preceding studies, that the phrase may mean the fulfillment of prophecy in a new and unexpected manner? In that case, an appeal to the obvious would be the wrong way of going about its understanding, since the clues of meaning are not in the words themselves directly regarded, nor in the sources from which they are quoted, but in the new interpretation which the Great Teacher gave them—a fact to be determined in every instance, from the context of the Gospel, not from the thought that went before. The proper attitude in literary circumstances like these is to suspend judgment respecting the location and meaning of the verse in question, until such time as it shall be known with surety, from evidence elsewhere gathered, whether the language here employed has old thought or new within its folds. To proceed upon the supposition that the Lord's personal Return to earth in the near future must have been the idea which St. Matthew had in mind when this mysterious verse was written is to presume the equivalence of the two phrases: "the coming of the Son of Man" and the coming of the Son of Man in "glory"—the very point which is in dispute. Instead of hazarding an impressionistic judgment, we shall leave this

\[Matt. x. 23.\]
text uninterpreted for the moment, hoping to return to it later with a key.

Have we the spark of meaning that fires the train, the kindly light that shimmers through the gloom, in a couplet of verses which we are now about to consider? They impress the searcher as of more significance to the present quest than almost anything else in the First Gospel; and one of them has about it all the beckoning invitations of a clue. The verses occur at the end of an instructive context where the Jewish preconception of theMessias comes into conflict with the unexpected teaching of the Lord. Jesus is proving from the prophets that He must go to Jerusalem, there to suffer many things of the priests and Scribes, when St. Peter, shocked beyond measure at the mention of death as part of the Messianic programme, undertakes to rebuke the Lord for this ill-beseeming utterance. To the impetuous Head of the Apostolic College, as, indeed, to all the Twelve, nothing could have been more abhorrent than the thought of death in connection with the Messias. It was opposed to the whole trend of Jewish speculation, at variance with the popular expectancy, out of keeping with the power and dignity of the Elect One, and at odds with the current doctrine of salvation. Death? It simply could not be. The Christ, when He came, was to come as its glorious overcomer, never, even for a time, to be subject to its sting. The Christ, when He came, would put an end to man's mortality, and reign forever at Jerusalem with the resurrected Just. No violent hand of priest or people could ever be laid upon the Anointed of the Lord, the Holy One Who was never "to see corruption," and over Whom the shielding mantle of Almightyness would forever drop its folds.

Imagine St. Peter's surprise, therefore, when the Lord instantly rebuked him for not "savoring the things which are of God, but those which are of men." Imagine his still keener disappointment when the Lord proceeded to describe physical death, not as something to be saved from, when the Kingdom came, but as the very portal of entrance into everlasting life itself. Christ corrects the whole Jewish conception of death before His astonished hearers, telling them not only that "he who loses his life for My sake shall find it," but also that persecution and mortality are not to cease when the King-

* Matt. xvi. 27, 28.
dom comes. These liabilities shall continue as before; and
whoso would remain in His following must take up his cross
in like manner and be prepared to suffer unto the end for His
name's sake. If St. Peter felt a shock of surprise at the
thought of the Lord's going to a death of shame on the wood
of the tree, his disenchantment was not lessened but increased,
when the Master exacted a like readiness on the part of His
chosen ones, as the price of their discipleship, nay, even of
their membership in the Kingdom. Ignominy and buffetings
and forfeiture of life stood forth as His appointed portion and
as theirs.

It was in this tense moment of shattered dreams and col-
lapsed expectancies, of vanished glory and of looming shame,
that the Lord gave utterance to two statements which seem
to us to be leading lights. After asking "What doth it profit
a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"
Christ immediately declares: "For the Son of Man 'shall'
come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then shall
He render to every man according to his works. Amen I say
to you, there are some of them that stand here who shall not
taste death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His King-
dom." 10

What is the textual relation of these two verses? Do they
connect the Lord's personal reappearance with His "coming
in His Kingdom?" Biblical critics see no alternative to this
conclusion. The verse which describes the coming in glory is
introduced in the Greek text by a near-future verb; and this,
they tell us, is the clearest of indications that the author ex-
pected the Return at the end of the Jewish age. The argu-
ment seemed well-founded, until investigation sapped it of
all base. 11 The supposed near-future verb was found to be a
verb of prophetic necessity instead, without any intended
reference to the nearness of the event described; and when
this fact stood forth in its truly leading light and import, the
accepted view of criticism lost one of its staunchest props.
Another prop vanished when the phrase, "end of the age"
was examined. Textual and critical considerations cleared
it of all association with the current thought of Judaism, nay,
established the fact of its reëmployment in a new and non-

10 Matt. xvi. 27, 28.
Jewish sense. The angels, it was discovered, are not said to go forth at the end of the age of Israel, but at the end of the age of the "Kingdom of Heaven," when its world-wide course is run. So that if previous results may be taken for pillars of guidance in reaching a conclusion, the author of the First Gospel had no intention of reasserting the eschatology of Palestine when he placed these two verses alongside in the sixteenth chapter.

But if the verses were not written to connect the "coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom" and His "coming in the glory of His Father"—were they written to disconnect these two events and to draw a distinction between them, not drawn before? It must be confessed that this is the first thought which suggests itself when the supposed grammatical connection of the verses melts away in the light of criticism. The dominating idea of the context in which the verses are found is the new interpretation of prophecy by Jesus. The Lord is portrayed as opening up the Scriptures afresh to the astonished Twelve. His corrective teaching is clearly indicated by the words: "From that time Jesus began to show"—a statement that would have no meaning, if the sum of existing opinion was about to be reaffirmed. And the future, as Jesus reveals it, is evidently not to the liking of His company; the new world-view not nearly so attractive as the old. The Chief of the Apostles protests against the forecast of the Master. He is manifestly disappointed at the thought of the Lord's not coming in glory, at the thought that He is not to triumph over His enemies, as all Palestine expected, but to be led like a lamb to the slaughter, without opening His lips to complain. And Jesus is evidently disengaging His new revelation from the doctrine of the schools, when He rebukes St. Peter for preferring the speculations of men to the Word of God. There is to be no exemption from death among His followers, no immediate Messianic Reign of glory over all the enemies of good. "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. . . . For the Son of Man shall, indeed, come, as prophesied, in the glory of His Father, and then shall He render to every man according to

---


Matt. xvi. 21.

Matt. xvi. 23.

Matt. xix. 28, no contradiction of this statement.
his works," even unto being ashamed of those who were ashamed of Him and the word of doctrine which He brought.\textsuperscript{18}

These two statements are connected. Three causative particles tie them together in all three accounts, as may be seen in the connective "for's" with which the verses are introduced.\textsuperscript{17} But—what is greatly to our present point—the verse about the Lord’s "coming in His Kingdom" is disconnected from the verse about His Second Advent, and made an independent utterance. All the reports so have it; grammatically the case is beyond all doubt.\textsuperscript{19} And, therefore, the scientific conclusion follows that St. Matthew, in these two verses, faithfully reports the disconnection which Jesus taught between His "coming in His Kingdom" and His "coming in the glory of His Father." The Lord’s own words themselves are recoverable in the present condition of the documents, notwithstanding existing opinion to the contrary.\textsuperscript{19}

When the relationship of the verses in dispute is thus slowly distilled from the surrounding context, the thought which instantly appears is a continuation of the idea already found expressed in the thirteenth chapter: the putting-off of the coming in glory, and the deferral of the Judgment, from the beginning of the Messianic Era to its close.\textsuperscript{20} The Lord is here announcing a doctrine that did not exist in the previous thought of Palestine: the doctrine of the Second Coming. The Jew had been educated to no such forecast of history as this. When the Christ came, He might disappear for a fractional while; but that He would come twice—the first time to establish the Kingdom, the second time to "gather out of it all scandals and them that work iniquity" \textsuperscript{21}—such a redistribution of events was neither taught nor expected by the official theologians of Israel. It is a doctrine plainly not of Jewry, but of Jesus, and the mere fact of its mention in the pages of the First Gospel shows the un-Jewish character of the teaching which is there set down. A suspect expression in the thirteenth chapter,\textsuperscript{22} another suspect expression in the six-


\textsuperscript{17} Matt. xvi. 25, 26, 27; Luke ix. 24, 25, 26; Mark viii. 35, 36, 37, 38.

\textsuperscript{19} ἅμα λέγει δὲ ἵνα.—Matt. xvi. 28; Καὶ Εὐαγγ. αὐτοῦ.—Mark viii. 39; Λέγω δὲ διὰ τὸ διδαχόμενος.—Luke ix. 27.

\textsuperscript{20} Theology of the New Testament, Stevens, pp. 150-166.


\textsuperscript{22} Matt. xiii. 41.
teenth, have unfortunately kept this distinguishing feature from the recognition which is its due. We have mistaken corrective teaching for the old eschatology of Palestine, and connected two events which Jesus and His disciples insistently put asunder.

That the Saviour quoted the phrase about the "coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom," to correct the beliefs of His hearers, and not to make these beliefs His own, appears even more clearly when we study the mental situation which had to be met and faced by a Teacher of the new. The audience to which the Saviour spoke and St. Matthew wrote, shrank from the thought that anything could possibly not happen which had been divinely foretold to come. The persuasion that history is the realization of prophecy, and that its course can know no swerving from the path which the prophets drew, stood like a sentinel truth before the minds of nearly all. Whoever undertook to speak or write to such an audience had to address himself particularly to this persuasion and wrap his new message, if he had one, in the old, prophetic language of the Seers. He would suffer an instant challenging, did his utterances seem to leave even a minor prophecy unfulfilled, as the Lord Himself was, on a celebrated occasion, while coming down with His disciples from the Holy Mount.

There was one prophecy dearer, perhaps, than any other to priests and people, the non-fulfillment of which would not be tolerated in any teaching, it was so inwoven for the Jew with the word of God itself. This was the golden prophecy of Daniel, which seemed to hold out the promise, that at the end of the Jewish days, when the power of the "holy people" was broken and their band dispersed, "One like unto a Son of Man would come on the clouds of heaven, to receive power, and glory, and a Kingdom—a Kingdom in which all peoples, tribes, and tongues should serve Him without end." "I beheld in the vision of the night, and lo, there came upon the clouds of heaven One like unto a Son of Man; and He came even to the Ancient of Days; and they presented Him before Him. And He gave Him power, and glory, and a Kingdom; and all peoples, tribes, and tongues shall serve Him: His power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away;

---

22 Matt. xvi. 27.
23 "Dominion," "sovereignty."
and His Kingdom one that shall not be destroyed.” In the eyes of a folk bred to look upon history as the faithful echo of prophecy, Daniel’s vision of the Parousia was bound to become reality when the ancient seat of David fell a prey to the heathen arms.

How was Jesus to prove Himself the fulfillment of this prophecy, and how was the author of the First Gospel to set Him forth as such? The Messias had been prophesied to come at the end of the Kingdom of Israel; but as a matter of fact, He had appeared early within the generation that was to live to see it, and had ascended to the Father some two score years before the Government fell. The point that needed proving was the truth of the predictions concerning the Parousia at the end of Israel’s days. And when we turn to the pages of the First Gospel, we find the “coming of the Son of Man” six times mentioned in connection with the destruction of the City, or the generation then living—exactly what we have just been led to expect from a study of the audience and its inherited point of view. The Pharisaic schools had mistaken the closeness of events in prophetic vision for their nearness in time, and Jesus was soon to apprise them of their error. He who had not come to destroy, but to fulfill, early assured the people that “all things” relative to Israel “would be brought to pass.” Even some of those standing by—St. Mark says the statement was addressed to the crowd—would not be gathered to their fathers, “till they saw the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom.” The assurance is most categorical and solemn.

But when we look with sharpened eyes into the structure and running of the text, we find that an unprecedented thing has happened: Jesus has divided the prophecies concerning the end of Israel into two distinct statements, where Palestine saw but one! Owing to that crowded form of predicting events, which was characteristic of Hebrew prophecy and not meant for close temporal sequence, Daniel was understood to say that at the time of the end, “The Son of Man would be given power, and glory, and a Kingdom.” Jesus omits the word “glory” from the quotation, when speaking of the coming of the Son of Man in connection with the fall of Jerusalem. He

---

"Dan. vii. 13, 14.  "Dan. ix. 27.  "Matt. x. 23; xvi. 28; xxiv. 27, 37, 39, 44.

omits it not only here in the sixteenth chapter, but in the tenth, and twenty-fourth as well; nay, in all the six cases above enumerated," where the City is the subject of reference. The only instance where the words "power and glory" are mentioned together in the same verse is in the eschatological discourse, where the Lord is speaking of the end of the world as distinct from the end of Israel." Even in the much-misunderstood reply of Jesus to His judges: "From now on, you shall see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven," the word "glory" is again conspicuously lacking.

Why was the prophecy of Daniel taken apart, and its elements redistributed, in this consistent and studied manner? Why did St. Matthew suppress the word "glory" in the six recorded references to the time of the City's fall? Why does he restore it to the text in the eschatological discourse, when the event described is the Final Return? More pointedly still: If the "coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom" and His "coming in the glory of His Father" meant one and the same event, why did not Jesus say so in the sixteenth chapter? He could easily have restored confidence to the bitterly disappointed Peter by identifying the two "comings." All the circumstances called for this reassuring declaration, if it was in mind. But instead of connecting these two events, Jesus casts them into two separate statements. He tells St. Peter that the Son of Man will deal deservedly with His enemies and "render to every man according to His works, when He comes in the glory of His Father with the angels;" immediately adding that this is not the coming which those about Him are to see."

The near event which the generation shall witness is His "coming in His Kingdom," as distinct from His Return in glory.

It is the Kingdom, therefore, not the Judgment, which draws nigh. The distinction is clear-cut and unmistakable. It is observed with scrupulous exactness from the tenth chapter of the First Gospel to the close. Even the adverb "immediately" of the twenty-fourth chapter does not contradict it, as investigation will later show. We are in the presence of a literary fact the existence of which cannot textually

---

be denied, and the importance of which it would be hard to overestimate. No Jewish reader of the time would any more fail to notice that the Lord had left the word "glory" out, when speaking of His "coming in His Kingdom," than an American audience, familiar with the phrase, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," would fail to marvel at a speaker omitting the word "liberty" in a lecture on the Constitution.

In the light of the evidence thus far gathered, not to speak of a vast deal more to come—who would dare venture to assert that "the coming of the Son of Man," when the words "glory" or the "angels" are not added, was ever intended to mean the visible reappearance of the Lord? A prophetical phrase, which has been divided for separate fulfillment, is not the same in its connotations as before. When Jesus declares that the "Son of Man shall come," as prophesied, "at the end of the Jewish age," it does not follow by any means that He employed the language of prophecy in the Palestinian, pre-Christian sense. New ways of fulfilling prophecy were among the wonders of His teaching. When he announced that "Elias had already come, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they would;" 

"when He declared that the angels would go forth at the end of the age," He was using current language, but not as currently understood. No one had identified the Baptist with Elias, until Jesus did so to the bewildered Twelve; nor had anyone dreamt of extending the "end of the age," from the last days of Israel to the close of an historical era yet to be. Those who knew the quoted sources far better than we, were struck by the newness of meaning which Jesus gave them. It was a feature that wrung comment even from His enemies. The officers sent by the Pharisees to apprehend Him came back empty-handed from their quest, pleading in excuse of their unaccomplished mission, that "never did man speak as He," and on a topic related to the present subject. "He would see them again," He told them, "after a little while." The Saviour taught the fulfilment of prophecy in a way and manner to which neither priests nor people looked; and all the scientific evidence thus far gathered concerning His use of the prophetical quotation about the "coming of the Son of Man" compels us to regard it as an-

other effective instance of His novel manner of teaching. The very fact that a distinction is made between "coming in the Kingdom" and "coming in glory" proves conclusively that existing opinion is not being reaffirmed by Master or disciples. What the scholar finds reasserted is the fulfillment of the entire prophecy of Daniel eventually, not at once. The part that has reference to the Kingdom will be realized within the generation; the part that deals with the Messianic Reign of glory is postponed. Jesus has lengthened out the crowded perspective of the Seers; and by so doing, has revealed the inner defect of Palestinian speculation.

The signal fact in the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew is the divided fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy there recorded. Out of its three component elements—power, glory, and a Kingdom—\(^{40}\) the Saviour selects the third for immediate realization, reserving the full accomplishment of the other two elements to a time when "the Gospel shall have been preached in the whole inhabited earth." \(^{41}\) The third element—"Kingdom"—which Jesus thus made so prominent by quoting it in severance from its companion element "glory," meant a very unwelcome prospect to a band of hearers whose daily bread was the literature of the Seers. The omission of the word "glory" in the Lord's references to the "Kingdom" changed the whole meaning of the "coming" from love to wrath, from favor to destruction. The verb "come" in the usage of the Old Testament, as they only too well knew, was associated with the exercise of destructive power. "Stir up Thy might and come to save us," was not a favorable utterance when divorced from the idea of rehabilitation, and set over against the idea of "glory." "Come" meant here, as in many other instances,\(^{42}\) a public show of mightiness, a didactic exhibition of avenging power, which would strike terror to the hearts of the wicked. And there is abundant evidence in the First Gospel, as its thought develops, that this pedagogy of force was the idea in mind throughout;\(^{43}\) nay, that the enemies of the Lord themselves thus caught His meaning.\(^{44}\) In fact, the distinction between "coming in meekness" and "coming in

\(^{42}\) Ps. xlix. (l.) 3; lxxix. (lxxx.) 2; Is. xl. 10; xli. 25; lxvi. 15; Mal. iii. 1; iv. 6; Apoc. ii. 5; et passim.
\(^{43}\) Matt. iii. 7; xxi. 40, 41, 43, 44; xxii. 7; xxiii. 38; xxiv. 2, 27, 37, 39.
\(^{44}\) Matt. xxi. 45; xxvi. 60.
strength” is one which the First Gospel explicitly calls to the attention of the reader.44

When we examine the word “Kingdom,” as here employed, we are brought to a like conclusion. Its primary and original meaning is “dominion” or “sovereignty,” and we find it frequently used in this sense throughout the Old Testament,45 and on one occasion, at least, in the course of the First Gospel;47 nay—what is even more to the point, in the very context of the prophetic quotation about the “coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom,” which the Lord is making from Daniel. One instance will suffice to typify this usage: “Generation and generation shall praise Thy works, and they shall declare Thy power. . . . And they shall speak of the glory of Thy Kingdom, and shall tell of Thy Power to make Thy might known to the sons of men; and the glory of the magnificence of Thy Kingdom. Thy Kingdom is a Kingdom of all the ages, and Thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.” 48

The parallelistic construction, italicized above, shows that the word “Kingdom” has reference to the dominion of God, and the spread of its recognition through some deed of might that will not be lost on the powerful and indifferent. In view of which, is it too much to claim that Jesus employed the phrase, “coming in His Kingdom,” in the sense of “making His sovereignty known by a public exhibition of destructive strength”—the fully kindled wrath of the King Who “sent His armies to destroy those murderers and to burn their City?” 49

Is not this the meaning of the threat that they would yet “behold their house left to them desolate?” 50 Is not this the substance of the twenty-fourth chapter, and the reason of the divided quotation—“the coming of the Son of Man”—which we there find? 51 Is not this the explanation of the triple warning of Jesus, not to look for the Return of the Messias in person, when the press of the heathen arms overthrew the power of the Synagogue and laid low the Jewish State? 52 It was wrath and rejection, not love and favor, which God would show unto His people at the appointed time. There is no intimation whatever of the Second Advent. Jesus is speaking of

44 Matt. xxii. 6; xxi. 39, 38.
45 Ps. cxliv. (cxliv.) 13; Ps. ciii. (ciii.) 19; Dan. iv. 31 (34), also in the Apocrypha:
Enoch lxxxiv. 2.
46 Matt. vi. 33.
47 Ps. cxliv. (cxlv.) 4-6, 11-13.
48 Matt. xxii. 7.
49 Matt. xxiii. 38.
50 Matt. xxiv. 27, 37, 39.
51 Matt. xxiv. 25, 26.
His return in might, as distinct from His return in person; of the putting forth of His ability to destroy, as distinct from His visible reappearance in the glory of His Father with the angels, to judge the living and the dead. It is a wonderful refutation of existing opinion, a defiant challenge to the whole eschatology of Palestine, this omission of the word “glory” by Jesus, in His divided reassertion of the truth of Daniel’s prophecy, that the Son of Man would receive “power and glory, and a Kingdom,” at “the time of the end.”

Jesus does not say, neither does St. Matthew, that the end of the Jewish age is to witness the glorious Advent of the Lord. What both declare is simply that “the Son of Man shall ‘come,’” that the generation shall “‘see’ Him ‘coming’ in His Kingdom.” Neither the word “see” nor the word “come” can be released from their quotation-marks in this connection. Both are part of the prophetic citation; their meaning depends on the sense which Jesus newly gave them; and we have already shown that He raised the whole phrase to a new significance. Daniel testified that He “saw in vision” the “coming of the Son of Man;”* and Jesus declares that those about Him shall see the vision realized, so far as the “Kingdom” is concerned. The retention of Daniel’s phrase about the “coming of the Son of Man” is without any demonstrable implication of the Lord’s return to earth in person. The eschatological meaning which the quotation had in Palestinian literature has been transferred from the “coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom” to His “coming in the glory of His Father with the angels”—a master stroke of corrective teaching, not lost on him who set these two divisive verses alongside in the sixteenth chapter.

Collateral evidence goes convincingly to show that the Final Advent, the Lord’s Return, is not the intended meaning of the “coming in the Kingdom.” In reporting this verse, St. Mark does not say, as does St. Matthew: “Some of them that stand here shall not taste death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom;” he says: “till they see the Kingdom of God come with power”**—exactly the thought which we have found St. Matthew expressing. St. Mark, in other words, plainly gives us to understand that the intellectual equivalent of “coming in His Kingdom” is the “Kingdom coming with

power.” He translates for the general Western public what St. Matthew sets down in the original terms of prophecy for a people long familiar with this intricate mode of speech; nay, not open to conviction through any other. St. Mark makes it clear to the Gentile reader that the point of the thought is not the Son of Man returning in person, but the Kingdom of God coming with power!

Coming in power, as distinct from His personal Return in glory! Is not this what Jesus meant when he assured His disciples that “the Son of Man would ‘come,’ before they had finished evangelizing the cities of Israel?” Is not this also the thought which He conveyed in the divided quotation from Daniel, when He said that “some of those who stood about would not taste death till they saw Him coming in His Kingdom?” Is not this the meaning of the phrase, several times repeated in the twenty-fourth chapter: “So shall be the coming of the Son of Man?” Is it not also the solution of that age-old mystery of the Fourth Gospel, where Jesus speaking of John to Peter, declares: “If I wish him to remain till I come” —John alone of the Twelve lived to see Jerusalem destroyed— “what is it to thee?”* The reference in all these cases is to the destruction of Jerusalem. This was very definitely a “coming of the Lord” in the old Testament sense of the term,* and it was most natural, all things considered, that the Evangelists should have used this consecrated expression when referring to the fate of the Jewish Capital.

Everything thus far found points to one conclusion: the new and de-Judaized interpretation which Jesus gave to the “coming of the Son of Man.” The divided manner in which the prophecy of Daniel was quoted; the fact that Jesus was wont to announce the fulfillment of the Scripture in ways at variance with official thought; the unprecedented distinction which He drew between “coming in His Kingdom” and “coming in the glory of His Father with the angels;” the transfer of eschatological meaning from the first of these phrases to the second; the usage of the Old Testament, where the word “Kingdom” is commonly employed in its primary sense of “sovereignty,” and the verb “come” has the meaning of “exerted might;” the corroborative testimony of St. Mark, who speaks of “the Kingdom coming with power”—thereby giv-

*John xxi. 22.

ing us to understand that this is what St. Matthew meant by the "coming of the Son of Man;" and last but not least, the express confining of the divine wrath to the Jewish government and Capital," as distinct from the "nation" which is to succeed to the Kingdom of God, when "the stone rejected by the builders has become the head of the corner" —who can ponder all this evidence fully and still maintain that St. Matthew meant the personal Return of the Lord in glory, by "the coming of the Son of Man?"

TO MY FAVORITE AUTHOR.

BY S. M. M.

DEAR God,
Herewith a book do I inscribe and send
To Thee Who art both its Beginning and its End;
A volume odd,
Bound in some brief, allotted years,
And writ in blood and tears;
Fragments, of which Thou art the perfect, whole
Book of my soul.

Break Thou the sealing clod
And read me, God!

* Matt. iii. 7; xxii. 7; xxiii. 37, 38.