

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

THE HISTORIC JESUS

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

The Union of England and Scotland, 8vo, pp. 542. 10s. 6d. net (Published, 1896; Re-issue, 1907).

The History of Edward the Third, 8vo, pp. xxx and 625. 18s. net (Published, March 1900).

The Growth and Decline of the French Monarchy, 8vo, pp. xx and 840. 21s. net (Published, April 1902).

A History of Modern Liberty, 3 vols. :—

Vol. I. 8vo, pp. xxii and 398.

Vol. II. 8vo, pp. xi and 490.
30s. net (1906).

Vol. III. 8vo, pp. xviii and 501.
15s. net (1908).

The Social and Industrial History of Scotland from the Union to the Present Time, 8vo, pp. viii and 298. 16s. net (Published, May 1921).

The Constitutional History of Scotland from Early Times to the Reformation, 8vo, pp. viii and 352. 16s. net (Published, 1924).

Luther and the Reformation :—

Vol. I. 8vo, pp. xix and 317.
16s. net (1925).

Vol. II. 8vo, pp. xvii and 354.
16s. net (1928).

Vol. III. 8vo, pp. xvii and 338.
16s. net (1929).

Vol. IV. 8vo, pp. xviii and 372.
16s. net (1930).

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO. LTD.

The Social and Industrial History of Scotland from the Earliest Times to the Union, 8vo, pp. viii and 183. 9s. net (Published, May 1920).

BLACKIE & SON LTD.

THE HISTORIC JESUS

BY

JAMES MACKINNON, Ph.D., D.D., D.Theol.

Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON :: NEW YORK :: TORONTO

1931

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO. LTD.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4

6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA

53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY

36A MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO

TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON

128-132 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, TORONTO

Made in Great Britain

TO

The Theological Faculty of the University of Halle-Wittenberg, which conferred on the Author the Degree of Doctor of Theology, *honoris causa*, 3rd July 1930.

IN TOKEN OF HIS PROFOUND ESTEEM

AND

In Memory of a Beloved and Gifted Wife and Mother, who Inspired and Sustained the Author in Writing this and Previous Works, and Read the Proof-sheets of the First Eight Chapters of this Work, when her Immortal Spirit was suddenly taken away, and entered into its True and Abiding Life.

In Deepest Gratitude,

AUF WIEDERSEHEN!

PREFACE

THIS work is an attempt to depict Jesus as he actually manifested himself in his life and work on earth. It attempts to set forth what manner of man he was and what he accomplished or sought to accomplish during his mission in Palestine. It does not cover what he became or effected in later history as the object of Christian faith, the spiritual head of a universal religion. It is the Historic Jesus in the former limited sense of the term "historic," not the Jesus of History in the latter, wider aspect of it, with whom the work is concerned. In estimating him and his achievement as a religious personality, it is permissible, and indeed advisable, to take account of the Jesus of History, to bear in mind that he was not merely the prophet of Nazareth, but the founder of a universal religion. But apart from such an attempted estimate, it is primarily the Jesus of the short span of his actual life, not the Jesus of later religious experience, or the ever-expanding Christian Church, or theological evaluation, that the writer has sought to portray. What manner of man was he, as the authentic tradition presents him? What did he achieve or attempt to achieve during his mission among his fellow-men in Palestine nearly 2,000 years ago? What were the vicissitudes of his active career? Why did his activity end in tragedy, and what were the elements in his person and work that, in spite of this tragedy, imparted to the life he lived, the movement he started, an undying vitality? Such are some of the concrete historic questions to which I shall seek such answers as are possible from the study of the tradition concerning him, as it has been preserved in written form.

Is the attempt to find answers to such questions a feasible one? There has been in recent years a tendency to doubt

or deny the possibility of writing a biography of Jesus, such as was often attempted in the second half of the nineteenth century. There is considerable reason for the doubt and the denial. All are agreed that a biography in the full sense is impossible. The material for such a biography is lacking. Apart from the nativity stories in the opening chapters of the Gospels of "Matthew" and Luke and a single incident recorded by the latter as occurring in his boyhood, we have no direct reliable evidence bearing on his early life. The apocryphal Gospels, which profess to furnish such evidence, are, in virtue of their fabulous character, of little or no value. At most we can only infer from the genuine record of his public career certain features or facts relative to the early period of his life. The historian can, therefore, concentrate only on his public career, which lasted but two or three years. He can only write a history of his mission, not of his life. But even of his mission it is impossible to give an exhaustive or a strictly consecutive survey. The record of it is largely incidental, and any account of it must perforce be somewhat fragmentary. There are ever so many things that we would fain know, of which the record tells us nothing. There are ever so many critical problems, arising out of the imperfection of the record, to be weighed before we can arrive at a knowledge of the facts, and even then we cannot by any means always be sure that this knowledge is certain and final. We must often be satisfied with conjecture, more or less probable, and with the consciousness of doing the best we can. Nevertheless, such record as we have, if critically treated, cautiously weighed, is of the highest value. If imperfect from the point of view of comprehensiveness, it is wonderfully informative, both in what it contains and what it enables us reasonably to infer.

This record is practically confined to the canonical Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and a fragment known as the Gospel of the Hebrews, though there is no lack of apocryphal Gospels. What we have in this record is, unfortunately, only a remnant of what we might have had. Of the existence of a large number of narratives about Jesus we learn from Luke, who, in the preface to his Gospel,

tells us that many before he himself wrote had undertaken such narratives from information handed down (*παρέδοσαν*) by those who "from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word." Only a few of them have, however, survived in the extant writings in which they were, in whole or in part, incorporated. Of these writings the earliest are the Pauline Epistles. Unfortunately, the Epistles do not tell us much of the actual history of Jesus, since Paul was chiefly concerned, not with the historic Jesus, but with the risen and glorified Lord. Incidental notices, chiefly of his last days, and some quotations of, or references to, his sayings are all he gives us, though he had evidently taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the main facts of his earthly career. This is all the more regrettable inasmuch as Paul was one of the early converts, and had thus ample opportunity of learning at first-hand about his life and teaching. He was too much absorbed in Jesus the risen Lord to dwell on the Jesus who had sojourned on earth. We need not, however, conclude that these incidental references represent all that he knew about the historic Jesus. They occur in letters to the churches founded by him, and it was outwith the purpose of these letters to write in detail about his life.

For this fuller record we must turn to the canonical Gospels, which were very probably not in existence in the lifetime of Paul. This record has been subjected to searching criticism, and as the result of it not a few of the critics, since about the beginning of the twentieth century, have doubted or denied that it is possible to write a history even of the mission of Jesus. Not only is the existing record mainly incidental. The tradition on which it rests has, according to these critics, been heavily overcast by later unauthentic additions. The record has, consequently, been so affected by this extraneous element that it is impossible to reproduce the actual mind and achievement of Jesus with anything like fidelity to the real facts, at least until this more recent criticism has come to agreement on the much debated topic how far the tradition has been thus modified before it took shape in written form. In short, the attempt to delineate even the mission of Jesus, whether

from the traditional or the liberal point of view, such as was often made in the latter half of the nineteenth century, is hopeless.

These critics seem to me to be all too pessimistic. The case is by no means so hopeless as they make out. It is, in my opinion, possible to construct, in accordance with scientific historic method, a fairly adequate account of the mission of Jesus, as far at least as it has been recorded in the first three Gospels. It is possible by a critical examination of this record to attain approximately a knowledge of the facts of his active career, and a reasonably realistic conception of the personality which the facts reveal. Criticism has already accomplished a great deal towards a general agreement on the problem of the Gospels as historic sources. It has produced positive as well as negative results of great value to the historian. From the end of the nineteenth century it has been generally agreed that the two earliest surviving sources are the Gospel of Mark and a didactic source, consisting mainly of sayings of Jesus, to which, for lack of a better title, the critics apply the term Q.¹ (German *Quelle*, source), which is credited to the Apostle Matthew, and which is preserved in the canonical Gospel that passes under the name of "Matthew," though it was not really written by the apostle, and in that of Luke. These two sources, it is further generally agreed, were used in the composition of their Gospels by the canonical "Matthew" and by Luke, who, besides incorporating Mark and Q., amplified their Gospels by adding matter derived from sources which have not otherwise survived. It is further generally agreed that a considerable interval elapsed before the tradition, contained in these sources, received written form. In the case of Mark and Q. this interval was probably between thirty and forty years after the death of Jesus; in that of "Matthew" and Luke it was probably extended by another twenty years or so. In view of this more or less extensive interval, allowance must be made for the modification or colouring of the original unwritten tradition by later conceptions of Jesus and his mission, current in the

¹ For a recent and elaborate discussion of the contents and character of Q., see Crum, "The Original Jerusalem Gospel" (1927).

Christian communities. Legendary matter, for instance, appears to have grown to a certain extent into it. The tendency to see in Jesus and his mission the fulfilment of prophecy, and in Christianity a new law, especially discernible in the Jewish-Christian "Matthew," seems also to have modified it. Luke is frankly universalist in the spirit of Paul, and shows the marked influence of the Gentile expansion of Christianity under Pauline auspices. All three Synoptists have a didactic or apologetic, rather than an historical purpose in their presentation of Jesus and his mission. Here, too, there is agreement among a large number of critics at least. The only question is as to the extent of this modification of the original tradition and how far the Synoptic Gospels, including even that of Mark, reflect this modification. How much must we eliminate from them, as importations into the genuine tradition about Jesus, before we can obtain a reliable knowledge of him and his mission?

Over this question there is, indeed, a wide divergence of critical opinion. Critics like Wellhausen, Wrede, J. Weiss, Loisy—to mention only a few since the opening years of the twentieth century²—accept the fact of this modification of the tradition under dogmatic or apologetic influence, even before Mark wrote his Gospel, and would eliminate a considerable portion of this Gospel as well as those of Matthew and Luke. This they do as the result of the application to these sources of the critical-historical method.³ The tendency thus to eliminate freely from the Synoptic record has also recently been exemplified by the new school of criticism, whose chief representatives are Dibelius and Bultmann, which has attained considerable vogue in

² I mention these only as representatives of the critical-historical school, in view of the widespread influence they have exercised on critical scholarship. There are many notable critics in the English-speaking world, as well as in Germany and France, who have applied this method with varying results. In the course of the work I have made ample use of their labours, as well as those of the more conservative school, as will appear in the notes.

³ Dr Warschauer's recent scholarly and "modernist" work, "The Historical Life of Christ" (1927), shows the marked and, it seems to me, at times one-sided influence of the application of this method. At the other extreme is M. De La Boullaye ("Jésus et l'Histoire," 1929), who upholds, in his orthodox Roman Catholic fashion, the inerrancy of the tradition.

Germany during the last decade of the present century. This school, which is known as the *Formgeschichtliche* or *Traditionsgeschichtliche*,⁴ has attempted to test the historicity of the Synoptic record by an examination of the specific form in which the tradition took shape. Following the lead of Gunkel in his study of the Book of Genesis, its method is literary rather than critical-historical. An examination of the literary form of specific themes or incidents betrays, it is contended, the later character of much of the matter in the growing tradition, as it was ultimately written down in the Synoptic Gospels.⁵

In my judgment this tendency to eliminate extensively from the Gospels what are deemed later importations into the tradition has been overdone both by the older critical-historic school of Wellhausen, etc., and by the quite recent *Formgeschichtliche* school. Both schools, especially the latter, have carried the *Geist des Verneinens* too far. They are too disposed on occasion to deal with the tradition in an arbitrary, subjective fashion, to be implicitly followed. Importations into the authentic tradition in the course of its transmission

⁴ Form-History of the Gospel, or Tradition-History.

⁵ The *Formgeschichtliche Schule* dates from 1919, when M. Dibelius, now professor at Heidelberg, published his "Formgeschichte des Evangeliums." This was followed in 1921 by Bultmann's "Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition" and by Albertz's "Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche." In 1922 appeared Bertram's "Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult." K. L. Schmidt, who published his "Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu" in 1919, is also reckoned an adherent of the school. Its chief representatives are, however, Dibelius and Bultmann, who is professor at Marburg. The method of critically examining the form, as well as the contents of the Gospels, in the quest for the genuine tradition is not really new. At the same time, this school may be allowed the merit of concentrating more specifically than before on the literary side of the problem of the developing tradition. But the tendency to judge the historicity of the tradition purely from a consideration of the literary form, in which it took shape, is of questionable value, as worked out by these critics. Bultmann, in particular, is far too sceptical on the question of historicity. It has been subjected to a searching examination by Fascher ("Die Formgeschichtliche Methode," 1924), L. Koehler ("Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Neuen Testaments," 1927), and Goguel ("Une nouvelle Ecole de Critique Évangélique" in the "Revue de l'Histoire des Religions," tome 94). All three critics, whilst recognising its merits, largely question its all too negative results. See also V. Taylor, "The Gospels" (1930); Easton, "The Gospel before the Gospels" (1928). A recent Life of Jesus, by Case ("Jesus, A New Biography," 1927), is, it seems to me, unduly influenced by these results. Differing from this method, though akin to it, is E. Stauffer's "Grundbegriffe einer Morphologie des Neutestamentlichen Denkens" (1929), in which the writer seeks to set forth the characteristic mentality of the New Testament writers and its working, as reflected in these documents.

are, indeed, discernible in the written form in which it has been preserved. But to me it seems that they are by no means so extensive, so material, as these critics contend. The imported element has not fundamentally affected the value of the Synoptic Gospels as historic sources, and a cautious and judicial criticism, which strives to eschew subjective presuppositions, too facile reasonings, and fanciful conclusions, will win from them a fairly adequate and substantially real *aperçu* of the historic Jesus, as far at least as he is made known to us in these sources. The critics would certainly profit at times by making more account of psychology than of mere theory. Equally serviceable would be a larger exercise of the historic imagination, which would enable them to visualise more truly a situation or an incident. Elasticity of judgment, in accordance with such considerations, is a safer guide to the truth than a rigid scheme of critical principles, whether of the critical-historical or the purely literary order, applied without due thought whether they necessarily apply to the data in question. As will be shown in the course of the work, it is quite feasible that Jesus spoke or acted as he is represented to have done in a given situation, if we take into due consideration the mood or the mentality begotten by it. Whilst the historian is greatly indebted to the labours of the higher critics, it would be unwise to regard all their opinions as fully ascertained verities. One is often mystified rather than edified by the jangle of conflicting views that grates on the ear of the seeker of historic truth. The assumptions made and the conclusions reached seem, at times, lacking in sound judgment and real historic insight. Some of them certainly suggest the mere hunt for novelty, the desire to make a reputation on the strength of the ingenuity of the critic. The independent historian will rightly decline to be the slave of this kind of criticism, and relying on his own judgment and experience in dealing with historic sources, will not burden his work and waste his time in carrying on a futile controversy with it.

In regard to the fourth of the series of Gospels, which passes under the name of the Apostle John, the historicity of the contents is far more problematic. In respect of value

as historic sources, the Synoptic Gospels are on a different plane, though, as we have noted, they, too, are to a certain extent influenced by didactic or apologetic considerations. The Fourth Gospel is not only the latest of the series (end of the first or beginning of the second century). It is, in my opinion, palpably coloured from beginning to end by the conditions of the time of its origin and by the theological views of the writer. It is an interpretation of the historic Jesus, not an historic account of Jesus in anything like a strict acceptance of the term "historic." The writer depicts him and his mission in the light of his Christian thought and experience and the conditions of the age in which he himself lived and taught, though it contains valuable historic data, and may, with discrimination, be used as a source for the actual life of Jesus. There is a marked tendency to idealise the historic figure in accordance with individual presuppositions as influenced by Paulinism and Hellenist philosophy. No historian, who knows by experience the exacting demands of scientific historic method, would dream of taking it at its face value. This will duly appear in the course of the work as the writer attempts, on occasion, to weigh the Johannine evidence in connection with the Synoptic record. It is a very mixed record of fact and the individual conception of fact.

At the same time, it is a mistake to ignore this Gospel as a source for the life of Jesus, and evade the obligation of grappling with the problem of the historicity of its contents. Too many recent Lives of Jesus, by limiting the evidence solely to the Synoptic record, are seriously weakened by this evasion. The Fourth Gospel does undoubtedly contain historic matter with which the historian ought to reckon. The problem of the incorporation of this matter in an account of the historic Jesus is an extremely difficult one. But it ought to be squarely faced, and the writer has striven to face it to the best of his ability.

It is not necessary to do more than refer to the theory of the purely negative school—revived by W. B. Smith, Drews, and others in the early years of the twentieth century—that Jesus never existed. According to this wild theory, he

was merely a god, or rather the name of a god, who was worshipped in certain circles of the Jewish Diaspora and for whom a human and symbolical history was invented. In short, he is a religious myth clothed in legend. The myth theory is an absurdity in the face of the evidence of Paul, let alone the Gospels. To establish it, its authors have perforce to treat this evidence in the most arbitrary manner, to wrest systematically the narratives of the Synoptic Gospels into symbolic representations of mere beliefs and aspirations, which centred in the worship of a god called Jesus. Even if we grant the enormous assumption underlying the theory that these narratives are from beginning to end an imposition by romancing dogmatists, we still have the positive evidence of Paul that Jesus existed. Paul was old enough to have witnessed the crucifixion, if he happened to be in Jerusalem. It is possible to infer from the words in 2 Cor. v. 16, "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him no more," that he had. The passage may not necessarily mean that he had any personal knowledge of Jesus, but it does show that he knew of his existence on earth; and it is certain that he came into close personal relations, a few years after his death, with those who, as his disciples, had been closely associated with him. He explicitly mentions in the First Epistle to the Corinthians⁶ some facts about him which he had evidently "received" from these disciples. He quotes the teaching of Jesus in 1 Cor. vii. 10 and ix. 14. He refers to him as a person that was actually born and lived, as well as died, in Palestine.⁷ He speaks of his brothers, one of whom he met at Jerusalem.⁸ Paul at any rate cannot be transformed into a myth, and his inconvenient testimony cannot be explained away merely by denying the genuineness of 1 Corinthians and other epistles, which are indubitably authentic, or by merely saying that his references are concerned with matters of no importance. "All expressions concerning Jesus which are found in Paul," says Professor Drews in his *ex-parte* fashion, "are accordingly of no consequence for the hypothesis of an historical person of that

⁶ xv. 3; cf. xi. 23.

⁷ Rom. i. 3; Gal. iii. 16; iv. 4.

⁸ 1 Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19.

name."⁹ Enough—the theory and the desperate special pleading, by which its exponents attempt to substantiate it, cannot be maintained in the face of the historic evidence to the contrary, contained in Paul's Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels,¹⁰ and confirmed, at least as far as his actual existence is concerned, by Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus.

A critical study of the historic Jesus, in accordance with scientific historic method, tends to a revision, in some respects, of the conventional conception of him and his mission. It may result, for instance, in the questioning of such beliefs as the virgin birth, the happenings of a magical character ascribed to him, the bodily resurrection, the metaphysical, in contrast to the historic, conception of him. Belief in the virgin birth, the resurrection of the body, the metaphysical Christ, found expression in the creeds as tests of right belief. It is, however, with Jesus anterior and external to the creeds that we are concerned, and the only befitting attitude of the historian is to approach the actual life of Jesus with the open mind, whilst giving due weight to the exceptional character of this life. For him it is, or ought to be, first and foremost a question of the genuine evidence bearing on the subject, and he will examine the evidence and set forth the results of his examination irrespective of the further question whether they are in accordance with the later creeds. This is the only course in keeping with scientific historic method. History is as much a subject for scientific investigation as any other branch of knowledge. Whatever the field in which the historian specially works, he is entitled to claim the right to examine and judge the data independently of any dogmatic restrictions or prepossessions. The dogmatic writing of history, including the history of Christianity, has rightly been relegated to the limbo of false method. The historian must come into line

⁹ "Christ Myth," 176.

¹⁰ For a cogent refutation of the theory, see Loofs, "What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?" (1913). Cf. the chapter on "The Name 'Jesus,'" by Deissmann, in "Mysterium Christi" (1930). The theory is elaborated by W. B. Smith (an American), "Der Vorchristliche Jesus" (1906), and "Ecce Deus" (1911); Drews, "Die Christus Mythe," 3rd ed., 1910, Eng. trans. J. M. Robertson, "Christianity and Mythology" (1900), grants the historic existence of Jesus as the obscure founder of the Christ cult. See also his "Pagan Christs" (1903).

with the man of science in this matter, or abandon the study of history as a branch of scientific knowledge. The latter alternative, besides being in itself irrational, is assuredly out of keeping with the scientific spirit of the age, which claims every kind of knowledge as its province.

It has long been apparent that the study of the origins of Christianity in a scientific spirit has not only enriched, but tended to modify, in some respects, previous views of the subject. The Christian Church has slowly been coming to the recognition of this fact and adapting itself to an altered or altering situation. To many it has seemed a menace to Christian faith thus to modify inherited beliefs, long-cherished convictions. To many, on the other hand—and the number is rapidly increasing—the independent investigation of its origins is no real menace to the essential truth of Christianity. It may be pointed out to over-anxious minds that disbelief in, say, the virgin birth, or the traditional view of miracles, or the physical resurrection, or the old Incarnationist belief—assuming that, on the evidence, they are untenable or, to say the least, problematic—does not affect the essence of Christianity. The essence of Christianity consists in the revelation of God, and of the divine in the human, on the exalted moral and spiritual plane of the life of Jesus. This is the perennial fact which, with growing unanimity, stands forth also as the indubitable fact in any study of the subject that is worth considering. Those who hold fast to this fact are true believers in Jesus and, in these days of widespread enlightenment, the most effective upholders of the Christian faith. Only the votaries of tradition, who persist in maintaining that the New Testament writings are infallible historic sources, or cling to an infallible external authority embodied in the Church or in an infallible earthly head of the Church, will venture to question this cogent contention.

There are many works on Jesus in English as well as other languages, and their number has been rapidly increasing in recent years. The appeal of Jesus to the modern world, as evidenced by these works, seems to grow, not to diminish in strength, and this appeal is manifold. Not merely theologians, but historians, philosophers, men

of letters, have responded to it and put their studies or their impressions in print. He is the perennial theme for the inquiring, serious mind, and to judge from history, will ever remain so. And yet this theme is not one of easy treatment, though a number of the recent books on it have been of a more or less popular character. It bristles with problems, and the problematic feature of it will ever renew the attempt to reach a feasible solution on the part of the individual student. "It is a task," says Professor Burkitt in a preface to one of these recent books, "which can scarcely be undertaken too often." This may help to explain why the writer has ventured to add another to the multitude of books already in existence. For many years he has had to treat of this subject in the discharge of his office as Professor of Church History, or rather the History of Christianity. A thorough study of the historic Jesus is an indispensable condition of an adequate treatment of Christian History. The life of Jesus, as Hase said in the preface to his "Leben Jesu," "is the portal to the history of the Church." On his life and teaching Christianity was founded. From them it evolved into the universal religion, the germ of which is latent in this foundation. The historian of Christianity can, therefore, never get away from the historic Jesus, for the enthralling figure of the Galilean is present in it as well as in the Gospel record. His person and achievement is the fundamental problem of this history.

Moreover, to attain an adequate conception of the historic Jesus is to attain a standard wherewith to measure the later conception of him as developed in the ancient Church and that of subsequent centuries. Besides this general reason for writing the work, the writer has been obsessed for years with the figure of Jesus as he stands forth in the Gospel record, and could not rest until he had come to something like a definite understanding of this greatest of religious personalities. In the course of this quest, the gist of which formed the introduction to his lectures on ancient Christianity, he has repeatedly revised the work, and with the waning years he has determined to set forth a final presentation of his studies and his reflections. Moreover, he has never been quite satisfied with the numerous works

on the subject, of which he has read or consulted a large number, though many of the older ones have, in the course of the repeated re-writing of his own, been displaced in the footnotes by the more recent bulky literature. Many of these previous works are valuable and helpful, and the writer has derived no little edification from the perusal of them. He would by no means be understood as disparaging the labours of others in this field. Nevertheless, no single work has said the last word on the subject, and doubtless this can be said of his own. The fact is that, viewing the subject from the standpoint of individual taste or ideal, no absolutely satisfactory account of the historic Jesus will ever be written. In regard, in particular, to the construction of the mission of Jesus and the evaluation of his historic personality, he has felt the urge to attempt his own formulation. It is extraordinarily difficult to attain anything like a true conspectus of the mission, owing, not only to the largely incidental character of the Synoptic narratives, but the almost insuperable difficulty of relating them to the Johannine account. This reconstruction the writer has attempted in his own way, and has, in addition, striven to revalue Jesus as a critical-historical and sympathetic scrutiny of the record appears to him to reveal him. In this sense the work might be termed, by way of sub-title, a reconstruction and a revaluation.

I had intended to prefix an introductory survey of the background of the life of Jesus. This introduction contains a review of the elements in Hebrew religion, especially in its post-exilic form of Judaism, from which Christianity was directly derived ; Jewish Apocalyptic of the two pre-Christian centuries, which materially influenced it ; the parties within Judaism with which Jesus came into collision ; the Græco-Roman world and the prevailing influence of Hellenist culture, etc. It has, however, become too bulky for insertion, and I have contented myself with the references made to these subjects in the course of the work. They have been worked out in detail in numerous works, such as those of Schürer ("The Jewish People in the Time of Christ," 1902), Felten ("Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte," 1910), Bousset ("Die Religion des Judenthums," third revised edition, 1926), and

others. The omission is the less material, inasmuch as there exist summaries, in handy form,¹¹ in English as well as other languages.

¹¹ For instance, Angus, "The Environment of Early Christianity" (1914); Fairweather, "The Background of the Gospels" (1908) and "Jesus and the Greeks" (1924); Muirhead, "The Times of Christ" (1905); Lightley, "Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Jesus" (1925); Charles, "Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments" (1914). In German, Staerk, "Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte" (1907), and the older summary of O. Holtzmann with the same title (1895); Krüger, "Hellenismus und Judenthum" (1908).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGES
THE NATIVITY - - - - -	1-26
I. THE SUPERNATURAL GENERATION - - - - -	1-16

The miraculous conception—The question of its historic reality—The theory of its Greek origin untenable—Hebraic character of the narratives of both Matthew and Luke—Dubious features of both narratives—The genealogies assume the legal paternity of Joseph—This not necessarily a guarantee of the historicity of the miraculous conception—The New Testament evidence tends to show the natural generation of Jesus—The question whether the belief in the miraculous conception could have arisen in current Jewish thought—Twofold motive underlying the stories—Radical weakness of this naive belief—The creative power of God operating through consecrated wedlock—The miraculous conception endangers the real humanity of Jesus.

II. THE SEQUEL - - - - -	17-26
--------------------------	-------

How far to be accepted as historical—Reasons adduced by negative critics against the birth at Bethlehem—The Lukan account rejected by them as unhistoric—Reasons adduced by Ramsay in vindication of its historicity—Question of the visit to the temple and the part played by Simeon—The Matthæan story of the visit of the Magi and Luke's account of that of the shepherds—Problematic features—Criticism of the Matthæan account of the massacre by Herod, etc.—Its incongruity with the Lukan narrative.

CHAPTER II

THE YEARS OF PREPARATION - - - - -	27-52
I. POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS - - - - -	27-34

The régime of Herod—Division of his kingdom among his sons—Judæa becomes directly subject to Rome—Restiveness under the Roman régime—The nationalist and the quietist

sections of the people—Galilee in the time of Jesus—Agriculture, industry, and commerce—Influence of social and economic conditions in preparing the way for the mission of Jesus.

II. EDUCATION AND SELF-DEVELOPMENT - - 34-52

The early life of Jesus largely a blank—The Lukan account of the visit to the temple in his twelfth year—Josephus on Jewish education—Careful instruction in the law and history of his race—Takes part in the synagogue worship—Knowledge of scribal lore and of apocalyptic literature—The religious atmosphere in which he grew up—Process of his mental and spiritual growth—The Nazareth in which Jesus lived—His love and intimate knowledge of Nature and rural life—Evidence of his parables and sayings—Home life—Love of children—Great capacity for friendship—The human note—Individuality and independence of view and character—His arresting look and manner of address—A psychologist's impression of his person—The full human life—Filiat experience of God—The idealist in the making in the effort to attain the highest spiritual life—Jesus and the Nazarenes—Friedländer's theory—Alluring, but unconvincing.

CHAPTER III

THE ADVENT OF JESUS . - - - 53-85

I. THE FORERUNNER - - - - 53-60

Commencement of the Baptist's mission—In the wilderness of Judæa—His prophetic message—Baptism unto repentance—Account of Josephus—Apocalyptic note—Later Christian colouring—Proclamation of the coming advent of the Messiah—Had John previously known Jesus?—Did he recognise in Jesus the Messiah?—The authentic evidence does not warrant an affirmative conclusion—John and Jesus represent different types of religious development.

II. BAPTISM AND TEMPTATION - - - - 60-70

Jesus arrested by John's preaching—Jesus and the need of repentance—His filial conception of God—Attains the consciousness of his Messianic vocation—What the experience meant at this stage—The reality of this experience—The profoundly spiritual and ethical element in it—Jesus sublimates the Messianic conception—The experience personal to himself—Misleading representation of the First and Fourth Gospels—Followed by an interval of spiritual perturbation—Questionings aroused by his newborn consciousness—Their character, as reflected in the Temptation narrative—Did Jesus come into further contact with John?—The Baptist sect.

	PAGES
III. THE BEGINNING OF JESUS' MISSION - - -	71-79

According to the Fourth Gospel, it begins on the lower Jordan—The calling of the first disciples—Question of its historicity—The return to Galilee—Question of its connection with the arrest of the Baptist—The problematic episode at Cana—All four evangelists locate him at Capernaum—Becomes the headquarters of the Galilean mission—Unlike the Baptist, Jesus seeks the centres of population—The calling of the first disciples in the Synoptic tradition—The stalwarts of the movement—The first eventful Sabbath and its immediate sequel—"All are seeking thee."

IV. A JUDEAN MISSION? - - -	79-85
-----------------------------	-------

In the Fourth Gospel Jesus makes only a flying visit to Galilee—Visits Jerusalem and cleanses the temple—Interviews Nicodemus, and conducts mission in Judæa—Retires to Galilee through Samaria—The early mission in the south unknown to the Synoptists—Anachronisms and improbabilities of the Johannine narrative—Grave doubt as to the actuality of the alleged incidents at this early stage of the ministry of Jesus.

CHAPTER IV

THE GALILEAN MISSION - - -	86-120
----------------------------	--------

I. THE COURSE OF THE MISSION - - -	86-102
------------------------------------	--------

Incidental character of Synoptic Gospels—Lack of exact chronological sequence—Primary use of the tradition for edification or propaganda, not historic instruction—Distinctive stages of the mission discernible in Mark's Gospel—Incorporation of Mark's Gospel by "Matthew" and Luke along with other sources—An invaluable record of the Galilean mission—An attempted outline—Spread of the movement from Capernaum—Its phenomenal success in spite of incipient opposition—Selection of the Twelve—Extension to the eastern side of the Lake of Galilee—Continued activity in Galilee—Ministering women—Mission of the Twelve—Herod Antipas and the movement—Withdrawal along with the Twelve—Feeding of the 5,000—Involuntary return to Capernaum—Climax of the popularity and power of the mission—Anticlimax—Defection—Wanderings of Jesus outside Galilee—The confession at Cæsarea Philippi—The version of the Fourth Gospel—The Transfiguration—Furtive passage through Galilee—Seeming failure of the mission—Duration of the mission.

	PAGES
II. CHARACTER OF THE MISSION	102-120

Its *prophetic-ethical* character—Jesus as prophet—The prophetic discourse at Nazareth—His prophetic message more than an echo of that of the Baptist—*Only indirectly Messianic*—Necessity for preparation and propaganda—Hence the veiled and furtive reference to Messiahship—The charge of silence on the subject—"The mystery of the kingdom"—Only at close of Galilean mission does the eschatological element come into foreground—The *popular-humanitarian* character of mission—Jesus' sympathy for "the poor," "the sinner," and the social outcast—Scandalises the scribes and Pharisees—Wages a conflict with Satan and the demons in his healing mission—Its powerful effect on the people—Movement threatens to take on a convulsive character—Hectic excitement—Questionable results—Inevitable collision with the scribes and Pharisees—*Reversive*, if not revolutionary character of the mission—Recurring controversy—The subjects of it—The mission distinctively *racial*, not universalist—Universalist implications—Seeming failure—Mystery of Jesus as well as of the kingdom—The Johannine version of the Galilean mission—The etherealised figure of Jesus and his activity—The human experience of Jesus as reflected in the Synoptic record of the mission.

CHAPTER V

THE SOUTHERN MISSION	121-170
----------------------	---------

I. ON THE WAY TO JERUSALEM	121-135
----------------------------	---------

Jesus' retirement from Galilee—Hurried notice in Mark and Matthew of his activity in the south—The more ample account of Luke—Depicts not a single journey to Jerusalem, but a lengthy period of missionary work over a wide area—Luke's special source and the light it throws on the southern mission—Embraces Samaria, Peræa, and Judæa—Indefinite chronology and topography of Luke's supplement of Mark and Matthew—Possibility that Luke has misplaced a portion of the matter relegated to this mission—A large portion evidently belongs to the later stage of Jesus' career—In Samaria—The sending out of the Seventy—Is it historical?—Incidents of the southern mission—Resumption of the healing ministry—Attraction of the multitude.

II. JESUS AND THE PHARISEES	135-143
-----------------------------	---------

Recurrence of antagonism—Its irreconcilable character—Jesus' scathing indictment—Criticisms of modern Jewish apologists—Substantial justification of the indictment—Views of Friedländer and Klausner—Jesus' discriminating

attitude—Wherein lies the root of his antagonism—System and practice objectionable from his spiritual standpoint—Phariseeism inverts and subverts moral and religious values—Klausner's judgment—Scribes and Pharisees not the only representatives of Jewish religious spirit—Vitality of later Judaism.

III. TEACHING THE MULTITUDE AND DISCIPLES - 143-151

Ethical, practical character of the teaching—The signs of the times—The Lukan parables—The teaching of the disciples largely concerned with the future—The outlook becomes more and more eschatological—The figure of the suffering Messiah—How far the tradition reliable—Service, not lordship—The disciples' lack of understanding—Founding and training a community of disciples—The teaching not solely eschatological.

IV. THE JOHANNINE SUPPLEMENT - - 151-170

Considerable duration of the southern mission—The Fourth Gospel provides a real supplement—Indications in the Synoptic Gospels of several visits to Jerusalem as in the Fourth—The received text of the Fourth Gospel not clear or coherent—Necessity of a rearrangement—Visits to Jerusalem in connection with various feasts—The healing of paralytic at the first of these—Controversy with "the Jews" over Sabbath-breaking—Jesus' discourse reflects the argumentation of the writer—Jesus reasons in terms of later developed Christology—Withdrawal of Jesus, who ultimately reappears at the Feast of Tabernacles—Different opinions regarding him—Miscarried attempt to seize him—Intervention of Nicodemus—Renewed disputation—"Who art thou?"—The One sent and taught by the Father—Makes a deep impression on many of his hearers—Disputation becomes a violent altercation on the theme of Judaism versus Pauline-Johannine Christianity—Reflects the conflict between them in the author's own time—Jesus proclaims his pre-existence—Withdrawal and reappearance during the Feast of Dedication—Cure of blind man and renewed controversy—The allegory of the Good Shepherd and the sheepfold—Jesus' oneness with God—God's immanence—Jesus withdraws again beyond Jordan—Goes to Bethany and raises Lazarus—A dramatic story—An allegory based on tradition of Jesus' psychic power over disease—The sequel—The Sanhedrin determines to destroy Jesus—Reflections on the Johannine controversy with "the Jews"—Contrast with the Synoptists.

CHAPTER VI

	PAGES
THE LAST DAYS AT JERUSALEM - - -	171-209

I. THE ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH - - -	171-179
------------------------------------	---------

"Will he come to the feast?" (the Passover)—The Messianic entry—The Synoptic and Johannine versions—Jesus in the court of the Gentiles—In what sense did Jesus accept the popular recognition of his Messiahship?—Jesus and the barren fig tree—The cleansing of the temple—Its effects on people and priesthood—Determination to destroy him.

II. FINAL ENCOUNTER WITH RELIGIOUS LEADERS	179-190
--	---------

Astonishing omission in Fourth Gospel—The question of authority—The parable of the wicked husbandmen—Two other parables—The Pharisees and the Herodians, and the question of tribute to Cæsar—Jesus and political liberty, civic rights—The Sadducees and the question of the resurrection—The doctrine of immortality—The first of the commandments—The question about the Son of David—The critical difficulty—Matthew's version of the outburst against the scribes and Pharisees—Jesus and the poor widow—Jesus and the Greeks—A device to introduce the Johannine apologetic for the Cross and the later expanding Christian mission.

III. THE SON OF MAN - - - -	190-209
-----------------------------	---------

The apocalyptic discourse—The Messianic woes and the coming catastrophe—End of the old order or æon and inauguration of the new—Matthew's expansion of the discourse—Substantial authenticity of the short Markan version—The Son of Man conception and Jesus' personal application of it—Combines with it the idea of the Suffering Servant—Both conceptions only gradually developed—No mere later reflection of the belief of the primitive Christian community—Views of Wellhausen and Lietzmann—Strong reasons for ascribing this double conception to Jesus himself—How far later belief colours discourse—Is the eschatology to be understood in a purely spiritual sense?—Views of Gould and others—Jesus undoubtedly an apocalyptic seer—The actual Messiah who will ere long return in glory to inaugurate the new æon—The extreme eschatological school of Schweitzer—Reasons for rejecting its contentions—Jesus holds both the present, ethical, and the future, transcendental view of the kingdom—The imminence of the Parousia—A transient phase of his faith which did not materialise—In what sense Jesus has often come with power—Jesus and the idea of suffering—The vast implication of the Cross.

Contents

xxvii

CHAPTER VII

	PAGES
FAREWELL - - - - -	210-237
I. BETRAYAL AND LAST SUPPER - -	210-225

The anointing at Bethany—The Sanhedrin seek his immediate seizure—Judas—His character and the motive of his treachery—What he revealed—The Passover Feast—The preparation—Was it the Passover meal of which Jesus partook with the Twelve?—The divergence between the Synoptic and the Johannine versions—Are both correct?—The institution of the Eucharist in Mark and Matthew—Luke's version—Signification of the rite—The question of its sacrificial character—"A ransom for many"—In what sense?

II. THE JOHANNINE VERSION - - -	225-237
---------------------------------	---------

The Agape or love feast—The washing of the disciples' feet—Service the true test of discipleship—Jesus and Judas—The new commandment and the prediction of Peter's denial—The farewell address, chap. xiv.—Amplification in chaps. xv. and xvi.—The valedictory prayer in chap. xvii.—Question of historicity—Divergence from the Synoptists—Echoes of Synoptic style and teaching—The differences in style and thought—It is the later Christ of Christian experience that speaks, not the historic Jesus—How far the writer reflects the historic reality—The extended discourse a conglomerate.

CHAPTER VIII

THE END - - - - -	238-275
I. ARREST AND INQUEST - - -	238-257

In Gethsemane—What it meant—Conquest of fear and doubt—Jesus the hero—Realism of the scene—The seizure of Jesus—Flight of the disciples—The Johannine version—An examination before Annas—Problematic Johannine account—The Markan and Matthaean account of the proceedings during the night—Not a trial, but a preliminary investigation by the Sanhedrin—The evidence of the witnesses—Jesus and Caiaphas—"Art thou the Christ?"—Jesus' reply deemed blasphemy—The conclusion unfounded—Jesus deemed worthy of death and maltreated—Luke's account—A morning consultation to draw up the indictment to be presented to Pilate—Peter's denial—The fate of Judas.

II. TRIAL AND CRUCIFIXION	- - -	PAGES 257-275
---------------------------	-------	------------------

Pontius Pilate—The reported procedure at the Prætorium—First stage of the trial—The indictment—"Art thou the King of the Jews?"—The Johannine version—The second stage of the trial—Jesus before Antipas—Third stage of the trial—Pilate vainly attempts to save Jesus as innocent of treasonable intent—Lacking in moral courage—The Johannine addition—"Behold the man!"—"Crucify him!"—"Whence art thou?"—Pilate tries anew to save Jesus—Finally delivers him to be crucified—Questionable reality of this elaboration—Characteristic Johannine apologetic—At Golgotha—The words on the Cross—The portents that accompany the crucifixion—Another Johannine addition—Joseph of Arimathæa and Pilate—The co-operation of Nicodemus—The death of Jesus the supreme event of his life.

CHAPTER IX

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS	- - -	276-300
---------------------------	-------	---------

I. SPIRITUAL OR BODILY?	- - -	276-294
-------------------------	-------	---------

Resurrection in Hebrew thought—Result of long development—Definite emergence of this belief—As reflected in Jewish Apocalyptic—The resurrection in the thought of Jesus—Holds the belief in the spiritual sense—The attestation of the resurrection of Jesus—The earliest form of it in Paul and the primitive preaching of Peter—Paul teaches a resurrection in the spiritual sense—His reasoning in 1 Cor. xv.—A spiritual body—Bases his belief on the appearances of Jesus to the disciples—The Gospel accounts of the empty tomb—Those of Mark, Matthew, and Luke vary more or less—Discrepancies more pronounced in the Johannine account—All influenced by the assumption of a bodily resurrection—But also reflect the existence of disbelief or doubt in the earliest tradition—Was the body extracted, or was the women's experience of the nature of a vision?—Even the Gospels reflect the fact of an unmaterial existence—How account for the rise of the stories of the empty tomb?—The apologetic element in them.

II. REALITY OF THE RESURRECTION	- - -	294-300
---------------------------------	-------	---------

The empty tomb not indispensable to the resurrection faith—The real proof the appearances of Jesus to the disciples—Dogmatic materialism and spiritual reality—This dogmatism superficial and unwarrantable—Objection that these appear-

ances occur only to disciples—Why this was so—The crude tendency to seek material proofs of the spiritual—The resurrection faith demanded by the personality and life of Jesus—The only rational faith.

CHAPTER X

THE MASTER - - - - - 301-332

I. HIS ORIGINALITY - - - - - 301-308

Jesus' magisterial claim—The teaching in Matthew and Luke—Jesus' method the intensive one—His arresting style of address—The parables—"A new teaching"—The inherited element in it—Moulds it in the crucible of his own mind and religious experience—Mr Montefiore on his originality—Jesus stands in a category by himself—More than the founder of a school.

II. GOD AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD - - - 308-314

Jesus' paternal conception of God—God's justice as moral Sovereign of the kingdom—Uncompromising antagonism to evil—Jesus and Gehenna—Degrees of guilt and punishment—The twofold sense of the kingdom—Present, ethical, and future, transcendental—In the former sense it is the realisation of God's will in the individual and the community.

III. THE NEW RIGHTEOUSNESS - - - 314-324

The highest moral ideal—Inwardness—Demands the utmost self-sacrifice—No compromise with lower instincts—Criticism—Jesus' right to impose the highest ideal of conduct—Takes account of actual conditions—Individualist and universalist—Jesus and the political and social organism—The eschatological influence—No self-centred life—Love the keynote of the new righteousness—Social side of the kingdom in the community of the disciples—A distinctive society which ultimately evolves in the Church.

IV. JESUS AND THE LAW - - - - - 324-332

Jesus' conception of religion diverges from the current one—Not to destroy, but to fulfil—Free attitude towards tradition and the ceremonial Law—Jesus the great freethinker and religious emancipator of his age—Embittered controversy over external observances—Divorce—The *Lex Talionis*—The new Law and the religion of the spirit—Anticipates Paul to a certain extent—The marvellous optimism of the Master.

CHAPTER XI

	PAGES
THE HEALER - - - - -	333-373

I. THE HEALING MINISTRY - - -	333-342
-------------------------------	---------

Jesus and the Hebrew theistic, providential conception of God—Healing an essential of his mission—The evidence of this—The compassion of Jesus—Healing involved in his warfare against the power of evil—The Fourth Gospel obscures this aspect of his healing ministry—The Synoptic contrasted with the Johannine conception of it—The power to work miracles—The tremendous impression produced by the healing ministry—The attitude of the people and the Pharisees respectively—Partial failure.

II. METHOD AND MEANS OF HEALING - -	342-347
-------------------------------------	---------

Jesus' procedure as healer—Contact with the patient—The touch—The power or Spirit of God operating through Jesus—The power of faith in an immanent God—Co-operation of healer and patient—Jesus' power of communicating vital force—Suggestion and prayer.

III. CREDIBILITY OF THE HEALING MINISTRY -	347-360
--	---------

Did Jesus actually achieve the cure of a variety of diseases?—Is the tradition trustworthy?—Is it compatible with the laws of Nature?—The mechanistic theory of the universe—The evidence of a Supreme Will immanent in the universe—Rules out the mechanistic theory—Nature the standing miracle, and man the greatest of all—Scientific dogmatism—Is the Hebrew view of supernatural interventions in Nature and history tenable?—God works by adapting means to ends—Psychotherapy and its effects—Evidence in modern times—The Holy Coat of Trier—Cures at Lourdes—Examination of the evidence—The ecclesiastical solution of the problem—Supernatural intervention—Influence of the psychic element—Sifting and criticism of the evidence—Faith cure and its limitations—Ignorance of the facts of Nature and life in the age of Jesus—Demonology—Exorcism as practised by Jesus—The cure of the Gerasene maniac—Uncritical character of the narrative.

IV. THE SUPERNATURAL WORKS OF JESUS -	360-373
---------------------------------------	---------

Jesus credited in a few cases with supernatural power over inanimate Nature—Jesus in these cases represented as possessed of divine omnipotence—Did Jesus risk experiments of the kind

attributed to him?—Refuses to give magical exhibitions in the manner of the vulgar wonder-worker—Obligation of critical scrutinising of such tales—Incidents underlying them—The feeding of the 5,000—The walking on the water—The raising of the widow's son at Nain—Evidence of the exaggeration of certain incidents into miracles in the supernatural sense—The question of symbolism—Our standard of adequate evidence—The growth of such tales—The reporters lacking in knowledge and critical insight—Questions they never thought of asking—God's immanence and providence do not necessarily warrant such happenings—The new apologetic—In what sense does it hold that God's working is at once natural and supernatural?

CHAPTER XII

THE SELF-MANIFESTATION OF JESUS - 374-397

I. WAS JESUS CONSCIOUS OF PRE-EXISTENCE? - 374-379

Jesus' appeal to prophecy—Does not ascribe to himself a pre-temporal existence—The question of the pre-existence of the soul—Jesus definitely becomes conscious of his Messianic Sonship at Baptism—His identity with the Son of Man relates to the present and the future—Other evidence—The designation, the Christ, the Son of Man, the Son of God, used in the vocational, not the metaphysical sense—His filial consciousness a concrete reality of present experience.

II. JESUS AS HISTORIC PERSONALITY - - 379-386

An arresting personality revealed in the record—The unique impression made by Jesus on his disciples and hearers—What the record reflects—The note of authority and the demands he makes—Categoric self-assertion—His supreme mastery—The passion for God combined with an immense love of humanity—A real man and a real life—Not a theophany—His limitations.

III. JESUS AND GOD - - - 386-397

How did Jesus conceive of his relation to God?—Did he hold and teach the later doctrine of the Trinity?—Relative utterances recorded by the Synoptics—Various views of Matt. xi. 25-27 and Luke x. 21-22—Is this utterance authentic?—Granting its authenticity, what does it actually assert?—Bears no later metaphysical and Trinitarian sense—Relation of Father and Son religious and ethical, not metaphysical—

Jesus is the highest manifestation of the divine in the human—Not as God, but as the One sent by God that he acts and teaches—Asserts his subordination to God—His relation to God and his revelation of God conditioned by Jewish monotheism—"God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself"—The later conception of Jesus as a hypostasis of the Godhead not warranted by his own authentic teaching or the primitive preaching—Even Paul does not equate the exalted Christ with God in the absolute sense—The immeasurable greatness of Jesus in the spiritual and ethical sphere—The secret of the power of Christianity—The supreme life and the greatest inspiration in religious history—The myth craze a chimera—Jesus not the creation of the religious consciousness, but the creator of a religion—In the upward evolutionary progress of the spiritual side of life Jesus has been and is the greatest factor.

INDEX	-	-	-	-	-	-	399-407
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------

THE HISTORIC JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE NATIVITY

I. THE SUPERNATURAL GENERATION

IN the opening chapters of the First and Third Gospels Jesus is represented as the miraculously conceived offspring of the Virgin Mary, who was betrothed to Joseph. Both accounts profess to reveal the mystery of his generation, which is communicated to the parties concerned in a supernatural manner. In Matthew the communication is made, after conception, to Joseph by an angel in a dream, in explanation of the condition of his affianced wife. In Luke it is made by the angel to Mary herself in anticipation of this condition. The writers evidently drew on a different version of the alleged fact, the first envisaging it from the standpoint of Joseph, the second from that of Mary.¹ But in both the conception of Jesus is ascribed to the operation of the Holy Ghost. It is due to the direct exercise of the divine power. To the naïve mentality of both writers, Jesus is physically the Son of God. "She was found with child of the Holy Ghost"; "that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."² "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God."³ The reason of this miraculous

¹ The usual view is that the two versions of the tradition are independent. Peake, "Critical Introduction to the New Testament," 101 (1919), says: "Completely independent." Box, "The Virgin Birth of Jesus," 3 (1916): "Almost (if not wholly) independent." Taylor holds that they are not independent, but two different narratives which arose out of the same belief. "Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth," 117 (1920).

² Matt. i. 18, 20.

³ Luke i. 35.

generation is, in both cases, that the child so conceived is destined to fill the rôle of the Messianic deliverer of the House of David. Hence in both cases the name Jesus (Jeshua or Joshua), the saviour of his people, is directed to be given him. In both, too, it is assumed that the virgin birth is an essential qualification for the Messianic vocation. In the Matthæan version it is, in fact, proclaimed to be the fulfilment of the promised virgin-born Immanuel in Isa. vii. 14. Whilst in the Lukan version the prophecy is ignored, the idea it was presumed by his fellow-evangelist to embody is substantially reflected.

From this twofold source the virgin birth ultimately passed in the second century into the so-called Apostles' Creed as a fundamental article of the Christian faith, though there was dissent on the part of the Jewish-Christian Ebionites and other sectaries. Since then it has been accepted by the Catholic Church. Whilst it is not now generally regarded as an indispensable adjunct of the Incarnation,⁴ it is held by many to be congruous to it,⁵ and by some to be demanded by the new creation in humanity which Jesus, as the second Adam, embodied, and which the Church enshrined in its creed.⁶ With the dogmatic side of the subject we are not here concerned. The important questions for us are: Can the miraculous conception be substantiated, as an historic reality, from the records relative to it in the opening chapters of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, so as to compel implicit credence? Is its acceptance involved from the point of view of the historic personality of Jesus as revealed in the records of it?

Some would reject the miraculous conception, as recorded in Matthew and Luke, as a legend, and ascribe the origin of this legend to the influence, in Gentile-Christian circles, of Greek religious ideas. According to Usener,⁷ for instance, following Hillman,⁸ "it must have arisen in Gentile-Christian circles, probably in those of the

⁴ Box, "The Virgin Birth of Jesus," 133 f.

⁵ Macintosh, "Dictionary of the Bible," ed. by Hastings, 705 (1909), and "The Person of Christ," 527 f. (1912).

⁶ Gore, "Dissertations on the Incarnation," 64 f. (1895), and "Jesus of Nazareth," 246 f. (1929).

⁷ Art., "Nativity," in "Encyclopædia Biblica" (1902).

⁸ "Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas" (1891).

province of Asia." With this conclusion Schmiedel agrees,⁹ and more recently Edward Meyer confidently derives it from Greek mythology.¹⁰ Those who thus challenge the historicity of the miraculous conception further contend that the sections of both Gospels in which it is narrated (Matt. i. 18-25 and Luke i. 34-35) did not originally form part of either Gospel, but were added by a later interpolator. In the case of both sections the excision of this later matter does no violence to the narratives. What precedes and what follows these excised sections form a coherent narrative, and in this narrative, as it thus originally stood, the generation of Jesus was represented as natural, not supernatural.

Such, briefly stated, is the negative contention which results from the consideration of these passages by the critics mentioned. Against this negative conclusion the upholders of the historicity of the miraculous conception adduce the markedly Jewish-Christian character of the narratives as they stand. This is predicable of the sections which the critics would reject as interpolations as well as of what precedes and follows them, which these critics are prepared to accept as authentic. This counter-contention seems to be a forcible one. The whole of these narratives, the supposed interpolations included, breathe the Hebraistic religious spirit and suggest a Jewish-Christian, not a Gentile-Christian, origin. Both narratives, indeed, show a trace of Jewish-Hellenist Christianity. The mention by Matthew in his genealogy of women of non-Jewish race and the visit of the Magi, the tracing by Luke of the genealogy back to Adam and the reference by Simeon to "all peoples," of whom the infant Jesus is to be "the light," points in the direction of this influence. But this influence does not justify us in assuming a Greek origin of the miraculous conception. Such a conception is not incompatible with Jewish-Christian thought¹¹ and does not require us to seek

⁹ Art., "Mary," in "Encyclopædia Biblica."

¹⁰ "Ursprung und Anfänge des Christenthums," i. 54 (1921).

¹¹ Strack and Billerbeck ("Kommentar zum Neuen Testament," i. 49-50 (1922)) assert that the idea of a miraculous conception of the Messiah was unknown to Jewish thought as represented by the Talmud and Midrash. The opposite view is maintained by Nork, "Rabbinische Quellen,"

its origin in Greek mythology. Moreover, the interpolation theory is very difficult to maintain in view of the fact that the style of these sections is identical¹² with that of the rest of the narrative in each Gospel.

Proof of the Jewish-Christian character of the sources and of the authenticity of the supposed interpolated sections does not, however, guarantee the historic reality of the miraculous conception. The narratives themselves contain features which tend to raise doubts on this point. In both writers the belief in it ultimately rests on angelic communications—in Matthew to Joseph, in Luke to Mary herself. The stories owe, in fact, much of their charm to this naïve angelology. In Matthew the angelic communication to Joseph, which occurs in a dream, is clearly subjective, and the form it takes need not, in view of the current belief in angelology, lead us to deny straightway that Joseph might, in this subjective manner, have come by the conviction of the miraculous conception. Dreams have sometimes been the means of leading to a knowledge of facts not otherwise attained. In the Lukan version of the angelic communication to Mary, on the other hand, the appearance of the angel seems to be visual. She is not asleep, but fully awake. Luke even knows the name of the angel, and Bernhard Weiss, who believes in the miracle, is fain to give up Gabriel as "an invention."¹³ Regarding it as a visual experience, there is thus a real difficulty for modern thought in accepting the story as reliable historic evidence. Even in this case it may be that the writer is merely representing the fact of such a revelation in pictorial

i. 12 f. It is, however, risky to dogmatise on Jewish ideas in the time of Jesus, seeing that this literature is later, and in any case, as Matt. i. 22-23 shows, it was quite possible, in Jewish-Christian circles, to read this idea into the Old Testament.

¹² See the evidence of this adduced by V. Taylor, in the case of Luke i. 34-35, "Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth," 55 f.; in that of Matt. i. 18-25, *ibid.*, 99-100. The writer holds that Luke i. 34-35 was not in the original draft of the Gospel, but was added by Luke himself before its circulation and after he had come to know the tradition. It is not, therefore, a later interpolation by an extraneous hand. He attempts to establish this contention by laborious reasoning. The book is a very thorough examination of the problem. The conclusion is, nevertheless, rather problematic. In any case, the insertion was made before the circulation of the Gospel, and rules out the theory of a later interpolation.

¹³ "Leben Jesu," i. 213 (1882).

fashion, in accordance with the Jewish, midrashic¹⁴ manner of setting forth an idea or doctrine in the form of a story, which is not necessarily to be taken literally. It may be mere "decorative embroidery," as Canon Box contends in reference to the Matthæan version. Even so, the question arises whether the alleged revelation of the miraculous conception, reported in this imaginative, fast and loose manner, is reliable history.

In both versions of the annunciation there is a further trace of current beliefs which do not strictly accord with historic fact. In Matthew the angelic promise of the virgin-born Saviour is represented as the fulfilment of the prophecy in Isa. vii. 14: "Behold the virgin shall conceive," etc. The quotation is from the Greek translation of the Old Testament, in which the word *παρθένος* (virgin) stands for the original Hebrew *almah*, which denotes a young woman, just come to maturity and capable of child-bearing.¹⁵ The substitution of "virgin" in the Greek translation for the "young woman" of the Hebrew original is now regarded as "unjustifiable,"¹⁶ and conveys a misleading impression of what the prophet evidently intended to convey. A young woman is to bear a son, and this son is not virgin-born, but appears to be generated in the ordinary way. The angelic communication in Matt. i. 22-23 is based on this mistranslation, and the angel (*i.e.*, the writer, or the tradition followed by him) was thus led into the mistaken assurance that the miraculous conception of Jesus was the fulfilment of the prediction in Isaiah. Moreover, in the Lukan version the Messiah, whose birth the angel proclaims, is depicted in the form of a king who shall

¹⁴ "Midrash" is a branch of Rabbinic literature. "It means 'exposition' especially of an edifying and moralising character . . . with stories and illustrative matter drawn from popular custom, tales, and beliefs." Oesterley and Box, "Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," 74 (1907). This midrashic matter is not necessarily to be taken literally, or intended to be so taken. It is the doctrine or idea that really matters, not the form or illustration of it, which may be purely fictitious. *Ibid.*, 77-78.

¹⁵ The Greek equivalent of *Ha-almah* is *ἡ παρθένη*; the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek *παρθένος* is *Bethulah*.

¹⁶ See Gray, "Commentary on Isaiah," i. 126 (1911). "The rendering virgin is unquestionably, and is now generally admitted to be, unjustifiable." On the other side, see Jeremias, "Babylonisches im Neuen Testament," 476 (1905); Gressmann, "Der Ursprung der Israelitisch-Judischen Eschatologie," 270 f. (1905).

reoccupy and hold for ever the throne of his father (ancestor) David. A restored Jewish kingdom is predicted, and this prediction ultimately proved not only an illusion, but incompatible with the spiritual kingdom which Jesus proclaimed and sought to establish. Here again the angelic communication, under the influence of current belief, is based on a misconception of historic reality. It is, to say the least, rather disconcerting to find what purports to be a revelation from a heavenly source misinterpreting a prophecy and also predicting a restored Davidic kingdom which failed to materialise.

There are further difficulties for the historian, connected with the genealogies, which Matthew prefaces to his version of the miraculous conception and Luke introduces after his account of the baptism of Jesus. As the restorer of the Davidic kingdom, Jesus must needs be a descendant of David. Matthew accordingly traces his lineage down from Abraham through King David to Joseph. Luke reverses the order and traces it from Joseph through David back to Abraham, and, in accordance with his pronounced universalism, still farther back to Adam. Both are rather artificial compilations and show divergences in the case of the names between David and Joseph. The writers, if they did not themselves compose the genealogies, evidently made use of varying sources. The discrepancy is a matter of no great moment, since mistakes in the names of ancestors over so long a period might easily occur. More material is the fact that both trace the Davidic descent of Jesus through Joseph, and not through Mary, and that the miraculous conception on the part of Mary does not really invest him with such a descent, unless Mary also was descended from David. Some have attempted to meet this difficulty by contending that this was actually the case.¹⁷ But there is nothing in these narratives to show that she was, and the fact that Luke describes her as a relative of Elizabeth points

¹⁷ Edersheim, for instance, holds that Luke i. 27, 32, 69; ii. 4, prove her Davidic descent. "Life and Times of Jesus," i. 149 (tenth impression, 1900). But these passages are by no means conclusive. In i. 27; ii. 4, Joseph only is said to be of the House of David, and Mary, who is also mentioned, evidently is not, whilst i. 32, 69, does not warrant Edersheim's conclusion.

to the conclusion that, like her, she was of the tribe of Levi, not of Judah. More feasible is the contention that the term "begat" in the Matthæan genealogy is used throughout in the legal, not in the physical sense. In accordance with Jewish law and custom, the betrothal of Joseph and Mary virtually constituted him her husband before actual cohabitation had taken place, and thus, assuming the miraculous conception, Joseph could be regarded as legally, if not actually, the father of Jesus. As the son by supernatural generation of Mary, who had become, in virtue of her previous betrothal to Joseph, a member of Joseph's family, Jesus legally shared in her supposed father's descent from David.

The critics differ as to the original form of the text of Matt. i. 16, in which the begetting of Jesus is related. In the traditional form it bears that "Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." In the Syriac-Sinaitic Palimpsest it bears that "Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary, the virgin, begat Jesus, who is called Christ."¹⁸ The traditional form of the text is quite compatible with the inference of the actual paternity of Joseph, which the Syriac-Sinaitic MS. states unequivocally. But, contend a number of critics, the begetting is, in both cases, understood by the writers in the legal, not in the physical sense, and does not, therefore, rule out the virgin conception. Granting the contention that the writers used the term "begat" in the legal sense, it does not follow that their view of the generation of Jesus corresponded to the actual fact, in virtue of the mere application of a legal device of this kind. This device might supply a reason for holding that Joseph might be only the legal father of Jesus. It is not necessarily a guarantee of the virgin conception, which the writers assert on the strength of a questionable angelic communica-

¹⁸ The MS. was discovered by Mrs Lewis and Mrs Gibson in the monastery at Sinai, in 1894, and was transcribed by Bensly, Rendel Harris, and Burkitt, "The Four Gospels in Syriac" (1894). On the reading, see Burkitt, "Evangelion Mepharreshe," ii. 263 (1904); Robinson, "Euthaliana," "Texts and Studies," iii. 82 (1895); Allen, "Commentary on Matthew," 8 (1907); Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, January 1910; Westcott and Hort, "Greek New Testament," ii., Appendix, 140 f.; Taylor, "Historical Evidence," 105 f.

tion to both parents. It is a proof of the belief of the writers, not of the fact which they believe.

Apart from these stories, there is no evidence in the rest of the New Testament that definitely tends to substantiate their belief, whilst there is evidence that tends to cast serious doubt on it.

What, now, is the testimony of these writings? Jesus himself seems to have cherished the belief in his Davidic descent. He accepted the title, Son of David, applied to him in the Gospels, which further describe him as the Son of Joseph, or the Carpenter's Son. His Davidic descent is also attested by Paul (Rom. i. 4), the earliest literary witness, and may be accepted as a fact. In thus sharing the current belief in his descent from David through Joseph there is nothing to show that he did not understand it in the natural sense, though he did not, with his contemporaries, base his title to be the Messiah on it,¹⁹ nor attain, on this ground, to his specific religious conception of his Messianic vocation.

These stories were evidently not known to Peter, from whom Mark mainly derived the material of his Gospel. The primitive tradition about Jesus, as communicated by Peter, began with the baptism by John,²⁰ and it is evident that Peter, according to his own words,²¹ believed in the natural generation of Jesus. Whilst this is admitted by the upholders of the virgin conception, they contend that, being the secret of Jesus' parents, it is only natural that it should not have been known to Peter and the other Apostles, who witnessed exclusively to what they had seen and known of the actual ministry of Jesus.²² But it is rather extraordinary that they had not learned the secret from Jesus' mother, who was a member of the primitive Christian community at Jerusalem, and had ample opportunity and every reason, one should imagine, to communicate it for the strengthening of the faith of her fellow-believers. Even in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, apart from their opening chapters and the

¹⁹ Matt. xxii. 45; Mark xii. 37; Luke xx. 44.

²⁰ Mark i. 2-9; Acts i. 22; *cf.* Acts x. 37-38.

²¹ Acts ii. 30.

²² See, for instance, Box, "Virgin Birth," 135 f.; Sweet, "Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ," 227 f. (1906).

passage in which Luke speaks of Joseph as his "supposed" father,²³ there is nothing to indicate or confirm the alleged miracle. Only in the problematic incident at Cana, related in the Fourth Gospel, is it possible to infer, as some have done,²⁴ a knowledge of the mystery on the part of his mother. Similarly Paul knows nothing of it, in spite of the fact that he has a very exalted view of the person of Jesus. The terms in which he refers to his birth apply only to one who was naturally generated. "Born of a woman" (an expression which Jesus himself uses of those so generated (Matt. xi. 11)); "of Abraham's seed"; "born of the seed of David according to the flesh"; "of this man's seed hath God, according to promise, brought unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus"; "in the form or likeness of sinful flesh"; "of the seed of David, according to my gospel."²⁵ For the seer of the Book of Revelation Jesus is also "the root and offspring of David,"²⁶ and it seems fanciful to see in the mythological figure of the woman "arrayed with the sun, etc., who was with child,"²⁷ a proof of the birth of the nativity stories of Matthew and Luke. Even in the Fourth Gospel "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us,"²⁸ and it is a forcing of the text to read into these words the miraculous generation as a necessary corollary of the spiritual birth of believers, mentioned in the previous verse.

In addition to these positive statements there is in the Synoptic Gospels evidence which seems to conflict with the assumption of a supernatural generation. In the Lukan version of the nativity "his father and mother" are found marvelling at the things spoken by Simeon concerning him,²⁹ though Mary had already learned from the angel of his future Messianic greatness.³⁰ In the incident, also

²³ Luke iii. 23.

²⁴ Box, for instance, "Virgin Birth," 143.

²⁵ Gal. iv. 4; iii. 16; cf. Rom. iv. 13; i. 3; Acts xiii. 23; Rom. viii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8. For an illuminating discussion of the Pauline passages in reference to the natural generation of Jesus, see Vincent Taylor, "The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth," 3 f. His conclusion is that Paul believed that Jesus was naturally generated.

²⁶ Rev. xxii. 16; cf. v. 5.

²⁷ Rev. xii. 1 f.

²⁸ John i. 14. If the author knew the tradition of the virgin birth, as seems likely, in view of his knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels, he ignores it.

²⁹ Luke ii. 33.

³⁰ Luke i. 22-33.

recorded by Luke, on the occasion of the visit to Jerusalem,³¹ "his parents" do not understand the explanation given by Jesus of his tarrying behind, which, if they knew the secret of his conception, ought to have been evident enough. Mary is represented as "keeping all these sayings in her heart." But this does not denote anything more mysterious than the natural keenness of the mother to note every sign of future promise in her boy. If, as Harnack, Moffatt, and others³² maintain, the original reading of the Lukan version of the heavenly communication at the baptism was, "Thou art my beloved son; to-day have I begotten thee" (instead of the traditional form, "in thee I am well pleased"), this would show that Luke himself, albeit inconsistently, shared what seems to have been the primitive belief in the natural generation of Jesus. In the early stage of his ministry "his mother and his brethren," alarmed at the commotion caused by it, came from Nazareth to Capernaum, or, on the assumption that they had already removed thither, from their house there, to take him home, in the belief that "he is beside himself."³³ In his reply to those who inform him of their presence, Jesus himself seems to be conscious of their lack of understanding, and on the occasion of his visit to Nazareth expressly says so: "A prophet is not without honour except in his own country and among his kin, and in his own home."³⁴ Even the Fourth Gospel acknowledges that his brethren did not believe in him.³⁵ It is only at a later stage, *i.e.*, after his resurrection, and for this reason

³¹ Luke ii. 50. In other passages in chapter ii., where "his parents" are mentioned, Luke may be merely representing the current terms in which the Jews would naturally speak of them, and these passages need not, therefore, be adduced as evidence against the virgin birth.

³² Harnack, "Sayings of Jesus," 310 f. (Eng. trans., 1908); Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament," 269 (3rd ed., 1918). Blass admits that this was the original reading of Luke iii. 22, but attempts to explain it away. "Philology of the Gospels," 167 f. (1898). The explanation is not convincing.

³³ His relatives (*οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*, Mark iii. 21) are explicitly said in verse 31 to be "his mother and his brethren." B. Weiss holds that the words, "He is beside himself," refer to the belief, not of his relatives, but of those who were circulating the report about him ("Leben Jesu," ii. 96). The construction of the original, however, makes it more probable that the words are those of the relatives themselves. Gould, "Commentary on Mark," 61. Matthew and Luke significantly omit the words in their striving to tone down Mark's more realistic narrative.

³⁴ *οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ* (Mark vi. 4).

³⁵ vii. 5.

that his mother and his brethren share the belief of the little community of his followers at Jerusalem in him as the Messiah.³⁶ Nor is there any evidence that Jesus himself was conscious of a supernatural parentage. He recognises Joseph and Mary equally as his parents, and seems to share the assumption of his fellow-citizens of Nazareth that he was their natural-born son and one of several brothers and sisters.³⁷ In the Fourth Gospel, indeed, in reply to the question of the Jews, "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" he is represented as proclaiming his pre-existence, but not his supernatural birth.

In the light of the evidence, direct and indirect, it is, therefore, hazardous categorically to assert this miracle on the ground of these stories relative to it. In the face of this evidence the believers in it do not seem to me to meet fairly the difficulty of unreservedly accepting their historicity. It may be conceded that their absence from Mark and the Fourth Gospel does not necessarily rule them out as actual history. It is further possible that Peter, Paul, and the early Christian community, who believed in the natural generation of Jesus, were mistaken owing to their lack of knowledge of the fact, which Matthew and Luke, writing long after the event, profess to relate. Possibly, too, as the believers in the miracle maintain, the knowledge of it was long confined to Mary (Joseph, having died before Jesus began his ministry, may be left out of account) and a small circle of feminine friends, and that the ignorance of Peter, Paul, and the other New Testament writers on the subject may be due to the silence of Mary, who, according to the twice-repeated statement of Luke, "kept all these things in her heart." It is, nevertheless, extraordinary that this silence seems to have persisted right through the period of the New Testament writings as far as these stories are concerned. That the writers knew it, but did not mention it, and merely implied it, is a rather far-fetched conclusion. There is no convincing reason why Mary and her small circle of feminine friends should have refrained from making known to the Christian community at Jerusalem a fact of

³⁶ Acts i. 14.

³⁷ Mark vi. 3; Matt. xiii. 53; Luke iv. 16.

such stupendous consequence for the claim of Jesus on the devotion of his followers. Is it not more reasonable to infer that the supposed silence was due to the fact, of which indications have been given from the Gospel records, that she and her family were in reality as ignorant as others on the subject?

The real difficulty thus involved in the negative New Testament evidence suggests the question whether the nativity stories may not have had a different origin. These stories palpably embody poetic, legendary matter, as even upholders of the virgin birth admit. A Greek mythological source is, as we have noted, ruled out by the pronouncedly Hebraic character of their contents. Could, then, the idea of a virgin birth of the Messiah have suggested itself to Jewish-Christian thought? The answer of the believers in this miracle is an emphatic negative. Such an idea was not current in Jewish Messianic belief. The virgin birth, as reflected in these stories, categorically declares Dr Edersheim, "could never have been invented by contemporary Judaism; indeed, ran directly counter to all its presuppositions."³⁸ These stories are, therefore, no mere fictions, but substantially rest "on a solid basis of fact."³⁹ The Jewish-Christian sect of the Ebionites, in fact, expressly rejected the virgin birth. One need not use the word "invented" in the sense of deliberate falsehood. The stories might quite artlessly have arisen out of the naïve Jewish mentality of the age. Such tales have a habit of starting up in all good faith in the appropriate atmosphere, and it is not so certain, as Dr Edersheim and those who accept his dictum assume, that the idea of a virgin-born Messiah was altogether alien to Jewish thought of the age of Jesus. The fact that the Jewish-Hellenist translators of the Old Testament could render the Hebrew *almah* of Isa. vii. 14 by the Greek word for "virgin," and that the Hebrew author of the First Gospel could read the virgin birth into this passage, shows that it was by no means out-with the purview of the Jewish mind. It is, in fact, discernible in the allegorising cogitations of Philo, in part the con-

³⁸ "Life and Times of Jesus," i. 153.

³⁹ Box, "Virgin Birth," 78; cf. 20.

temporary of Jesus, and the Old Testament belief in the divine interposition in reference to the birth of some of the great figures of Israel's history might easily tend to suggest the miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost. Such an interposition in the case of the barren Elizabeth is, in fact, adduced in Luke's nativity story, though the son born to her is apparently naturally generated. In the case of "one greater than John," it was easy, in certain crudely thinking circles, to go a step farther and predicate a divine origin of the physical generation as well as of the pre-existent person of the Messiah.⁴⁰ Harnack⁴¹ sees in Isa. vii. 14 the direct source of this belief, and it is not so evident, as the defenders of the virgin birth assert, that the prophecy did not suggest the fact, but that the fact suggested the application of the prophecy. Again, the idea of the divine begetting of Jesus as the Messiah at his baptism, based on Ps. ii. 7, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee," might well carry the divine generation back to his birth. Jewish-Christian piety was by no means all of the Ebionite type. Moreover, in current Jewish folklore there were, it seems, also elements, derived maybe from a Babylonian source, that might tend to engender this belief.⁴²

It is, therefore, rather risky to dismiss offhand the possibility that such a belief could have developed out of Jewish Messianic thought, and that it could only have been derived from the fact alleged in these stories.

Assuming this possibility on what appears to be reasonable grounds, is there discernible any underlying motive to account for their genesis and circulation?

A twofold motive seems to me to underlie them. In both stories it is evident that the Messiah, whose generation they profess to relate, must be conceived by the Holy Ghost in order to fill his Messianic vocation. "That which is

⁴⁰ This is the view of Lobstein, "The Virgin Birth of Christ," 72 (Eng. trans., 1903).

⁴¹ "History of Dogma," i. 100 (Eng. trans. of the 3rd German ed., 1894).

⁴² Cheyne, "Bible Problems," 73 f. (1904); Gressmann, "Das Weihnachts-Evangelium" (1914), who contends for an Egyptian source. Both theories are criticised by Box, "Virgin Birth," 157 f. See also Conybeare, "Myth, Magic, and Morals," 199 f.; Schonfield, "The Lost Book of the Nativity of John," 48, 63 f. (1929).

conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost," is the angelic announcement to Joseph, and the name, Jesus, is prescribed because "he shall save his people from their sins."⁴³ "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God."⁴⁴ The reason, also in this case, which precedes the divine announcement of the generation, is that the son is destined to be the Messianic king. Human procreation being accounted necessarily sinful in Jewish religious thought, nothing less than a divine generation could be commensurate with the character of the promised Saviour and Son of God. True, the belief in the natural generation of the divine Saviour might well consort with a very elevated conception of him in the thought of Paul and even the Fourth Gospel. To the more naïve type of mind, reflected in the nativity stories, this generation was evidently incompatible with the person and function of the Messiah.

Moreover, the tradition, from which the writers borrowed, was evidently influenced by the additional motive of meeting the calumnies that were being circulated by the unbelieving Jews about the birth of Jesus. Their purpose is, partly at least, apologetic. According to those tales, Jesus was the offspring of the amour of Mary, a women's hairdresser, with the Roman soldier Pandera, and had learned the art of sorcery in Egypt.⁴⁵ There is no reason to doubt that he is referred to in early passages in the Talmud as Ben Pandera, the son of Pandera,⁴⁶ and there is perhaps in John viii. 41,

⁴³ Matt. i. 20-21.

⁴⁴ Luke i. 35.

⁴⁵ See Dalman, "Jesus Christ in Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, etc.," with introductory essay by Laible (trans. by Streane, 1893).

⁴⁶ See Klausner, "Jesus of Nazareth," 20 f. (1925, Eng. trans. from the Hebrew by Danby). The designation Ben Pandera is supposed by Nietzsche and Bleek to mean Son of the Virgin, Pandera being the Jewish translation of the Greek *παρθένος*. In that case the story originated from the Christian belief in the virgin conception, maliciously interpreted. Laible rejects this derivation, and suggests that it was derived from the Greek *πάνθηρ*, Son of the Panther, i.e. of sensuality (p. 22). For other views, see Box, 199 f. To me it seems more probable that the virgin conception was rather the attempt of Christian apologetic to meet Jewish calumny. Klausner forcibly shows that there is no reason to infer that Jesus was also referred to in the Talmud as Ben Stada, the false Egyptian prophet, who was overthrown by the Procurator Felix between A.D. 52 and 60. See also Herford, "Christianity in Talmud and Midrash" (1903).

“We were not born of fornication,” an echo of this Jewish calumny. The motive for emphasising the virgin conception lies as much in the necessity for vindicating the character of Jesus from later Jewish aspersions as in the assumption that it alone was in keeping with the function of the divine Saviour, whose coming was fulfilled in Jesus. It is an early form of the Christian apologetic in refutation of these calumnies. Jesus is the legal descendant of David, miraculously generated in accordance with prophecy—the promised Messiah, the divine Saviour, the Immanuel whom the unbelieving Jews have unwarrantably rejected and scurrilously defamed.

In thus eliminating the physical paternity of Joseph, under the influence of a preconceived notion of the person and function of the Messiah and in the interest of the early Christian apologetic against the Jews, the tradition, as reflected in Matthew and Luke, has overlooked a radical weakness of this naïve belief. By eliminating human paternity, whilst retaining human motherhood, it does not necessarily assure the desired result—the absolute holiness of the divinely generated Saviour—unless we arbitrarily assume the sinlessness of the mother. Jesus would still be born of frail humanity, and the miracle of a divine generation would require the further miracle of an immaculate medium. Paul, on the other hand, finds the evidence of the exalted moral nature of Jesus in his supremely holy life, as crowned by his resurrection from the dead, which is for him the incontestable proof of the ideal human life. “Marked out or declared to be God’s Son in power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead.”⁴⁷ On his own testimony, it is evident that he believed that God had fashioned in Jesus the instrument of His purpose in the ordinary course of nature. Out of the seed of David, through the natural generation of his parents, He had brought into existence the unique being who was not merely to fulfil the part of the Messiah in the Jewish sense, but to be in himself and in his human life the revealer of God in a unique sense to all men. In him, from his conception onwards, God’s creative agency was at work forming

⁴⁷ Rom. i. 4.

the personality, the character, the Jesus type of mind and soul and heart in its highest manifestation.

In this formative process heredity and upbringing doubtless counted for much, and Luke gives us a glimpse of the deeply pious home and circle into which Jesus was born. Joseph and Mary, Zacharias and Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna, seem to be real types of this piety which takes its inspiration from the old prophetic source, and which produced the Magnificat, the Benedictus, and the Nunc Dimittis, though they may be etched in a poetic, legendary setting. This is the religious atmosphere in which Jesus developed from his infancy—the atmosphere of the spiritually minded, or “the quiet ones of the land,” who were waiting for the dayspring from on high, the light to shine in the darkness. In this environment and out of this material the creative power of God could truly effect the consecration and the perfection of the developing mind and soul of Jesus for his future vocation, without the naïve adjunct of the partial human origin which these nativity stories recount, but which fails to meet the demands of the case. Wedlock consecrated to God in the home of a Joseph and Mary, a Zacharias and an Elizabeth, is not necessarily impure. It is a natural and, therefore, a divine ordinance, and to reject human paternity as unfitted for the divine purpose, whilst retaining human motherhood as the medium of this purpose, is too artless to pass for history.

Moreover, this naïve belief endangers the real humanity of Jesus, and by transforming him into the demigod, unwittingly tends to a Docetic view of his person. What was born of Mary, if its procreation was due to the Holy Spirit, was not a real, a whole man. What, on the contrary, we have in the Synoptic Gospels is not a half, but a whole man, in whom God operated in a unique degree, and an ideal life in which He reflected Himself as in no other. The greatness of Jesus rests on the reality of his moral personality and his supreme religious significance as the highest manifestation of the divine in the human; not on the problematic miracle of his birth, which there are such strong historic reasons for questioning.

II. THE SEQUEL

The annunciation of the supernatural generation is followed in both narratives by an account of the birth and its immediate sequel. How far are the events thus related to be accepted as historical? The two accounts are evidently drawn from different sources, and the difference in detail is so great that it is very difficult to believe that there was a definite and certain tradition underlying the events related. Both, too, are coloured by the characteristic standpoint of the respective writer, and evidently contain subjective elements. The Jewish-Christian Matthew seeks to convince the unbelieving Jews of the Messiahship of Jesus by the repeated appeal to prophecy. Not merely the miraculous conception, but the events connected with the birth of Jesus have happened in fulfilment of a series of ancient prophetic sayings, and the introduction in the genealogy of women of non-Jewish race and the visit of the Magi only indirectly suggest the world mission of the Messiah. The Gentile Luke, whilst also presenting Jesus in the Magnificat and the Benedictus as the fulfilment of the Messianic hope of the ancient Jewish writings, traces back the genealogy to Adam, and frankly represents him in the *Nunc Dimittis* as the light of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, in accordance with his pronounced universalist standpoint. At the same time, in spite of difference of standpoint and discrepancy of event, there is a certain amount of agreement between these two otherwise disparate traditions. Both agree that Jesus was born in the reign of King Herod. Both state that Bethlehem was his birthplace, though for different reasons. Both further agree that he was brought up at Nazareth, though again for different reasons, and his early residence there is attested as a well-known fact in all four Gospels. Both reflect the sanguine expectation of the promised Messiah or Saviour which undoubtedly permeated the pious, spiritually minded section of the Jewish people. Luke, in particular, has left us a realistic picture of the prevailing mood of this pious circle, and has hardly invented the representatives of this mood,

who are too true to life to be the empty echoes of mere later belief, though in the telling of these stories later belief has evidently intruded itself into the realm of fact.

The birth at Bethlehem may seem problematic in view of the striking differences in the two narratives relative to it, and recent critics like Johannes Weiss and Edward Meyer¹ reject it as unhistoric. For Matthew, Bethlehem, not Nazareth, is the home of Joseph and Mary, and the birth accordingly takes place there in accordance with prophecy. For Luke, Nazareth, not Bethlehem, is the family home, and the birth takes place there in consequence of the first enrolment decreed by Augustus for the whole Empire, which required the parents of Jesus to journey to Bethlehem for this purpose. Both writers, contend the sceptical critics, have blundered, and the traditions on which they relied are, therefore, worthless as far as this episode is concerned. In the one case, the belief that Jesus must, in accordance with prophecy, have been born at Bethlehem led to the conclusion that his parents resided there. In the other, ignorance of the political conditions of Palestine under Augustus and King Herod led to the antedating of the first enrolment by at least a dozen years, and therefore the supposed reason for the birth at Bethlehem cannot have applied. It may be granted that the Matthæan tradition betrays a misapprehension as to the home of Jesus' parents before the birth, though it does not necessarily follow that Jesus could not, therefore, have been born at Bethlehem. In the case of the Lukan account it is by no means so certain, as the sceptical critics have assumed, that it is based on a gross historical blunder, and that, therefore, the birth could not have taken place in the manger at Bethlehem in the circumstances which it mentions. Luke states that it occurred when Quirinius was governor of Syria, and that the enrolment which took place under his Syrian governorship was the first made in accordance with the decree of Augustus "that all the world should be enrolled." In-

¹ "Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments," i. 51, 423 (1907); "Ursprung und Anfänge des Christenthums," i. 52 f. Keim, an older writer, also rejects it as unhistoric. "The birth of Jesus at Bethlehem is devoid of all adequate historic evidence." "Jesus of Nazara," ii. 106 (1876, Eng. trans.). •

ferentially it is evident that he also believed it to have taken place within the reign of King Herod, who died in 4 B.C. He further asserts that Joseph and Mary went to Bethlehem, "the city of David," to be enrolled, on the assumption that the enrolment had to be made in the ancestral place of origin, Joseph being of the house and family of David. Both these statements have been rejected as inaccurate. Quirinius, maintain the critics, was governor of Syria only in A.D. 6, when, on the testimony of Josephus, an enrolment in Syria and Palestine was unquestionably made, *i.e.*, ten years after the death of Herod. The first enrolment could not, therefore, have taken place both during the governorship of Quirinius and in the lifetime of Herod. There could have been no census, such as is alleged, to occasion the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, who, it is assumed, was born within the lifetime of Herod. The birth at Bethlehem is, thus, a figment of Luke's imagination. Moreover, it is a pure assumption that enrolment required the parents of Jesus to journey to Bethlehem for this purpose, and, wherever made, it involved the presence only of the husband, not of the wife.

The critics have, however, been rather premature in both these negative conclusions. Luke himself² knows of the enrolment which took place in A.D. 6, and distinguishes between it and the previous one, which was the occasion of the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, and which he accordingly calls the first enrolment. Evidence has been adduced by Sir William Ramsay tending to show that the census made by Quirinius in A.D. 6 was not the first of its kind. He gives reasons for concluding that Quirinius was associated with Sentius Saturninus in the government of Syria between 10 and 7 B.C., and that the first enrolment mentioned by Luke as taking place under his government might thus feasibly have been made within the lifetime of Herod.³ Further, in the eastern part of the Empire it was, it seems, customary to enrol in the ancestral locality, and household enrolment, not merely that of the head of the family, was

² Acts v. 37.

³ Ramsay, "Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?" (1898), and his re-study of the question in "The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament" (1915).

the rule.⁴ There is, therefore, no necessity for questioning Luke's accuracy in representing Joseph and Mary as journeying from Nazareth to Bethlehem for this purpose. Judæa was not, indeed, subject to Roman taxation till A.D. 6, when it was incorporated into the Empire as part of the province of Syria and placed under a Roman procurator. But this earlier enrolment was not necessarily for the purpose of taxation. It seems to have been rather a census in our sense of the term, *i.e.*, a numbering of the people of a subject State of the Empire. Ramsay's contentions⁵ do not amount to an absolute demonstration of the truth of Luke's statements. But they supply a feasible reason for accepting them as substantially correct, and they do shake the rather offhand assertions of the critics that Luke's chronology is hopelessly wrong and that his version of the birth at Bethlehem is, therefore, based on a fiction. Moreover, there is some force in the contention that, since the Jews expected the Messiah to come as a glorious deliverer, the lowliness and poverty of the birth in the manger are an indication of its historicity.⁶

Nor is there any substantial reason for questioning the accuracy of Luke's account of the circumcision and the naming of the infant on the eighth day, his redemption as the first-born son, and the offering made to the priest for the purification of his mother. These observances are in accordance with the stipulations of the law, which enjoined the redemption of the first-born son from a month old by the payment of five shekels,⁷ and the offering for purification forty days after birth.⁸ Neither ceremony in the age of Jesus required the presence of mother or child in the Temple. The redemption might take place before the local priest, and the purification offering—in this case a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons, the offering of the poor—

⁴ "Recent Discovery," 261 f., 272.

⁵ They are ignored by Joh. Weiss and Edward Meyer. Berguer ("Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus," 1923) also writes in ignorance of the recent discussions on the question. His reasonings on the subject are, therefore, inadequate and misleading. Felten accepts the substantial accuracy of Luke's statement. "N.T. Zeitgeschichte," i. 139 f. (1910).

⁶ Gilbert, "Student's Life of Jesus," 93 (1898).

⁷ Exod. xiii. 1 f. About 10s. or 12s. in our currency.

⁸ Lev. xii. 1 f.

which had to be made in the Temple, could be made by another on behalf of the mother.⁹ But Bethlehem was only about two hours' walk south of Jerusalem, and the parents might well have desired to perform the double ceremony in the Temple. If so, there was nothing in the practice of the time to render their going thither, as recorded by Luke, unworthy of credence. The only points that raise some difficulty are the words, "their purification" (evidently referring to the father as well as the mother), and the presentation of the child in the Temple. The law regarded the mother alone as unclean, and the "their" does seem to reveal ignorance on the part of the writer of the exact character of the ceremony. Presentation of the child to God in the Temple (*i.e.*, consecration) on such an occasion is not otherwise attested.¹⁰ But such an act of consecration to the divine service on the part of those who belonged to the deeply pious circle, to which the Nativity stories introduce us, is not, as Box has forcibly pointed out, to be absolutely ruled out, in view of the admittedly imperfect state of our knowledge of the religious conditions of the time.

More problematic is the sequel in which Simeon and Anna recognise in the child the promised Messiah. Simeon is an apocalyptic on the outlook for the advent of the Saviour of Israel as delineated in the old prophetic and the more recent apocalyptic literature, with which his mind is obsessed. As parents and child enter the Temple, his obsession at once flashes into his brain the thought that here at last is "the consolation of Israel," for which he has been long looking. He impulsively grasps the child in his arms and intones the *Nunc Dimittis*. The incident is by no means incredible. Such a sudden inspiration is common enough in religious psychology, and it is all the more feasible inasmuch as it is based, not on the artificial conception of the virgin birth, but on a flash of spiritual illumination, which sees in the appearance of the child the realisation of the long-cherished conviction that he should not see death before he had seen the Christ. The amaze-

⁹ Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus," i. 194.

¹⁰ Box, "Virgin Birth," 89. The Syr. Sin. MS. attempts to get rid of the difficulty on the score of "their" by altering it to "her."

ment of "his father and mother" on hearing the *Nunc Dimittis* is, in fact, incompatible with a knowledge of the miraculous conception on their part, and shows that the source from which the writer took this part of the narrative assumed the natural generation of Jesus, though the writer himself apparently failed to note the fact. It is less easy to accept as strictly historical the additional announcement to Mary of the future rôle of the Messiah and the tragic experience that awaits both mother and son. This sounds like a later reflection inspired by the actual course of events, though the foreboding of the "travail" of the Messianic vocation, which ancient prophecy (*Isa. liii.*) might suggest, need not be absolutely ruled out. In Simeon's counterpart, the prophetess Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, who catches the enthusiasm of the moment and communicates the discovery to her like-minded circle, we may also recognise a real figure. At the same time these prognostications appear to have been the ebullition of an evanescent enthusiasm. When, thirty years later, Jesus comes to the consciousness of his Messianic function, the secret is known to no one but himself, not even to his mother and his brethren.

From Jerusalem the parents return straightway to Nazareth.

So much of the Lukan narrative may fairly be accepted as historic. Far more dubious are other parts of both narratives which appear to show legendary features, and to be mutually contradictory. Matthew, who believes in the astral influence on human destiny, or perhaps has in view the star that was to come forth out of Jacob (*Num. xxiv. 17*), knows of the visit of eastern Magi to Bethlehem. Being astrologers and reasoning from the appearance of a remarkable star in the far east, they conclude that its appearance marks the birth of a Jewish king, the divine agent of a new epoch in the history of humanity.¹¹ They travel a long distance from the far east to Jerusalem (inferentially about two years appear to have elapsed between the appearance of the star and their arrival at Jerusalem) in order, as representatives of the Gentile world, to render homage to

¹¹ On the Oriental astrological prognostication of the birth of great men, see *Jeremias*, "Babylonisches im Neuen Test." 50 f.

the newborn world-redeemer. King Herod is startled by their inquiry regarding him, "and all Jerusalem with him." He consults the chief priests and the scribes, who adduce the prophecy of Mic. v. 1, that the Messiah shall have his origin at Bethlehem. For his own sinister purpose, Herod accordingly sends them thither to discover the child. On the way the star again appears and guides them to the home of the child, whom they worship and present with costly gifts. Then, warned in a dream not to go near Herod, they escape back to the land whence they came. Joseph, similarly warned by an angel, flees with mother and child to Egypt. Herod massacres all the male children at Bethlehem below two years, and only after his death does Joseph, again warned by an angel, venture to return with the mother and child. He avoids Bethlehem for fear of Herod's son, Archelaus, now ruler of Judæa, and settles at Nazareth in fulfilment of an indefinite prophecy that Jesus should be called a Nazarene (inferred, perhaps, from the Branch (*Neser*) in the Messianic sense of Isa. xi. 1).

Instead of the visit of the Magi, which could only have taken place at a considerable interval after the birth, Luke, on the other hand, has the visit of the shepherds on the night of the birth, and knows nothing of the startling episode of that of the Magi and its sequel. He takes Jesus and his parents to Jerusalem, the very centre of danger, according to Matthew, and thence straightway back to the home at Nazareth. In both narratives angels play a dramatic part, and here again, whilst these poetic, legendary touches invest the narratives with a naïve charm, they hardly tend to predispose the reader in favour of their actuality. The Matthæan story, in particular, reflects in addition the influence of prophecy in the shaping of events and raises a doubt whether the data, which are supposed to fulfil these prophecies, were not the fruit of mere belief expressing itself in pictorial language. Given this belief, it was easy enough for the Oriental mind to show in circumstantial fashion that the wisdom of the East accepted the world mission of Jesus, which the unbelieving Jews rejected, and that they were inexcusably blind in refusing to acknowledge Jesus as the world Messiah or Saviour. It

seems to be, not history, but Midrash, in accordance with the Rabbinic method of conveying a doctrine or teaching in the form of a story, which is not necessarily, or intended, to be taken literally, but meant to illustrate or enforce certain edifying ideas.

Moreover, this Matthæan drama is, in essential respects, both lacking in probability and irreconcilable with the Lukan narrative. That the wise men should have left no trace of their homage in the other Gospels (the Apocryphal Gospels,¹² with their sheer revelling in the fabulous, may be left out of account) is extraordinary. That such a striking testimony to the future world mission of Jesus should otherwise disappear with the vanishing Magi, in spite of the sensation which it excited at Jerusalem and Bethlehem, is unaccountable. That, further, Herod, in spite of the public recognition of Jesus by the wise men, which must have made it easy to distinguish the infant from all others in Bethlehem, should have slaughtered all the male children below two years, is in these circumstances hardly credible, even making allowance for his blood-stained character as a ruler. Josephus, who tells of his many crimes, knows nothing of such a massacre, and Luke is equally silent. This part of the story may, in fact, be an echo of the prediction, mentioned by Josephus and imputed to members of the sect of the Pharisees, that Herod would lose his kingdom to another, and that he slew the members of his family who had been privy to the plot against him, along with those of the Pharisees who were also implicated in it.¹³ Or, more probably, it may have been suggested by the atrocity of Pharaoh in ordering the midwives to kill all the newly born male children of the Israelites in Egypt, and the miraculous escape of the infant Moses, the future deliverer of his people, from the tyrant's atrocious design.¹⁴ The influence of the early history of Moses on that of the Matthæan account of the sojourn of Jesus in Egypt further appears in the command

¹² See James, "The Apocryphal New Testament" (1924).

¹³ "Antiquities," xvii. 2, 4 (ed. Niese, iv. 77), *cf.* xvii. 6, 6, where he tells that on the eve of his death he ordered that one out of every family should be slain, and thus the whole people should be plunged into mourning.

¹⁴ The tradition in its elaborate form is reflected in the account of Josephus (ii. 9), and this form of it seems more likely to have influenced the Matthæan story than that of Exod. i. and ii.

of the angel to Joseph to return to "the land of Israel." The reason given by the angel (Matt. ii. 20) is almost verbally the same as that adduced by the Lord to Moses in Exod. iv. 19.

The most serious obstacle in the way of accepting the dramatic recital of the first evangelist as history is the fact that the Lukan narrative leaves no room for these alleged events. This recital presupposes that Bethlehem, not Nazareth, was the home of Joseph and Mary. It further presupposes a lengthy interval between the birth of Jesus there and the flight to Egypt, since the wise men evidently only reach Bethlehem after such an interval (inferentially, two years). But, according to Luke, the stay of the Holy Family at Bethlehem did not extend over more than six weeks, when they returned from Jerusalem straight to Nazareth. The defenders of the Matthæan story have been hard put to it to imagine a way out of this almost insuperable dilemma. Luke's statement, it is said, about the immediate return from Jerusalem to Nazareth is merely a summary one,¹⁵ which does not necessarily exclude a further stay in Bethlehem. Possibly. But this is certainly not the impression conveyed by the intimation that "after accomplishing all things that were according to the law, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth."¹⁶ Or, in his ignorance of this prolonged stay, he may have blundered. Or, assuming the accuracy of the statement, Joseph and Mary, attracted by the sacred associations of the place, or actuated by the knowledge that another presentation of the child was to be made to the representatives of the Gentiles, might have returned to Nazareth, and the adoration of the Magi and the flight to Egypt might thus have taken place.¹⁷ This is really too fanciful for serious consideration. Later Jewish calumny certainly knows of a stay of Jesus in Egypt, where he learned the art of sorcery. But this is rather a Jewish explanation of his miracle-working power than a confirmation of the Matthæan story. This story is, on the face of it, inspired

¹⁵ Box, "Virgin Birth," 105.

¹⁶ Luke ii. 39.

¹⁷ Nolloth, "Rise of the Christian Religion," 175-176 (1917).

by the elaborated tradition of the birth of Moses, and is meant to show that Jesus, like Moses, was preserved by divine intervention for his world mission in accordance with the prophecy of Hos. xi. 1, "Out of Egypt did I call my son."

CHAPTER II

THE YEARS OF PREPARATION

I. POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS

At the birth of Jesus, which must be antedated several years before the conventional date,¹ King Herod was nearing the end of his long reign (37-4 B.C.). He was a native of Idumæa, which had been judaised by the Maccabæan rulers, and was therefore only a naturalised Jew. On this account his rule was obnoxious to Jewish religious feeling. He was besides regarded as an alien usurper, who owed the kingship to the grace of Rome, as Klausner aptly phrases it.² He was the strong man whom the civil strife and anarchy of the expiring Maccabæan or Hasmonæan régime had thrown up, and derived the appellation "Great" from the ruthless energy with which, with Roman aid, he had crushed Antigonus, the last of the dynasty, and extended his rule over the whole of Palestine.³ His despotic government and the atrocities and oppressions, which he perpetrated in the interest of his power, justly earned for him the detestation of his Jewish subjects, and have attached to his memory a series of terrible crimes. His despotism had, however, the merit of restoring the unity of the Jewish kingdom which the internecine strife and bloodshed of the thirty years of Hasmonæan faction, which preceded it, had threatened to disrupt. He strove, too, to enhance his own renown and its prestige by lavish ex-

¹ The actual date was probably between what corresponds to 8 and 6 B.C.

² "Jesus of Nazareth," 191 (Eng. trans. by Danby).

³ Josephus, "Antiquities," xiv. 14 f.; "Jewish War," i. 14 f. The edition of the original is that of Niese, "Flavii Josephi Opera" (1887 f.). Whiston's English translation (1880), and Thackeray's translation in the Loeb Classical Library (1926) for the "Life" and the "Contra Apion." Also the French translation under the direction of Reinach (1900 f.).

penditure on extensive building schemes at Jerusalem and throughout Palestine. He founded a number of cities, including Sebaste, in Samaria, and Cæsarea, on the sea-coast, and indulged his Hellenist tastes by adorning them with splendid temples in honour of Augustus, amphitheatres, and other public buildings.⁴ His craving for fame even led him to present costly edifices to cities outside Palestine.⁵ With his patronage of Græco-Roman civilisation he combined an ostentatious zeal for the Jewish religion, in order to conciliate the goodwill of his Jewish subjects. Hence the reconstruction of the temple on a magnificent scale, which he began in 20 B.C. and which was still unfinished at his death, and was only completed in A.D. 64.

This lavish expenditure, involving heavy taxation, extortion, and confiscation, intensified the widespread and deep-set, if underground, disaffection which prevailed throughout his reign and welcomed his death as a relief from an intolerable tyranny.⁶ This disaffection found expression in a revolt at Jerusalem, in Galilee, and elsewhere before Varus, the governor of Syria, succeeded in enforcing subjection to those of his sons to whom he had by his will bequeathed the kingdom. With the sanction of Augustus, Archelaus thus became ruler of Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa, with the title of ethnarch, instead of king, as his father had directed. To Antipas was assigned Galilee and Peræa; to Philip the north-east regions, Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, with the titles of tetrarch.⁷ In his rapacity and oppression, Archelaus proved a true son of his father, and in response to a petition of his subjects, in A.D. 6, Augustus deposed and exiled him to Vienne, in Gaul, and incorporated his territory in the province of Syria, whilst leaving his two brothers as the dependent rulers of their respective territories,⁸ and allowing the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem to exercise a certain measure of jurisdiction in matters affecting life, property, and religion.

⁴ Josephus, "Antiquities," xvi. 5; "War," i. 20; see also P. Thomsen, "Denkmäler Palestina's aus der Zeit Jesu," 11 f. (1916).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ "Antiquities," xvii. 11, 2; "War," ii. 6, 2.

⁷ "Antiquities," xvii. 11, 4; "War," ii. 6, 3.

⁸ "Antiquities," xvii. 13.

Judæa thus passed under the direct rule of Rome and was governed by a procurator, who in the years of Jesus' mission was Pontius Pilate (A.D. 26-36).⁹

Roman rule involved Roman taxation and the enrolment of A.D. 6 under Quirinius, the Syrian governor, for the purpose of this taxation, was widely resented, inasmuch as it was a mark of bondage to a pagan power, which presumed to usurp God's heritage.¹⁰ Moreover, this taxation, in addition to the customs on transported goods and the tithes and offerings in support of the temple worship and the priesthood,¹¹ was a heavy drain on the people, and the economic burden was increased by the method of levying it. The procurators farmed the taxes and customs to collectors (publicans), who transmitted the proceeds to the public treasury, and whose harsh and corrupt discharge of their office rendered them, in the eyes of their victims, little better than robbers and brigands. It is not clear that the territories ruled by Antipas and Philip were directly subject to these taxes and customs. In any case their rulers seem to have been, like their father, liable in a tribute to the Emperor, and in this indirect fashion their subjects were compelled to pay for the Roman overlordship of these regions, in which detachments of Roman soldiers were stationed.¹²

On national and religious grounds, therefore, the change from the Herods to the Roman procurators only intensified the revulsion from the rule of the alien. In Galilee, in particular, where the nationalist spirit was strongest, it

⁹ "Antiquities," xvii. 13, 1, 2, 5; "War," vii. 3.

¹⁰ "Antiquities," xviii. 1, 1; "War," ii. 8, 11.

¹¹ Matt. xviii. 24 f.; Luke xxi. 1-2.

¹² On this oppressive system, see Josephus, "Antiquities," xviii. 6, 5, in which he reports the sardonic comments of Tiberius upon it. On the Roman fiscal system, see Chapot, "The Roman World," 93 f. (Eng. trans., 1928). For Palestine in particular, see Muirhead, "The Times of Jesus," 44 f. (1905). He holds that the territories of Antipas and Philip were not directly subject to Roman taxation, and that the publican Matthew (Mark ii. 14 f. and parallels) was an official of Antipas, whereas Zacchæus, the "chief publican" at Jericho (Luke xix. 3 f.), was an official in the service of the Roman Procurator. These publicans, he further contends, had only to do with the collection of the customs, not with that of the poll-tax and the land-tax. Klausner holds that they collected both. "Jesus of Nazareth," 161. So also Carpenter, "Life in Palestine when Jesus Lived," 82 f. (3rd ed., 1915); see also Grant, "The Economic Background of the Gospels," 87 f. (1926); Felten, "N.T. Zeitgeschichte," i. 154 f.

resulted in the rise of an extreme nationalist party which Judas of Gamala, and Zadok, the Pharisee, fomented in vindication alike of the national liberty and the national theocracy, and which sedulously fanned the spirit of revolt throughout the land.¹³ These nationalists were the stalwarts of the Messianic hope, who believed in re-establishing the rule of God by force, and were eagerly expecting the warrior deliverer from the yoke of the Roman oppressor. In this respect they differed totally from the quietist section of the nation, which, under the influence of the bloodshed and misery of the Herodian régime, had lost faith in a national redemption by violent methods, and looked to a moral and religious transformation for the establishment of the kingdom of God. These quietists were of the otherworldly type, the meek and poor in spirit of the Gospel, those who, in the words of the prophet of old, "hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord, who sit alone and keep silence under the yoke and give the cheek to him that smiteth" (Lam. iii. 26 f.). Those who thus, in quiet and humble faith, waited for the end of the present evil order of things and the inauguration of a better, ere long found a prophet of their aspirations in John the Baptist, and in a greater than he—the carpenter prophet of Nazareth. The nation was thus approaching the last and the greatest crisis of its history—the crisis which was to eventuate, on the one hand, in the destruction of the Jewish state as the result of the policy of revolt and force, and, on the other, in the rise of

¹³ "Antiquities," xviii. 1, 1. Klausner asserts that the Zealots, who embodied the extreme nationalist spirit, arose out of this early movement of antagonism to Rome. "Jesus of Nazareth," 16 f. "Judah, the Galilean, and Zadok, the Pharisee, founded the sect of the Zealots." It seems, however, that the name and the sect only came into existence at a later time, during the great revolt under Vespasian. See Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings of Christianity," i. 423 f. (1920). Moore, in the same volume, holds that there is no trace in contemporary Jewish rabbinic thought of the expectation of a warrior Messiah and that it is only after the time of Jesus, *i.e.*, after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, that this expectation becomes apparent. He thinks that what the Jews in the time of Jesus envisaged was rather the coming of the reign of God than the coming of the Messiah. "Beginnings of Christ," i. 357. But this does not hold of Jewish Apocalyptic of the time of Jesus, which certainly looked for the coming of the Messiah either as a warrior king ("Psalms of Solomon") or as a transcendental figure ("Book of Enoch"). How far this expectation had spread among the people is a moot question. The Gospels, if not rabbinic Judaism, do show its presence in both forms, and also show that Jesus modified it in his own original fashion and in accordance with his personal experience.

Christianity, the transformation of the Jewish religion into a new spiritual movement, independent of race and nationality.

Such was the political atmosphere in which Jesus was born and grew up amid the hills of Galilee, and which imparted its distinctive colouring to his message and his mission. It is rather surprising that the most aggressive embodiment of the Jewish spirit should have found its focus in Galilee, the region stretching north of Samaria, between the Mediterranean and the lake of this name, to the lower spurs of Lebanon, where Jesus began his prophetic mission. It appears in Isaiah (ix. 1) as "Galilee of the Gentiles," and the bulk of its population was descended from the Assyrians and other immigrants, who had settled in this attractive region after the overthrow of the northern Israelite kingdom. With its incorporation into the Macabæan kingdom, towards the end of the second century B.C., there was an influx of Jewish settlers from Judæa, and its inhabitants had become largely judaised, though they were looked on by the southern Jews as an inferior race. "Out of Galilee cometh no prophet,"¹⁴ was a current saying at this period in Judæa, and gave expression to the contempt of the Judæans for the guttural dialect of the Galileans and their intercourse with their Greek neighbours. Nazareth, the home of Jesus, was, in fact, the butt of one of these contemptuous sayings: "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"¹⁵ Its population included a Greek element in the towns on the lake, and in the region of the Decapolis, or ten cities, and in Peræa, on the eastern side of the lower Jordan, which was combined with Galilee under the government of Antipas.¹⁶ It was in these towns around the lake and beyond Jordan that the influence of Greek culture had survived from the days of Alexander, and in the age of Jesus this influence was apparently at work in

¹⁴ John vii. 52.

¹⁵ John i. 46.

¹⁶ Peræa extended down the eastern side of the Jordan from near the Lake of Galilee to the Dead Sea. These Greek cities of the Decapolis owed their origin to the conquest of Alexander, and dominated much of the territory, east and south-east of the Lake of Galilee, as far east as the desert. Among them were Gadara, Gerasa, Pella, Philadelphia. G. A. Smith, "Historical Geography of the Holy Land," 601 f. (1894).

Galilee as well as beyond Jordan.¹⁷ Jesus and his disciples, whose mother tongue was Aramaic, were probably acquainted with the current colloquial Greek, if not with Greek thought.

Though held in little esteem by the inhabitants of Judæa, Galilee was the most fertile, thickly populated, and affluent part of Palestine. Its towns, of which Sepphoris, the capital, was the largest, were numerous, and the region was dotted with large villages, of which Josephus says, doubtless with exaggeration, that the smallest contained as many as 15,000 inhabitants.¹⁸ Around the lake there were as many as nine of these cities—including Tiberias, which Antipas founded and adorned in honour of the Emperor—with a teeming population, engaged in the fishing industry and the handicrafts and commerce which it contributed to nurture. Outside the cities agriculture was the main industry, and the wheat and oil of Galilee were the finest in Palestine. From the Gospel parables we get glimpses of the prevailing social and economic system. In Galilee, as in Palestine generally, the mass of the people consisted of small landholders—the householders of the Gospels—who lived in village communities and cultivated their own holdings. There was also a class of tenant farmers, who held the land of another, from whom they received seed, implements, and beasts of burden, and paid in return a proportion of the produce in rent, as we learn from the parable of the householder, who let his vineyard out to husbandmen.¹⁹ From another parable we learn that there was a class of landowners on a larger scale, whose estates were managed by a steward and worked by free labourers.²⁰ Many of this labouring class had fallen in the social scale, from the status of a small holder to that of a labourer or hired servant, through inability to pay their debts to their

¹⁷ Smith, "Hist. Geography," 608; Friedländer, "Synagoge und Kirche," 131 f. (1908). Smith thinks that "it is impossible that our Lord and his disciples did not know Greek." See also Kittel, "Die Probleme des Palästinischen Spätjudenthums und das Ur-Christenthum," 34 f. (1926). Thomson goes the length of saying that "it was the language which he customarily used." "Books which Influenced Our Lord," 5 f. (1891).

¹⁸ "War," iii. 3, 2.

¹⁹ Matt. xxi. 33 f.

²⁰ Matt. xx. 1 f.; Luke xvi. 1 f.

wealthier neighbours or through bad seasons. In addition to these free labourers, there were the slaves or bond-servants,²¹ bound to serve their masters for a term of years, incapable of changing them at will and disposing of their labour. On a still lower level were the Canaanitish slaves, who could be bought and sold and punished at will, and had practically no social rights.

In addition to agriculture the crafts were practised in the cities, and some of these cities specialised in particular trades, as at Nazareth, which appears to have specialised in carpentry and wood-sawing,²² and where dwelt Joseph, the carpenter, and his carpenter son. Besides the tillers of the soil and the craftsmen we hear also, in the parables, of the merchant and the banker—the rich men clothed in purple and fine linen, the rich man who had grain laid up for many years in his barns and built greater ones, and the rich neighbours who amassed wealth in buying and selling the produce of the land in the markets of Sepphoris, or Tiberias, or Jerusalem, or other large towns, and in the export and import trade with foreign countries.²³ Banking, too, brought fortunes to those who, as in the parable of the talents, invested their money at a profitable interest through the bankers.²⁴ The great centre of this banking business was the court of the temple—a sort of national bank of Palestine—where the money-changers, whose tables Jesus wrathfully overthrew, plied their unseemly business, and to whom he addressed the scathing rebuke, "It is written, my house shall be a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of robbers."²⁵

From the Gospels it thus appears that in Galilee and elsewhere in Palestine in the age of Jesus there was ample room for the social as well as the religious reformer. On the one hand, a class of large landowners, wealthy merchants, and bankers, growing rich at the expense of the small holders, who were diminishing in number; on the other, a growing proletariat of landless peasants and free labourers, dependent

²¹ Luke xvii. 7 f.

²² Klausner, "Jesus of Nazareth," 178.

²³ Luke xvi. 19; xii. 16 f.; xiv. 12.

²⁴ Matt. xxv. 14 f.

²⁵ Mark xi. 15; Matt. xxi. 12 f.; Luke xix. 45-46.

on this wealthy class for a precarious existence.²⁶ It is not surprising, therefore, that there was widespread unrest in the land on social and economic as well as political grounds. This unrest is particularly noticeable in Galilee. The Galileans were a vigorous, mobile, enterprising race. "Ever craving for revolution, by nature addicted to change and delighting in sedition," is how Josephus describes them.²⁷ It was among these choleric, restive, freedom-loving Galileans that Jesus grew to manhood. It was no mere chance that the new religious movement, which he originated, took its rise in such an environment, and that its first aggressive missionaries were bred amid the hills and by the Lake of Galilee. Whether, with Klausner,²⁸ we should also seek in the social and economic conditions of the time, and in the cosmopolitan policy of Herod in favouring Greek culture and commerce in the pursuit of his own glory, and thus fanning a non-Jewish universalist spirit, an explanation of the rise of Christianity is very questionable. At most these conditions and this policy tended to prepare the way for the mission and the message of Jesus among those to whom it was directly addressed. The secret of both the mission and the message is, however, to be sought in his own personal religious experience rather than in the external circumstances of his developing manhood, though these must undoubtedly have had a certain influence on his growing mind and outlook. It is certainly significant that he habitually showed in his teaching and his works his deep interest in the poor, and strove to alleviate their hard lot by reminding the rich of the clamant duty of "giving to the poor."

II. EDUCATION AND SELF-DEVELOPMENT

The life of Jesus up to about his thirtieth year is practically a blank as far as any direct record of it is concerned.

²⁶ Klausner, 189; Grant, "Economic Background of the Gospels," 54 f.; Carpenter, "Life in Palestine," 41 f.; Merrill, "Galilee in the Time of Christ," 34 f. (1885).

²⁷ "Life," 17 (Loeb Classical Library).

²⁸ "Jesus of Nazareth," 189 f.

Mark begins his narrative with the baptism by John, and apparently had no interest in the long interval between his birth and this event, his object being to depict his active career in Galilee, as the preacher of the kingdom of God, and its tragic close at Jerusalem. Matthew is equally ignorant, and there seems to have been little or no available information concerning this long interval. As the result of his investigations, Luke was able to add only a single incident, besides the general statement that "the child grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him."¹ Such a general statement has at least the merit of avoiding the fabulous tales of the apocryphal Gospels, as in the Gospel of Thomas and its appendices.² We may infer from this statement that Jesus grew up a healthy, intelligent, and serious-minded boy. His remarkable intelligence and his keenness to learn are borne out by the episode in the temple on the occasion of his first visit with his parents to Jerusalem in his twelfth year, when, having attained the requisite age as "a son of the law," he was under obligation to attend the Passover with them. In spite of some later colouring, it may be accepted as historical.³ In his eagerness to profit from the instruction which the doctors of the law gave in a portico of the temple on Sabbaths and festival days, he remains behind, unknown to his parents, instead of starting with them on the return journey with the caravan of pilgrims from Nazareth, and astonishes the doctors by his amazing intelligence in asking and answering questions.⁴ There is nothing incredible in this remarkable precocity, considering the earlier maturity of Jewish children compared with those of our northern climate. "Why all this searching?" is the reply to his mother's reproachful query, on finding him

¹ ii. 40.

² See James, "The Apocryphal New Testament," 49 f.

³ J. Weiss emphasises what he considers the impossibilities of the story. "Schriften des Neuen Testaments," i. 430-431. But his arguments concern the later form and motive of the story, and do not exclude the possibility of some such incident. Deissmann thinks that it is not at all improbable. There was an intense and widespread interest in the ancient sacred writings and in the scribal elaboration of the ancient law. Jesus shared this interest in the Scriptures, and it is highly probable that it dates from his boyhood. "New Testament in the Light of Recent Research," 23.

⁴ Luke ii. 47 (ἐξίστατο δὲ πάντες).

after the lapse of three days' anxious seeking, sitting in the midst of the doctors. "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business," or more probably, "in my Father's house?" This absorption in religious instruction which, he implies, they knew, and ought at once to have suggested to them the reason of his absence, is quite in keeping with what we know of his later career. In this respect the boy was father to the man, even if the form of the answer to his mother's query appears to convey a reflection of the later belief in his supernatural origin as the Messianic son. "My Father," in antithesis to "Thy father and I sought thee sorrowing"—taken in conjunction with the author's remark that "they understood not the saying which he spake unto them"—is suggestive of this later reflection. At the same time the expression, as actually used by him, may denote the dawning sense of the filial relation to God which was to develop into a distinctive note of his later teaching, and of which he became fully conscious at his baptism. For the rest the author seems unconscious of any lack of consideration on the part of the boy in failing for three days on end to realise the natural anxiety of his parents and to get into touch with them, though he adds that he forthwith evinced the sense of his filial duty to them and "went down with them to Nazareth and was subject unto them."⁵ The same impression of a remarkably developing intelligence and an attractive goodness, as well as continued healthy physical growth, is conveyed in the general reference to the years of adolescence with which he concludes the episode. "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man."⁶

The incident further shows that in the home, the school, and the synagogue at Nazareth he had been carefully instructed in the Scriptures and in the history of his race. To the Jews, as we learn from Josephus, writing towards the end of the first century A.D., education was a matter of the first importance.⁷ "Above all, we pride ourselves on the education of our children." The law, he further tells us, made it obligatory to teach the children to write and

⁵ Luke ii. 41 f.

⁶ Luke ii. 52.

⁷"Contra Apion," i. 18 (Loeb Classical Library).

learn the laws and deeds of their forefathers.⁸ No Jew was, therefore, ignorant of the law. "Should any one of our nation be questioned about the laws, he would repeat them all more readily than his own name. The result, then, of our thorough grounding in the laws from the first dawn of intelligence is that we have them, as it were, engraven on our souls."⁹ The claim may contain a spice of exaggeration, especially if we understand it of the Torah, the law in the developed scribal sense, of which the rustic Jewish boor (the Amhaaretz)¹⁰ was largely ignorant. But his testimony is confirmed by Philo, unlike him the contemporary of Jesus, and the example of Timothy is very significant in this connection. "From a child thou hast known the sacred writings."¹¹ What is remarkable in the temple episode is not that Jesus in his twelfth year already possessed a knowledge of the law, which he would share with the children of his age, but the extraordinary intelligence with which he had assimilated this knowledge.

This knowledge he evidently amplified in the subsequent years of adolescence and manhood. There is undoubtedly a reminiscence of this intensive study in the later repeated question to the Pharisees, "Have ye not read in the Law?"¹² From the later incident in the synagogue at Nazareth, we know that he could read the Scriptures in the ancient Hebrew and translate and expound them in the Aramaic dialect to the people. From this incident we know also that, whilst working at his father's trade, he took an active part in the worship of the local synagogue before he began his actual mission.¹³ "He entered, *as his custom was*, into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up to read."¹⁴ He could later dispute with even the scribes on passages of the Hebrew Bible, and was

⁸ "Contra Apion," ii. 25.

⁹ *Ibid.*, ii. 18.

¹⁰ On the Amhaaretz, see Bousset, "Religion des Judenthums," 187-188, 3rd ed., edited by Gressmann (1926).

¹¹ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

¹² Matt. xii. 3 f.; xix. 4; xxi. 16.

¹³ Réville ("Jesus de Nazareth," i. 422-423, 1897) thinks, in view of the astonishment produced by this incident, that he had hitherto not taken part in the synagogue worship. The inference does not necessarily follow. This astonishment was produced not by his taking part, but by his new Gospel.

¹⁴ Luke iv. 16.

doubtless speaking from his own experience of Bible study when he averred that man does not live by bread alone, but by the Word of God.¹⁵ In a considerable town like Nazareth the professional scribe would doubtless be at hand to expound the law for the guidance of the local council of elders, and he would learn from this class something of the legal lore which it professed, but which evidently did not attract him. The scribes or lawyers were in fact the special objects of his later invective. Probably also he would come in contact with the Pharisees, who haunted the synagogues as well as the street corners and the market-places, only to be repelled by their ostentatious religiosity.¹⁶

The religious atmosphere in which he grew up was, we may further conclude, that of the pious, spiritually minded circle in which the Messianic expectation in the more religious sense was very ardent, not that of the extreme nationalist party which had come into existence about the time of the visit to Jerusalem, and whose aggressive, revolutionary Messianism would certainly have no attraction for this circle. It was to this type of simple-minded, pious Jew—"the babes," "the little ones," those who in the eyes of the Pharisees were accounted "sinners" because of their ignorance of the scribal tradition—that he later preferred to address his message.¹⁷ We may infer from the Gospels that he drew from the Pentateuch, the prophetic writings, and the Psalms the main material of his religious thought in these formative years. These he accepts as the Word of God, and his mind seizes directly the natural meaning of the sacred text without troubling itself with critical questionings or losing itself in the maze of scribal interpretation. At the same time, he shows his originality in the independence with which he can on occasion interpret the received Scriptures. These Scriptures existed only in separate rolls. They had not yet been completely collected into an authorised Canon, and not every synagogue possessed a full set of these rolls. But, to judge from Luke iv. 16 f.,

¹⁵ Matt. iv. 4.

¹⁶ Matt. vi. 2, 5; cf. xxiii. 6.

¹⁷ Mark ix. 42; Matt. x. 42; xi. 25; xviii. 6 f.; Luke x. 21; xvii. 2.

the synagogue at Nazareth contained the Pentateuch (the law) and some at least of the prophets, and in the synagogue at Sepphoris, at no great distance from Nazareth, Jesus would have the opportunity of consulting a larger collection of the sacred writings. In addition to these, it is highly probable that he had some knowledge of the ethical and apocalyptic literature of the previous two centuries, especially of the Book of Daniel, the first Book of Enoch, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,¹⁸ as far, at all events, as this literature entered into the religious thought of the time.

In addition to the formal influence of the rich Hebrew literature, ancient and more recent, there is not lacking evidence that in his receptive, reflective mind, alert eye, and impressionable soul he possessed a rare power of self-development. As he grew to maturity he evidently developed in a marked degree the capacity to be his own teacher and at the same time to be the teacher of others. He was in this respect far more the product of his own originality than of any formal teaching. Nor are we left entirely to mere assumption in trying to depict to ourselves the process of his mental and spiritual growth throughout these years of silence. In the parables, sayings, and incidents of his later mission we have what we may call a certain reflex knowledge of this otherwise silent period. With due discrimination, coupled with caution, we can read back into the personal experience of those years¹⁹ when he was learning much from nature and life as well as from the sacred page.

Much has been written on Nazareth and its environment

¹⁸ See Walker, "Jesus and Jewish Teaching," 30 f. (1923), and "What Jesus Read" (1925); Thomson, "Books which Influenced Our Lord," 12 f.

¹⁹ One of the first attempts thus to read back from the parables and sayings to the earlier life of Jesus was made by Merrill in a detailed article, "Christ as an Observer of Nature, Persons, and Events," in "Bibliotheca Sacra," July 1872. Mr Sinkovitch has overlooked the substantial information thus obtainable of the early period of the life of Jesus. He is certainly wrong in maintaining that we have no knowledge at all of the development of Jesus' character and mind during this period. "Under what circumstances he was developing, what he was doing, what influences impressed themselves upon his life and thought before he was thirty—what do we know about it? Nothing." "Towards an Understanding of Jesus," 2 (1925). Bultmann goes further, and opines that "we know practically nothing of the life and personality of Jesus." "Jesus," 12 (1926).

as the source of this process of self-education. It lay in a basin among the lower hills of Galilee bordering the plain of Esdraelon, which cut through from the Jordan valley to the Mediterranean Sea, and separated Galilee from Samaria. It was within easy reach of the roads that ran both north and south of it between the Mediterranean and the Jordan, and from the hills around it there is a far-reaching and varied view over the fertile landscape, rich in historic interest, through which passed the caravans connecting Acca on the seacoast with distant Damascus, on the one hand, and Judæa and Egypt, on the other. Only an hour's walk distant was Sepphoris, the capital of Galilee before Antipas replaced it by Tiberias, and next to Jerusalem the largest town in Palestine and the centre of a thriving commerce and industry. From Sepphoris a road, almost touching Nazareth, ran through the neighbouring village of Japha, the largest in Galilee, and across Samaria to Jerusalem, and on this highway also there was a constant stream of travellers to and from the Holy City. Case ²⁰ has pictured him working at his trade not only at Nazareth, but at Sepphoris, and thus coming into contact with the varied life of a large city, experiencing the larger impressions of life and thought and gaining a wider outlook than were possible in his native place. The picture is, of course, largely imaginary. But there is no improbability in the assumption that he was thus brought into contact with the larger and more varied life of the time, through the proximity of Nazareth to a larger centre of population, as well as to the main routes that connected Galilee with regions far and near. In any case, Nazareth itself, with perhaps a population of from 15,000 to 20,000 inhabitants,²¹ afforded ample opportunities for observation and reflection to an alert mind.

In the man ²² of the ruling class in the parable, who travels into a far country, we have a glimpse of what Jesus might and probably did see on these roads near it—the caravans of the travelling merchants and government

²⁰ "Jesus: A New Biography" (1927).

²¹ Merrill, "Galilee in the Time of Christ," 122.

²² Luke xix. 12-13.

officials and pilgrims from afar, and the detachments of the Roman legions. Renan seems to have overlooked these opportunities for contact with the outside world when he says that "he had no knowledge of the general state of the world."²³ Certain it is that the parables and sayings reflect a close observation of Nature and the life and social conditions of the time, which could only have been gained by one who took an observant interest in the world around him. They throw light, too, on the character and circumstances of the observer.

Nature evidently laid its spell over him. He has the artist's eye for landscape, the naturalist's interest in the wild life that haunts it. He is struck by its beauty, its fruitfulness, the mystery of the silent process at work in mother earth, "bearing fruit of herself, the seed springing up and growing, he knoweth not how, first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."²⁴ The commonest flowers, the lilies of the field bursting forth as the concrete expression of this invisible creative power, a divine artistry which the ordinary eye hardly notices, are for him a never-failing marvel and delight. "Yet I say unto you, Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."²⁵ In his walks among the hills he notes the wild life that haunts them—the raven, the eagle, the fox—and observes their habits. He studies the heavens as well as the earth, and the varied mood of both reacts on his own. Sunrise and sunset, the clouds, the winds and the rains, storm and calm, are full of suggestion to his reflective mind. "Your Father maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust."²⁶ "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit."²⁷ He knows, too,

²³ "Vie de Jésus," 41. Réville shares this view, "Jesus de Nazareth," i. 427. Son champs d'observation était extrêmement restreint. For a description of Galilee, the situation of Nazareth and its environs, and also the roads in its vicinity, see Merrill, "Galilee in the Time of Christ" (1885); G. A. Smith, "Hist. Geog.," 379 f. (1894); Dalman, "Orte und Wege Jesu" (1924); Klausner, "Jesus of Nazareth," 229 f.; Case, "Jesus," 199 f.

²⁴ Mark iv. 26-28.

²⁵ Matt. vi. 28-29.

²⁶ Matt. v. 45.

²⁷ John iii. 8.

that the cloud rising seawards on the western horizon and the wind blowing from the south portend rain and scorching heat.²⁸ Though bred a townsman and a craftsman and acquainted with the communal life, he loves the open country and seeks relaxation in its solitude from the toil of the carpenter's shop and the bustle of the street and market-place. The common life of the countryside, the work of man in field and vineyard and grove, that makes Nature subservient to his needs, also excites his interest. He pauses by the way to watch the peasant ploughing, or sowing, or reaping, or storing the grain in the granary. He can tell what sort of harvest the various kinds of soil will produce and what is the inevitable result of careless sowing.²⁹ He takes note of the farmer inspecting the field or trying the new team of oxen he has just bought,³⁰ and appreciates the prudence of the countryman who finds the darnel springing up along with the good seed sown, and waits till the harvest before attempting to separate the wheat from the weeds.³¹ Likewise that of the vinedresser who counsels the owner of the unfruitful fig tree in the vineyard not to cut it down, but to try first the experiment of manuring it more richly.³² He has firsthand knowledge of vine-planting and wine-making, and knows the futility of pouring the new wine into old, instead of new, wineskins.³³ He has watched the shepherds tending their flocks on the hills and moors of Galilee, leading them about and penning them in the fold, separating the sheep from the goats, or leaving them in order to search for a stray one, and rescuing the one that has fallen into a pit on the Sabbath day.³⁴ Similarly he takes note of the lowly occupation of the despised, ill-fed, and hunger-stricken swineherd.³⁵

As a carpenter he knows all about housebuilding and the indispensable preliminary of choosing a solid foundation of rock, instead of sand, and counting the cost before beginning the work of construction.³⁶ He has, too, an intimate knowledge of life inside the little house in which

²⁸ Luke xii. 54-55.

²⁹ Mark iv. 3 f.

³⁰ Luke xiv. 18-19.

³¹ Matt. xiii. 24-30.

³² Luke xiii. 6-9.

³³ Matt. iii. 22; xii. 1-3.

³⁴ Matt. xii. 11; xv. 46; xxv. 12; John x. 9.

³⁵ Luke xv. 14.

³⁶ Matt. vii. 24-27; Luke xiv. 2.

he, like his class, lived during his working life as a carpenter. His father died some time after his twelfth year, for his mother appears at the commencement of his mission as a widow with five sons (including himself) and several daughters,³⁷ and on him, as the eldest, devolved the main share of the maintenance of the household by his toil in the carpenter's shop. His home was evidently one of these little houses, so small that the children sleep in the same bed with the father, and the father can converse without rising with the friend who knocks at the barred door at midnight and asks the loan of three loaves.³⁸ Other parables reveal his close acquaintance with this home life as he experienced it in his widowed mother's modest dwelling. The inference gives a more realistic touch to the parables which tell of women grinding their small portion of corn at the mill, leavening the meal and putting it into the mud oven and kindling the wood fire with the withered grass gathered from the field, patching the old garments to make them go as far as possible in clothing a large family, purchasing the cheapest form of food (two sparrows for a farthing each) when bread and fish or an egg were lacking in the scanty home larder, lighting a candle and sweeping the floor to find a lost coin and joyfully telling the neighbours of its finding.³⁹ He knows what it costs the poor widow whom he observed throwing her two mites into the temple treasury—"all that she had"—and the thought of his own widowed mother struggling to bring up her large family

³⁷ Mark vi. 3; Matt. xiii. 56. There is no doubt that Joseph and Mary had other children besides Jesus. Mark and Matthew give the names of these "brethren" as well as mention his "sisters." Paul also makes mention of his brothers (1 Cor. ix. 5, and Gal. i. 19). Luke ii. 7, distinctly says that Jesus was Mary's first-born. It is only in later apocryphal stories that they are transformed into the children of Joseph, who was a widower, by a first marriage. Bishop Lightfoot's arguments in favour of this assumption are not convincing ("Commentary on Galatians," 258 f.). Joseph is said by tradition to have had a brother, the Clopas of John xix. 25, and Mary to have had a sister, Salome, who was probably the wife of Zebedee, and thus the mother of James and John, who became Jesus' disciples (Mark xv. 40; Matt. xxvii. 56). If so, Jesus had relatives living at Capernaum, and this would explain the fact that his home was there during his mission in Galilee. See Headlam, "Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ," 95-96 (1923).

³⁸ Luke xi. 5-7.

³⁹ Mark ii. 21; Luke xi. 11-12; xii. 6; xv. 8-9; xvii. 35; Matt. xiii. 33; vi. 30; vii. 9-10.

would make the sense of her self-denial all the more real to him.

The parables afford, too, an insight into the developing character and personality of the young carpenter. He loves children and delights to watch them playing in the market-place, representing in their own artless way the incidents of daily life, as he himself had done as a boy, and quarrelling at times in the midst of the game.⁴⁰ Evidently a capacity for winning their love in return, of attracting to himself their confidence, of understanding and appreciating the guilelessness and simplicity of the child soul, which he retained in his own.⁴¹ How he would fascinate them by telling them didactic little stories after the fashion of his parables, about what he had noted in his rambles amid the fields and the hills. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he folded them in his arms and blessed them."⁴² Renan is certainly wrong in saying, in reference to the later incident of his mother and brothers seeking him, that "his family does not seem to have loved him."⁴³ This is assuredly a false impression of the spirit that reigned in the home circle at Nazareth, and even the later incident, to which he refers, is the expression of their anxious affection, not their lack of it, if it also shows inability to understand him in his new vocation of prophet. He who later knew how to calm the fretful and worried Martha in the home at Bethany⁴⁴ must have shed in the careworn household at Nazareth the beam of a comforting and cheerful spirit. Evidently, too, a rare capacity for friendship, a nature instinct with sympathy, and the insight, the understanding, and the forbearance which sympathy engenders. Women especially figure in the circle of his later followers,⁴⁵ and even "the sinners" among them come under the spell of his boundless charity as well as unique moral elevation.⁴⁶ The tragedy of life is evidently already exercising his soul and nurturing the compassion with the sorrowing, the poor, the disabled, which spontaneously made his later mission one of healing and helping. It is the human note that

⁴⁰ Luke vii. 32.

⁴¹ Luke ix. 46-48.

⁴² Mark x. 13-16; *cf.* Luke ix. 47-48.

⁴³ "Vie de Jésus," 44 (19th ed., 1883).

⁴⁴ Luke x. 38 f.

⁴⁵ Luke viii. 2-3.

⁴⁶ Luke vii. 47.

comes out so characteristically in such later works of mercy, and the humanity was there long before the mission brought it into active operation. "Now when he drew near the city, behold, there was carried out one that was dead, the only son of his mother and she was a widow. And when the Lord saw her he had compassion on her and said unto her, Weep not."⁴⁷ At the same time, this natural fund of human sympathy is not the index of a weak sentimentalism. He had the quick Galilean temperament which could flash out in anger at deception, or lack of insight and right feeling in others. He was "incensed" with the disciples who would prevent the children being brought to him.⁴⁸ Again he looked round about on the Pharisees "with anger,"⁴⁹ being grieved at the hardness (insensibility) of their hearts. He could be a sharp critic of the disciples as well as the Pharisees,⁵⁰ and had learned to speak his mind freely and forcibly in rebuke and denunciation. When hungry and disappointed at not finding fruit on the fig tree, he is represented as giving expression to his vexation by cursing it for bearing leaves without fruit, even though "it was not the season for figs."⁵¹

He had, we may be certain, been developing a strong individuality throughout these years of preliminary training for his future vocation. His Galilean upbringing away from the centre of Judaism favoured the growth of an independent attitude towards the conventional religion as the result of his own reading and reflection, even if he shared the observance of the religious practices of the time. A habit of looking at the heart of things had been forming itself, an instinct for truth, and an intense dislike of mere appearance without reality. He had been learning to think for himself, to follow his own intuitions, even if it involved opposition to the official religious leaders and aberration from external religious practice, the minute ceremonialism with which these leaders burdened the daily life. "Master,

⁴⁷ Luke vii. 12-13.

⁴⁸ Mark x. 14 (*ἡγανάκτησεν*). Matthew and Luke omit the passage.

⁴⁹ Mark iii. 5 (*μετ' ὀργῆς*). Luke omits any reference to the anger—another evidence of the tendency to gloss over such a human trait.

⁵⁰ Matt. iv. 41; vii. 18; viii. 17; xviii. 33.

⁵¹ Mark xi. 14. The cursing is, however, open to doubt.

we know that thou art true and teachest the way of God in truth, and carest not for any one, for thou regardest not the person of man.”⁵² These crafty words of the Pharisees suggest an attitude of mind which had not been acquired solely in the course of his mission. Such an independent character is not formed in a day. It had been in the making years before. When, for instance, he stood by in the marketplace and observed buyer and seller striving to overreach each other in false asseveration and swearing their veracity by heaven, or earth, or Jerusalem, or their own heads, he had turned away from the unreality of it all and resolved to practise simple truthfulness, straightforwardness of speech, and mean what he said, whether yea or nay.⁵³ He who grew up in the freer atmosphere of Galilee which, we might almost say, predestined it to be the nursery of Christianity, and assiduously learned in the school of nature and life, would have little taste for the formal and complicated lore of the scribes. His robust sense of things, his artless mind, would perforce tend to revolt against the artificial religiosity of the pundits of the law. Their scholasticism would only excite dislike and drive him to the living fountain of the prophets and the Psalms. The “wisdom,” which later astounded his fellow-townsmen, he drew from this living fountain and from his own musings in contact with nature and life. It bears the stamp of Hebrew, not of Greek thought, for by the wisdom and culture of the Greeks he is quite untouched. With it he absorbs the angelology and the demonology, the current beliefs which play such a striking part in the records of his mission. He is, indeed, in this respect a son of his time, and only as a son of his time could he have brought his message home to the hearts and minds of his hearers. He had learned to live with his time, and only so could he have read men and gauged a given situation with that wonderful resource and readiness of apprehension, which strike the modern student of his life at every step of it. He has, too, the vivid imagination which this wonderful power implies, so vivid that he sees Satan

⁵² Matt. xxii. 16.

⁵³ Matt. v. 33-37. See Glover, “The Jesus of History,” 37-38 (1917), for some pertinent remarks on this subject.

fallen from heaven, visualises the demons which he exorcises, and in the temptation story sees the angels ministering unto him, at least in spirit. He has a quiet and simple relish of life, eating and drinking even with publicans and sinners⁵⁴ without meticulous ceremonial scrupulosity or parade of fasting. What God gives he thankfully enjoys; what He withholds he gladly does without. He is a born altruist and optimist. He must take every opportunity to serve others, whilst gaining his daily bread in the sweat of his brow. He has all the optimist's impulse to change and better his Galilean world, and is prepared to challenge opposition in behalf of his lofty moral and spiritual ideal when the time comes. He will venture on the hazardous enterprise of realising this ideal with a daring, a soaring faith that lifts him far above the common religious level. His message will be a sublime, uplifting, and enthusing one, the Gospel, the glad tidings of God's kingdom, God's presence among men as he has learned to know Him in his own soul, in the best of the old Hebrew literature, and in the marvel and beauty of God's world around him. It is not so much a doctrine as an experience of God that he is gradually acquiring and preparing to proclaim.

One would fain know how he looked as he attained to mature manhood. A great teacher like Socrates is not necessarily of comely or impressive presence. There is only a single hint in the Gospel narratives on his personal appearance. Luke tells of his increase in stature and in favour with God and men⁵⁵—a saying from which, in spite of its vagueness, we may infer a well-developed body and a comely face and figure. Otherwise the writers were too exclusively interested in his prophetic mission to reckon with the natural curiosity of posterity on this head. Mark several times mentions his looking around him on his hearers,⁵⁶ and there was evidently something arresting in this look, and also in his voice and bearing, to judge from the effect of his presence and his address. He looks at a man by the wayside as he passes, and it is enough for him to say, Follow me, and the man follows. The look and

⁵⁴ Matt. ix. 11.

⁵⁵ ii. 52.

⁵⁶ iii. 5, 34; v. 30, 32; xi. 11.

the tone of the voice grip the soul and compel the will. At other times it is the winsomeness of his words that strike the listeners. He has a marvellous power of saying striking things so spontaneously and naturally that the people wonder at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth.⁵⁷ They come to his lips so simply and appealingly "out of the abundance of the heart," the treasure of the reflections which he had been storing up during the obscure Nazareth years. One who inspired the boundless love and devotion of his followers must have had a singularly engaging manner and address—the fitting expression of an elevated mind and heart functioning in a nervous, emotional, high-strung, yet wonderfully self-possessed nature. A recent writer hazards the conclusion that he was of large build, on the rather questionable generalisation that large men have been the leaders of humanity. A more pertinent argument in support of such a conclusion might be found in Luke's reference to his growth "in stature."⁵⁸ He further infers that he must have been physically strong from the fact that he worked as a carpenter, or rather a builder accustomed to handle heavy material, and therefore a man of strong muscle. He thinks that this impression is confirmed by the driving out of the money-changers from the temple and the bearing of the heavy cross until he fell under its weight. From the transfiguration story he argues that his face must have been strikingly beautiful and that the personal magnetism, to which the Gospels bear witness, betokens distinction of presence.⁵⁹ The women of Nazareth are said to have been very comely,⁶⁰ and there is nothing improbable in believing that Jesus derived a certain beauty from his mother.

We are accustomed to think of him as the man of sorrows, oppressed by the weight of an overwhelming task; physically exhausted at times and ever wrestling with the problem of establishing the kingdom of God among men; faced towards the end with the thought of the Cross as the grim and awful bourne of his life. But there is another and a brighter aspect of his person which we are apt to overlook

⁵⁷ Luke iv. 22.

⁵⁸ Stature, rather than age, seems to be the correct translation of ἡλικία.

⁵⁹ Hall, "Jesus in the Light of Psychology," i. 35-38 (1917).

⁶⁰ Renan, "Vic de Jésus," 28-29.

in the shadow of his sorrow and suffering—the tender, human, joyous, even playful mood of the hour which must have lighted up his countenance with a singular charm. We are apt to forget, too, that he lived the full human life in its joys as well as its sorrows, and could share the pleasures of its festive side as well as feel its sombre and its tragic things. One feature, at all events, is there in striking lineament all through the Gospels—the manly, the heroic, the commanding spirit which was being nurtured during these years of silence and was to give a decisive turn to the world's religious history. The mysterious force of character and personality behind that, to us, otherwise unknown exterior has been operating well-nigh two thousand years in the hearts and souls of men. This is the immeasurable measure of it.

Jesus, we may conclude, had attained certain religious convictions as the result of the experience of these preparatory years. God had entered into his consciousness as the divine Father and he had come to experience a filial relation to Him. Whilst this conception appears as an intuition rather than an acquired doctrine, it had been deepened by long meditation on the word and work of God as revealed in the old Hebrew literature and the unwritten book of Nature. In him the belief in a new manifestation of this Father-God had, too, been taking shape. The shape was the current one of the Messiah, though, in accordance with the spiritual caste of his thought, the figure of the Messiah was not that of the Galilean nationalists. The current patriotism does not seem to have appealed to him. He was too spiritually minded to concern himself with the crass politics of the time. His absorbing interest lay in the moral and spiritual life. The problem of the Messiah is for him a religious, not a political problem. It is the idealist in life and thought, not the ebullient patriot, that has been in the making throughout these years of becoming. In this process God and humanity are finding themselves. Though there is evidently a predisposition to this idealism, it only develops in the struggle with self, in the effort to overcome the limitations and the trials of his human existence. It is clear enough that he had experienced what it cost to pluck

out the right eye and cut off the right hand—to use his own drastic language—in the effort to live the ideal life. Such trial and effort are the conditions of the moral and spiritual advance, which consists in the conquering and controlling of self. This was to Jesus a very real thing—all the more real in such a nature ; and to assume an untried humanity in him from the beginning is to deny him the essential of a real human experience and transform him into a moral automaton, a shadow of humanity. He chose the narrow gate ⁶¹ that leads to the highest life of the soul, and the choice and its attainment was not a matter of course. The way in which he speaks of this effort is certainly a reflection of his own experience. Tried in all things like as we, yet without sin in the sense of free consent to evil, with the ideal of the perfect man always leaving room for the effort, the struggle. “ Why callest thou me good ? There is none good but God ” ⁶² — an answer which Matthew, with a strange lack of reality, deemed it necessary to modify into, “ Why askest thou me concerning the good ? ” ⁶³

In these years the idealist had doubtless been seeking the way to realise what we may call his innate bent towards the service of God, as this idealism, coloured of course by his own time and Jewish environment, conditions it. Had he turned to any of the Jewish sects of the day who were striving to render this service in their own fashion ? If so, he had found no satisfaction in any of them, and had turned only to turn away. With the Essenes he is plainly not in his true setting, though he may have heard of them, and there were some affinities between his later teaching and theirs. With the Nazarenes Friedländer conjectures some contact, since they were to be found in Galilee as well as in the region beyond Jordan, where the Baptist movement took its rise. These pre-Christian Nazarenes, whom he regards as a section of the Minim of the Talmud, adopted a very free attitude towards the law, were strongly influenced by Hellenism, showed Gnostic tendencies, and were keenly interested in the coming of a Messiah who would abrogate the crude Old Testament legislation, and would establish the reign of the Supreme God in place of that of the Old

⁶¹ Matt. vii. 13-14.

⁶² Mark x. 7.

⁶³ Matt. xix. 17.

Testament Demiourgos.⁶⁴ They show affinities with the Essenes, and Friedländer is of opinion that it was from this circle that John the Baptist, the ascetic preacher of righteousness and the antagonist of the Pharisaic legalism,⁶⁵ emanated. He is further of opinion that Jesus himself was to some extent influenced by their freer attitude towards the law—that, in fact, it was mainly from their ranks that both he and the Baptist drew their first disciples. Hence, thinks he, the name Nazarene, or Nazorean, applied as a term of contempt or reproach to the followers of Jesus by their enemies, the Pharisees, to whom the pre-Christian Nazarenes were an abomination—a name derived, not from Nazareth, the place of Jesus' abode, but from those members of the sect who became his disciples. There may be something to be said for this derivation of the name⁶⁶ as applied to the early Christians, and the movement may have served to some extent as a preparation for his teaching. Many of the followers of Jesus in the early period of his ministry came from Decapolis and the region beyond Jordan as well as from Galilee and elsewhere.⁶⁷ The term Nazarene or Nazorean is frequently applied to Jesus in the Gospels and the Acts, and it became the current designation of the early Christians in Jewish circles. It was so applied, in Friedländer's opinion, because Jesus himself was originally regarded as an associate, if not a member of this sect, and because his early adherents came, at first at least, from its ranks. There is considerable force in the derivation of the name Nazarene in the Christian sense from this source rather than from the town of Nazareth, as the first Gospel, in accordance with an undiscoverable prophecy, avers. If it could be proved that Jesus before his public appearance maintained relations with the sect, it would throw a significant ray of light on the years of silence in which the long period of preparation for his mission is wrapped, and

⁶⁴ M. Friedländer, "Synagoge und Kirche," 99 f. (1908).

⁶⁵ Matt. iii. 4-11.

⁶⁶ Nazarene is derived by some, not from Nazareth, but from Nesar, the Messianic Branch or Shoot of Isa. xi. 1, "the Messianic One." On the various derivations of the name, see Box, "Virgin Birth," 28 f.; Burrage, "Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity" (1914); Burkitt, "Syrian Forms of New Testament Names."

⁶⁷ Matt. iv. 25; cf. Mark iii. 7-8.

Friedländer's view is very alluring on this account. The evidence is, however, only inferential, and that which may be gathered from the New Testament does not warrant us in yielding to this temptation. The pious circle into which Jesus is born, in the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke, is not that of the pre-Christian Nazarenes, as Epiphanius describes it. Joseph and Mary, Zacharias and Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna, do not shun the temple or reject sacrificial offerings or deny the authority of the books of Moses. Neither does Jesus himself in the sense in which the pre-Christian Nazarenes are said to have done. The early associates of Jesus and John are spiritually minded people, and in this respect they may have had something in common with the Nazarene sect. But they are also pious Jews. They reverence the law and look for the fulfilment of the promises. Moreover, while both Jesus and John appear as the antagonists of the Pharisees and lay the main stress on the ethical rather than the ceremonial law, neither of them appears as directly influenced by Hellenism, as in the case of the Nazarenes. John is a typical Jewish prophet. Jesus confines his mission to the lost sheep of Israel, to the Jews, whilst transforming Judaism by his characteristic teaching of the kingdom. The sect of the Nazarenes cannot be regarded as the foster-father of Christianity, and even Friedländer admits that, if he associated with them, he was not of them.⁶⁸ Even if we grant his problematic contention that such a pre-Christian Jewish sect existed in Galilee and Peræa,⁶⁹ the name subsequently applied to the early Christians does not prove that Jesus grew up among these Nazarenes and maintained relations with them, but that, at most, a section of them accepted his teaching, to which they were in some respects predisposed, and furnished the designation by which the early Christians were known in hostile Jewish circles.

⁶⁸ "Synagoge und Kirche," 149-150.

⁶⁹ Herford contests his contention that the Minim of the Talmud were pre-Christian Gnostics, and holds that they were very probably Jewish Christians ("Christianity in Talmud and Midrash," 368 f., 1903). In this case the Nazarenes, who are identified with the Minim, could only have come into existence as the result of Jesus' mission, and could not have influenced him. Friedländer, however, persists in maintaining that they were a pre-Christian sect.

CHAPTER III

THE ADVENT OF JESUS

I. THE FORERUNNER

THE direct impulse to his mission came from the preaching of John the Baptist. We are enabled from Luke's account of the commencement of the Baptist's ministry to date approximately the advent of Jesus. Both began, according to Luke, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. He seems to have reckoned this year from A.D. 11-12, when Tiberius was associated in the government with Augustus, rather than from the year 14, when he became sole Emperor. This would give 26-27 for the appearance of the Baptist, and consequently for the beginning of the mission of Jesus. If Jesus was born about 6 B.C., he must have been in his thirty-second year, which corresponds roughly with Luke's statement that "he was about thirty years of age."¹

John was a Nazarite from his birth, *i.e.*, dedicated by his parents to the ascetic service of God.² According to the nativity story of Luke, he was also destined from infancy to the prophetic vocation. He was to be a second Elijah who should inaugurate a radical reformation, make ready the people for the coming kingdom of God.³ As in the case of the nativity of Jesus, the birth story of John is overcast with legendary belief, as it was recounted among the adherents of the Baptist sect, though there is no reason to

¹ Luke iii. 23. Plummer ("Commentary on Luke," 82) argues that it was not usual to reckon the beginning of the actual rule of an emperor from the year of his association with his predecessor. But it is quite possible to conclude that Luke did so, and that this represents the actual date of the beginning of Jesus' mission, though the decision either way leaves some uncertainty.

² Luke i. 15.

³ Luke i. 16-17.

dispute the real existence of Elizabeth and Zacharias. Certain it is that he ultimately appears (presumably from his early manhood) as an ascetic recluse, who haunted the wilderness of Judæa,⁴ the arid waste lying westwards of the Dead Sea, where robbers lurked and the Essenes had monastic settlements. From this waste, in which he had brooded for years on the demoralisation of the previous half-century of the Roman-Herodian régime, he suddenly emerged as a second Elijah to summon a doomed world to repent in preparation for the establishment of the rule of God, the theocracy in its Messianic form. His attire suggests his prophetic vocation. Like Elijah, he is clad in a rough garment of camel's hair, girdled around his loins by a leathern band,⁵ though he himself, according to the Fourth Gospel, disclaimed that he was the new Elijah or the expected prophet.⁶

In this wilderness "the word of the Lord came unto John,"⁷ as to the prophet of old, whose voice had been silent in the land for centuries. The startling apparition of this devotee of the desert as the preacher of the imminent theocracy is confirmed by the matter-of-fact account of Josephus,⁸ which substantially agrees with the more lurid picture of the Gospels. The scene of his prophetic activity was the country on both sides of the lower Jordan,⁹ *i.e.*, Peræa, the territory of Antipas, as well as Judæa. His message is apocalyptic, as well as ethical, in keeping with the spirit of the pious circle in which he had been nurtured, and finds a ready response in the apocalyptic mood of the time. "The people," says Luke of the crowds whom his preaching attracted from Jerusalem and all Judæa and the region bordering the Jordan valley,¹⁰ "were in expectation, and all were reasoning in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were the Christ."¹¹ It tore like lightning through the apocalyptic atmosphere of the time. Mark sees in his appearance the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies in Mal. iii. 1 and Isa. xl. 3, which he

⁴ Luke i. 80; iii. 2.

⁵ See 2 Kings i. 8; *cf.* Zech. xiii. 4; Mark i. 16; Matt. iii. 4.

⁶ John i. 21.

⁷ Luke iii. 2.

⁸ "Antiquities," xviii. 5, 2.

⁹ Luke iii. 3; *cf.* John i. 28; x. 40.

¹⁰ Matt. iii. 5.

¹¹ Luke iii. 15.

combines as an indication of the character of his mission. "Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, etc." Matthew and Luke, though omitting the passage from Malachi, equally stress his prophetic rôle as the forerunner of the Messiah, whilst the Fourth Gospel, with the eye of the dramatist, puts the passage from Isaiah into the mouth of the forerunner himself, in answer to the question of the priests and Levites from Jerusalem, "Who art thou?"¹²

As the forerunner of the Messianic theocracy, his mission is concerned with the righteousness, which is an essential of its establishment by the "one that is mightier than he," whose shoe latches he is not worthy to unloose and whose imminent coming he proclaims.¹³ This coming one will test men by the standard of the divine righteousness. He will appear as a consuming, a refining fire (as in Mal. iii. 2 f.), as the winnowing who will separate the chaff from the wheat and burn it in unquenchable fire, as the woodman who will hew out the unfruitful trees and cast them to the flames. The preacher's style is steeped in the old prophetic utterance, and he finds apt metaphors in the burning scrub and the fleeing vipers of his wilderness environment. To the ascetic seer the Coming One, as the instrument of an avenging God, is the inexorable judge, the destroyer of a godless generation. He will baptise with fire, and the fire will devour whatever in religion and morals is based on hollow profession and mere pride of race, and has not the vital force of righteousness behind it. He will exercise judgment not merely on the heathen nations, as the Jews are apt to assume, but on the Jewish people itself, which falsely presumes on its racial descent and its hollow formalism. "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones (by the river here) to raise up children unto Abraham."¹⁴ Sin, however masked, is what the Coming One is commissioned to destroy. Hence the trumpet-call to "the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins,"¹⁵ as the indispensable condition of membership of the new theocracy, for which the people

¹² John i. 23.

¹³ Mark i. 7; Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 18.

¹⁴ Matt. iii. 9; Luke iii. 8.

¹⁵ Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3.

are on the outlook. "Repent ye, for the kingdom or reign of heaven is at hand"¹⁶—repent in the sense of turning round¹⁷ from the old to the new life.

Of this repentance unto remission, baptism, preceded by the confession of sin,¹⁸ is the visible sign. It is the outward initiation into the new, the real Israel fitted for the reign of God. It seems to have had an ethical, not a sacramental significance.¹⁹ Baptism by immersion, and in the presence of witnesses, was required of proselytes to the Jewish religion as a symbol of the transformation from the old to the new life of the convert, of fellowship with Israel's God and the community of His people.²⁰ Within Judaism this symbolical cleansing found expression in the ceremonial washings in purification from what was esteemed offensive to God and unfitted the unclean from fellowship with Him.²¹ In contrast to the Gospels, Josephus represents him as baptising, not repentant sinners, but those who trained themselves in virtue and practised righteousness, whom he baptised as a sign of the previous purity of their souls. "For Herod," he says, in reference to Antipas' detestable treatment of him, "killed him, this good man who commanded the Jews to gather for baptism, training themselves in virtue and practising righteousness towards one another and piety towards God. For thus it appeared to him that the baptism of those was acceptable who used it, not to escape from any sins, but for bodily purity, on condition that the soul also had been previously cleansed thoroughly by righteousness."²²

¹⁶ Matt. iii. 2.

¹⁷ This is the meaning of the Aramaic *tubhu*. See Burkitt, "Christian Beginnings," 19 f. (1924).

¹⁸ Mark i. 5; Matt. iii. 7.

¹⁹ Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus," ii. 746; Robinson, "Commentary on Matthew," 15 (1923). Oesterley and Box, on the other hand, think that its sacramental significance is implied. "Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," 264 (1907).

²⁰ It has been maintained that the baptism of proselytes to Judaism was not in usage in the time of Jesus. The contrary is maintained by Schürer, "Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes," ii., pt. ii. 322 f.; Edersheim, "Life and Times," ii. 747; Lambert, "Sacrament in the New Testament," 60 f. (1903); Strack und Billerbeck, "Kommentar," i. 102 f.; Jeremias ("Babylonisches im Neuen Testament," 75) traces the Jewish baptism to a Babylonian origin.

²¹ Oesterley and Box, "Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," 257.

²² "Antiquities," xviii. 5, 2. See also Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings of Christianity," i. 101-102; Moffatt in "Christianity in the Light of

The Jewish historian has not only suppressed the apocalyptic note of the Baptist's preaching. He has evidently misapprehended its real purport and the symbolic significance of the rite which accompanied it.

The movement inaugurated by the austere preacher from the wilderness was thus a purely moral and spiritual, not a political one. John is an apocalyptic in the spiritual sense of the pious circle from which both he and Jesus emanated. All the emphasis is on righteousness and repentance as the indispensable condition of salvation from sin, the coming theocracy or rule of God. Like Jesus, too, and in anticipation of him, it is with the moral and spiritual realities, with the inward state, not with the outward profession of religion as represented by the Pharisees and the priests, or the outward form of the communal life, that he is concerned. In this respect the movement differed markedly from the crasser form of the current apocalypticism which saw in the Messiah the restorer of the political independence and predominance of the Jewish people. The coming reign of God will be founded on righteousness, moral regeneration based on individual repentance. It will not take the form of a political revolution. The prophet preacher does not attack the existing political order. His crusade is directed against the false religion and the racial presumption underlying it. He even hints that in the coming theocracy God can find other subjects fit to serve Him outside the children of Abraham. He urges the publicans to desist from extortion and the mercenary soldiers of Antipas from violence, without questioning the régime, whether Roman or Herodian, under which they exercise their office,²³ though ere long his prophetic mission excited the apprehensions of Antipas and led to his martyrdom at his hands.

Such is the character of the eruptive movement in the Jordan valley which the Gospels enable us to descry. Luke evidently used a special source, which gave an account of his parentage and birth, and he and Matthew made use of

Modern Knowledge," 192 (1929). Also translated by Barnes, *Contemporary Review*, 57 (1914). The Greek version is expanded in the Slavonic version by what seem to be spurious additions. For the latest discussions of this version, see Eisler, "Jesus Basileus," i. 99 f. (1929).

²³ Luke iii. 11 f.

a common source which contained a fuller account of his teaching than was available to Mark, whilst the Fourth Gospel is concerned to depict his witness to the actual Christ. Whilst the Synoptists reflect the early tradition about the man and his mission, they, as well as the Fourth Gospel, colour it with later Christian conceptions. In the primitive tradition John proclaims the Messianic baptism with fire, which accords with his minatory preaching. For this Mark, with the later Christian conception of baptism in mind, substitutes the baptism with the Holy Spirit. "He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost."²⁴ Matthew and Luke retain the authentic Johannine baptism with fire, but combine it with the later Christian baptism with the Spirit. "He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." The Fourth Gospel, which, like Mark, omits the details of John's prophetic teaching, also, like him, makes the Christ baptise with the Spirit only.²⁵ Such a representation is at variance with what we know from other sources about the Baptist's pronouncement on the Messianic baptism. When, for instance, Apollos of Alexandria and others of his later followers turn up at Ephesus, they know nothing of the baptism with the Holy Spirit, which is contrasted with John's "baptism of repentance"²⁶—a clear proof of the later, arbitrary Synoptic combination of Christian baptism with the Spirit and the Johannine proclamation of baptism with fire.

Mark and Luke further speak of the crowds who flocked to his preaching.²⁷ Matthew brings the Pharisees and the Sadducees on the scene, and makes John unsparingly denounce them, evidently in anticipation of the later conflict between them and Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel "the Jews" and the Pharisees of Jerusalem, if not actually present, send priests and Levites as their emissaries to question him, and thus this writer also introduces the later enemies of Jesus as the opponents of his forerunner. Luke describes his preaching as "the Gospel,"²⁸ and thus identifies it with that of Jesus, from which in some respects it markedly differed. John's message, for instance, is one of divine judgment,

²⁴ Mark i. 8.

²⁵ John i. 33.

²⁶ Acts xviii. 25; xix. 3-6.

²⁷ Mark i. 5; Luke iii. 7, 10.

²⁸ Luke iii. 18.

of which the Coming One is the agent, not the revelation of the Father-God by one who was to emphasise man's filial relation to Him.²⁹

All four evangelists agree in making him proclaim the near advent of the Messiah, and it is evident that this proclamation, in keeping with the apocalyptic character of the movement, was an integral part of his message. It is not so clear that, in making this proclamation, he had Jesus definitely in his mind, though Matthew and the Fourth Gospel,³⁰ if not Mark and Luke, represent him as recognising, on Jesus' approach, the One mightier than he. Luke, who records the birth of both John and Jesus, does not hint at any intercourse between their families during the intervening thirty years. Possibly, as Plummer surmises, they might have met on the occasion of the Passover festivals, when their parents would bring them, after the age of twelve, to Jerusalem.³¹ This is only a supposition and, even if we grant the possibility, it would not warrant us in inferring that John had discerned, from such personal knowledge, the future Messianic vocation of his youthful relative. There is nothing in the primitive tradition, as reflected by Mark and Luke,³² to warrant the inference that, in baptising him in the Jordan, he was conscious of the momentous importance of the act, as it suddenly revealed itself to Jesus himself.

According to this tradition, this revelation was Jesus' own secret. Even the Fourth Gospel, which makes the Baptist publicly witness to his Messiahship³³ as "the one that cometh after me," represents him as protesting that hitherto he had not known him in this capacity at least.³⁴ Only Matthew conveys the impression that he had so known him.³⁵ The impression we derive from his preaching is, in fact, that he had reached his conviction of the

²⁹ On the content of the original tradition, see the critical discussion of Dibelius, who seems to me to excise rather too freely from it what he deems later elements. "Die Ursprüngliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer," 46 f. (1911). For an examination of the text of Matthew and Luke from Q. and Mark, see Stephenson, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 133 f. (1920).

³⁰ Matt. iii. 13-14; John i. 29 f.

³¹ "Commentary on Luke," 44.

³² Mark i. 9 f.; Luke iii. 21 f.

³³ John i. 27 f.

³⁴ John i. 31, 33.

³⁵ Matt. iii. 14.

near advent of the Coming One from his solitary meditation on the prophetic and apocalyptic literature, apart altogether from any previous personal connection with Jesus. Moreover, his conception of the Coming One is hardly that which had been developing in the mind of Jesus himself. To John he is the instrument of the divine judgment on a presumptuous, but godless generation. We miss in his apocalyptic message the thought of the divine Father and man's filial relation to him, which Jesus combined with his proclamation of the coming rule of God. Only in their emphasis on righteousness as the essential of membership of this kingdom and in their conception of the coming theocracy as something ethical and spiritual, not political, is there an affinity between their respective outlook. Otherwise, they represent two different types of religious development, as they had differed so markedly in their previous experience of life. Jesus himself, whilst recognising and highly evaluating John's greatness as a preacher of righteousness and repentance, later expressed his sense of this difference in the saying, "Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John; yet he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."³⁶ Evidently, then, the Coming One mightier than he, whose herald John proclaimed himself to be, was not, consciously, for him Jesus, but the indefinite figure of the prophetic and apocalyptic literature.

II. BAPTISM AND TEMPTATION

At the same time, his proclamation of the imminence of the kingdom or rule of God seems to have been of superlative moment in the religious experience of Jesus. In reality the preacher proved, if unwittingly, to be the herald of Jesus, inasmuch as his preaching was the occasion of revealing Jesus to himself. The report of this preaching of the

³⁶ Matt. xi. 11; Luke vii. 28. It is possible, but hardly probable, that Jesus was referring to himself, *i.e.*, he that is accounted by you inferior to John in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. See Michael, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 155 f. (1920).

baptism of repentance had spread to Galilee as well as throughout Judæa. Like many more in this northern region, Jesus was arrested by it, and joined the crowd that streamed down the Jordan valley to listen to the new prophet. He himself later speaks of the crowds that went from Galilee to hear him, and vividly reproduces the impression produced by this report. "What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? A reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings' houses. But wherefore went ye out? To see a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet."¹ This journey was a most momentous one not only in the story of his own life, but in the religious history of the world. It was the final step to the definite recognition of his vocation as the divinely chosen instrument of the new theocracy.

According to Matthew, he went for the express purpose of being baptised.² He must, therefore, have felt the need of undergoing a rite which presupposed repentance, and Mark and Luke seem to accept this as a matter of course, and do not attempt to explain it away. Matthew, on the other hand, puts into the mouth of the Baptist what is evidently a later apologetic disclaimer of his need of baptism at his hands. "But John would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me? But Jesus, answering, said unto him, Suffer it now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffereth him."³ For the same reason the Fourth Gospel omits the rite altogether, although he seems to infer it,⁴ and makes John forthwith proclaim him the Lamb of God and Son of God in the later sense of the Logos Christ. These representations are clearly dogmatic attempts to meet the difficulty of ascribing to Jesus the need of repent-

¹ Matt. xi. 7 f. Renan ("Vie de Jésus," 108 f.) asserts that Jesus was already a teacher and had disciples when he came to John. He bases his assertion on John iii. 22. It is an unwarrantable inference from the passage cited. Renan lends a far too easy credence to the Fourth Gospel as a source for the mission of Jesus.

² Matt. iii. 13.

³ Matt. iii. 14-15.

⁴ John i. 33.

ance.⁵ They ignore the fact that he was conscious of his limitations in the presence of the perfect good, and that he knew, if not sin, at least the liability to sin and the constant need of resisting evil. The temptation story, as well as certain of his sayings, put this human experience beyond a doubt. In this spirit he would seek baptism as a moral tonic, a consecration to the higher life. Moreover, he would recognise it as a condition of the coming of God's kingdom on earth, which to him, as to John, though in a different sense, is the absorbing fact of the near future, to be furthered in every possible way. That, with the filial conception of God, which, we may infer, had already been developing within him, he was conscious of estrangement from Him through wilful sin, we may hardly assume, if only in view of the fact that he was capable of the profound experience of sonship in the special sense that came to him as he emerged from the water on the river bank. The conviction of this sonship could only have entered the consciousness of one who had attained a very exalted moral and spiritual level. Without this unique moral and spiritual development this conviction would have been impossible. Equally impossible the wondrous career as teacher, healer, and suffering Messiah. It was the initial condition alike of a life and an epoch without parallel in the world's religious history; a reality of which both were the concrete expression. There must have been something uniquely elevated in this personality to account for either, and unless we keep this fact before our minds, we cannot come near anything like an adequate judgment of this personality.

According to Luke, the experience of his sonship in the special Messianic sense came to him as he was engaged in

⁵ Robinson ("Commentary on Matthew," 15 f., 1920) suggests that the assertion of Josephus that John baptised only those who were righteous and not merely those who repented of sin furnishes a solution of the problem. But this is not in accordance with the Gospel presentation of the Baptist's mission. Mr Murry, on the other hand, rather too emphatically asserts the sense of sin in Jesus. "It is certain that he sinned. . . . He was baptised for his sins, because he had sinned," "Life of Jesus," 15, cf. 30-31 (1926). He seeks to tone down this rather categoric assertion by saying that the sin, of which Jesus, as a man of genius, was conscious, was different from the sin of an ordinary man. Considering what Jesus in his life was, I do not think we can safely go further than the consciousness of the liability to sin, which, indeed, was all the more a reality to one of his moral elevation.

prayer, immediately after the baptism. Luke and the other two evangelists say that it took the form of a vision, during which he sees the heavens opening and the Holy Spirit descending on him in the form of a dove, and hears the voice from the open heaven proclaiming him the beloved son, in whom God is well pleased. Unlike the other two, who preserve the older tradition, Luke adds that the dove descended "in a bodily form,"⁶ and thus imparts an objective character to what was evidently a spiritual experience. In all three the vision reflects the naïve Hebrew fashion of pictorially conveying the fact of a special spiritual enlightenment by the Holy Spirit.⁷ To Jesus himself it came in the form of the conviction that he was chosen, destined to fill the vocation of the Messiah, in accordance with certain passages of Scripture on which he had evidently been long meditating (especially Ps. ii. 7; *cf.* Isa. xlii. 1 and xlv. 1-2).⁸ "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased."⁹ This conviction is, I think, the culmination of a long process of searching for the meaning of his life, his destiny, such as many have felt since then—for the loadstar by which to shape his course through time into eternity.¹⁰ He has attained the certainty of his sonship in the Messianic, if not in the metaphysical sense of the eternal Logos of the Fourth Gospel. The son in the Messianic sense is the beloved whom God has taken into His special favour, has chosen or adopted, as He had chosen or adopted Israel in Isa. xlii. 1, for the fulfilment of His redemptive

⁶ σωματικῶς εἶδεν.

⁷ On this Hebrew method of representing spiritual facts, see Rawlinson, "Commentary on Mark," 9-10 (1925); Blunt, "Commentary on Mark," 139-140 (1929). It is a midrashic representation in allusion to Isa. xlii. 1.

⁸ See also "The Book of Enoch, Pseudepigrapha," Charles, ii. 277.

⁹ Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22. In the Western reading of the Lukan text the original words of the Ps. ii. 7 are quoted: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Here the term denotes the function of the Davidic king. Streeter thinks that this is the right reading, "The Four Gospels," 188 (1924). We may also read the received text, "Thou art my Son the Beloved," the Beloved in this case being a title of the Messiah (Eph. i. 6).

¹⁰ Was this experience of the nature of what is termed "conversion," which the late Professor James would define as "the change by which religious ideas, previously peripheral in one's consciousness, now take a central place and religious aims form the habitual centre of one's energy"? "Varieties of Religious Experience," 196.

purpose.¹¹ God, he is assured, has laid on him the task of his life, has chosen him to carry out His will in the establishment of His kingdom, has endowed him to this end with His Spirit, and thereby given him the power and authority to accomplish his mission. Probably he is not yet fully conscious of all that this involves ; does not see in this flash of inspiration the whole drama of his destiny. He is only potentially the Messiah, though he is conscious from the outset of his election as the Christ, and the Fourth Gospel certainly anticipates when it presents him on the threshold of his public career in the rôle of the fully fledged Logos Christ of later Christian experience. How God will shape his course towards the distant goal before him, and work out His purpose, is still, we may reasonably infer from the sequel, in the realm of contingency. Meanwhile for him, if not for the Messiah as the Baptist conceived him, there will be a further period of preparation, in which he himself as prophet and teacher must pave the way for the Messianic kingdom.

That such an experience was but a fantasy without solid foundation in reality, only a superficial reading of religious history will presume to maintain. That God can and does take possession of the soul in some moment of overmastering religious conviction, which transfuses it with a new life and power, is an elementary fact of religious psychology. History is full of such moments of religious illumination. True, the element of delusion has often entered into them, and in the case of the Messianic idea there are verifiable instances of such delusion in the age of Jesus on the part of other claimants¹² to this dignity. The idea lent itself to fantastic and visionary representations of moral and spiritual truth and of the divine scheme of history.

¹¹ Matt. xii. 18, ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, whom I have chosen or adopted. The first evangelist thus later applies the passage, which originally referred to Israel, to him, using the Greek παῖς to translate the Hebrew "servant" of the original passage and conveying the idea that Jesus has taken the place of Israel as God's servant. On the passage see Dalman, "Words of Jesus," 276 f.

¹² While it is doubtful whether any of the leaders of rebellion in the age of Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, it is certain that Bar-Cocheba did so in the reign of Hadrian. See Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings of Christianity," i. 361, 421 f.

Moreover, it was too closely associated with the national aspirations of the Hebrew people to be a satisfactory vehicle for the expression of either. It has thus, in some respects, its questionable aspects as the focus of a religious experience, and its specifically national character, the crude imagery in which the apocalyptic imagination clothed it, its naïve anthropomorphism and irrationality tend to estrange rather than attract the modern mind.

At the same time, as assimilated by Jesus, it is the profoundly spiritual and ethical element that forms the kernel of it. The Messianic function, while perforce retaining something of its traditional aspect, is for him alike the highest form of the service of God and the expression of his filial relation to Him as the chosen instrument of His will and purpose in the salvation of the world. Moreover, the conception was there as an integral part of the religious aspiration of his race, and he could not ignore or discard it, if he would venture on the enterprise of fulfilling this aspiration and accomplishing the rule of God over men. But whilst appropriating this conception, he sublimated it and made it the medium of a movement of immeasurable potential scope and effect. It betokens a truly marvellous elevation of thought and ideal that it could, in this sublimated form, take possession of his consciousness and find concrete shape in a life of surpassing moral and spiritual power. Assuredly the creative power of God did operate through this conception as absorbed by him, the elect instrument of a moral and religious transformation, of which this conception, in its highest form, was the expression. "Much as modern enlightenment might scruple at this Jewish dream of the Messiah," says Keim expressively, "it was the noblest spiritual ideal which the world, Greece included, has devised, and one which he could not disdain who desired really to satisfy his own age in the first place, and in the second to realise the ideal of humanity in its loftiest traits; and, let us openly say it in defiance of little faith, actually could realise it."¹³

His Messianic vocation was, however, as yet his own secret. It was hidden within his own consciousness. The experience is personal to himself. The voice in Mark and

¹³ "Jesus of Nazara," ii. 295.

Luke is addressed to him alone: "*Thou* art my beloved Son." This is the early form of the tradition. It was no public declaration as in Matthew, "*This* is my beloved Son," or in the Fourth Gospel, in which John himself is represented as seeing the Spirit descending upon him and bearing public witness to his sonship in the Logos sense.¹⁴ That the secret of his sonship, which came to him in this supreme moment of illumination, was known only to himself is further proved by the fact that John later sends to ask him whether he is the Messiah. Such a question would be superfluous if he was convinced by supernatural means that he was. This later incident seems to show conclusively that the Baptist was ignorant that, in baptising Jesus, he was consecrating the Coming One to his Messianic mission. It was only later that, on the report of Jesus' wonderful activity, it occurred to him that he might be "he that cometh." It is also significant of the personal character of the experience that his disciples only gradually came to recognise in him the Christ.

The experience produced in Jesus a spiritual perturbation which is vividly and naively represented in the story of the temptation. "And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into the wilderness, and he was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan."¹⁵ The other two evangelists amplify this brief statement from a fuller tradition (Q.), while the Fourth Gospel, in keeping with its dogmatic purpose, omits it. As he journeys homewards¹⁶ doubts overcloud his newborn Messianic consciousness, and he tarries in the solitude of the wilderness to wrestle with them. The detailed story of this struggle is not to be taken literally. It reflects, for instance, the current oriental belief which made the wilderness the haunt of the devil and the demons, and knew of a high mountain in the far north, from the summit of which all the lands of the earth could be seen.¹⁷

¹⁴ John i. 32 f.

¹⁵ Mark i. 12-13. The other two evangelists use, instead of *ἐκβάλλει*, the less violent terms *ἀνήχθη* and *ἤγετο*, was led.

¹⁶ Luke seems to place the temptation in the wilderness after he has started on the way back to Galilee (iv. 1, 14).

¹⁷ Jeremias, "Babylonisches im Neuen Testament," 94-95. Ed. Meyer goes too far in regarding the whole story as a myth, "which has nothing to do with the historic Jesus." "Ursprung," i. 94 f.

It is a pictorial representation of a testing spiritual experience in accordance with such belief. The devil and the angels, who play a rôle in it, are merely the figures of this belief, which regarded Satan as the incarnation of evil and "the adversary" of the Messiah, as in the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs."¹⁸ The high mountain and the pinnacle of the temple, to which he is taken by the devil, are imaginary touches, and the forty days¹⁹ appear to be suggested by the parallel incident in the life of Elijah (1 Kings xix. 4). Probably enough this protracted spiritual struggle, which so absorbed him that he neglected to think of bodily sustenance, would result in a series of visions,²⁰ and these visions would take on the colouring of current belief in the devil and the angels in which Jesus shared. Both Matthew and Luke represent the temptations, which they record, as taking place at the end of this long fast, though Luke, in agreement with Mark, implies that they were not the only ones, and that the experience lasted throughout the sojourn in the wilderness. What is indubitable is that Jesus went through an intense struggle with the questionings which his newborn consciousness aroused within him. They all start from this source. "If thou be the Son of God," is the preface of the various forms of these temptations, and indicates the train of thought which gives rise to them.²¹ Is he truly the beloved, the chosen son, and if so, what does this sonship

¹⁸ See Charles, "Pseudepigrapha," ii. 327 and 335.

¹⁹ The number need not be taken literally. Forty is a typical number in the Old Testament. For instance, the forty years of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness. See L. Schmidt, "Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu," 31 (1919).

²⁰ Both Matthew and Luke say that he fasted throughout the forty days, Matt. iv. 2; Luke iv. 2. On this effect of protracted fasting, see Clodd, "The Question: If a Man Die, shall he Live Again?"

²¹ Joh. Weiss, who gives a very illuminating exposition of the temptation, does not think that the point of it lies in the "If," but in what the devil asks him to do. "Schriften des N.T.," i. 248. The doubt about his Messiahship seems, however, to be the real cause of this spiritual perturbation. It is his Messianic consciousness that is being put to the test all through. Weiss rather weakens his exposition by seeing too exclusively in the story a reflection of the later apologetic of the Christian community about Jesus. He does, however, acknowledge that Jesus went through some such spiritual experience, which some one, probably gathering up some expressions of Jesus on the subject, put into the form of the story as recorded by Matthew and Luke. That it was influenced by the temptations recorded of Buddha and Zoroaster is far fetched. See Eysinga, "Jüdische Einfluss auf evangelische Erzählungen" (1904).

imply and involve? Does he possess power adequate to his special vocation, and how is he to make use of it? Shall he not test it by changing stones into bread in order to revive his flagging physical strength? The enterprise on which he is venturing is a very hazardous one. Shall he, on the strength of his sonship, commit himself to some headlong course in the attempt to realise it, in the belief that God will work miracles and protect him from the dangers to which such action will assuredly expose him? Above all, does his sonship imply worldly rule, the rôle of the king whom the extremists would fain place on the throne of David on the overthrow of the Roman usurper? More especially, shall he yield to the suggestion of the tempter that he may have the sovereignty over the nations of the world by leaguings himself with this infernal power, with Satan, the adversary of God, "the prince of this world" (John xii. 31), who, in the belief of the time, exercises in the present the sway over them?

In rebutting such doubts he adduces certain passages from the Book of Deuteronomy. He will not seek to still his hunger and test his sonship by commanding stones to become bread. He will depend on God, who will provide for his needs by His all-powerful word, as He did for the children of Israel in the wilderness. "It is written, Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every Word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Deut. viii. 3). Nor will he test God unnecessarily in reliance on Ps. xci. 10-11, as the tempter suggests, by a rash presumption which the Word forbids. "It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" (Deut. vi. 16). Nor will he be allured by the prospect of worldly rule and its glory into being the vicegerent of Satan, and emphatically decides for the service of God, in obedience to the divine will. "Get thee gone, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him alone shalt thou serve" (Deut. vi. 13).²² Jesus has thus struggled to the firm resolution to commit himself and his cause to God, to wait and work in absolute

²² The passage is adapted to the situation, "worship" being substituted for the original "fear," and the adverb "alone" added. The order of the temptations differs in Luke from that of Matthew, the demand to throw himself down from the pinnacle of the temple coming last.

dependence on His will, to walk in unquestioning faith in the path that He will mark out for him. Need we wonder that, with the achievement of this resolution, "angels came and ministered unto him."

Jesus does not seem to have come into further personal contact with the Baptist. The narrative in the Fourth Gospel (i. 29 f.), which professes to give an account of their relations, has been interpreted²³ to mean that, after the temptation, Jesus returned to the Baptist, who had in the meantime moved higher up the river to "Bethany beyond Jordan." What the narrative makes John say of him on this occasion is, however, so much coloured by the writer's later conception of Jesus as the saviour of the world and the Son of God in the Logos sense that it cannot be taken as actual history. The Baptist becomes, in fact, the spokesman of the writer's own thoughts about Jesus, and what he says is too subjectively Johannine to be accepted as a statement of fact. In the subsequent notice of John's continued activity at Ænon, near Salim (iii. 22 f.), Jesus is not brought into actual touch with him, but is represented as prosecuting his mission independently of him. This continued activity is rather singular if he had actually recognised the Coming One in Jesus. Logically he ought to have become his follower and joined forces with him.

Some time after his baptism John, who apparently pursued his mission in Peræa as well as on the Judæan side of the river, was arrested by Antipas, thrown into prison,²⁴ and ultimately beheaded. Apparently he had not refrained from aspersing the conduct of Antipas, the husband of the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia, in marrying Herodias, his brother Philip's wife.²⁵ This, at all events, is the reason for his arrest given by Mark.²⁶ Josephus, on the other hand, tells us that it was actuated by Antipas' fear of a revolution

²³ Rhees, "Life of Jesus of Nazareth," 92 f. (1900).

²⁴ Josephus says that he was thrown into the fortress of Macherus, on the frontier between the territory of Aretas, King of Arabia, whose daughter he had married, but forsook for Herodias. It is, however, very doubtful whether he was imprisoned in this fortress, which adjoined the territory of his enemy Aretas, and Mark seems to imply that he was imprisoned and beheaded in Galilee. Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 17.

²⁵ Not the tetrarch Philip, but a half-brother of the same name by one of Herod the Great's numerous wives.

²⁶ Mark vi. 14; cf. Matt. xiv. 1 f.

as the result of the Baptist's preaching.²⁷ Both motives may well have contributed to bring about his tragic end. His mission as the forerunner was thus of brief duration. But in baptising Jesus he had unwittingly ushered on the scene the Coming One, though his conception of him was far from corresponding to the reality, and he lived long enough to hear of the greater movement that Jesus was inaugurating in Galilee. What he heard of this movement from his disciples, who were evidently allowed to keep in touch with him, raised a doubt whether the new Galilean teacher could be the agent of the divine judgment, whose near advent he had foretold. Hence the question which he directed some of his disciples to put to him, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?"²⁸ In reply, Jesus told them to go back and report to John what they had seen and heard of his mission of teaching and healing. How John received "the glad tidings"²⁹ we know not. Whilst some of his disciples doubtless attached themselves to the new movement, others seem to have kept aloof from it and retained their allegiance to the dead prophet. To them Jesus' freer attitude towards life, his freedom from asceticism, his filial conception of God as the Father, rather than the judge, did not appeal. John became, in fact, the founder of the Baptist sect, which continued to administer the baptism of repentance and to practise the ascetic life after his example.³⁰ In the Fourth Gospel his adherents appear to have regarded himself as the Messiah,³¹ and did not recognise him in Jesus. On the other hand, as the Acts of the Apostles show, there were semi-Christians, like Apollos of Alexandria and the disciples at Ephesus whom Paul baptised, who, whilst honouring John as a prophet, recognised the Messiah in Jesus, though they required further Christian instruction and baptism in the Christian sense.³²

²⁷ "Antiquities," xviii. 5, 2.

²⁸ Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 20. Jackson and Lake think that the question expresses hope, not doubt. "Beginnings," i. 107-108. But the words of Jesus, "Blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me," appear to invalidate this interpretation.

²⁹ Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 22.

³⁰ Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33.

³¹ John i. 6-8, 20; iii. 28 f.

³² Acts xviii. 24 f.; xix. 1 f.

III. THE BEGINNING OF JESUS' MISSION

What course did Jesus adopt after the temptation? The writer of the Fourth Gospel ignores the temptation which did not suit his conception of him as the Logos Christ from the outset. He even, for the same reason, avoids mentioning the baptism, though there is apparently a side glance at it in i. 33. John is there solely for the purpose of bearing witness to the infinite superiority of Jesus, as the Logos Son of God, to himself, and the writer abruptly introduces him in this capacity as "John was baptising at Bethany beyond Jordan,"¹ a place not otherwise known. He thus slides over both the baptism and the temptation. But if there is any truth in this obviously pragmatic representation, both must have preceded this apparition of Jesus, whom the Baptist on two successive days proclaims as the Lamb of God. As the result of this repeated proclamation, two of John's disciples follow Jesus, enter into converse with him, and recognise in him the Messiah. One of them, Andrew, brings his brother Simon to Jesus, and he also becomes a disciple, and is informed by him that he shall be called Cephas, the Rock—in Greek, Peter. On the following day, when he has resolved to return to Galilee—and apparently still in the same locality—Philip of Bethsaida obeys the command "Follow me," and the enigmatic Nathanael (Bartholomew, or an indefinite representative of the open-minded "Israelite") also acknowledges him as the Messianic King, the omniscient Son of God.²

Thus, before starting for Galilee, Jesus has acquired five of the followers, including the unnamed companion of Andrew, supposed to be John, the son of Zebedee, who were to be among the most stalwart associates of his Galilean mission.

Can we accept this as a reliable account of what supervened on the temptation? It is possible, perhaps

¹ John i. 28, 29.

² John i. 35 f. MacGregor ("Commentary on John," 39, 1928) thinks that Jesus was already in Galilee when he called these two. Bernard ("Commentary on John," 60, 1928) says it took place either as he was starting or on the way. This is the more likely locality.

likely, that, like Jesus himself, these men had repaired from Galilee to the Jordan and attached themselves to the Baptist. Possible also that they had been attracted to Jesus and had some intercourse with him as a like-minded adherent of the Baptist movement. Their later adherence to him as their Master might well presuppose such a preliminary acquaintance, based on a common religious interest. But their definite recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, at this early stage of his career, is quite at variance with the gradual growth of this recognition as reported in the Synoptic narratives of Jesus' mission. The public proclamation of him as the Messiah from the very beginning of his active career seems also to be a complete contradiction of the primitive Synoptic tradition, which veils his Messianic consciousness in the secrecy of the soul of Jesus himself. It was not, according to this tradition, till towards the end of the Galilean mission that the Twelve reached the definite conviction that Jesus was the Christ, and this Christ was not the Logos, whom the writer of the Fourth Gospel depicts and to whom the Baptist repeatedly bears witness,³ but the Christ of the conventional apocalyptic belief. There is here indubitably an anachronism, and this anachronism arises from the writer's method of freely writing history in accordance with his subjective view of it. The anachronism appears further in his anticipation of the designation Cephas—Peter—conferred by Jesus on Simon. This designation is given, not at Bethany beyond Jordan, at the beginning of Jesus' active career, but according to Mark and Luke, at the earliest, on the appointment of the Twelve; or, according to Matthew, at Cæsarea Philippi at the close of the Galilean mission. Again, the call "Follow me" is an anticipation of the call later addressed to the fishermen-disciples by the Lake of Galilee. Even if we grant an earlier association with these men on the lower Jordan, it can hardly have been such as this writer represents. Besides, a double call is not likely.

In this narrative we have thus a series of anachronisms, which may be natural enough in a writer whose chief concern is with the doctrinal adaptations and interpretations

³ John i. 7, 15, 26 f.

of history rather than with actual fact, but which it would be highly questionable to accept as in exact accordance with history.

The Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel agree in representing Jesus as returning to Galilee from the lower Jordan. All three Synoptists place the return after the temptation. Mark and Matthew connect it with the arrest of the Baptist by Antipas, Mark adducing the arrest as the date, Matthew as the reason of the return.⁴ Luke, who has already mentioned the arrest in the conclusion of his account of the Baptist's preaching, does not mention it again in connection with the return, but simply makes the return follow the temptation, from which Jesus emerges to undertake his Galilean mission "in the power of the Spirit."⁵ It is a fair inference, however, that he, too, regarded the return as taking place after the arrest, which he has already mentioned, especially as his narrative of the incident leaves the impression that the Baptist's mission was cut short by the intervention of Antipas.

The Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, says nothing about either the temptation or the arrest in connection with the return, but places it on the third day after the Baptist's repeated testimony to Jesus and the incidents connected therewith. As to the arrest, he subsequently informs us that John was still at large for a considerable time after the return, and evidently wishes us to understand that the Synoptic version of the return is incorrect as far as its connection with the arrest, whether as date or as cause, is concerned. Waiving meantime the question of the reliability of the statement in the Fourth Gospel that the arrest had not yet taken place, we infer that according to all four sources Jesus returned to Galilee after an absence, which would not have extended over more than three months, and that according to Mark and Matthew, and, inferentially, Luke, the arrest had actually occurred apparently during the weeks that Jesus had spent in solitary retirement in the wilderness. That the arrest should cause him to retire to Galilee, as Matthew, who modifies Mark's statement, reports, may seem rather dubious, inasmuch as

⁴ Mark i. 4; Matt. iv. 12.

⁵ Luke iv. 14.

Galilee, as well as Peræa—the scene of the Baptist's mission—was subject to the jurisdiction of Antipas. But the Baptist movement was confined to the lower Jordan valley, and as Galilee was only indirectly affected by it, it might well seem a sufficiently safe refuge in the meantime at least. Moreover, as already noted, the oldest tradition, as reported by Mark, gives the arrest only as the date and not as the reason of Jesus' return. In returning to Galilee, Jesus, we may reasonably conclude, was choosing what he deemed the most promising environment for the proclamation of his message. Nothing more probable than that, after the straining experience of the baptism and the temptation, he should desire to withdraw from the scene of the hectic excitement aroused by the Baptist's preaching to the quieter atmosphere of Galilee before commencing his own mission. This excitement, which fostered the cruder notion of the coming Messianic kingdom, was fitted to hinder rather than advance the preaching of his more spiritual conception of the kingdom. Moreover, it is far more likely that he should have decided to begin his mission in Galilee, where the spirit of the people was more receptive of his message, than attempt to win adherents for it in the south, where he would, like John himself, be faced with the opposition of the Pharisees. The Fourth Gospel itself, in recording the greater receptiveness of the Galileans,⁶ later reveals the play of this consideration.

How, now, did Jesus set about his mission? Matthew implies that he went first to Nazareth,⁷ and we should in any case infer his return thither. The Fourth Gospel locates him at Cana,⁸ about an hour distant to the north-east of Nazareth, on the road to Capernaum. He is accompanied by his mother, and performs here his first miracle. There is no reason why he and his mother should not have accepted the invitation to a marriage feast in a village within a short distance from his home. But the miracle story which

⁶ iv. 45.

⁷ Matt. iv. 13.

⁸ Identified with the modern Kefr Kenna. Renan thinks, on the testimony of John ii. 1, that Jesus' mother had retired on the death of Joseph from Nazareth to Cana, and that this is the reason why he began his public ministry there. "Vie de Jésus," 75. This is not a very forcible inference, as she was probably there along with Jesus as an invited guest.

follows⁹ and reflects the author's characteristic conception of the Logos Christ as displaying his glory from the beginning of his mission, seems really to be a piece of symbolism which transforms the incident of the attendance at the marriage feast, in itself likely enough, into a magical demonstration of the divinity of the new Rabbi and Son of God, as Nathanael addresses him.¹⁰

All four evangelists agree in taking him to Capernaum, and Matthew in making him leave Nazareth for the purpose of beginning his mission there appears to be giving the true tradition, though he characteristically sees in his transference thither the fulfilment of prophecy.¹¹ For the first evangelist this transference is, at the same time, the beginning of what in his own day was developing into a world mission for the enlightenment of the Gentiles. "Galilee of the Gentiles! The people who sat in darkness saw a great light; yea, light dawned on those who sat in the land and the shadow of death."¹² The Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, makes him start from Cana, and, in accordance with the assumption that he had already found a number of adherents on the lower Jordan, states that he was accompanied by his disciples as well as his mother and brothers.¹³ That he already had a train of disciples is, as we have seen, very questionable. That he was accompanied by his mother and brothers is a possible inference from the story of his later visit to Nazareth, when only his sisters are mentioned as residing there. "Are not his sisters here with us?" query his fellow-townsmen on that occasion.¹⁴ If a later tradition that his mother's sister, Salome, was married to Zebedee may be trusted, he had relatives at Capernaum, and may have been influenced by this consideration.¹⁵ More likely is the inference that the teeming population around the Galilean lake offered the most promising field for the mission.¹⁶ Certain it is that Capernaum appears from the outset as its headquarters, and that it and

⁹ John ii. 2 f.

¹⁰ John i. 49.

¹¹ Matt. iv. 13 f.

¹⁵ Keim rejects the tradition as baseless.

¹⁶ This is more forcible than the assertion of Ed. Meyer that his resolution to migrate from Nazareth to Capernaum was influenced by the lack of sympathy of his family. "Ursprung," i. 99.

¹² Quoted from Isa. ix. 1-2.

¹³ John ii. 12.

¹⁴ Mark vi. 3; Matt. xiv. 56.

the towns near it—Chorazin, Bethsaida, Magdala—were the scenes of his most concentrated activity. It had a synagogue and a Roman garrison,¹⁷ and its thriving trade is indicated by the fact that Matthew (Levi), the collector of customs and his future disciple, practised his calling there. He himself emphasises its high place among the Galilean cities.¹⁸ Henceforth it became “his own city,” as Matthew terms it.¹⁹ The choice already reveals the spirit and method of the new movement in contrast to that of the Baptist. Instead of haunting the wilderness, Jesus goes to the centres of population, brings his message to the thickly populated lake region and to the villages studded all over the Galilean land and, unlike the Baptist, combines the ministry of healing with his prophetic function. Not as an ascetic, like John, does he attract men to his solitude, but as one to whom nothing human is alien, he seeks contact with his fellows in the market-place, among the fishermen and artisans of the lake-side, in the synagogues, the homes of the people, with a passionate love and sympathy for his fellow-toilers.

By the lake-side Jesus summons Simon and Andrew his brother, and James and John, the sons of Zebedee, to become his followers. The summons is, indeed, very abrupt, and the instant response is more explicable on the supposition that he had already become the leader of a new movement, and that those who obeyed it had already heard him proclaim the good news of the kingdom. Matthew’s statement that “leaving Nazareth, he came and *dwelt* in Capernaum” seems to imply that he had been some time there before the calling took place, and that of Mark that he “came into Galilee preaching the Gospel” seems to warrant the conclusion that he had already begun to preach even before his arrival at Capernaum. At all events after, if not before his arrival, he must have begun to proclaim the imminence of the kingdom and summon men to repentance,²⁰ and those whom he called would thus hear the message and know

¹⁷ Matt. viii. 5; Luke vii. 2. Or, were the soldiers whom the Roman centurion commanded, mercenaries in the service of Antipas?

¹⁸ Matt. xi. 23.

¹⁹ Matt. ix. 1. Kapharnaum, Nathan’s village, the modern Tell Hum, rather than Khan Minjeh. Pal. Explor. Fund, 1907, 220 f.

²⁰ Mark i. 15; Matt. iv. 17.

something of the Master and the movement they were being cited to join. "Come ye after me and I will make you fishers of men."²¹ Luke, who relates the calling somewhat later, follows a different tradition, which makes it the result of a miraculous draught of fishes and has a legendary colouring.²² He has, however, already related the healing of Simon's wife's mother, and thus reveals the fact that Peter was already a disciple. The Lukan story shows at all events that the mission had already started, for Jesus is represented as addressing the multitude from Simon's boat and Simon himself as a hearer of the address. None the less, the calling certainly owed most to the personality of the preacher. Only a master of souls, sure of himself and his message, could have produced such instantaneous acquiescence. "And straightway they left the nets and followed him."²³

The calling at this early stage was an essential of the success of the mission. If his message was to prevail, he needed disciples to co-operate in carrying it out, and in these fishermen he found a devoted band of helpers who henceforth gave themselves wholeheartedly, if not apparently exclusively, to their vocation as fishers of men. With the exception of Andrew, who is little noticed in the Synoptic record (in contrast to that of the Fourth Gospel, where he comes in as a sort of offset to Peter), they appear as the stalwarts of the movement. Simon, better known by his second name of Peter, appears in the Synoptic story as an enthusiastic and impulsive leader, if at times lacking in persistent resolution. James and John are equally energetic, as the designation "Sons of Thunder or Wrath" shows, if their irritable, assertive, and vindictive disposition earned the rebuke of Jesus on more than one occasion. Of the others who became his intimate associates we hear somewhat later in the Synoptic record only of the calling of Matthew (Levi), though the Fourth Gospel knows from the beginning

²¹ Mark i. 17; Matt. iv. 19. Mark has "make you to become," *γενέσθαι*.

²² v. 1 f. Blunt points out that the sudden following of a previously unknown "holy man" is not unfamiliar in the East. "Commentary on Mark," 143-144. But the assumption of some previous knowledge seems to me more likely.

²³ Mark i. 18.

of Philip and the rather enigmatic Nathanael. The first disciples thus belonged to the prosperous class engaged in the thriving fishing industry. Of Zebedee, the father of James and John, it is expressly stated that he had hired servants. They had probably, like Jesus himself, received a careful scriptural education in the home and the synagogue school, and were familiar with the history and religious institutions of their race. Matthew, the tax collector, must have been a person of affluence, for he entertained Jesus and a large number of other guests "to a great feast" in his house.²⁴ It cannot be said that Jesus attracted only the scum of the population, though he is subsequently found consorting with the sinner and the outcast and spending himself in the alleviation of their spiritual and bodily ills.

On the Sabbath after the calling he makes his first appearance as teacher and healer in the synagogue. The authoritative tone of the teaching and the spectacular cure of the demoniac make a profound impression on the audience,²⁵ which is heightened by the subsequent healing in Peter's house of his fever-stricken mother-in-law. In the evening, when the Sabbath rest was over, a great crowd, bringing their sick folk, gathers in front of the house, and Jesus heals many of the sufferers from various diseases and exorcises a number of demoniacs.²⁶ His activity on this first eventful Sabbath produces a veritable tidal wave of excitement, which disconcerts rather than encourages him, especially in view of the public and premature recognition of his Messiahship by the demoniacs in their deranged fashion.²⁷ This recognition, though very naïvely repre-

²⁴ Luke v. 29; cf. Mark ii. 15; Matt. ix. 10. Some exegetes think that the house in these passages denotes the house in which Jesus habitually resided at Capernaum, either his own house or that of Simon Peter. It more probably denotes here Matthew's own house. See M'Neill ("Commentary on Matthew," 127), Allen ("Commentary on Matthew," 90) for the inference that Jesus had a house of his own at Capernaum in which he lived with his mother and brothers, and that the frequent reference to his residence in the house of Simon is explicable from the lack of understanding on their part. Their residence there is, however, problematic.

²⁵ Mark i. 22 f.; Luke iv. 31 f.

²⁶ Mark i. 32 f. Matt. (viii. 16) and Luke (iv. 40) heighten the exercise of his healing power by saying, in contrast to Mark, that he healed *all* that were brought to him.

²⁷ Mark i. 24, 34; Luke iv. 34, 41. The phrase "Holy One of God," which the demoniac applies to him, is taken from Ps. xvi. 10, and is here given a Messianic significance.

sented, is not necessarily incredible. The maniac might easily have suffered from a religious obsession of this kind in the excited apocalyptic mood of the time, though it is also possible that the writer has put the late Messianic title of Jesus (the Holy One of God, as in Acts ii. 27) into the maniac's mouth.²⁸ At all events, to Jesus this hectic popular excitement was both unwelcome and embarrassing. It was likely to obscure the spiritual character of his mission. He, therefore, furtively leaves the house at Capernaum early next morning for solitary prayer, and determines to depart elsewhere, in spite of the importunity of the people, communicated to him by the disciples. "All are seeking thee."²⁹

IV. A JUDÆAN MISSION ?

In the Synoptists, Jesus then sets out on a preaching tour in the neighbouring towns, which Mark and Luke expand so as to embrace all Galilee.¹ In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, Jesus' visit to Galilee is only a flying one and his stay at Capernaum lasts only a few days. For this writer Jerusalem, not Capernaum, Judæa, not Galilee, is the main scene of his mission, and Galilee is throughout only a sort of refuge to which he occasionally retires from its opponents in the south. His advent as a teacher takes place, in fact, at Jerusalem, not at Capernaum. After a few days' sojourn there, of which the writer tells us nothing, he sets out for Jerusalem to attend the Passover, and proclaim his message at the very centre of Judaism, where he at once challenges the antagonism of the religious authorities ("the Jews"). He starts with an act of astounding daring. Scourge in hand, this unknown Galilee pilgrim indignantly drives the sheep and oxen of the traffickers, which are being sold for the temple sacrifices, out of the outer temple court, and overturns the tables of the money-changers, who do a

²⁸ So Blunt, "Commentary on Mark," 148 (1929).

²⁹ Mark i. 37.

¹ Mark i. 39 f.; Luke iv. 44; cf. Matt. iv. 23 f., who, however, follows a different order of the beginning of his activity as healer and preacher by inserting the Sermon on the Mount, omitting the episode of the cure of the demoniac on the first Sabbath at Capernaum, and giving the other events of this Sabbath later.

brisk business in changing Roman into Jewish coin. In controversy with "the Jews," who ask a sign of his authority, he enigmatically refers to the destruction of the temple and his resurrection. He apparently performs a number of indefinite miracles ("signs") and wins many believers in consequence, though he distrusts the people of Jerusalem in virtue of the omniscience which enables him to know their hearts. Among those impressed by these signs is Nicodemus, with whom he has the nocturnal interview on the new birth by the Holy Spirit and on eternal life through the Son of Man. He then retires to carry out a mission in Judæa, and baptises, as John is still doing at Ænon, near Salim, though the writer subsequently informs us that not he, but his disciples, of whom we have hitherto heard nothing, do so. In consequence of a dispute of John's disciples, who resent his baptising ministry, with "a Jew" on the subject, the Baptist again gets an opportunity of testifying to the Christ and the infinite superiority of his work to his own. But the Pharisees are on the alert, and their ominous watch on his baptising mission, which is threatening to eclipse that of John, leads him to cut it short, and retire to Galilee through Samaria, where he has the conversation with the Samaritan woman at Sychar, discourses on the water of life and the spirituality and universality of the true worship of God, and declares himself the Christ. In consequence of the testimony of the woman, many of the inhabitants of this Samaritan city believe in him before he resumes the journey to Galilee.² The writer gives as a reason for this second arrival at Cana the saying of Jesus that a prophet has no honour in his own country, which, as the text stands, seems to make him a native of Judæa, though he has already (i. 46) spoken of him as belonging to Nazareth. For he goes on to tell us that, when he arrived in Galilee, "the Galileans received him, having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem at the passover, since they also went to the feast."³ It is possible that, as some of the critics⁴ contend, the saying in iv. 44

² This mission to Jerusalem and Judæa is related in John ii. 13-iv. 42.

³ John iv. 43-45.

⁴ Moffatt, for instance, "Introduction to the New Testament," 553.

has been misplaced and should come after verse 46, which tells of his arrival at Cana in Galilee. It would then stand as a reason why he went to this town rather than to Nazareth, "his native place."⁵

Of this early Jerusalem-Judæan mission, as recorded in this lengthy narrative, the Synoptists know nothing. The only possible hint of it in the Synoptic tradition is found in a variant reading of the passage in which Luke concludes his report of Jesus' initial teaching and healing ministry at Capernaum. This variant represents him as leaving Capernaum to preach in "the synagogues of Judæa," instead of "Galilee."⁶ But this variant is in contradiction to the earlier tradition recorded by Mark, from which Luke otherwise borrows in relating the beginnings of the Galilean mission at Capernaum. "And he went into their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils."⁷ Moreover, in this part of his narrative Luke purports to be describing the Galilean mission, and what follows refers solely to it. The variant reading "Judæa" for "Galilee" in the received text is, therefore, very dubious as an indication that, as the harmonists contend, this lengthy mission to the south actually took place, and that the mission in Galilee really began at Capernaum, not as the Synoptists represent after the first, but after this second return to Galilee. The Synoptic narrative of the beginning of Jesus' activity at Capernaum and elsewhere in Galilee really coincides with John iv. 43 f., where Jesus arrives there after his visit to Jerusalem, Judæa, and Samaria; not with John ii. 12, where he merely, on his first return to Galilee, pays a flying visit to Capernaum.⁸ All that the Fourth Gospel relates of the visit to Jerusalem and its sequel has simply been ignored by the Synoptists on the assump-

⁵ Assuming that the *πατρις* of verse 44 means "native place" and not "native country."

⁶ Luke iv. 44. Luke's version of the temptation (the leading of Jesus by the devil to Jerusalem and setting him on the pinnacle of the temple) has also been interpreted as implying an early visit to Jerusalem. So Windisch, "Zeitschrift für N.T. Wissenschaft," 159 (1911). But this interpretation is very shaky in view of the visionary character of this experience.

⁷ Mark i. 39.

⁸ So Rhees, "Life of Jesus," 102 f. (1900); Gilbert, "Student's Life of Jesus," 158 (1899); Sanday, "Outlines of the Life of Christ," 50 f. (1906); D. Smith, "The Days of His Flesh," 80 (1905); and others.

tion that it was unknown to the tradition of which they made use, or that they had no interest in this early Jerusalem-Judæan mission, and confined themselves simply to recording the mission in Galilee.

It is, however, not easy to understand why this important mission should have been unknown to the earlier tradition, or why, if it really occurred, the Synoptists should have taken no notice of it. Their silence raises grave doubt as to its actuality, even if we admit that the Synoptic narratives are evidently not exhaustive accounts of Jesus' career. The doubt is increased by the character and purport of the Johannine narrative itself. As in the account of the Baptist's public proclamation of the Logos Christ and its sequel in chapter i., it appears to contain a series of anachronisms and improbabilities. Jesus, for instance, is represented as cleansing the temple at the outset of his mission, whereas the Synoptists explicitly inform us that he did so only at its close on the occasion of his final (and for them apparently his only) visit to Jerusalem. The weight of evidence seems to me to be in favour of the Synoptic, not the Johannine, version of the cleansing. Either the one or the other version is erroneous, for it is most unlikely that Jesus would perform this daring action twice, as Westcott⁹ and others maintain. Nor is it likely that he would venture to do so at the commencement of his career, when he was entirely unknown and shortly after he is represented, in the temptation story, as definitely rejecting the suggestion to resort to impulsive and reckless expedients in the prosecution of his mission.¹⁰ Those who prefer the Johannine to the Synoptic version of the cleansing have, I think, failed to give due weight to this consideration.¹¹ The majority of recent critics, on

⁹ "Commentary on the Gospel According to St John," i. 198; Askwith, "Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel," 195 f. (1910). The distinction made by some (Moffatt, etc.) between the Johannine cleansing as an act of moral authority and the later Synoptic one as a Messianic act seems to me unwarranted.

¹⁰ Stanton's view of "the inherent probability" of the visit at this early stage, and his conclusion that it was natural that the young prophet should so act, appear to me very problematic. "The Gospels as Historical Documents," iii. 235 (1920).

¹¹ Cadoux, for instance, in an article on the Johannine account of the early ministry of Jesus, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 312 f. (1919). Lewis agrees with him. *Ibid.*, 173 (1920).

the other hand, either query the Johannine version or discard it as a palpable inversion of the order of events, due to the author's characteristic tendency to handle his material very freely for pragmatic reasons, and in accordance with his allegorising method after the example of Philo.¹² As in the miracle at Cana, which precedes the cleansing of the temple, Jesus, in manifesting his divine glory, turns the water of Judaism into the wine of Christianity, so in driving out the sellers and money-changers and undertaking to raise up a new temple, he proclaims his purpose of supplanting the old faith in favour of the new. In effect this was what the new movement he inaugurated ultimately accomplished. Only it is not to be regarded as what Jesus contemplated doing from the outset and actually attempted to do, as the author intends us to believe that he did in this antedated incident at Jerusalem.

Again, the alleged interview with Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrin,¹³ would be far more in place at a later stage of the mission, when Jesus' ministry had excited the active hostility of this body and the precaution of seeking an interview by night with the notoriously dangerous agitator would be natural enough. The "signs," to which Nicodemus refers, had not yet really been given,¹⁴ except the one at Cana in Galilee, though the author vaguely speaks of such signs as taking place at Jerusalem. Nor does the reference of the clandestine visitor to Jesus as a teacher come from God and of wide reputation fit the

¹² Moffatt, "Introduction," 538 (1911): "The act is at once antedated and minimised." Latimer Jackson, "Problem of the Fourth Gospel," 55 (1918): "The balance of probability is surely against the Johannine dating." Streeter regards the cleansing at the beginning of the ministry as a mistaken inference on the part of the author. "The Four Gospels," 420 (1924). Strachan finds it wrongly placed and related, not for an historical, but for a symbolic purpose. "The Fourth Gospel," 75 f., 85 f. (1925). See also Muirhead, "The Message of the Fourth Gospel," 48 (1925); Hazzard, "Mysticism of the Fourth Gospel," 45 f. (Edinburgh University Thesis, 1927); Heitmüller, "Schriften des Neuen Testaments," ii. 739; Sanday, "Criticism of the Fourth Gospel," 149; Green, "Ephesian Canonical Writings," 43 (1910). Stanton is unable definitely to decide for or against. "Gospels as Historical Documents," iii. 235 (1920). The latest commentators (MacGregor, "Commentary," 64, and Bernard, "Commentary," i. 88) decide against the Johannine version. On Philo's method, see Kennedy, "Philo's Contribution to Religion" (1919), and on its application in the Fourth Gospel, Muirhead, "Message," 19 f.

¹³ John vii. 50.

¹⁴ See Bernard, "Commentary on John," i. 100.

opening career of the new Rabbi. The impression conveyed by the interview is that, like the cleansing, it is out of place here. Nor does the interview as it stands tend to commend it as a piece of actual history, though it may be based on a later conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus. It is, for the most part, unlike what is reported in the Synoptic Gospels on similar occasions.¹⁵ Much of it, from verse 11 onwards, sounds like a homily by the writer on the new birth by water and the Spirit in the later Christian sense, on the heavenly Son of God as the bringer of eternal life, and on faith in him as the Saviour of the world, as it was being proclaimed in the author's own time. It is not exact history, but the edifying, homiletic interpretation of it, as it was being related in the later assemblies of the Christian community that the author really has in view. "This book," aptly says Deissmann, "was intended for the divine services."¹⁶

Equally dubious is the account of the baptising mission in Judæa. The Baptist is again introduced for the purpose of bearing testimony to the superiority of the Logos Christ to his forerunner, and of the mission inaugurated by him to the Baptist movement. "He must increase, but I must decrease," or, as Professor Moffatt aptly translates, "He must wax, I must wane." It is clearly meant as a reminder to the Baptists of the writer's own day that they are mistaken in perpetuating this movement and regarding their founder as the Christ. Moreover, as in the Nicodemus interview, the Baptist is made to testify in the author's own style and train of thought, whilst the ascription of the practice, which is understood in the later Christian sense,¹⁷ to Jesus and his disciples is incompatible with the Synoptic representation of their mission as exclusively one of teaching and healing, not of baptising. When, for instance, Jesus, in the Synoptic narratives, sends out the disciples to preach and heal, there

¹⁵ Some have seen in the story a version of the Synoptic teaching about becoming as little children in order to enter the kingdom, and of the rich young man, which follows it in Mark x. There seems, indeed, to be an echo of Mark x. 15 in John iii. 3, "Unless a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." But what follows differs markedly, and in any case the incident is too early here.

¹⁶ "The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research," 103 (1929).

¹⁷ "Born of water and the Spirit" (John iii. 5).

is not a word about baptising, and it is only after his death that the practice in its Christian form appears in the early Christian community. The authentic reading of the command of the risen Jesus in Matt. xxviii. 19 to go and teach all nations does not appear to have contained the baptismal formula, if indeed the whole passage is not a later interpolation.¹⁸

Finally, the presence of Jesus in Samaria at this early date is another anachronism. It has, indeed, a basis in historic fact, as reflected in Luke's narrative of the mission which Jesus undoubtedly attempted to carry out there after the close of the Galilean ministry. But, like other incidents in this Johannine narrative, the Samaritan mission is antedated, and the conversation with the Samaritan woman¹⁹ on the water of life and the new and universal spiritual worship of God is clothed in characteristic terms of the later conception of Jesus and the developed Christianity as a world movement.

When we have thus subtracted from the narrative this series of anachronisms and improbabilities, there really remains no room for the occurrence of the alleged incidents at this early stage of the ministry of Jesus. They are transposed and coloured by the writer to suit his purpose of portraying Jesus, as the Logos Christ, challenging and undermining the current Judaism at its centre in Jerusalem and setting forth the developed Christianity of the writer's time from the outset. The transition from Capernaum to Jerusalem in chapter ii. 13 is introduced very abruptly, and did not in reality follow on verse 12, though the writer, in accordance with his pragmatic method of handling the early tradition very freely, intends us to believe that it did. This abruptly mentioned visit of Jesus to Jerusalem to attend the Passover and its sequel, as far as it reflects authentic history, might quite well have taken place, nay, evidently did take place, at a later period.

¹⁸ Conybeare, arguing from the form of the passage in Eusebius, thinks that the command to go and teach all nations is the authentic form. "Zeitschrift für N.T. Wissenschaft," 275 (1901). Jackson and Lake think that the whole passage is an interpolation. "Beginnings of Christianity," i. 335 f.

¹⁹ Bacon and other critics see in the story the author's version of that of the Syro-Phœnician woman of Mark and Matthew. Possibly. At all events, it is antedated.

CHAPTER IV

THE GALILEAN MISSION

I. THE COURSE OF THE MISSION

THE Synoptic Gospels do not give a chronological account of the mission. They are incidental rather than chronological narratives. Mark, the oldest and the shortest of the three, has a framework into which he fits his material, which is largely composed of a series of incidents and scenes, his purpose being to recount the deeds, rather than the teaching of Jesus. But the incidents are not fitted into the framework in strict chronological order, and their rather haphazard character largely bears out the assertion of Papias that Mark reported accurately what Peter preached, but not in (chronological) order.¹ Even Luke, who in the preface to his Gospel professes to give an ordered narrative,² does not enable us to construct a chronological account from his compilation. The Fourth Gospel, which makes use of Synoptic material, does attempt a chronological arrangement of this and other material in accordance with a series of feasts, which Jesus attends at Jerusalem. But this Gospel may be largely left out of account, as far as the Galilean mission is concerned, since its main interest lies in the mission in the south, and its account of that in Galilee is extremely fragmentary.

The incidents related by the Synoptists may be, on occasion, chronologically connected. But such connecting words as "immediately" and "again,"³ joining incidents together, characteristic of Mark, and phrases of this kind in

¹ Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.," iii. 39; *cf.* xi. 15.

² *καθ' ἑξῆς*. Jackson and Lake think that this word means not chronological order but literary form. "Beginnings of Christianity," ii. 505. See also Streeter, "The Four Gospels," 423.

³ *ἐνθίς, πάλιν*.

the other two Synoptists, are not necessarily to be regarded as denoting consecutive events, even if, to the writers, they may have appeared as such. They evidently did not find the material arranged in chronological order, as in a modern historical narrative, in the source or sources of which they made use. This material formed an important part of the later apostolic mission preaching or of the edification of the later Christian communities, and was thus necessarily related in a haphazard fashion.⁴ The motive of this practical use of the tradition was not historic instruction, but propaganda or edification, and this haphazard form of the tradition is reflected in the Synoptic narratives based on it. Moreover, the writers of these narratives were not so much concerned with chronology as with the task of giving, from this tradition, illustrative details of the work of Jesus as teacher and healer, arranged in what may appear to be, but really is not, a consecutive narrative. Even if they had possessed the modern interest for chronological order, the character of the material at their disposal would have made it impossible to give it such an order. The Synoptic Gospels are primarily "story books," as Deissmann phrases it, "not critical, historical books in the modern sense."⁵ Otherwise expressed, we might describe them as collections of stories, interspersed with didactic matter and set down without any real sense of exact chronological sequence, and without critical discrimination. We cannot even tell the exact year in which any incident occurred, and can only infer in a few cases from such phrases as "the cornfields," "the green grass," the season when a given incident happened. Nor are the narratives to be taken as complete accounts of the mission. They only illustrate, they do not exhaust the activity of Jesus as healer and teacher. They are hardly more than illustrative expansions of such general statements of this activity as Mark i. 29, Matt. iv. 23, Luke iv. 15, etc. That nothing like a complete record is attempted appears from the fact that, if we sum up the incidents related by Mark alone, without having regard to what is

⁴ See on this subject, K. L. Schmidt, "Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu," Preface, vi., and *passim* (1919).

⁵ "The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research," 43 (1929).

mere summary, or allowing for gaps in the narrative, the mission in Galilee might be compressed into a period of, roughly, four months !⁶

Out of Mark's framework we are enabled to extract, if not a chronological outline, at least certain distinctive stages in the development of the mission. These are the beginning of the mission at Capernaum and the prolonged, though not uninterrupted activity there ; its extension throughout Galilee ; the sensational effects produced by the healing and teaching ministry which promises to range, with some exceptions, the masses on the side of the popular prophet ; the rise and growth of the antagonism of the scribes and Pharisees ; the formation of a more intimate circle of disciples and the sending out of the Twelve all over Galilee ; the signs of a mixed reception of his teaching, as in the parable of the sower ; the unsuccessful attempt to extend the mission to the eastern side of the lake ; the ultimate withdrawal twice from Galilee to the north in the face of this growing antagonism and the threat of the intervention of Antipas ; the conviction of Jesus of his future tragic fate as the result of both ; the recognition of his Messiahship by the inner circle of disciples and the departure from Galilee to undertake the mission in the south and meet his tragic doom at Jerusalem. There is thus discernible a series of stages in the Markan account of the mission, though the writer does not particularly note this development and leaves us to gather it for ourselves.

Matthew and Luke adopt the Markan framework and incorporate a large part of its content in their own varying fashion, whilst giving in addition from an important source named Q.⁷ (German "Quelle") by the critics, and consisting mainly of sayings or discourses, a much larger

⁶ See Windisch, "Zeitschrift für Neu-Testament. Wissenschaft," 149 (1911).

⁷ Q. is not to be understood as identical with the "Logia," of which Papias speaks, and which was a collection of Old Testament Messianic passages, drawn up by the Apostle Matthew, who is not to be identified with the author of the Gospel of Matthew. On the "Logia," which means, not sayings (Logoi), but Old Testament passages, Oracles, see Armitage Robinson, "The Study of the Gospels," 68 f. See also Rendel Harris, "Origin of the Prologue of St John," 14-15 (1917) ; Burkitt, "Gospel History," 127. Stanton criticises this view. "Gospels as Historical Documents," ii. 48. He prefers to call Q. "the Logian Document."

portion of the teaching of Jesus. Matthew does this most liberally in a series of discourses, including the longest of them, known as the Sermon on the Mount. Both have additional incidental matter derived from sources peculiar to each. For this additional matter from both Q. and their other sources they have to find room in the Markan narrative, which they accordingly enlarge, each in his own distinctive fashion. In doing so, Matthew has inserted more of Mark's matter than Luke, who omits the whole of Mark vi. 45 to viii. 26, describing the wanderings of Jesus towards the close of the Galilean mission. On the other hand, Matthew, in making these insertions, departs more extensively from Mark's order down to the closing period of the mission (Matt. iv. 12 to the end of chapter 13). From here he follows the Markan outline closely, whilst Luke, though discarding more of Mark's matter, adheres closely to his order in the large sections which he inserts from him (Luke iv. 31-vi. 19 and viii. 4-ix. 50).⁸

Despite the lack of a real chronological sequence, which renders them unsatisfactory documents from the modern point of view, the Synoptic Gospels furnish in incidental fashion an invaluable record of the Galilean mission. The record is rich in detail, and enables us to obtain a living impression of Jesus and his activity as healer and teacher in the lake region and throughout the Galilean land. The writers drew from sources containing first-hand evidence derived from those who "companied" with Jesus, if they also contain what bears to a certain extent the mark of later interpretation or legendary colouring. Mark, in fact, clearly derived portions of his narrative from Peter,⁹ who played an important part in this early ministry. From Q. Matthew and Luke have, in addition, preserved the precious legacy of the teaching which the older evangelist incorporated far too sparingly, whilst they also borrowed from other

⁸ For a more detailed examination of the reproduction of Mark by the other two evangelists, see Streeter, "The Four Gospels," 164 f. See also Stanton, "The Gospels as Historical Documents," ii. (1909).

⁹ See, for instance, Ed. Meyer, "Ursprung," 147 f., against Wellhausen, "Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien," 152 (2^{te}. Auflage). Burkitt also concludes that Mark derived much of his material from what Peter told him. "Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus," 193 (1910). So also Stanton, "The Gospels as Historical Documents," ii. 187 f.

supplementary sources. With the aid of this additional matter, it is possible to give a fairly adequate, if not a strictly chronological outline of the mission.

Capernaum remains the headquarters of the mission till towards its close, and here and in the lake region many of the incidents in the Synoptic narratives take place. During the tour of the neighbouring towns, which ensues on the events of the first Sabbath at Capernaum, the popular concourse and excitement induced by the tales of his curative powers (the cleansing of the leper) again become so embarrassing that he avoids the towns and the synagogues, at least for the time being, sojourns "in desert places," and preaches in the open air to the multitude, who comes to hear him and seek the benefit of his healing ministry. Mark and Luke¹⁰ seem to connect the cleansing of the leper and its sequel with this tour, though the connection is not otherwise apparent, while Matthew¹¹ gives it in connection with the Sermon on the Mount. At all events, it took place, according to all three, at an early stage of the ministry, and shows once more the striving of Jesus to avoid a premature popularity, which might lead to misconception on the part of the superficial crowd and compromise him, in such circumstances, with the secular authority.

His reappearance in Capernaum, which Mark next abruptly chronicles, again brings the crowd around Peter's house to hear him. The healing of a paralytic, for whom admittance can only be found through the roof, leads to the first of a series of conflicts with the local scribes and Pharisees which Mark and Luke give connectedly, Matthew more incidentally.¹² These local religious leaders unite with the Herodians on whom they otherwise, for religious and patriotic reasons, look askance, in conspiring against him, and they are, somewhat later, reinforced by scribes who come down from Jerusalem to watch him and enter into controversy with him.¹³ In spite of this opposition, the multitude continues to throng the wonderful teacher and

¹⁰ Mark i. 40; Luke v. 12 f.

¹¹ viii. 1 f.

¹² Mark ii. 6-iii. 6; Luke v. 17-vi. 11; Matt. ix. 2 f.; xii. 1 f.

¹³ Mark iii. 22; Luke v. 17, who brings them early on the scene; Matt. xv. 1, who introduces them at a late stage of his narrative.

healer, whilst his relatives, alarmed by the report of his doings and thinking him mad, come to take him away and are rather brusquely countered. "Behold thy mother and thy brethren without (the house) seek for thee. And he answereth unto them and saith, Who is my mother and my brethren?"¹⁴ By this time the report of his ministry has spread from Galilee as far as Idumæa in the south, and Tyre and Sidon in the north, and, as in the case of that of the Baptist, the crowd is now swelled by accessions from far and near.¹⁵ So great is the pressure that he is fain to take refuge in a boat and address the crowd from it on occasion.¹⁶ Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, tell of his preaching on the mountain, and give, though in a different connection, a sample of this preaching (Luke less fully).¹⁷ Instead of this discourse, Mark has samples of his parabolic teaching from the boat (iv. 2 f.), which Matthew also gives more at length (xiii. 1 f.), while Luke has only the parable of the sower (viii. 4), and gives those of the mustard seed and the leaven later (xiii. 19 f.). Matthew and Luke circumstantially, though with varying details, tell of the cure of the centurion's servant at Capernaum, which took place after the Sermon on the Mount,¹⁸ and which the writer of the Fourth Gospel, in his rather confused version of what is evidently the same incident, represents, with glaring misapprehension of fact, as the second sign done in Galilee!¹⁹ To ease the strain, which leaves him no time even to eat, he selects twelve disciples (the number being apparently suggested by the twelve tribes of Israel) to co-operate with him in the work.²⁰ Of the seven thus added to the five already called, Simon the Canaanæan has been erroneously assumed, from this designation, to have

¹⁴ Mark iii. 32-33; Matt. xii. 46 f.; Luke viii. 19 f., give the episode in a different order from Mark and from each other.

¹⁵ Mark iii. 7-8; Matt. iv. 25 f.; Luke vi. 17.

¹⁶ Mark iii. 9; iv. 1; cf. Matt. xiii. 2.

¹⁷ The so-called Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v. 1-vii. 27; Luke vi. 20 f. In Luke it is rather the Sermon on the Plain, or at least a flat place on the mountain.

¹⁸ Matt. viii. 5 f.; Luke vii. 2 f.

¹⁹ John iv. 46 f.

²⁰ Mark iii. 13 f.; Matt. x. 1 f.; Luke vi. 13 f. The clause in Mark, "and Simon he surnamed Peter," does not necessarily imply, as Warschauer asserts ("The Historical Life of Christ," 59, 1927), that Simon received this surname now, rather than at the Confession at Cæsarea Philippi.

been a member of the extreme patriotic party of the Zealots before attaching himself to Jesus. Luke, indeed, gives the Greek "zealot" as an equivalent of the Aramaic Canaanæan. But the Zealots as a political party did not come into existence till long after the time of Jesus, and the designation has been more feasibly interpreted to mean "the zealous" in the religious sense.²¹ According to the Fourth Gospel,²² Philip was a native of Bethsaida; Judas Iscariot alone belonged to Judæa (Kerioth, south of Hebron). James, the son of Alphæus, is not the brother of Jesus, who was not yet a disciple, but is probably identifiable with James the Little.²³ Matthew, the publican, we take to be identical with Levi, the son of Alphæus, already called, and if this identification is correct, and the father of James is the same as that of Levi-Matthew, there must have been three pairs of brothers in the selected Twelve. Bartholomew is possibly the Nathanael of the Fourth Gospel, who was a native of Cana in Galilee, and whom Jesus, according to this writer, pronounced "an Israelite in whom is no guile." The assumption that Paul is cryptically meant by the writer is far fetched. Thomas is the sceptic of the band, while for Thaddæus, Luke substitutes another Judas, the son of Jacob. According to Mark and Luke, the selection takes place on "the mountain," and to them in particular he addresses, according to Luke,²⁴ part of what is the Sermon on the Mount. To them is also addressed, according to Mark and Matthew, the more intimate explanation of his parabolic teaching—"the mystery of the kingdom."²⁵

To escape the crowds and recover from the harassing and wearing effects of this strenuous activity, he directs the disciples to row away in the boat, from which he has been preaching, to Gersa, on the eastern side of the lake.²⁶ He miraculously calms the storm during the crossing and exorcises the demoniac living among the tombs.²⁷ Here, as the result of the loss of the herd of swine, he experiences

²¹ Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings of Christianity," i. 425.

²² i. 44.

²³ Mark xv. 40.

²⁴ vi. 20 f.

²⁵ Mark iv. 10 f.; Matt. xiii. 36 f.; Luke viii. 10.

²⁶ Modern Khersa. See Thomson, "The Land and the Book," ii. 34 f. (1859); Schmidt, "Rahmen," 140-144; Dalman, "Orte und Wege Jesu," 190 f.

²⁷ Matt. viii. 28 has two demoniacs.

a reverse on the part of the people of the place and the surrounding country, who evidently regard him as a dangerous magician and entreat him to depart. On his return to Capernaum we discover another trace of incredulity—this time on the part of the mourners in the house of Jairus, the ruler of the synagogue, whose daughter, in spite of their unbelief, he restores from a swoon. With this incident is connected the cure of the woman suffering from an issue of blood, who touches his garment in the midst of the crowd, during his progress to the house, and is immediately healed.²⁸

Mark next notes the visit to Nazareth and his rejection by his fellow-townsmen, which Luke places at the commencement of the ministry.²⁹ “Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended in him.” This visit appears to have taken place during another tour of Galilee.³⁰ Luke also tells of such a tour, though in a different connection—“soon after” the incident of the anointing of his feet in the house of Simon, the Pharisee, by the woman who was a sinner³¹—and knows of a visit to Nain, where he raises the widow’s son.³² From him we further learn that he was accompanied on this occasion, not only by the Twelve, but by a number of women of the higher class whom he had cured of infirmities and who provided maintenance for him and the disciples on these journeys. Among these devoted women, “who ministered unto them from their substance,” he mentions Mary Magdalene, Joanna the wife of Chuza, Antipas’ steward, and an otherwise unknown Suzanna.

The mission appears still to evoke the eager response of the people, and the eagerness to hear his message and

²⁸ Mark iv. 35-v. 43; Matt. viii. 18 f.; Luke viii. 22 f. Matthew departs markedly from Mark’s order here, placing the crossing and its immediate sequel at an early stage of his narrative, and giving the cure of the woman and the raising in another connection. Luke adheres more closely to Mark.

²⁹ Matthew agrees with Mark in placing the visit at a later stage of it (xiv. 53 f.).

³⁰ Mark vi. 6; cf. Matt. ix. 35.

³¹ viii. 1. It is very probable that in viii. 1-3 Luke is referring to the tour mentioned by Mark and Matthew, not to a separate one.

³² vii. 11 f.

participate in its benefits leads him to organise an extension of it through the Twelve. "But when he saw the multitudes he was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd. Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he send forth labourers into his harvest."³³ He accordingly sends the Twelve out in couples as "apostles"³⁴ to preach and heal. He gives them instructions which, in the detailed version of Matthew, reflect the circumstances of the later Christian mission, and which Mark and Luke contract into a few sentences, whilst Luke repeats it in a fuller and somewhat different form on the occasion of the later sending out of the Seventy.³⁵

By this time the movement, so extended, has attracted the attention of Antipas, who had probably hitherto been too absorbed by political troubles (the war with his father-in-law Aretas, king of Arabia³⁶) to concern himself with it. This accordingly leads Mark to introduce the story of the fate of the Baptist at his hands,³⁷ which Matthew³⁸ gives more briefly and Luke omits, whilst both have the story, which Mark ignores, of the emissaries of John coming to inquire whether Jesus was the Messiah, and Jesus' estimate of him as the second Elijah.³⁹ During the absence of the Twelve he appears to have been engaged in preaching in the lake region,⁴⁰ where, at all events, they rejoin him on their return, and find him still the object of the eager interest of the multitudes.⁴¹ On their return he retires with them by boat to a sequestered spot for a season of rest.⁴² Matthew gives the additional reason for this withdrawal of the news of the Baptist's fate, and Luke implies that the ominous interest

³³ Matt. ix. 36 f.

³⁴ All three evangelists apply this later term to them.

³⁵ Mark vi. 7 f.; Matt. ix. 35-x. 42; Luke ix. 10 f.; x. 1 f.

³⁶ Josephus, "Antiquities," xviii. 5, 1.

³⁷ vi. 14 f.

³⁸ xiv. 1 f.

³⁹ Matt. xi. 2 f.; Luke vii. 18 f.

⁴⁰ Matt. xi. 1. Briggs thinks that he undertook in their absence the journey to Jerusalem referred to in John vii. 2 f. "New Light on the Life of Jesus," 43 f. (1904). A very improbable suggestion.

⁴¹ Mark vi. 30 f.

⁴² Mark vi. 31.

of Antipas in him and his activity had something to do with it.⁴³ "And Herod said, John I beheaded; but who is this about whom I hear such things? And the apostles, when they were returned, declared unto Jesus what things they had done. And he took them and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida." The situation is clearly becoming dangerous, and the retirement for rest to the desert place seems at the same time to be the first step towards the abandonment of the Galilean mission in consequence of the growing danger from the menacing attitude of Antipas.

His intention is discovered by the alert people, who observe the direction taken by the boat and hurry along the north-western shore of the lake, gathering in numbers as they move from the towns and villages on the route. By the time they reach the spot⁴⁴ where they land, the crowd had swelled to 5,000 men, besides women and children, and, according to Matthew and Luke, included sick people whom they had brought with them. The miraculous feeding of the multitude from five loaves and two fishes produces such an overwhelming impression that, according to the Fourth Gospel, the crowd see in him "the prophet that cometh into the world," and would fain seize him and crown him king.⁴⁵ Instead of fleeing before the hostility of Antipas, he should, as the leader of the people, repel force with force. Here was a danger of an opposite kind which was developing out of the enthusiastic support of the people, who evidently see in Jesus, if not the Messiah himself, the leader of a Messianic movement in the popular sense of the subversion of the Herodian-Roman régime, and the restoration of the divine rule or theocracy over an independent nation. This was, of course, a total misapprehension of Jesus' spiritual teaching of the kingdom and his own conception of his Messiahship.

The popular demonstration only strengthens his resolu-

⁴³ Matt. xiv. 13; Luke ix. 9-10.

⁴⁴ Luke says it was towards Bethsaida on the north-east shore. But this is not in accord with Mark and Matthew, who speak of a desert place evidently on the same (*i.e.*, the western) side of the lake, since the multitude reach it in a comparatively short time, and could not have done so if it had been situated on the north-east side. Such a lengthy detour would have necessitated the crossing of the Jordan and required a much longer time.

⁴⁵ John vi. 14-15.

tion to leave Galilee and make for the territory of Herod Philip. Accordingly, after the feeding he sends the disciples away in the boat in the direction of Bethsaida-Julias, the capital of the tetrarch Herod Philip, at the north end of the lake, whilst he remains to dismiss the crowd and thereafter retires to the high ground to pray. Owing to the contrary north wind, the boat can make little headway in spite of hard rowing towards Bethsaida,⁴⁶ and in the night Jesus rejoins them (the story of the walking on the water). Whereupon the wind falls; but instead of making for Bethsaida, they land at the plain of Gennesaret, near to which apparently the boat had been driven. His landing is again the occasion of a great concourse of people from the neighbourhood, who carry the sick in their beds to be healed, and the dramatic scene is repeated in all the villages and towns and in the open country through which he passes before returning to Capernaum.⁴⁷ The spell exercised by Jesus during these strenuous days is as powerful as on the first Sabbath at Capernaum. In every market-place the sick are collected to await his coming, and a touch of the tassel of his cloak suffices to heal them. It is the climax of his popularity and the power of his healing ministry over the common people.

But the anticlimax has also been reached. He is once more in dangerous proximity to Antipas, through the accident of the storm on the lake. The scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem are again on his track and challenging his aberration from "the tradition of the elders" on the question of ceremonial washings.⁴⁸ Moreover, the continued antagonism of these official religious leaders and his refusal to accept the popular kingship have tended to react unfavourably on a section at least of the people. In Matthew ⁴⁹ we hear of the wilful blindness, the unrepentant perversity of the lake cities, Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, notwithstanding his "mighty works." In the Fourth

⁴⁶ The Bethsaida of the narrative (Mark vi. 30 f.; Matt. xiv. 13 f.; Luke ix. 10 f.; John vi. 1 f.) is Bethsaida at the north end of the lake, and there is no need of the assumption that there was another Bethsaida on the western side.

⁴⁷ Mark vi. 53 f.; Matt. xiv. 34 f. That the journey ended at Capernaum appears from Mark vii. 17.

⁴⁸ Mark vii. 1; Matt. xv. 1.

⁴⁹ Matt. xi. 20.

Gospel, as the result of a dispute with the Jews and a discourse on himself as the bread of life from heaven, in the synagogue at Capernaum, after the landing at Gennesaret, there is a large defection of his professed disciples.⁵⁰ The incredulity about the claims of Joseph's son, which had found expression at Nazareth, recurs here. "And they said, Is not this Jesus, whose father and mother we know? How doth he now say, I am come down out of heaven."⁵¹ Though the exact historicity of the scene is open to serious question, and the author displays once more a confused and pragmatic treatment⁵² of events in Galilee, it may be taken as substantially reflecting the reaction, which in virtue of popular disillusion and official antagonism, was now taking definite shape.

In the face of this defection, in addition to the menacing antagonism of Antipas and the official religious leaders, it is not surprising that Jesus proceeded to carry out his resolution to leave Galilee. Hence the journey northwards to the region of Tyre and Sidon⁵³ and the period of indefinite and furtive wandering with the Twelve through regions beyond the jurisdiction of Antipas. The journey was evidently not a missionary tour, but a retirement, first north-westwards towards Tyre and Sidon, then, by a detour south-eastwards, through the territory of Herod Philip as far as the Decapolis region on the eastern side of the lake and the Jordan.⁵⁴ The only incident recorded till he reaches the Decapolis region is the exorcism of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter, whose humble faith calls forth this exercise of his healing power.⁵⁵ His presence on the eastern side of the lake and the cure of a deaf and dumb man arouses this time the liveliest interest and goodwill, and Matthew

⁵⁰ John vi. 66.

⁵¹ John vi. 42.

⁵² The question of "the Jews" seems an echo of that of the people of Nazareth, and in the discussion with "the Jews" the writer is palpably putting into the mouth of Jesus his own later doctrinal views.

⁵³ Mark vii. 24 f.; Matt. xv. 21 f.

⁵⁴ Blunt ("Commentary on Mark," 192) thinks that the geography of the journey is impossible, as the distance covered is too great. But we are not told how long the journey lasted, and cannot therefore pronounce it impossible.

⁵⁵ Mark vii. 24 f.; Matt. xv. 21 f. Luke omits the whole of the Markan account of this journey and its sequel, and only takes up the Markan story at Cæsarea Philippi, though he does not particularise the locality.

presents us with a vivid picture of the multitude once more bringing to him a variety of infirm people to be healed⁵⁶ as he sat on the hillside. Both Mark and he tell of a second miraculous feeding of the multitude—this time 4,000 in number—who have been with him three days without food,⁵⁷ which Luke omits and which many critics and exegetes, rightly it seems to me, regard as a duplicate of the previous miracle.⁵⁸ After the feeding he crosses to the western side—to Dalmanutha⁵⁹ or Magadan (Magdala). Here the Pharisees reappear on the scene⁶⁰ and ask for a sign from heaven, “tempting him,” says Mark. This he refuses, evidently on the ground that the request was a mere subterfuge to entrap him.⁶¹ “Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod,” he warns the disciples. His stay on the western side is, therefore, of brief duration. He breaks off the dispute to embark for Bethsaida, where he cures a blind man, and then journeys northwards beyond the borders of Galilee to the region of Cæsarea Philippi, situated towards Mount Hermon, at the source of the Jordan, about twenty-five miles north of the lake, which Herod Philip had enlarged and renamed in honour of the reigning Emperor, Tiberius, and himself. Here the disciples in answer to the question, “Who, say ye, that I am?” explicitly recognise him as the Christ. In reply Jesus, evidently apprehensive of the popular misconstruction of his Messiahship, charges them not to divulge the secret to others, and makes the, to them, incredible announcement of his ultimate suffering and death, his resurrection, and the supervening speedy coming of the kingdom with power.⁶²

⁵⁶ Matt. xv. 29 f. Mark vii. 31 f. mentions only the cure of the deaf and dumb person.

⁵⁷ Mark viii. 1 f.; Matt. xv. 32 f.

⁵⁸ See, for instance, Menzies, “The Earliest Gospel,” 160-161 (1901); Schmidt, “Rahmen,” 192. Even if the story of the feeding is a doublet, there is no reason for doubting the historicity of Jesus’ movements at this stage of his mission.

⁵⁹ On this place, see Dalman, “Orte und Wege Jesu,” 136. Warschauer identifies Magdala with the modern el-Medjdel. “Historical Life of Christ,” 60.

⁶⁰ Matthew adds the Sadducees—an anachronism, since Jesus only comes in contact with them at Jerusalem.

⁶¹ Mark viii. 11 f.; Matt. xvi. 1 f.; cf. xii. 38 f.

⁶² Mark viii. 27 f.; Matt. xvi. 13 f.; Luke ix. 18. Matt. xvi. 17-19, in which Jesus proclaims the pre-eminence of Peter in the Church of the future, but which are absent from the other two accounts, is of very question-

This is the turning-point in the life of Jesus. The mission involves death for himself, but ultimate triumph for his cause. It means alike the cross and the crown.

In the Fourth Gospel the equivalent of this scene is given, in the writer's confused, pragmatic manner of treating the Galilean mission, as occurring at Capernaum immediately after the feeding.⁶³ The confession is here also made by Peter as the mouthpiece of the others. But both the question and the answer are characteristically different, though the answer is in part an adaptation of the Synoptic version. "Would ye also go away?" "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God."⁶⁴ Instead of the announcement of his passion, which follows in the Synoptic Gospels, the writer makes him anticipate and announce his betrayal by Judas.⁶⁵

Near the scene of the confession Peter, James, and John experience the vision of his transfiguration on the high mountain (Hermon?) and hear the proclamation from the overshadowing cloud, "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him."⁶⁶ At the baptism this proclamation was made to Jesus alone. It has hitherto been his secret, which the disciples have, in their own fashion, gradually been divining from his words and works. Now it is made to the three most prominent of them in confirmation of the confession. Such a visionary experience is not necessarily a mere invention of the later tradition—an adaptation of that of Moses on the mount⁶⁷—though the story has features which remind of the scene at the giving of the Law to Moses at

able authenticity. There are strong grounds for regarding these verses as a later interpolation. Mark, in stating that he communicated his future fate "openly," seems to be under a misapprehension. He also errs in making Jesus address the multitude as well as the disciples in verse 34. Matthew gives the correct version.

⁶³ Luke also has the confession immediately after the feeding. But this is because he has omitted the section of Mark which tells of Jesus' wanderings after the feeding, and the sequel of his narrative implies that the confession took place at Cæsarea Philippi. He was evidently not interested in this section containing the exclusive saying to the Syro-Phœnician woman, which grated on his universalist spirit.

⁶⁴ John vi. 68-69.

⁶⁵ John vi. 70-71.

⁶⁶ Mark ix. 2 f.; Matt. xvii. 1 f.; Luke ix. 28 f. The proclamation is amplified in Matthew and Luke.

⁶⁷ Exod. xxiv. 12-18.

Mount Sinai, and its composition appears to have been influenced by the Old Testament narrative. It is sufficiently explicable as the effect of the excitement and exaltation accruing from the previous scene.⁶⁸ In Luke the disciples are awakening from sleep, when they have the vision of their transfigured Master and hear the heavenly voice. Such a vision is by no means an unfamiliar phenomenon in religious psychology.

In this region also takes place the last of his cures in connection with the Galilean mission—the exorcism of the epileptic lad, whom the other disciples have meanwhile attempted in vain to relieve. With them, according to Mark, the local scribes are disputing when Jesus appears on the scene and, rebuking their lack of faith, effects the cure, and privately explains their failure by saying that “this kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer.”⁶⁹ Once more the multitude, who have presumably come in contact with him for the first time, express admiration for the supernatural healer⁷⁰ who has anew vindicated his cause in the presence of his scribal opponents.

From this region he turns southwards to Capernaum, preparatory to the journey to Jerusalem to face the doom which now looms definitely before him. His short sojourn at Capernaum and his passage through Galilee are of a furtive character. He confines his teaching to the disciples on the way of the Cross, which is relieved by the conviction of the resurrection, though the disciples do not understand it; inculcates the supreme obligation of service in rebuke of their striving for first place in the kingdom; and condemns their narrow disposition to ostracise one who was attempting to cast out devils in his name, even if he did not belong

⁶⁸ See Selwyn, “The Oracles of God,” 275.

⁶⁹ Mark ix. 29.

⁷⁰ Luke ix. 43. The appearance of the scribes on the scene is mentioned only by Mark, who gives the fullest account. Some critics have concluded that this part of the incident is not historic on the ground that there would be no scribes in this region. The inference does not necessarily follow. The presence of a multitude, mentioned by all three recorders, is also regarded by some as unhistoric, but in view of the widespread reputation of Jesus as teacher and healer, this critical implication is by no means conclusive. A. Schweitzer’s attempt to place the transfiguration on “the mountain” near Bethsaida, and to make it precede the confession at Cæsarea Philippi, is unconvincing. “Quest of the Historical Jesus,” 380 f. (Eng. trans., 2nd ed., 1926)

to their circle.⁷¹ The only incident of a public character recorded of this furtive visit to Capernaum is the demand for the payment of the temple tax, which he recognises in the legendary story of the catching of the fish with the shekel in its mouth.⁷²

The Galilean mission thus culminates in seeming failure and the conviction of the tragic doom awaiting him at Jerusalem. In view of the deadly antagonism of the scribes and Pharisees which it has aroused, his fate has in reality already been decided in Galilee. His enemies are engaged in an intrigue with the Herodians and with the authorities at Jerusalem to bring about his destruction, and he already sees what will be the outcome for him and his work. It is with this insight into the inexorable trend of events that, according to the Synoptic evidence, he determines to go to Jerusalem to challenge the inevitable issue; to seal his mission by sacrifice and suffering as the indispensable condition of its ultimate triumph.

The mission evidently lasted considerably over a year. Mark, indeed, leaves the impression of a rapid development of events. These seem to follow in quick succession. This impression is, however, misleading. Not only is the sequence of events, except in a small degree, not chronological. The material given is only a selection, as we learn from the general statements relative to the subject, and also from the amplifications of Matthew and Luke, who add to it from other sources. From the mention of the green grass in the story of the feeding of the 5,000 and of the cornfields, it may be reasonably inferred that one Passover at least occurred in the course of it.⁷³ In recounting the former incident the Fourth Gospel explicitly says that the Passover was at hand.⁷⁴ The mission had evidently extended over a considerable period before this episode, whilst the sequel

⁷¹ Mark ix. 30 f.; Matt. xviii. 1 f., who gives a more elaborate account of the teaching.

⁷² Matt. xvii. 24 f.

⁷³ If the variant reading of Luke vi. 1 means the second Sabbath after Passover, when Jesus walked through the cornfields (*δευτεροπρώτῃ*), and this reading is preferred, though it is rather dubious, we have here also an indication of one Passover occurring during the Galilean mission. On this question see Plummer, "Commentary on Luke," 165-166.

⁷⁴ John vi. 4.

requires another lengthy interval before the final departure from Galilee southwards. If we could regard the narrative of these two events—the feeding and the plucking of the ears of corn—as chronological, a whole year would elapse between the two. The plucking of the ears of corn, which comes first in the narrative, takes place in the spring; the feeding, which comes later, also takes place in the spring, *i.e.*, in the following spring. The difficulty in the way of this interpretation lies in the fact that the narrative is not necessarily chronological. At all events, one Passover does seem to have occurred during the mission, which had already been in progress during a lengthy period and lasted a considerable time after it—say till the following late summer at least.

II. CHARACTER OF THE MISSION

In the Synoptic Gospels his mission up to the great confession at Cæsarea Philippi is specifically that of a prophet and a healer who moves about in Galilee, preaching and ministering in the synagogues, in private houses, and in the open air. Matthew summarises it as one of teaching, proclaiming, and healing.¹ Jesus himself emphasises its prophetic character in the discourse at Nazareth. “A prophet,” he exclaims, in reproach of his rejection by the Nazarenes, “is not without honour except in his own country.”² To the people the evidence of his teaching and his works suggests the same inference. Though he is addressed as Rabbi or Teacher, this designation did not suffice to convey the impression produced by these. He is more than the conventional scribe, and his teaching, coupled with his healing ministry, excite astonishment, nay, amazement.³ He is from the outset regarded as one of the prophets, and ultimately the people are found speculating whether he is not a reincarnation of Elijah or other of the ancient prophets.⁴

¹ Matt. iv. 23, *διδάσκων, κηρύσσων, καὶ θεραπεύων*.

² Mark v. 4; Matt. xiii. 57, *cf.* x. 41; Luke iv. 24; John iv. 44.

³ Mark i. 27; Matt. vii. 28-29; Luke iv. 36, and other passages.

⁴ Mark viii. 28; Matt. xvi. 14; Luke ix. 19.

In the face of the raising of the widow's son at Nain, the multitude is convinced that "a great prophet is arisen among us and God hath visited his people."⁵ Even the Fourth Gospel, despite the halo which it casts over him from the beginning, reflects on occasion this popular estimate, "Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet," says the Samaritan woman.⁶ "This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world," exclaims the multitude after the feeding of the 5,000, in reference apparently to Deut. xviii. 15.⁷ Whilst Jesus from his baptism knew himself to be more even than a prophet, he had perforce to be the prophet before he could be the Messiah. He had to take up the work of proclamation and preparation before he could actually assume the Messianic function. Hence the *prophetic-ethical* character of the mission which he began at Capernaum and carried on in the lake region and all over Galilee.

It is as a prophet that Jesus introduces himself to his fellow-townsmen of Nazareth, and in his address on this occasion, as reported by Luke, we have an actual specimen of his prophetic preaching at an ordinary service in the synagogue. The address is only indirectly Messianic. It is primarily meant and understood as a prophetic deliverance in preparation for the coming kingdom. At the request of the ruler or president of the synagogue, he stands up to read from the roll of the prophet Isaiah. The passage chosen, which Luke quotes rather freely, is taken from Isa. lxi. 1-2: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord has anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek. He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." Rolling up the parchment⁸ and handing it back to the attendant, he sat down to deliver his address from this appropriate passage. He evidently applied it to his own mission as God's servant (it occurs in "the servant" portion of Isaiah). "To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears." As he proceeded with his discourse amid the tense attention of his hearers, he read in their

⁵ Luke vii. 16.

⁶ John iv. 19.

⁷ John vi. 14.

⁸ Not closing the book, as in A.V. and R.V.

fixed gaze, with his innate quickness of observation, astonishment at his gracious speech ("the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth"). It was customary for the audience in the synagogue to interrupt the reader and expounder of the Scriptures with questions relative to the matter of the discourse. In this case the question asked reveals the incredulity as well as the astonishment of the listeners. "Is not this Joseph's son?" implies astonishment not only at the wonderful skill of the speaker, but at the presumption which arrogated the rôle depicted by the ancient prophet. Hence the sharper tone of the remainder of the discourse in which he reminds them that a prophet hath no honour in his own country and among his own kin and in his own house, and passes on to reprove their spiritual pride and blindness and remind them that God had more than once reserved His blessings for the heathen, in place of His people. At these words the intent interest of the beginning of the discourse quickly changes into anger and tumult. They will listen no longer to the would-be prophet and mob him out of the synagogue and the city. According to Luke, they would have ended the tumult by throwing him down a precipice, had he not succeeded, in miraculous fashion apparently, in escaping their vengeance.⁹ No wonder that "he could do there no mighty work, save that he laid his hands on a few sick folk and healed them."¹⁰

The keynote of his early prophetic message is the same as that of the Baptist, "Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."¹¹ The kingdom or rule of God is about to begin, and repentance is the indispensable condition of entrance into it. It seems only an echo of that of the Baptist. But, as Jesus developed it in his discourses and parables, it has a far deeper, richer content, and is to Jesus himself and to the people who hear him something arrestingly new. For him it is the new wine that will not be put into

⁹ Luke iv. 16 f.; cf. Mark vi. 1 f.; Matt. xiii. 53 f. Sherlock thinks that the Lukan account of the preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth is not identical with the incident described by Mark and Matthew, but refers to a subsequent Sabbath during the visit, which was of some duration. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 552 f. (1910).

¹⁰ Mark vi. 5.

¹¹ Matt. iv. 23, the more original version as compared with Mark i. 15, who adds "and believe in the Gospel"—a later addition.

the old bottles, the new cloth that cannot be sewn on the old garment.¹² For them it is "a new teaching," differing radically from that of the scribes.¹³ New is also the optimistic spirit that pervades it, in contrast to that of the Baptist, at least before the controversy with the scribes and Pharisees and the official religious leaders. It is the proclamation of a new hope springing from his own profound spiritual experience of the will and love of God, fraught with the fullness of blessing for man. The term Gospel, glad tidings applied to it by the evangelists is, in this sense, substantially correct even if they use the term in its later, more developed sense, as connoting all that it implied in the later apostolic preaching. Waiving meanwhile the detailed consideration of its originality, it may suffice to say here that he is the herald of a new era in religion, and that he and his hearers were substantially justified in the conclusion that with this preaching the new era had begun.

The mission is *only indirectly Messianic*. The Galilean ministry is a ministry of preparation for the establishment of the rule of God. Hence the prominence of the didactic element, if not in Mark, in Matthew and Luke, who borrow from the record of the teaching, of which both, in varying degree, avail themselves. The kingdom can only be established on an ethical foundation, and this foundation the prophet strives to lay by vitalising the ethical and spiritual life in accordance with the highest ideal of both. Jesus is engaged, as God's chosen instrument, in a great venture. The mission is an experimental one, and it seems that at first he was not clear how the experiment would work out. His aim from the outset is the founding of a new spiritual realm, and the record of the mission reveals its genesis in the work of propaganda, which is creating an epoch in the history of Israel and, by inference, of the world. But the work of propaganda is conditioned by the circumstances of the time, and entails a tentative procedure. The great innovator must beware of a precipitate revelation of his Messianic function, in view of the crass popular notion of the Messianic kingdom as a vindication of the political

¹² Mark ii. 21-22; Matt. ix. 16-17; Luke v. 36 f.

¹³ Mark i. 22; Matt. vii. 29.

independence of Israel, a restoration of its material felicity. He must spiritualise the popular mind before he can establish the kingdom in the spiritual sense in which he understands it. He has to reckon with the danger of a popular upheaval under the influence of the current popular Messianic hope, which would inevitably arouse the antagonism of the secular power. He has, too, to reckon with the antagonism of the representatives of the conventional religion, of the local scribes and Pharisees, and the emissaries of the Sanhedrin, whose attention his venture ere long invites.

Hence the veiled, indirect, parabolic, suggestive form of the public teaching on the kingdom, the reserved and furtive reference to his Messiahship, and the abeyance of the more purely eschatological element in the teaching. To assume from the words uttered at the start of the mission at Capernaum, "To this end came I forth, or was I sent,"¹⁴ that he openly declared his Messianic vocation is very rash. The context, in which he refers to his vocation as preacher, points rather to the prophetic function. The discourse at Nazareth, reported by Luke, is, as we have noted, only indirectly Messianic. The question at issue between him and his fellow-townsmen is, whether he can claim to be a prophet, or not. He discourages from the outset the precipitate recognition of his Messianic person. He enjoins silence on the demons who, in accordance with the naïve belief of the time, are credited with supernatural knowledge, and recognise in him the Messiah who has come to overthrow the realm of Satan. Only in one case—that of the Gadarene demoniac—does he command the exorcised sufferer to go and proclaim his deliverance, and in this case the miracle is wrought in a largely non-Jewish district, where popular commotion was less to be feared. Similarly in the case of other sufferers who experience the benefit of his power over a variety of diseases. They are charged to tell no man.¹⁵ To the question put to him by the emissaries of John the

¹⁴ Mark i. 35 ; Luke iv. 43.

¹⁵ For the most recent detailed discussion of the subject of the Messianic secret, see Charue, "L'Incrédulité des Juifs dans le Nouveau Testament," 86 f. (1929).

Baptist he does not give a direct answer, but bids them go and tell John of his works and teaching.¹⁶

This prohibitive attitude is most marked in the Second Gospel, and it has been regarded by radical critics like Wrede and Bultmann,¹⁷ who hold that Jesus did not regard himself as the Messiah, as merely a reflection of later Christian apologetic, in explanation of the supposed failure of the disciples to recognise his Messiahship. But the injunction of silence appears in the other two Gospels, though not so prominently, and it is sufficiently explicable on the ground of the misconception to which a premature declaration of his Messiahship was liable and the complications to which it would have inevitably led. It is, too, in keeping with the fact that the references of Jesus to himself as the Son of man, before the close of the mission, are of a furtive nature, if indeed the two passages in Mark ii. 10 and 28, in which he uses the term, are not to be explained in the impersonal sense of "man" rather than as a specific designation of Jesus in his Messianic capacity.¹⁸ The use of the title in Matthew and Luke in the early period of the mission is more frequent. But some of these passages may be fairly assigned to the later period of it,¹⁹ whilst others are evidently imputed to him by the writer.²⁰ In any case the reference is indirect and unobtrusive, and his hearers do not seem to infer a personal application of the title on his part.

He discards, indeed, this attitude of reserve in his more intimate converse with the disciples, and expounds to them "the mystery of the kingdom." "Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom."²¹ Even so this esoteric teaching seems to have been concerned with the ethical, rather than

¹⁶ Matt. xi. 2 f.; Luke vii. 20 f.

¹⁷ Wrede, "Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien" (1901); Bultmann, "Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition" (1921).

¹⁸ The Aramaic *Barnasha*, Son of man, was the term used to express man in the general sense, not necessarily Son of Man in the apocalyptic sense, and the question is whether Jesus used it, in these passages, in this general sense, or as a title denoting his Messiahship. See Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings of Christianity," i. 368 f.

¹⁹ Matt. viii. 20, for instance, on the Son of Man having no place to lay his head. This is palpably referable to his later wanderings outside Galilee, though Matthew puts it in the early period. In Luke (ix. 38) it occurs after he has finally left Galilee.

²⁰ Matt. xii. 33; cf. Mark iii. 28.

²¹ Mark iv. 11; iv. 34; vii. 17; Matt. xiii. 11; Luke viii. 10.

the eschatological, character of the kingdom, with the kingdom in the spiritual sense in which he apprehended it, and it was certainly not specifically concerned with his own Messianic function in relation to it. Otherwise the question ultimately directed to them at Cæsarea Philippi, Who, say ye, that I am? which assumes the previous lack of any such communication, would have been rather superfluous.²²

It is thus only at the close of the mission that the eschatological element comes into the foreground, though even then the charge of secrecy is repeated.²³ There has evidently been a development of his own self-knowledge as well as the knowledge of the disciples about him. In the face of the obtuseness of the multitude in failing to understand or misunderstanding his spiritual Messiahship, and of the active antagonism of the authorities, both secular and religious, he has himself been gradually led to a definite conviction of what his Messianic mission involves for him—the fate of the suffering servant of his people—if this is still an enigma to the disciples. Matthew, indeed, in the discourse to the Twelve in sending them out to preach, makes him speak of the necessity of taking up the cross and following him, and of losing their life in order to find it. But the words are absent from the shorter and more original Markan and Lukan version, and are a reflection of the conditions prevailing in the later Apostolic mission. Henceforth the eschatological element in the teaching to the disciples, if not to the multitude, becomes the main element. The figure of the prophet is transformed into that of the Son of Man, who must die at the hands of an implacable opposition before he can enter, through his resurrection and his exaltation, on his Messianic function in the transcendental sense.

²² Goguel argues that Jesus made himself known to, and was known by, the disciples as well as others as the Messiah from an early period of the mission, and that the assumption of the Synoptic writers that the disciples' recognition of his Messiahship came only at Cæsarea Philippi does not correspond to the actual history. "Jesus the Nazarene," 199 f. (Eng. trans., 1926). The argument does not seem to me convincing.

²³ Mark viii. 30; Matt. xvi. 20; Luke ix. 22. Mark represents him (verse 34) as subsequently speaking to the multitude as well as the disciples on the subject. The multitude is absent from the report of Matthew and Luke, and the phrase "the multitude" is a later redactorial addition. See Cadman, "The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem," 65-66 (1923).

Another distinctive feature of the mission is its powerful appeal to the people. It bears throughout a *popular—humanitarian* character. It is instinct with his sympathy with the mass—with the poor in the material, and the poor in the spiritual sense, with the toilers who are not sure of to-morrow's bread,²⁴ and the humble folk, whose instinctive, unsophisticated piety fits them to become members of the kingdom, though, as "sinners," they are the objects of the contempt of the superior formalist. "To the poor the Gospel is preached."²⁵ His sympathy embraces even the social outcast—the publican or tax-gatherer, with whom no respectable Jew will consort, the "sinners" not merely in contrast to the legally "righteous," but the harlots, the prodigals, the lost. It is to the lower stratum of the people, the disreputables in the religious, social, and moral sense that Jesus directs his mission. He is to be found in the slum as well as the synagogue, and ere long the synagogue is closed against him, and only the crowd (the ὄχλος) in the open air forms his congregation. "And he had compassion on the multitude because they were as sheep not having a shepherd, and he began to teach them many things."²⁶ This man of the people is entirely free from current religious and social prejudice. He sets out to found a spiritual realm which knows no distinction of class or condition, and finds its subjects among the single-minded folk, the publicans and sinners rather than among "the wise and understanding."²⁷ This feature of the mission, equally with the teaching, is something new, and equally scandalises the scribes and Pharisees. "And the scribes and Pharisees, when they saw that he was eating with sinners and publicans, said unto the disciples, He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners. And when Jesus heard of it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they

²⁴ The petition for daily bread (ἐπιούσιος) in the Lord's Prayer refers to this class. It means, Give us our amount of daily bread for to-morrow, *i.e.*, the portion usually, it seems, allotted a day beforehand to soldiers, slaves, and labourers. See Deissmann, "The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research," 84 f. See also Moulton and Milligan, "Vocabulary of the Greek Testament," 242-243 (1914-29).

²⁵ Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 22.

²⁶ Mark vi. 34.

²⁷ Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21.

that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."²⁸ It is also reflected in the beautiful stories of the woman of Capernaum who was a sinner, but who loved much and anointed his feet in the house of Simon the Pharisee,²⁹ and of the woman taken in adultery whom the scribes and Pharisees would have stoned, but whom he bids go and sin no more.³⁰

To this large-hearted, untrammelled humanity is due also the humanitarian character of the mission as a ministry of healing as well as teaching. This ministry is, in the Synoptists, specifically the outcome of his sympathy with human need, his compassion on the multitude. At the same time, it is an essential of his Messianic vocation and evidently has an indirect didactic purpose. "Go your way," he tells the emissaries of the Baptist, "and tell John the things which ye do hear and see ; the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up and the poor have good tidings preached to them."³¹ It is part of his prophetic task in preparing the advent of the kingdom in the spiritual sense in which he understands it. It is intended to convey to the people a true apprehension of the spiritual character of his mission which they were so prone to misunderstand. He is there not to lead a popular revolt against the established political order, but to make war by moral and spiritual means on the power of evil, which manifests itself in disease, sin, and death, and hinders the coming of the divine rule. The enemy whom he would overthrow is not the Roman Cæsar or the Herodian régime. The enemy is the devil. It is Beelzebub, the prince of this world, and his satellites, the demons, to whom the ills and miseries of human life, spiritual and bodily, are ascribable. This diabolic power must be deprived of its sway over body and soul before the rule of God in the spiritual sense can come. From this point of view the mission is a conflict between Jesus and Satan, the adversary of God, for the moral supremacy of the world.³² Hence the prominence, especially

²⁸ Mark ii. 18 f. ; Matt. ix. 12 f. ; Luke v. 31 f.

²⁹ Luke vii. 36 f.

³⁰ John viii. 3 f.

³¹ Matt. xi. 4 f. ; Luke vii. 22.

³² Mark iii. 22 f., and parallels.

in Mark, of the exorcism of the demons as they manifest their power in a variety of diseases, which are ascribed to a demoniac source. After his own temptation by the devil, he begins this conflict in the synagogue at Capernaum and carries it all over Galilee and elsewhere. The people may not comprehend the far-reaching purport of his healing mission. But they are quick to respond to the humanitarian spirit of it and the divine power operating through it. Again and again the evangelists chronicle the overpowering effects of this beneficent activity. His fame as healer and teacher rapidly spreads over the whole of Palestine and even beyond.³³ "All are amazed, and glorify God, saying, We never saw it in this fashion."³⁴ "And they were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well."³⁵ "And the multitude marvelled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel . . . and they glorified the God of Israel."³⁶ "And amazement took hold on all, and they glorified God and were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things to-day."³⁷ So overwhelming is the impression that the crowd begins to query whether the healer is not something more than a prophet.³⁸ "Is this the Son of David?"

The excitement and enthusiasm rose to such a pitch that the crowd would fain compel the prophet to become their king.³⁹ The movement thus threatens more than once to take on a convulsive character and defeat the spiritual purpose of the mission. This hectic excitement, being based on misunderstanding, lack of true enlightenment, might easily react into disappointment and disillusion. Even at the height of the popular enthusiasm over the healing ministry we hear of this contingency at the conclusion of the message forwarded to John. "Blessed is he whosoever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me."⁴⁰ The parable of the sower reveals the unpromising substance of much of the soil on which the seed is being sown, and the difficulty of achieving out of all this enthusiasm fruitful and permanent results. The cities in which the greatest of his works were

³³ Mark i. 28, 45; iii. 7, etc.; Luke iv. 37; vii. 17.

³⁴ Mark ii. 12.

³⁵ Mark vii. 37.

³⁶ Matt. ix. 33; xv. 31.

³⁷ Luke v. 26.

³⁸ Matt. xii. 23.

³⁹ John vi. 15.

⁴⁰ Matt. xi. 6.

done ultimately appear strangely irresponsive. Most ominous of all, the local scribes and Pharisees take the lead in criticising and opposing both his teaching and his works, and those who come down from Jerusalem see in the ministry of healing the agency of the devil, not of the Spirit of God.⁴¹

Jesus does not seem to have begun his mission in direct opposition to the scribes and Pharisees. He sought rather to avoid a collision, and, as we have seen, one of the reasons for the charge of silence was to obviate as far as possible their hostility. Collision was, nevertheless, inevitable. It was the result both of his spiritual conception of religion and his emancipation from the religious and social prejudices of his time, as shown in the overflowing humanity that led him to seek and save "sinners." For him the current formalism, the load of scribal tradition and Pharisaic ceremonial minutæ was an obstacle, not a help to the coming of the kingdom. It was, too, an index of religious decline, of poverty of religious thought and intuition. He accordingly represents a revulsion from this exaggerated and maleficent formalism. As against this formalism, he is the protagonist of spiritual religion and individual liberty—the great Protestant, we might call him, in the spirit of the prophets of old. However much he might seek to avoid a collision with this formalism, his mission must perforce acquire a *revulsive*, if not a revolutionary character. This revulsion was, in fact, to eventuate in a revolution. The people had been quick to notice the difference between his teaching and that of the scribes on the occasion of his first appearance in the synagogue at Capernaum. Here was a teacher with a message of his own to proclaim and an arresting diction in proclaiming it. As a man of the people, familiar with the common speech and train of thought, he could express himself in a style that struck home to the heart and touched the imagination. It is not formal or technical, but comes from the living fountain of his own profound spiritual experience. It is instinct with life; ethical and practical, rather than theological. It is concerned, not with the theology of the rabbinic schools, but with life, with practical ethical and religious questions of

⁴¹ Mark iii. 22; Matt. xii. 24 f.; Luke xi. 15.

common interest, replete with pregnant sayings of the character of proverbs and with parables derived from the ordinary life. His manner of address was thus very different from the conventional scribal method of repeating the comments of the pundits of their class on the text of Scripture and on the content of the tradition accumulated around it. Naturally, therefore, the scribes were from the beginning disposed to look askance at the popular young Rabbi, and their distaste was increased by the daring originality and independence with which he erelong treated the ordinances and customs of the current religious life. With these scribes, the Pharisees generally are conjoined in the rising opposition, which is ultimately strengthened by the accession of representatives of both classes from Jerusalem and Judæa, though a few of both seem to be tolerant and even sympathetic.

Hence the growing antagonism and animosity of these formalists throughout the mission, which runs parallel with the enthusiasm of the people. It begins early over Jesus' claim to declare the forgiveness of sins in the case of the paralytic in Simon's house at Capernaum.⁴² It recurs on the occasion of his presence with publicans and sinners at the feast provided by Matthew (Levi), when they reproach him and his disciples for sitting at meat in such company.⁴³ Anon, it is the abstinence of the disciples from fasting that offends the adherents of John as well as the Pharisees, who call him a glutton and a wine-bibber.⁴⁴ Fasting later became a Christian practice, but, like baptism, it owed its origin to the Baptist, not to Jesus. More heinous is the audacity of the disciples in plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath,⁴⁵ and that of the Master himself in curing the man with the withered hand in the synagogue on the sacred day.⁴⁶ Jesus' persistence in such desecration and the independent, authoritative, and, even at times, defiant manner in which he rebuts their reproaches and confronts them with the prophetic teaching on mercy, not sacrifice

⁴² Mark ii. 1 f.; Matt. ix. 1 f.; Luke v. 17 f.

⁴³ Mark ii. 15 f.; Matt. ix. 10 f.; Luke v. 28 f.

⁴⁴ Mark iii. 18 f.; Matt. ix. 14 f.; xi. 19; Luke viii. 35 f.; vii. 34.

⁴⁵ Mark ii. 23; Matt. xii. 1 f.; Luke vi. 1 f.

⁴⁶ Mark iii. 1 f.; Matt. xii. 9 f.; Luke vi. 6 f.

(Hos. vi. 6),⁴⁷ make the breach between him and them henceforth irremediable. From this time the Pharisees conspire with the Herodians to destroy him. They not only continue their efforts to entrap him into compromising utterances, but appear to have communicated with the Sanhedrin to this end. It is significant of this wider plot against him that in the next two encounters over the exorcism of the demons and the neglect of the disciples of the ceremonial washing before meals,⁴⁸ scribes from Jerusalem appear in Mark⁴⁹ on the scene. In the latter, for which the Fourth Gospel substitutes the problematic controversy on the Eucharist with "the Jews" in the synagogue at Capernaum, he challenges the authority of "the tradition of the elders"⁵⁰ as an unwarrantable human imposition and confronts it with the commandments of God. This tradition, as embodied and practised in Judaism, is incompatible with, subversive of the ethical religion of the prophets, of which he is the representative, and which it is his mission to restore. He appeals to Isaiah as well as Hosea, alike in vindication of this religion and in denunciation of the counterfeit of it, which the leaders of the current Judaism represent. "Finely did Isaiah prophesy concerning you, hypocrites, as it is written, This people honour me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. In vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men."⁵¹ In their insistence on a fanatic formalism they are acting against the law of Moses as well as the teaching of the prophets. The example chosen is the practice of Corban, by which one vowed something to the temple, even if it might deprive one's parents of their right of subsistence by their children and thus contravene the command to honour father and mother. It seems that a dispensation by the doctors of the law from such a vow was already, in the time of Jesus, permissible, though the evidence for this is later.⁵² It is,

⁴⁷ Matt. xii. 7.

⁴⁸ Mark iii. 22 f., and vii. 1 f.; Matt. xii. 22 f. and xv. 1 f.; Luke xi. 14 f.

⁴⁹ In Matthew they appear only in the case of the second incident. Luke v. 17 signalises their appearance at an earlier stage of his narrative.

⁵⁰ παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, Mark vii. 5; Matt. xv. 2.

⁵¹ Isa. xxix. 13, in the Septuagint version.

⁵² See Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar zum Neuen Testament," i. 712 f. (1922).

however, significant that the scribes and Pharisees do not contest the charge, and the assumption of Herford that Jesus, in making it, was ignorant of Pharisaic teaching on the subject is rather questionable.⁵³ In vindication of his aggressive and defiant attitude towards his antagonists, he proceeds to explain in parabolic fashion to the people and the disciples, in reference to the particular point at issue, that purity depends on the state of the heart, not on the observance of the minutiae of the external acts, which the scribal and Pharisaic religion imposes upon them.⁵⁴ The principle involves a profound modification of the conventional religion and at least the prospective development of the mission into a movement transcending the limits of Judaism.

Jesus himself may not have envisaged this development at this stage of the mission at least. The Galilean mission in Mark and Matthew, if not in Luke, who is frankly universalist from beginning to end, is distinctively *racial*, not universalist. With the exception of the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum and the daughter of the Greek woman in the region of Tyre and Sidon, the teacher and healer confines his mission to his own race. According to Matthew, he expressly enjoins the Twelve, in sending them forth to preach, to avoid the Gentiles and the Samaritans and limit their mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and the cities of Israel.⁵⁵ Matthew evidently incorporated this limitation from his primitive source, and it certainly accords with that of the early apostolic mission in Palestine after Jesus' death. Moreover, his answer to the request of the Syro-Phœnician woman, which is given by Mark as well as Matthew, appears to show that he shared the current particularist spirit, if he did not allow it to dominate him in this instance. "Let the children first be filled," he replies rather unsympathetically, "for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs."⁵⁶ In

⁵³ "The Pharisees," 205 f. (1924).

⁵⁴ Mark vii. 14 f.; Matt. xv. 10 f.

⁵⁵ Matt. x. 5, 23.

⁵⁶ Mark vii. 27; Matt. xv. 26. The expression is harsh. But Jesus is only using the current phraseology, and may have spoken with "a half-humorous tenderness of manner which would deprive the words of all their sting." McNeile, "Commentary on Matthew," 231. Some would conclude that he was only using the words that the woman herself had

Galilee it is specifically with the preparation of his own people for the kingdom, in accordance with Scripture, that he is concerned, and this is generally the standpoint of Mark and Matthew. At the same time there are indications, even in Mark and Matthew, that the mission is, by implication at least, and prospectively, if not directly, universalist. The prohibition to preach to the Gentiles and the Samaritans is absent from Mark as well as Luke, and it is difficult to reconcile it with the large-minded freedom from the narrow, legalist conception of religion. Luke, in fact, knows of a later mission to the Samaritans, and his testimony is confirmed by the Fourth Gospel.⁵⁷ Despite the reputed command to avoid the Gentiles and the Samaritans, Matthew, as well as the other two evangelists, shows his readiness on occasion to extend his healing ministry to non-Jews. Moreover, it is highly probable that among the crowds in Galilee, who thronged to hear him, there would be not a few of Gentile race who, like the centurion, were attracted by his teaching and his works of mercy. In the Decapolis region, where he had previously enjoined the exorcised demoniac to proclaim what God had done for him, and whither, towards the close of the mission, his wanderings led him, we may fairly assume that his message would find some response among the non-Jewish portion of its inhabitants. Matthew himself, in recording the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum, as well as Luke, represents him as foretelling the inclusion of many from the east and the west in the kingdom and the rejection of "the sons of the kingdom."⁵⁸ He thus imparts a universalist note even to the early teaching, which is undoubtedly characteristic, in all three evangelists, of his later standpoint.

The mission, thus etched, seems to end in failure. Despite its beneficent effects, its meteoric popularity, the prophet becomes the fugitive. In the end, his confirmed adherents, outside the intimate circle of the Twelve, are relatively few. One feels that for the people Jesus is from

spoken. Robinson, "Commentary on Matthew," 135-136 (1929). But this seems forced. Luke, as a Gentile, naturally omits the episode.

⁵⁷ Luke ix. 32 f.; x. 1 f.; John iv. 5 f.

⁵⁸ Matt. viii. 11-12; Luke xiii. 28-29, who, however, gives the words in a different and apparently later connection.

the outset an enigma, in spite of the profound impression produced by his words and works. There is not the contact based on a real understanding. The elusive attitude on his part, which the circumstances rendered inevitable, the lack of true insight on theirs, make such contact, except in the case of the few, impossible. Even in the case of the few, there is lack of insight. His personality is too original, his intuitions and ideals too isolated from ordinary experience to be plumbed by lower souls, however receptive. Even when the great confession comes at last from the lips of Peter, it is immediately followed by failure to understand. There is a mystery of Jesus as well as of the kingdom. In the Synoptists he speaks little of himself and much of God and His ways and works. He expatiates on the kingdom, especially in Matthew; he says nothing directly on himself as its Messianic king. Amazement and fear are reported of the disciples as well as of the multitude. Both incur rebuke for their lack of faith and enlightenment. All alike are impressed by the strange power revealed in his words and works. That he is in possession of supernatural gifts and that the power thus manifested is an evidence of the working of the Spirit of God in him, and not, as the scribes and Pharisees assert, of diabolic agency, is clear to multitude and disciples alike. But what underlies it in the consciousness of Jesus himself is, and could not be otherwise than, a mystery. It is also a mystery to us who can only indefinitely fathom it from the records of his mission. The Twelve are, indeed, represented, in the Matthæan version of the walking on the water, as worshipping him as the Son of God. But this recognition is lacking in the original Markan version, which merely reports that they were mystified by it.⁵⁹ Even when they do confess him to be the Christ, it is not clear in what sense they exactly understood the term, and it is evident enough that it was not in the sense in which Jesus himself understood it.

The mystery is enhanced in the Johannine account of the Galilean mission. The Fourth Gospel does, indeed, profess to give a revelation of his personality. But it is rather a revelation of the writer's conception of him than a

⁵⁹ Mark vi. 51-52; Matt. xiv. 33.

reflection of the actual Jesus of the more primitive tradition. From this point of view it contrasts, in essential points, too glaringly with the Synoptic account to be a reliable historical solution of the Synoptic mystery, unless we grant the writer's theory that Jesus discarded from the outset, and all through the Galilean mission, the veiled and furtive Synoptic method of presenting his person to his Galilean hearers. In the Johannine account, while he is in touch with human life, the human is largely etherealised, and he appears characteristically as an abstract, transcendental, apparitional figure, emanating from heaven rather than belonging to earth, invested with a divine halo, as the Logos Christ, from the outset—an alien among mortals.

The only resemblance in the Synoptists to this apparitional figure is in such legendary tales as the walking on the water, in which the magical conception predominates and the human is similarly etherealised. In John this supernatural figure is placed in the foreground. The Galilean teacher, healer, prophet, is overshadowed by the mystic Son of God. The Logos halo of the prologue is always there. There has been no development of his Messianic consciousness, such as is indicated in the communication to the disciples at the close of the mission. There is nothing furtive about his person and vocation as transcendental Son of God ; no gradual unfolding of his Messianic person and destiny. The recognition of it is not confined to the demons as in the Synoptists. Not only the Baptist and his first disciples on the Jordan, but his mother and brethren are aware of his supernatural being from the very beginning. It is the human, not, as in the Synoptists, the superhuman element that is here veiled. Jesus, indeed, takes part in the marriage feast at Cana and provides for those present an extra supply of wine out of water. This seems a very human trait, in keeping with the humanity so realistically depicted in the Synoptic narratives. It may appear on a par with the provision of food for the hungry multitude, though it accords ill with his practice of only exercising his power in the alleviation of human misery, not for the gratification of such an instinct as mere conviviality. In the Johannine story it is as an unearthly

sort of guest that he appears and acts and "manifests" his supernal glory. In the feeding of the 5,000 the miracle is an act of omnipotence, not of compassion, as in the Synoptists. His miraculous healing mission in Galilee is a demonstration ("sign") of his divine origin and nature.⁶⁰ He reproaches the people because they do not understand these "signs," but seek him merely for the relief of their bodily wants,⁶¹ as if he had no feeling for human need. The corresponding Synoptic narratives also show his power to do these wonderful works. But in the Johannine Gospel they are recorded to prove his divinity, not his humanity. It is also significant that for the writer there are evidently no demons in Galilee to be exorcised. They are ignored because others can exorcise as well as Jesus,⁶² and therefore these exorcisms do not serve as "signs." The teaching of the only discourse recorded of the Galilean mission is also strikingly different from the practical, concrete Synoptic teaching of the kingdom. Its theme is the relation of himself to his Father and his significance as the heavenly bread of life, and on faith in him in the writer's later sense of the word. It sounds, in fact, like a later homily on the Eucharist.

Whilst there is enigma, mystery, in the Synoptic record of the Galilean ministry, the human experience of the teacher and healer is realistically depicted. Jesus needs and seeks retirement to restore his over-strained body and mind. He repeatedly has recourse for spiritual strength to solitary prayer.⁶³ He knows disappointment and has to change his plans. He feels the pain of being misunderstood or not being sufficiently trusted by the disciples. "And he said unto them (evidently painfully surprised), Do ye not yet understand?"⁶⁴ He is capable of anger and impatience in the presence of malevolent opposition. In his fugitive wanderings he knows to the full what it means to be homeless, in spite of Simon's hospitable house at Capernaum and the tender ministry of loving women. "The foxes have holes and the birds of the heaven have nests, but the Son of man hath not

⁶⁰ John vi. 2.

⁶¹ John vi. 26.

⁶² Matt. xii. 27; Luke xi. 18.

⁶³ Especially in Luke v. 16; vi. 12; ix. 18, 28-29.

⁶⁴ Mark viii. 14.

where to lay his head." ⁶⁵ The estrangement of his family doubtless adds to this feeling of loneliness. He is alike keenly receptive of life's joys and weighed down by the sense of its ills and its sorrows. Though his habitual attitude is that of a serene optimism in dependence on God, he has his hours of depression. Even if not explicitly expressed, it is there in the atmosphere of the journeys to the regions north of Galilee. There is a touch of sadness in the saying, "The harvest is plenteous, but the labourers are few." The impression made by the narrative is, at times, that of a harassed spirit whom antagonism has worn out. Anger and embitterment sometimes take hold of an otherwise so self-possessed soul, though his absolute conviction of his God-inspired vocation ever enables him to cope with and master a difficult situation, and saves him from precipitation and loss of nerve.

⁶⁵ Matt. viii. 20 ; Luke ix. 58 gives the saying in a later connection.

CHAPTER V

THE SOUTHERN MISSION

I. ON THE WAY TO JERUSALEM

In the Synoptic narrative the drama now centres in the progress of Jesus from Galilee through central Palestine towards Jerusalem as his ultimate goal. He moves furtively from the region of the transfiguration to Capernaum, confining his teaching on the way thither and at Capernaum itself to the disciples. "And they went forth from thence and passed through Galilee, and he would not that any man should know it."¹ The main motive for this furtive passage through the lake region appears to have been the fear of arrest in the more immediate neighbourhood of Antipas at Tiberias. He, therefore, avoids publicity and makes unobtrusively for the southern frontier of Galilee. From this point, according to all three evangelists, he resumes his mission of teaching and healing² during his further progress towards Jerusalem. They differ, however, both as to the route followed and the area of the mission. According to Mark, who is followed by Matthew, he resumes his mission in "the borders of Judæa and beyond Jordan"³—the region on both sides of the lower Jordan valley, including Peræa as well as Judæa, from which he ultimately emerges at Jericho. Both these leave the impression that in retiring from Galilee he went southwards by the more circuitous

¹ Mark ix. 30.

² Mark x. 1; Matt. xix. 1-2; Luke ix. 51 f.

³ Mark x. 1; Matt. xix. 1-2. "He cometh into the borders of Judæa and beyond Jordan." Matthew omits the "and." On this clause, see "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament," ii. 81; M'Neile, "Commentary on Matthew," 183; Burkitt, "Gospel History and its Transmission," 96-97 (1906), and *Journal of Theological Studies*, 412 f. (1910); West Watson, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 269 f. (1910).

route of the Jordan valley, which took him through Peræa, and, crossing the river into Judæa, continued his progress via Jericho to Jerusalem. In both writers he seems in a hurry to reach his objective and face the great crisis of his career. Mark compresses his account of the journey into one chapter (x.). Matthew, who amplifies the controversy with the Pharisees over the question of divorce and adds the parable of the hired labourers, extends his account to two chapters (xix. and xx.). Jesus is always on the move. "And as he was going forth on his way."⁴ "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem."⁵ "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem."⁶ The general impression of haste is, however, rather deceptive. On leaving Galilee, Jesus resumes teaching and healing, and multitudes again gather around him. It is evident that this teaching and healing ministry was far more extensive than the writers in their hurried notice of it reveal. Compared with that of Luke, their accounts are very fragmentary and, in this respect, distinctly misleading.

Luke agrees with them in representing his movement after leaving Galilee as a gradual progress toward Jerusalem. He notes at the outset his fixed purpose, on leaving Galilee, to go there.⁷ Again and again he tells us in the course of his narrative that he and his disciples were on the way thither.⁸ But he devotes nine chapters (ix. 51-xviii. 14), or about one-third of the whole Gospel, to the account of his progress to the Holy City. It is thus evident that his account embraces a lengthy period of teaching and healing in the course of this progress, which is merely a literary device for arranging the far larger material at his disposal. It is, otherwise, not really a single journey straight to Jerusalem that is sketched, but a continued missionary activity, embracing a wide area, with, indeed, Jerusalem as the ultimate goal in the mind of the writer, as in the other accounts.

The difference between his account and those of Mark

⁴ Mark x. 17.

⁵ Mark x. 32.

⁶ Mark x. 33; cf. Matt. xx. 17-18.

⁷ Luke ix. 51.

⁸ Luke ix. 57; x. 38; xiii. 22; xvii. 11.

and Matthew⁹ appears at the outset in the route chosen on leaving Galilee. Jesus takes the more direct route which ran through Samaria to Jerusalem and which, as we learn from Josephus, was usually followed by pilgrims from Galilee thither.¹⁰ If his immediate object was to get clear of the territory of Antipas as quickly as possible, the choice of the more direct route, in preference to that through Peræa, is sufficiently explicable. Once across the Samaritan frontier, he proceeds to carry out what was evidently a mission of some duration in Samaria, though the set purpose and the goal of his journeying is Jerusalem. "He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem."¹¹ He meets, indeed, with a rebuff by the Samaritans on crossing the frontier. But the account of this rebuff does not necessarily imply that he refrained from penetrating farther into Samaritan territory and that he turned eastwards towards Peræa along the Galilean-Samaritan frontier, as some have inferred from the later statement that "he was passing between Samaria and Galilee," which we shall notice presently. The intimation that they went to another village¹² most probably means that they went to another Samaritan village and began and continued for some time, on leaving Galilee, a mission in Samaria.

For the southern mission Luke had access to a source which was unknown to his fellow-evangelists. He drew on this, to them unknown, source in order to supplement their meagre accounts of the mission, of which, but for this source and this supplement, we should have known nothing from Mark and Matthew. That Jesus did evangelise at some time in Samaria is confirmed by the story of the Samaritan woman incorporated in the Fourth Gospel, though the writer, as we have seen, very improbably places it in the early period of Jesus' career. In addition to the mission in Samaria, Luke's account reveals to us, in the story of Martha and Mary, the fact of Jesus' activity in Judæa and his

⁹ It is possible that they meant by "the borders of Judæa" the Roman province of Judæa, which included Samaria, and that they thus assume the Samaritan mission mentioned by Luke. In that case there would be no difference in this respect in the various accounts. This view is taken by Headlam, "Jesus Christ in History and Faith," 65-66 (1925).

¹⁰ "Antiquities," xx. 6, 2.

¹¹ Luke ix. 51.

¹² Luke ix. 56.

presence at Bethany,¹³ where, we learn from the Fourth Gospel, the sisters had their home.¹⁴ At Bethany he was within a couple of miles of Jerusalem, and thus we may reasonably infer that he was at least once during the southern mission in the Holy City itself, before his final visit thither. His presence there thus tends to confirm the Johannine account of the later mission in the south, which reports a number of visits to Jerusalem before the final one. In thus bringing Jesus to Judæa, Luke is also in line with Mark and Matthew. Equally so in locating him in Peræa, where he is warned by "certain Pharisees" to make a speedy departure in view of the design of Antipas on his life.¹⁵ Again, he is found journeying "between Samaria and Galilee."¹⁶ Galilee appears to be used here in the inclusive sense of the whole territory ruled by Antipas, *i.e.*, Peræa as well as Galilee proper, as in iii. 1, where Luke describes Antipas as tetrarch of Galilee (including Peræa). It is possible that the words, "passing between Samaria and Galilee," may refer to his movements after his rebuff by the Samaritans, when, as some think, he renounced further progress through Samaria, and skirted the Galilean-Samaritan frontier towards Peræa.¹⁷ But, as we have noted, the clause is more feasibly explained of a movement along the Samaritan-Peræan frontier in connection with or subsequent to the mission in Samaria. His presence in Peræa may indeed seem problematic in view of the hostility of Antipas. If he left Galilee to escape this hostility, would he be likely to venture into a region which was under the jurisdiction of his declared enemy? Jesus evidently took the risk, and his resumption of his ministry in Peræa as well

¹³ Luke x. 38 f.

¹⁴ John xi. 1.

¹⁵ Luke xiii. 31 f. Cadman would refer the warning to the time of Jesus' sojourn in Galilee. He considers that there was no such Peræan ministry. "Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem," 31 f. This seems to me very disputable.

¹⁶ Luke xvii. 11. *διὰ μέσων* evidently means "between," not "through the midst of." See Plummer, "Commentary on Luke," 403. Moffatt and others assume that the phrase implies a journey *from* Jerusalem. "Introduction to the New Testament," 541. But the previous words show that Luke is speaking of a journey *to* Jerusalem.

¹⁷ Kent, for instance, "Biblical Geography and History," 258 (1911); cf. Stephenson, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 254 (1922).

as Judæa is attested by Mark.¹⁸ It is, in fact, in the lower Jordan valley, where Mark and Matthew locate him in his journey towards Jerusalem via Jericho, that Luke picks up again the Markan narrative in the concluding stage of the southern mission.¹⁹

From Luke, with the addition of the Fourth Gospel, we thus discover that this mission embraced a wide area and lasted a longer time than we should conclude from the hurried and evidently greatly abbreviated accounts of Mark and Matthew. Even from these accounts we are able to descry a somewhat lengthy teaching and healing ministry in Judæa and Peræa before the arrival at Jerusalem. From Luke we learn, in addition, of the Samaritan mission, which the Fourth Gospel confirms, and from this Gospel we further glean substantial details of the mission in Judæa and Peræa. Lives of Jesus—and they are many—which ignore this extensive and lengthy ministry and take the narratives of Mark and Matthew of a hasty and continuous journey to Jerusalem from Galilee at their face value, are thus evidently wide of the historic reality.

Luke's lengthy supplement itself of Mark and Matthew professes to be a travel document. It is intended to narrate a gradual and evidently a slow movement southwards towards Jerusalem, and a mission in regions where he had not previously laboured, though the method of the narrative, as we have noted, is merely a literary device, not necessarily a historical arrangement of the material. There is, in fact, no clear and definite account of either the movement or the mission. Exactly when and where the incidents occur there is, for the most part, no indication. Chronology and topography are even more indefinite than in the account of the Galilean mission. Moreover, a large part of the material in the first four chapters, which both he and Matthew evidently derived from Q., is given by the latter in connection with the Galilean mission, and we must reckon with the possibility that Luke, who evidently found little or no indication of time and place in his source,²⁰ has misplaced

¹⁸ Mark x. 1.

¹⁹ Luke xviii. 15.

²⁰ Streeter thinks that the Gospel of Luke, as we have it, is a compilation out of Q. and another document containing more purely historical matter,

part at least of this common matter. At the same time, there is a considerable residuum both of incident and teaching which undoubtedly belongs to this later phase of Jesus' activity, and is of great value as a supplement to the meagre and rapid sketch of the other two evangelists. Nor does it necessarily follow that the first evangelist's assignment of this common material to the earlier stage of Jesus' career is to be preferred to that of the third. The long Sermon on the Mount and the long charge to the Twelve given by the former are, for instance, made up of sayings slumped together without regard to the actual time of their utterance. Both are conglomerates, and Luke, in distributing them over his mission²¹ and assigning them a later date, would appear to have kept nearer to their historic setting, though he, too, shows on occasion the tendency arbitrarily to deal with his material in fitting incidents and sayings into the scheme of the later mission. For instance, the passage in the Matthæan charge to the Twelve about taking up the cross and losing one's life in order to find it clearly belongs to the later stage of Jesus' ministry. Apart from the broad fact that Jesus is gradually moving towards Jerusalem, and that he is carrying out a mission of wide extent and considerable duration as he moves, we cannot be sure of the time or the place of the occurrences noted. On the whole, too, the atmosphere of the mission is that of the later rather than the earlier stage of Jesus' career.²² Though he resumed healing and teaching as a preparation for the kingdom, and the sayings reflect the practical-ethical character of the Galilean teaching, the note of coming tragedy runs like an undercurrent through it, especially

which he calls Proto-Luke. He argues forcibly in favour of this theory. "The Four Gospels," 208 f. See also Stanton, "The Gospels as Historical Documents," ii. 227 f.

²¹ Luke gives, for instance, in xii. 22 f. part of what Matthew gives as the Sermon on the Mount in vi. 20 f. See also xi. 9 f. compared with Matt. vii. 7 f.

²² Burkitt, on the other hand, holds that the greater part of the sayings and anecdotes, which Luke assigns to this journey, do not really belong to it, but to the earlier period of Jesus' activity. "Transmission," 208-209. Stanton, on the contrary, concludes that much of the teaching peculiar to Luke in the second half of this long section of the Gospel (the Great Insertion) is suitable to the closing period of Jesus' ministry. "Gospels as Historical Documents," ii. 94.

in the instruction to the disciples, which forms a large part of the recorded teaching.

Near the Samaritan frontier, as in the Lukan version of the incident at Nazareth, the mission begins with a rejection. Jesus sends messengers to find a lodging in a certain village and the villagers refuse him and his disciples, as Galilean pilgrims to the Holy City, hospitality, "because his face was set as though he were going to Jerusalem." He treats these hostile aliens with a fine magnanimity and rebukes the irascible James and John, who would fain, following the example of Elijah, invoke fire from heaven on them. He moves to another village, where they are apparently accorded a friendly reception. Otherwise there is no trace of the readiness of the Samaritans to receive his message, as in the story of the Fourth Gospel. That he was intent on winning adherents in this region we may infer from the instances given by Luke of those who would fain join the ranks of his followers, but shrink from the condition of absolute surrender which discipleship now involves. Whilst Matthew²³ places two of these incidents at an early stage of the Galilean ministry, the third is peculiar to Luke, who has thus preserved the striking saying in response to the excuse adduced, "No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."²⁴ Here the question suggests itself, Which of the two evangelists has given the right setting? In view of the circumstances which render the demands for complete self-surrender more fitting at the end, rather than the beginning of his public career, one is inclined to prefer Luke's setting as against that of Matthew.²⁵

In the case of the next incident (x. 1 f.)—the temporary sending out of the seventy or seventy-two—which is recorded only by Luke, the point is whether this special mission is not a version of the sending of the Twelve, and whether such a commission is likely to have been given in Samaritan territory, as he seems to imply. In the previous chapter, Luke,

²³ viii. 18 f.

²⁴ ix. 62.

²⁵ Stephenson would make the incident added by Luke follow Luke viii. 3 (mention of a mission in Galilee), and thus connect it with the later stage of the Galilean mission. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 254 (1922). This is a possible, though not a self-evident solution.

following Mark, has related the mission of the Twelve and undoubtedly regarded this second mission as a distinct one. The charge to the seventy is different from that to the Twelve, as recorded by both him and Mark, though it has some features in common with the far more elaborate one recorded by Matthew. The direction to exclude the Samaritans is, however, significantly absent, and there is no substantial reason why he should not, as Luke says, have adopted the plan of sending these missionaries, two by two, to prepare the way for a favourable reception of his teaching "in every city and place where he was about to come."²⁶ The shortness of the time would of itself suggest such an intensive plan of campaign, and the assumption that Luke, as a Gentile and a Paulinist, invented this more universalist development under the influence of the later Pauline mission, is gratuitous. He evidently found the story in his source, and the fact that Jesus had been compelled to retire from Galilee goes far to explain why he should now think of giving his mission a wider scope. Matthew as well as Luke has the saying, in reference to the opposition of the scribes and Pharisees in Galilee, about the Gentiles displacing the sons of the kingdom, and the saying finds its natural sequel in this new venture on alien soil. The Samaritan mission receives confirmation from the pointed reference to the Samaritan in the parable of this name and in the incident of the cure of the ten lepers, one of whom was a Samaritan, both peculiar to Luke. The omission of it by Mark and Matthew is no more surprising than their omission of so much of the matter, contained in Luke, bearing on the gradual progress to Jerusalem.

If the mission of the seventy is thus historical, Jesus must have been accompanied in his retreat from Galilee by a considerable number of disciples besides the Twelve, and there are indications, in the presence of a number of

²⁶ On the historicity of the mission of the seventy, see Stephenson, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 138-139 (1920); and Bartlet, "Oxford Studies on the Synoptic Problem," 342 f. (1911). Goguel, on the other hand, concludes that it is "incontestably a doublet" of that of the Twelve. "Introduction au Nouveau Testament," i. 465 (1923). Smith avers that he sent them out, as a sort of advance party, before leaving Galilee. "Days of His Flesh," 290. But in Luke the sending distinctly takes place after crossing the Samaritan frontier.

his Galilean women followers in the last scenes at Jerusalem, that this was the case. Why the number of those selected from these followers was limited to seventy or seventy-two is not explained. It was possibly suggested by the parallel of the seventy elders whom Moses associated with himself in the task of instructing and judging the people, or by the assumed number of the nations of the earth (seventy-two), in keeping with the more universal spirit of the later teaching.²⁷ At all events, the tragic climax which looms ahead in the Lukan narrative of the progress towards Jerusalem, and the consequent need of intensive effort, sufficiently explain this enlarged number. Hence also the rapidity with which they are to carry on the work. "Salute no one on the way"²⁸—an injunction lacking in the charge to the Twelve, though the message—the proclamation of the nearness of the kingdom²⁹—is the same. Unfortunately, we are not told where they went, or how long they were absent, or where and how Jesus spent the interval before their return.³⁰ In view of the eagerness of the people to hear Jesus as he moved onwards on the journey towards Jerusalem, the mission probably included Peræa as well as Samaria. It seems, at all events, to have been remarkably effective in arousing widespread interest in the coming prophet. It was with these heartening tidings that they rejoined Jesus. "They returned with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject to us in thy name."³¹ Jesus is deeply moved by the report, and sees in it a proof of the end of the reign of Satan over the world. "I beheld Satan falling as lightning from heaven."³² In his profound emotion he gives expression to his thankfulness in the words, "I thank thee, O Father," etc., which Matthew³³ reports in a different setting. But while the setting differs, both

²⁷ See Plummer, "Commentary on Luke," 269.

²⁸ x. 7.

²⁹ x. 9; cf. 11.

³⁰ Briggs thinks that he sent them out before finally leaving Galilee to prepare his advent in Peræa and Judæa. "New Light on the Life of Jesus," 36. An unlikely supposition, which ignores the Samaritan mission, and as pointed out in note 26, it is not in accordance with Luke's statement.

³¹ x. 17.

³² x. 18. In view of the belief of the time, this visionary experience is psychologically quite credible.

³³ xi. 25 f.

evangelists give them in close association with the woes denounced on the Galilean cities, which had rejected his message. Whether these woes were uttered in the charge to the seventy, as in Luke, or in connection with the discourse on John the Baptist, as in Matthew, the pæan of victory, which Luke puts into his mouth on the return of the seventy, is the fitting offset to the failure in Galilee. In this renewed gauge of the triumph of his cause, he sees the dawn of a new era for the world. "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see," he exclaims in conclusion to the disciples; "for I say unto you that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not."³⁴

The narrative of his own mission, in contrast to the brief mention of that of the seventy, is expanded into nine chapters. If the scene has changed to the south, the texture of the story is the same as that of the Galilean mission. Here also he is engaged in healing and teaching, and though the larger part of the narrative is concerned with teaching, there is no lack of incident. It gives, too, characteristic glimpses of the circumstances in which what is recorded takes place, and how Jesus acts in a given situation or emergency, if it leaves us for the most part in doubt as to the exact locality or order of their occurrence. Four times³⁵ in the course of the narrative we are told that he is on the way to Jerusalem—intimations of so many stages of the same lengthy journey, not four different journeys to Jerusalem, as some assume. At the outset of it, Jesus is found instructing a lawyer or scribe (*νομικός τις*), who "stands up" (either in a house or a synagogue) to test his powers as a teacher, with the question, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" and evokes, as the result of the dialogue between them, the parable of the good Samaritan.³⁶ The incident seems to be identical with that reported, minus the parable, by Mark and Matthew³⁷ after the arrival at Jerusalem. A similar incident is related by all three evangelists of the rich young man who, unlike the lawyer, eagerly puts the

³⁴ x. 23-24.

³⁵ ix. 51; xiii. 22; xvii. 11; xviii. 31.

³⁶ x. 25 f.

³⁷ Mark xii. 28 f.; Matt. xxii. 35.

same question and receives the same answer, but cannot bring himself to face the added condition to renounce his wealth and give it to the poor. The sorrow with which he departs seems to have been shared by Jesus, who, we read, "looking upon him, loved him" (Mark x. 21), and speaks to the disciples of the extreme difficulty for the rich of entrance into the kingdom.³⁸ Another incident in which a second lawyer angrily takes him to task for his denunciation of the Pharisees calls forth a triplet of woes on the whole scribal profession, with scathing references to their perverse and fanatic formalism.³⁹ Anon we find him in "a certain village," which the Fourth Gospel identifies with Bethany, near Jerusalem, and where the right human story of Martha and Mary—reminding of the ministering women of the Galilean mission—takes place.⁴⁰ On another occasion he is accosted by one of his hearers with the request to intervene in a dispute between him and his brother over an inheritance. He refuses the request and makes it the text of a homily on the true value of a man's life, which he illustrates by the parable of the rich fool, who laid up much store in his barns, and whose prospect of many happy years in luxurious ease is cut short by a sudden death.⁴¹ Again he is "praying in a certain place" when, in response to the request of the disciples to teach them to pray, "even as John also taught his disciples," he repeats to them the Lord's Prayer.⁴² Whilst this version is lacking in three of the clauses of that which Matthew inserts in the Sermon on the Mount, and which is, therefore, nearer the original form, it is probable that the incident is here in its true setting, rather than in what is an artificial composition. It is fitly followed by the parable of the Friend at midnight, and by the relative passage in the Sermon on the Mount about persistent asking.⁴³ On two occasions he is invited by leading Pharisees to a meal.⁴⁴ In the first case, at least, the Pharisee appears in a friendly light. But he is scandalised by his

³⁸ Mark x. 17 f. ; Matt. xix. 16 f. ; Luke xviii. 18 f.

³⁹ xi. 45 f.

⁴¹ xii. 13 f.

⁴⁰ x. 38 f.

⁴³ xi. 1 f.

⁴³ Cf. the parable of the unjust judge and the importunate widow (xviii. 1 f.).

⁴⁴ xi. 37 f. ; xiv. 1 f.

neglect to wash his hands before eating, and the meal ends in a violent scene outside the house on the part of the local scribes and Pharisees, who resent the denunciation of their class, and is followed by a warning to the disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, who are mere religious mummers (hypocrites).⁴⁵ In the second case, the motive of the invitation is less friendly, since there were other Pharisees present who, we are told, "were watching him," but who on this occasion do not dare to question his right to heal the dropsical man on the Sabbath, in answer to his question whether it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath or not. For their benefit he addresses them on the subject of behaviour at feasts, and concludes with the parable of the Great Supper. In Peræa the Pharisees figure in another professedly friendly episode. They warn him of the hostile intentions of Antipas, and tell him to get away as quickly as possible. Their real object evidently is to frighten him out of this region, and Jesus, evidently sure of the protection of the people, retorts that he is not to be hustled into interrupting his ministry of healing by fear of "that fox." "Go and say to that fox, Behold, I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected . . . for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." Another bout with the Pharisees, reported by Mark and Matthew,⁴⁶ but omitted by Luke, apparently also occurred in this region—the discussion of the question of divorce, which may have been dictated by the desire to entrap him into a compromising statement likely to embroil him directly with Antipas.

As in Galilee, the mission is largely an open-air one. In every village and town where he appears the multitudes gather together to hear him,⁴⁷ and we are expressly told that he teaches as he goes from place to place.⁴⁸ On a certain occasion he is found teaching and healing in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath day, as at Capernaum, and his temerity in thus breaking the Sabbath arouses the

⁴⁵ xii. 1 f. "Hypocrite" may, however, mean only "inconsistent."

⁴⁶ Mark x. 2 f.; Matt. xix. 3 f.

⁴⁷ xi. 29; xii. 1.

⁴⁸ xiii. 22.

indignation of its ruler and revives the old controversy on the subject.⁴⁹

There is ample evidence of the resumption of his healing ministry. Not only are the disciples empowered to heal in the charge to the seventy. He himself appears, in the reply to the Pharisees who sought to frighten him out of Peræa, as "casting out devils and performing cures," and details are given of several of these works of mercy. The first of those mentioned—the exorcism of the dumb devil⁵⁰—is clearly a doublet of that related by Matthew of the Galilean mission,⁵¹ which Luke has erroneously transferred to this later period. The case for identifying⁵² the cure of the dropsical man in the house of a ruler of the Pharisees⁵³ with that of the man with the withered hand in the synagogue at Capernaum is not nearly so cogent. Nor is the cure of a woman, who has suffered from an infirmity for eighteen years,⁵⁴ a mere confusion of the earlier case of the woman who had suffered from an issue of blood for twelve years. In this case the cure takes place in a synagogue, not in the open air, and Jesus effects it by laying his hands on the sufferer, who is bent together, whereas in the former the woman furtively follows him in the crowd and seeks relief by touching his garment. Equally questionable is the assumption⁵⁵ that the cleansing of the ten lepers in a certain village on the borders of Samaria and Galilee⁵⁶ (Peræa) is an amplification of that of the single leper during one of his Galilean tours. The details are too distinctive, and the fact that one of them was a Samaritan fits the southern locality where the cleansing is effected. The healing of the blind beggar, Bartimæus, near Jericho,⁵⁷ is vouched by both Mark and Matthew, though according to both it took place not before entering, but on leaving the town.

In this southern region we hear of no prohibitions to

⁴⁹ xiii. 10 f.

⁵¹ Matt. xii. 22 f.; cf. Mark iii. 22 f.

⁵² So Keim, "Jesus of Nazara," iv. 15, 162-163.

⁵³ xiv. 1 f.

⁵⁴ Keim, for instance, iii. 163, 210.

⁵⁵ xvii. 11 f.

⁵⁷ xviii. 35 f.; Mark xi. 46 f.; Matt. xx. 30 f.

Matthew has two blind men, apparently in order to enhance the miracle.

⁵⁰ xi. 14 f.

⁵⁶ xiii. 11 f.

make known the exercise of his healing power. He is, in fact, from the outset of this southern mission on his way to Jerusalem to challenge a final issue on his Messianic claim, and the blind beggar near Jericho openly and repeatedly appeals to him, as the son of David, to have mercy upon him, without any caveat on his part. The beggar expresses what others besides the Twelve have come to recognise.

As in Galilee, this healing ministry contributes, along with his teaching, to arouse the enthusiasm of the people. Once more we hear of the multitudes crowding to hear him, "insomuch that they trode one upon another."⁵⁸ As he moves onward from place to place "there went with him great multitudes."⁵⁹ We see the people siding with him against his adversaries on the occasion of the healing of the infirm woman. "And all the multitude rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him."⁶⁰ Again, "all the people, when they heard it, gave praise unto God."⁶¹ As in Galilee, too, it is the lower class that is specially attracted by his message. "All the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto him for to hear him,"⁶² though "the scribes and Pharisees murmur, saying, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." In the parable of the Great Supper it is in the streets and lanes of the city, the highways and the hedges, among the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind that the master of the house sends his servants to find guests, in place of those who have excused themselves from coming.⁶³ It is over the lost sheep, the lost piece of silver, the lost son that the finder rejoices.⁶⁴ It is with the eager Zacchæus, the chief publican, or tax collector, that he lodges at Jericho, in spite of the carping of the bystanders. "He is gone in to lodge with a man that is a sinner." He reminds them that the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost,⁶⁵ and adds the parable of the nobleman and his servants.⁶⁶ Luke also characteristically shows his power to attract women. He has not only the story of Martha and Mary,

⁵⁸ xii. 1; cf. xi. 29.

⁵⁹ xiv. 25.

⁶⁰ xiii. 17.

⁶¹ xviii. 43.

⁶² xv. 1-2.

⁶³ xiv. 16 f.

⁶⁴ xv. 1 f.

⁶⁵ xix. 1 f.

⁶⁶ xix. 11 f.

but has preserved the saying of the woman "out of the multitude," who voiced this feminine appreciation in the words, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts that gave thee suck."⁶⁷ Equally significant the scene reported by Mark and Matthew as well as Luke of the mothers bringing their little ones to be blessed by him.⁶⁸

II. JESUS AND THE PHARISEES

All the more noticeable is the antagonism of the scribes and Pharisees. In this respect also there is a recurrence in the south of the Galilean experience. Whilst there are instances of friendliness and readiness to receive instruction on the part of individuals of both classes, the prevailing attitude is one of mutual hostility and aversion. In addition to the contention over the question of divorce,¹ we have the old controversy about ceremonial washings, Sabbath observance, the demand for signs, and meats. As in the Galilean mission, Jesus regards their bitter opposition to his teaching and his healing ministry as blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Whilst ready to condone opposition to himself as the Son of Man, he sees in their wilful rejection of the word he proclaims and the works he does in the power of the Spirit the unpardonable sin.² Moreover, as the tragic issue, which this antagonism renders inevitable, approaches, the note of irreconcilable division becomes ever sharper. In prospect of the Cross which, in foreseeing, he is already bearing, Jesus is in no mood to forbear with the class which he regards not merely as his own, but as God's enemies. In spite of the strength and self-mastery which he maintains in converse with the disciples, he is overstrained by the burden he is bearing. "I came to cast fire on the earth, and what will I if it is already kindled? But I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I

⁶⁷ xii. 27.

⁶⁸ Mark x. 13; Matt. xix. 13 f.; Luke xviii. 15 f.

¹ Mark x. 2 f.; Matt. xix. 3 f. Luke omits this incident.

² xii. 10; cf. 11, 15, on the accusation of Beelzebub, which is Luke's parallel to Mark iii. 22 f. and Matt. xii. 24 f., who both ascribe the accusation to the Galilean ministry.

straitened till it be accomplished ! Think ye that I came to give peace on earth ? I tell you nay, but rather division." ³ The conflict has become a fight to a finish. Jesus attacks with a terrible downrightness and directness. His opponents are maddened by the attack, and return it with angry gestures or biting ridicule. " And when he was come out from thence (the Pharisee's house), the Pharisees began to press upon him vehemently and to provoke him to speak of many things, laying wait for him to catch something out of his mouth." ⁴ Or again, " And the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all these things ; and they scoffed at him." ⁵

As a class, Jesus can only see hypocrisy and cant in their ostentatious profession of a righteousness which they do not possess or practise. For him they are mummers, actors (generally assumed to be the current meaning of " hypocrite "), who play a rôle which is but the counterfeit of real righteousness—a mere veil thrown over their true character. They justify themselves in the sight of men, and thus attempt to hoodwink God, who knoweth the heart, and in whose sight that which is exalted among men is an abomination. ⁶ They cleanse the outside of the cup and the platter, but their inward part is full of extortion and wickedness. ⁷ In their zeal for trifles they tithe mint and rue and every herb in the peasant's holding and pass over judgment and the love of God. ⁸ They profess humility and love the first seats in the synagogues and salutations in the market-places. They are as tombs which, not being white-washed and therefore unknown, men walk over without knowing the pollution they incur by doing so. ⁹ They load men with heavy burdens (minute legalist ordinances), and yet they touch not the burden with one of their fingers. ¹⁰ They build tombs to the prophets whom their forefathers have killed, and though thus seeming to honour them, they are equally guilty of ignoring or distorting their teaching, which he would revive. ¹¹ They have taken away the key

³ xii. 49 f.

⁵ xvi. 14.

⁴ xi. 53-54.

⁶ xvi. 15.

⁷ xi. 39 f.

⁸ xi. 42. The second part of the verse, "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone," is inconsistent with the first part, and seems a later addition. See Easton, "The Gospel Before the Gospels," 107 (1928).

⁹ xi. 44.

¹⁰ xi. 46.

¹¹ xi. 47.

to the true knowledge of God, and neither enter in themselves nor allow the people to enter.¹²

Hence the series of woes hurled against them in the course of this terrible indictment, which Matthew places, in amplified form, not during the journey to, but after the arrival at, Jerusalem.¹³ Hence also the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, in condemnation of their self-righteousness,¹⁴ that of the prodigal son whom the father received with rejoicing in spite of the murmurs of the elder brother,¹⁵ and that of the rich man and Lazarus in exposure of their covetousness and unrepentant perversity in spurning even Moses and the prophets.¹⁶

In reading this scathing indictment, allowance must be made for the circumstances in which it was spoken, and for the tendency of the impassioned idealist to overstatement and over-emphasis. Bias was perhaps inevitable in the sense that the thoroughgoing religious idealist can perforce only see things from his own point of view, and is not concerned to give what is called a judicial verdict. With him it is usually a case of "either-or." The apologists of Judaism naturally see in the indictment an exaggerated and misleading outburst of overstrained nerves. They maintain that the picture of Pharisaic and scribal teaching and practice reflected in the Gospels is biased and one-sided. Jewish scholars like Mr Montefiore and Mr Abrahams, who are not unsympathetic towards Christianity, infer from the violence of the Gospel polemic against the scribes and Pharisees either that Jesus did not so speak as he is represented by the later evangelists, or that, if he did, he misrepresented his opponents and their teaching. Mr Montefiore apparently holds the former view. "To go to Matthew, or indeed any New Testament book, for a true account of Rabbinic righteousness is like looking for a true account of the Roman Catholic religion in a Protestant tract."¹⁷ It is, indeed, possible that the extreme bitterness

¹² xi. 52.

¹³ xxiii. 1 f.; *cf.* Mark xiii. 38 f.

¹⁴ Luke xvi. 19 f. For a detailed examination of the charges of the Pharisees against Jesus and the charges of Jesus against them, see A. T. Robertson, "Jesus and the Pharisees" (1920).

¹⁵ "Synoptic Gospels," ii. 481.

¹⁶ xviii. 9 f.

¹⁷ xv. 3 f.

between the Jews and the Christians of a later time was, in the case of Matthew and hardly less so in that of Luke, allowed to overcolour the account of Jesus' polemic against them. On this and other grounds Christian writers like Mr Herford and Mr Riddle have come forward as their strenuous champions, whilst others like Mr Burkitt and Mr Rashdall have shown a tendency to judge them more discriminately. Mr Herford thinks that Jesus, in attacking the Pharisaic system, was really ignorant of it.¹⁸ Mr Riddle sets out to prove (by no means convincingly, in my opinion) that Matthew and Luke, under the influence of the later antagonism between Jews and Christians, have simply manipulated their sources and put into the mouth of Jesus this anti-Pharisaic polemic.¹⁹ On this arbitrary assumption he explains away to his own satisfaction the controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees, which a later time invented for apologetic purposes. But if this controversy is a later invention, how explain, for instance, the fact that Paul, himself a former Pharisee, appears as a persecutor of the followers of Jesus soon after his death? Does not this fact imply that during the lifetime of Jesus there was bitter contention between them and him as a subverter of current Judaism? Moreover, there is not lacking evidence in Jewish sources of the existence of the practical evils against which Jesus inveighed so passionately. The Talmud itself roundly accuses them of hypocrisy. Josephus, who belonged to the Pharisaic party and mingles appreciation with blame, speaks of their assumption of a superior holiness, and represents them as experts in craft and intrigue. He refers unfavourably to "the great influence over women" exercised by them, and it was apparently this that

¹⁸ "The Pharisees," 205-207 (1924).

¹⁹ "Jesus and the Pharisees" (1928). Mr Riddle arrives at his negative results by the application of what he calls "the social-historical method." This is virtually what the recently developed school of Dibelius and Bultmann call the "formgeschichtliche Methode," which seeks to analyse the tradition incorporated in the Gospels, and practically explains it away by attributing much of it to a later growth than the time of Jesus himself. Whilst it is necessary to subject the tradition to a careful scrutiny, the method is not so new as its exponents profess. It has been applied more or less by many New Testament scholars before this school was heard of, and it is undoubtedly being overdone by this school in the sense of attributing far too much in the Gospels to the later Christian community.

Jesus had in mind when he denounced the scribes "who devour widows' houses." Mr Abrahams contends that Josephus is not referring to the Pharisees as a body, but only to a faction of them, and that to justify the words which Jesus applied to the scribes "as a description of average scribes would require much more evidence than has ever been adduced."²⁰ He seems too much disposed to minimise the evidence of the Gospels, which is both explicit and abundant enough. Moreover, Jewish scholars are not at one in their evaluation and vindication of Phariseism. Friedländer adopts the representation of the Gospels as substantially correct, and regards the dominance of Phariseism as a fatal inheritance of Judaism. "Jesus scourges the dominant religious hypocrisy (of the Pharisees) with the sharpest expressions, which, however, thoroughly correspond to the truth."²¹ He quotes from the Talmud to show that the Jewish doctors of the period, after the destruction of the Temple, warned against Pharisaic hypocrisy, and it may be said that the evidence of the Gospels receives at least a partial confirmation from Jewish sources. Klausner, whilst deprecating the indiscriminate application of this accusation, freely admits the existence of the vices charged against them. "It is not worth while to deny all these things and, like most Jewish scholars with an apologetic bias, assert that they are nothing but inventions."²² According to Klausner, Jesus himself was a Pharisee, and the statement holds as far as he shared their views on providence, predestination (qualified by free will), and the future life. He had, too, from experience a knowledge of the system as practised in his own day, and, unless we regard him as a pure fanatic, could hardly have ventured publicly to asperse it in such scathing terms and in such detail had these evils not been substantially founded on fact. Nor does the indictment of these evils, sweeping as it is, necessarily exclude the possibility that there were individual scribes and Pharisees who were sincere in their devotion to the legalist system which, as practised by them, was to him

²⁰ "Studies in Phariseism," 80.

²¹ "Religiöse Bewegungen," 110.

²² "Jesus of Nazareth," 213 (Eng. trans., 1925). See also Hart, "Philo and Catholic Judaism," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 39 f. (1910).

anathema. There were good and bad Pharisees and scribes as there are good and bad men under every religious system, and even the Gospels know of the better type of scribe who was not far from the kingdom of God and of friendly Pharisees. He is found associating on friendly terms with individuals among them, and we may see in this attitude an indication that he was prepared to admit that the individual might be better than his creed. It is not necessary to assume that the word "hypocrite," which he hurled against them, invariably meant conscious infidelity to professed conviction. It is, in fact, difficult for the modern reader to catch exactly what the word denotes. It may have meant what our word "inconsistent" may sometimes convey—lack of harmony between profession and practice without necessarily denoting deliberate and conscious infidelity to principle.²³ Nor does he seem to have embarked on a set crusade against them in order to undermine their influence over the people in the interest of his own mission. He exhorted "the multitudes" to observe what they commanded, if not to follow their example. "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All things, therefore, whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe. But do not ye after their works, for they say and do not."²⁴ It is against the formalism, the legalism, which they ostentatiously set forth, but belied in practice, that he inveighs so remorselessly—the tendency to live by mere rule without sincerely carrying the rule into real life. Even if we make allowance for the overcolouring of the picture of their hypocrisy, it is obvious that the very effort to live in accordance with an intricate series of regulations was bound in many cases to become mechanical and foster the tendency to emphasise the form at the expense of the spirit. The kingdom of God, Jesus told them, is within or among you. It is something spiritual, not material or mechanical, which the striving after outward righteousness hinders them from perceiving, or renders them unfit to be

²³ See on this point the illuminating remarks of Anderson Scott, "New Testament Ethics," 44 f. (1930).

²⁴ Matt. xxiii. 2-3. Easton thinks that the passage is not authentic, since it contradicts the teaching of the rest of the chapter. "The Gospel," 107.

the receptacles of it. "And being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation ; neither shall they say, Lo, here or there, for lo, the kingdom of God is within (or in the midst of) you." ²⁵ Herein lies the root of his antagonism to the system and its representatives. Both system and practice are objectionable from his spiritual point of view, since they tend to displace true religion by a mechanical and burdensome religiosity. The type of piety which querulously challenges and excommunicates people for plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath, or associating with publicans and sinners, for instance, is evidently of the hard, narrow, and self-righteous type, and is as the poles asunder from the large-hearted, spiritual thought of Jesus. He refused to magnify such petty things into cast-iron canons of conduct, and did not share the assumption that they were divinely ordained regulations, the neglect of which constituted an offence and even a sin against God. He treated them as man-made infringements of human liberty, a burden grievously to be borne and imposed by a tradition which made void the word, the commandments, of God.²⁶ Jewish theologians like Dr Schechter have laboured to prove that the Torah—the law in the wide sense of religious teaching as well as the more restricted sense of the commandments (Mizvoth)—was not a burden to the Jew, but the delight of his life. This may be admitted in the case of those who combined religious form and ordinance with a sincere religious spirit. Evidently, however, there were many Jews in the time of Jesus, to whom excessive Pharisaic legalism did not so appeal, and such a generalisation can only be maintained by ignoring his definite testimony on the subject. Nor is there much force in the contention of some Jewish apologists that the Pharisaic attitude towards the social and religious outcast was really actuated by zeal for the vindication of righteousness as against the evil-doer. Such zeal might easily degenerate into the spirit that said, "I thank Thee, O Lord, that I am not as other men." One of the great dangers of Judaism was spiritual pride—the overvaluation of the Jew in the sight

²⁵ Luke xvii. 20.

²⁶ Mark vii. 12.

of God because of his divine election among the nations, and it is only natural to find the presence of this pride in the *virtuosi* of Judaism, though it is well to remember that many Christians have had their own share of it in the assumption of a superior virtue as against non-Christians. There was evidently too good ground for the reproach of the Baptist, "Think ye not to say, We have Abraham to our father. For I say unto you that God is able from these stones to raise children unto Abraham."

Above all, Phariseism tended to invert and subvert the real moral and religious values. "It must, however, be admitted," says Klausner, "that Phariseism did in truth contain one serious defect which enabled the more hypocritical to pride themselves on the mere performance of the commandments and which justified Jesus fighting against it *qua* Jew and even *qua* Pharisee. . . . This defect was that the Pharisees attached as much importance to those commandments dealing with the relations between man and God (the ceremonial law) as to those dealing with the relations between man and his fellow-man (the ethical law). . . . Yet the casuistry and immense theoretical care devoted to every one of the slightest religious ordinances left them open to the misconception that the ceremonial laws were the main principle and the ethical laws only secondary. To the orthodox Pharisee (and to the modern orthodox Jew) the violation of the Sabbath and the oppression of the hireling were alike crimes deserving of death (and to the average Jew of all times the former seems the worse crime) ; and it almost inevitably followed from such an attitude that, despite the efforts of the best Pharisees, the common people of that day should assume that the value of morality was less than that of religion—just as in the time of the Prophets the people assumed that the Temple and Sacrifice were more important than to do judgment and love mercy."²⁷

The representation of the Pharisees in the Gospels strikes one as too natural to be invented. And the misrepresentation, if such there be, was not all on the one side. The Pharisees at a later time paid back the Christians by circulating calumnies about their master, which are

²⁷ "Jesus of Nazareth," 215-216.

atrocious travesties of his person and character. The view of Jesus in hostile Jewish circles came to be that which we find expressed in the Talmud. "Jesus practised magic and led astray and deceived Israel." ²⁸ It is, however, a mistake to assume that the scribes and Pharisees of the time of Jesus were the only representatives of the Jewish religious spirit. They were only one of a number of Jewish parties or sects. They were opposed not only by the Sadducees, who championed the ancient written law as against tradition, and the Minim, who adopted a free attitude towards it as well as tradition, but by the more spiritually minded circle to which Jesus evidently belonged, and also by the mass of the country folk, whose religion was of a less sophisticated type. Even granted that there is in the Synoptic record exaggeration, indiscriminating generalisation, due to the later antagonism between Jew and Christian, it is probably no misrepresentation to say that, with its emphasis on external acts, on the minutiae of devotion, the Pharisaic system tended to breed the hypocrite, and that it intensified the formalist, legalist spirit. The man who makes a parade of religion in the streets and the market-places, whilst "devouring widows' houses," is evidently drawn from real life. The same type of Christian is only too well known. The Judaism of the Talmud, the later Judaism which showed such an extraordinary vitality in spite of centuries of persecution at the hands of the Christians, is, however, not necessarily identical with that of the Pharisees of the age of Jesus, and there is considerable force in Mr Burkitt's contention that the terrible experiences of the two great catastrophes that overwhelmed the Jewish nation in A.D. 70 and 135 "must have had a purifying and spiritualising influence on Jewish religion." ²⁹

III. TEACHING THE MULTITUDE AND DISCIPLES

In addition to the renewed controversy with the scribes and Pharisees, a large part of the narrative deals with the teaching of the people and the disciples. To the people the

²⁸ Herford, "Phariseism," 115.

²⁹ "Gospel History," 171-173.

teaching is of the same ethical, practical character as in the Galilean mission, and reflects the same uncompromising, otherworldly, ethical idealism. He lays the greatest stress on love as the fulfilling of the commandments¹ and on self-sacrifice for the sake of others, involving, for those at least who would take an active part in his mission, the complete renunciation of possessions for the benefit of the poor as the supreme test of love and fidelity.² He repeatedly warns against the materialising effect of wealth and covetousness in the pursuit of it, and reminds them that a man's highest life consists not in the abundance of the things he possesses.³ He severely reproves the hankering after outward signs of the kingdom and their spiritual obtuseness in failing to read in his message the true sign of the coming of the Son of Man.⁴ Matthew refers both rebukes to the Galilean mission, and further differs from Luke in making Jesus in the first case address the scribes and Pharisees, and in the second the Pharisees and the Sadducees.⁵ In the first case, his order seems to be the correct one, but in the second the introduction of the Sadducees is clearly an anachronism, and Luke's order in this case is to be preferred. In contrast to the Ninevites, who repented at the preaching of Jonah, and to the Queen of Sheba (southern Arabia), who hastened from afar to hear the wisdom of Solomon, they will not, in their predilection for visible proofs of the kingdom, read the signs of the times aright, and cannot therefore see that a greater than Solomon and Jonah is here.⁶ Hence the saying about putting the lamp on the stand instead of in the cellar or under a bushel, and about keeping the lamp of the body, the eye, single in order that the body may be full of light instead of darkness,⁷ which Luke has already given in his account of the Galilean mission, and which Matthew introduces in the Sermon on the Mount, but which Jesus may well have repeated on this later

¹ x. 26 f.

² Mark x. 19 f. ; Matt. xix. 18 ; Luke xviii .20 f.

³ xii. 15.

⁴ xi. 29 f. ; xii. 54 f.

⁵ xii. 33 f. ; xvi. 1 f. ; cf. Mark viii. 11.

⁶ The neuter *πλεϊον* makes it probable that the word means a greater matter rather than a greater person is here.

⁷ xi. 33 f.

occasion. Hence also the charge of hypocrisy in the sense that, whilst quick enough to interpret the signs of the weather when their material interest is in question, they neglect to apply their wits in the discernment of spiritual things. "Ye hypocrites; ye know how to interpret the face of the earth and the heaven. But how is it that ye know not how to interpret this time? And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?"⁸ Hence also the call to repentance, which reappears as a characteristic note of his message and which is enforced by two illustrations drawn from recent events (the slaughter of the Galilean pilgrims by Pilate, and the fall of the tower of Siloam at Jerusalem), and by the parables of the barren fig tree in the vineyard⁹ and the prodigal son. "Are there, then, few that be saved?" he is asked by one of his hearers. Jesus replies with the saying about the narrow door and the difficulty of entering in, reminiscent of the passage in the Sermon on the Mount, and the prediction of the displacement of the children of Abraham in the kingdom by the Gentiles from the east and the west, the north and the south, which Matthew gives in connection with the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum. All three evangelists agree at any rate in attributing the concluding saying, "Many that be first shall be last, and the last first," to this stage of the ministry.¹⁰ Hence further the warning to count the cost before seeking to become his disciple. In the face of the hostile world and the tragedy that looms ahead, discipleship involves the bearing of the cross and the complete renunciation of family ties and possessions, yea, life itself.¹¹

In this teaching he makes ample use once more of the parable or similitude. Some of these—the mustard seed and the leaven—belong to the Galilean mission, though they may well have been repeated later. But several are peculiar to Luke, and among them are gems like the good

⁸ xii. 56-57.

⁹ xiii. 1 f.; cf. xvii. 30-31.

¹⁰ Mark x. 31; Matt. xix. 30; Luke xiii. 30.

¹¹ xiv. 25 f.; Matt. x. 37 f. Matthew gives the saying in the charge to the Twelve. The reference to the cross is, however, in its true place in Luke's setting.

Samaritan, the prodigal son, and the lost sheep,¹² in which he attains the perfection of the parabolic story.

The teaching to the disciples is largely concerned with the future. Luke fitly transfers to this period parts of what Matthew gives as the charge to the Twelve and of the Sermon on the Mount.¹³ He exhorts them again and again to banish fear, and strives to inspire them with his own heroic spirit, to face with courage and steadfastness the trials which he foresees. "Fear not," "Be not anxious," is the recurring note of these intimate talks on the way to Jerusalem. They are to fear God, not man, in the firm confidence that God will always avail, in the most complete belief in His special providence. Confessing the Son of Man in the face of a world of enemies is the supreme obligation. Of this heroic spirit Jesus himself is the wonderful exemplar. He who bids them assimilate it is himself carrying the load of a tragic destiny. He is assuredly no mere arm-chair teacher. He shows the hard way that he himself is treading in the strength of an absolute faith in God, in unquestioning obedience to His will. What sustains him is the irrefragable faith, in dependence on God, in himself and his mission as the Son of Man, and the vision of the ultimate realisation of the kingdom through him as the result of suffering and enduring. The disciples are, therefore, to live as watchmen looking for the coming kingdom and its returning lord. "Let your loins be girded about and your lamps burning, and be ye yourselves like unto men looking for their lord when he shall return. . . . Be ye also ready, for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh."¹⁴ The outlook becomes more and more eschatological, as in the parable of the lord and the faithful and unfaithful servants,¹⁵ though the practical side of the teaching is by no means displaced, as in those of the householder and the labourers¹⁶ and the rich man and his unjust steward.¹⁷

In contrast to his brusque treatment of the Pharisees,

¹² Matthew also has the lost sheep (xviii. 12-14). But the Lukan version is fuller and the connection is different. Probably such a parable was used more than once.

¹³ xii. 2 f., 22 f.

¹⁴ xii. 35-36, 40.

¹⁵ xii. 41 f.

¹⁶ Matt. xx. 1 f.

¹⁷ Luke xvi. 1 f.

who seek material signs of the coming kingdom and are blind to its actual presence in his person, he expatiates to the disciples on the subject of his future coming. Of mere external signs, such as men will continue to seek and see, there will be none. The coming will be like the lightning which flashes from one part of heaven to the other—suddenly, unexpectedly. “So shall the Son of man be in his day.”¹⁸ At the same time, he repeats the warning given after the confession at Cæsarea Philippi and the transfiguration. “But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation.”¹⁹ Men will be taken by surprise, for the world in its unthinking materialism will be unprepared for the sudden cataclysm, as in the days of Noah and Lot.²⁰ “After the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed. . . . Whosoever shall seek to gain his life (literally—himself) shall lose it ; but whosoever shall lose his life (*i.e.*, himself) shall preserve it.”²¹ A last time the warning of his impending suffering is given—evidently when the journey is nearing its close.²² From the outset the disciples could not understand the weird communication, and even now, after repeated intimations and the emphasis on the cross in his teaching both to them and the people, they fail to realise what lies before him and them. In the vision of the transfiguration he had appeared in the halo of a glorified being, and this aspect of the Messianic dignity had evidently impressed itself on the minds of those disciples who had experienced this vision. It was difficult to displace in their consciousness this glorified being by the figure of the suffering Messiah. From Mark’s narrative we can vividly perceive the mystification of the disciples, who follow whither he leads with doubt and misgiving. Jesus is in front, heading grimly for Jerusalem in pursuit of a purpose which they really do not understand or share ; the disciples behind him ; other followers farther back, who, like them, are bound for the Passover, and are struck with fear at the spectacle, seeing more clearly in what the journey will likely eventuate. “And they were on the road to Jerusalem

¹⁸ xvii. 24.¹⁹ xvii. 25.²⁰ xvii. 26 f.²¹ xvii. 30, 33.²² Mark x. 32 f. ; Matt. xx. 17 f. ; Luke xviii. 31 f.

and Jesus was going in front of them (the disciples), and they were in amazement, and those who were following him (farther in the rear) were afraid.”²³ Thereupon follows the detailed announcement to the disciples of what is to happen at the journey’s end. The tradition has evidently elaborated these details in the light of what actually did happen, and Luke’s appeal to the fulfilment of prophecy²⁴ tends to bear this out. But Jesus must certainly have indicated the rejection and doom which he divined and which cast their shadow at times over the narrative of this fateful journey. He probably did speak of his resurrection as well as his death, since belief in his survival after death was an indispensable element of the faith that could thus resolutely face his coming doom. It was, moreover, an essential condition of his prospective rôle as the glorified Son of Man. To the disciples, however, such a pronouncement was still unthinkable. “And they understood none of these things, and the saying was hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were said.”²⁵ Their minds were still full of the notion of a triumphant Messianic kingdom on earth. According to Matthew,²⁶ Jesus himself, in answer to Peter’s question, “What, then, shall we, who have left all and followed thee, have?” (in the future Messianic kingdom) had spoken to them of their future function as judges of the Twelve Tribes of Israel in the day of regeneration when the Son of Man should sit on the throne of his glory. Two of them—the enterprising James and John—right humanly seized the opportunity to bespeak the first places in the future kingdom. “Grant unto us that we may sit the one on thy right hand, the other on thy left hand in thy glory.”²⁷ In reply, Jesus tells them that they know not what their request involves, and asks them whether they are able to share with him the trials that await him. In their eagerness to participate in his glory, they promptly answer in the affirmative. He accepts their assurance and answers that

²³ Mark x. 32.

²⁴ xviii. 31.

²⁵ Luke xviii. 34.

²⁶ xix. 27 f.

²⁷ Mark x. 35 f.; Matt. xx. 20 f. Matthew apologetically says it was their mother who asked this favour. Luke omits the incident, probably as reflecting on the character of the later apostles. He gives instead the contention among them who should be the greatest in the kingdom in connection with the last supper (xxii. 24 f.).

they will indeed ultimately share his fate, though they evidently did not realise what this was to mean for them. But it is not his to dispose of the future, which is in God's hands, and he, therefore, cannot grant their request. In answer to the reproaches of their fellow-disciples at their presumption, he conveys to them an indirect rebuke. His function as Son of Man is to serve, not to lord it over others, like the rulers of the nations ; not to be ministered to, but to give his life a ransom for many. The greatest in the future Messianic kingdom will be he who serves the most.²⁸

Clearly the disciples, one and all, do not yet understand what the Messianic kingdom is, or the rôle of the Messiah as the servant who must suffer before he can rule, or the fact that service is the only title to distinction in it. In the long intercourse with Jesus they had probably learned to regard it from the religious, not from the merely popular, point of view. But they had not emancipated themselves from the current ideas of place and power associated with it in contemporary Jewish thought. Jesus himself, in transforming it, does not entirely discard its external framework, as the reference to the throne of his glory and the twelve thrones of the disciples within it shows. But while he retains the Jewish framework he has imparted to the Messianic conception a distinctive religious and ethical significance, and it is this significance in all its fullness that the disciples have still to learn. The greatest things in life are not their external forms, and can only be won by selfless service and sacrifice.

Though he retains the idea of a Messianic kingdom of which he is ultimately to be the recognised king—the kingdom in the Jewish apocalyptic sense—the kingdom in its ethical and spiritual sense is already being established through his mission of teaching and healing. As the result of this mission he founds and trains a community of disciples who are to continue it after his death until his coming as the Messianic judge and king. Of this coming and what it will signify, he will have more to say in the last converse with the disciples at Jerusalem. Meanwhile he is still engaged

²⁸ Mark x. 41 f. ; Matt. xx. 24.

in laying the foundation and making the preparation for it in the community, which he has been forming and training for this purpose from the outset. The forming and training of this community—the kingdom in the moral and spiritual sense—has been the grand object of his mission on earth. The other aspect of the kingdom lies in the future, and has been obtruded only in the later stage of the mission, as the thought of the suffering Messiah, in the face of the accumulating antagonism of the scribes and Pharisees, has taken definite possession of his consciousness. But this is by no means the only aspect of it in his thought, or the sole inspiration, the dominating motive of the ministry of teaching and healing from the beginning, as the extreme eschatological school maintains. The Jesus of this ministry is not merely a visionary apocalyptic, though the apocalyptic strain in the teaching comes into the foreground, now that he is within sight of his tragic end. He is there from the beginning and even unto the end to inaugurate and foster a moral and spiritual movement, which, like the mustard seed, shall grow into a great tree, or, like the leaven, shall permeate and transform Judaism into a new religion of the spirit and extend its sway over Jew, Samaritan, and Gentile alike. To ignore this patent fact is to evaporate his mission in the dreamland of Jewish eschatology, and to underestimate and even ignore the genuine ethical motive and purpose underlying it. To this end Jesus has been unobtrusively and, in this later phase of the mission, intensively training and organising his adherents, who are not confined to the Twelve, though the Twelve chiefly figure in the process. To this community Matthew applies the term “Church” (ἐκκλησία)²⁹—obviously a later editorial designation. Luke more fittingly makes him designate it by the word “flock.” “Fear not, little flock” (ποίμνιον), “for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”³⁰ But the distinctive term is the

²⁹ xvi. 16; xviii. 17. The passage is absent from Mark and Luke, and seems to be an interpolation by a champion of the later Petrine party in the Church, though commentators like Allen, 176, M’Neile, 240, Strack and Billerbeck, “Kommentar,” i. 731, regard it as genuine. On the other side, see the weighty remarks of J. Weiss, “Schriften des Neuen Testament,” i. 344-345.

³⁰ xii. 32.

kingdom ³¹ in the sense of a religious and ethical community, which is to grow and expand until the coming of the kingdom in the current, but transformed, apocalyptic sense.

IV. THE JOHANNINE SUPPLEMENT

The southern mission must have extended over a considerable period—from the late summer or early autumn to the following spring at least. Did it include, as the Fourth Gospel indicates, several visits to Jerusalem before the final one, as to which both it and the Synoptics at last coincide? As we have seen, the latter represent this mission as a movement towards the capital, which culminates in the final and apparently the only arrival there. The writers evidently did not find in their sources any indication of these visits, though Luke brings him to Bethany within half an hour's distance from the city. The fact that Jesus left Galilee with the conviction of his ultimate rejection and death at the hands of the religious authorities at the centre of Judaism, and that he repeatedly expressed this conviction in the tradition followed by the Synoptists, apparently tended to induce the belief that he avoided contact with it before the close of the mission.

With this representation the Fourth Gospel is at variance. According to this Gospel, Jesus appears to have visited Jerusalem thrice in the course of the mission, and in this case there are, I think, substantial reasons for preferring, in this respect, the Johannine account to that of the Synoptists. It may, it seems to me, be accepted as a real supplement to the Synoptic narrative of the southern mission. How far the details of the controversy, on these occasions, between Jesus and "the Jews," which it reports, are exact history is another matter. We must here again reckon with the author's pronounced tendency to adopt both the works and teaching to the purpose and the age for which he wrote, to subordinate history to later belief, to interpret it in accordance with his own religious experience and later

³¹ Allen, "Commentary on Matthew," 177, contests the identification of the kingdom in this sense with the community—mistakenly, in my opinion.

Christian development. But this subjective presentation does not necessarily invalidate the general veracity of the movements of Jesus which he describes. There is at least indirect evidence in the Synoptic narratives in support of this series of visits to Jerusalem in the course of the mission in the south. Luke, for instance, discloses the intimate intercourse of Jesus with Martha and Mary at Bethany, just outside it. The later saying of Jesus during the final visit, reported by Mark and Matthew,¹ "I was or sat daily with you in the temple, teaching, and ye took me not," seems to imply the previous teaching ministry of Jesus at Jerusalem, which the Fourth Gospel recounts. The fact that he has disciples in Jerusalem on the occasion of his final visit there also seems to imply a longer contact with its inhabitants than we should otherwise infer from the Synoptic narrative. The lament over Jerusalem, recorded by Matthew and Luke,² "O Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children, etc., and ye would not!" points in the same direction. Even if the lament is a quotation from "The Wisdom of God"—a supposed non-canonical work adduced by Luke³—this does not necessarily rule out the visits which on the lips of Jesus it connotes.⁴

Unfortunately, the Johannine narrative, as it stands in the received text, is by no means clear and coherent, though the writer evidently had access to traditions unknown to the other evangelists. He is supposed by some to have derived his material from "the disciple whom Jesus loved," who appears only in the late stage of the mission in the south (from chapter xiii. 27 onwards), and is identifiable with "the witness" of chapter xxi. Many have contended that this beloved disciple and witness was the Apostle John

¹ Mark xiv. 49; Matt. xxvi. 55.

² Matt. xxiii. 33; Luke xiii. 34. Matthew represents it as uttered at Jerusalem. Luke gives it in another connection, and apparently it is uttered in Peræa.

³ Luke xi. 49.

⁴ Harnack evidently regards it as a quotation from this work. "Sayings of Jesus," 111 (Eng. trans. by Wilkinson, 1908). Rendel Harris, on the other hand, maintains that "The Wisdom of God" was not a book, or the contents of a book, but an early title applied to Jesus as the divine Wisdom of Prov. viii., and that the application of this title preceded that of the Logos of the Fourth Gospel, with which it is practically identical. "Origins of the Prologue of St John," 4 (1917).

and that this Apostle was also the author of the Gospel. The identification is, in my opinion, very questionable. The beloved disciple and witness was evidently a native of Judæa, not, like the Apostle, a native of Galilee, and the author of the Gospel may have been his disciple, who owed to him this supplementary account of the southern mission, which shows familiarity with the scenes of Jesus' activity as far as they are centred in Jerusalem, but into which he freely worked his own conceptions and reflections. Moreover, it appears to have undergone a clumsy manipulation by an editor or redactor, which accounts for the disarrangement of the order of events, intensified in addition, perhaps, by the accidental displacement of certain portions of the contents.⁵

Considerable rearrangement of the received text of this supplement is absolutely necessary in order to transform it into a passably coherent narrative. This rearrangement has been attempted by many critics and commentators, though they are not exactly agreed on the details of it. It is, however, generally held,⁶ as far as the account of these visits to Jerusalem is concerned, that chapter v. and part of chapter vii. (verses 15-24) must come after chapter vi., in which the closing phase of the Galilean mission is recorded. So rearranged, the Johannine account of the southern mission contains three visits made by Jesus to Jerusalem in the course of it. The first, soon after the close of that in Galilee, is related in chapter v. and chapter vii. 15-24, and takes place on the occasion of an unnamed feast. The second is to the Feast of Tabernacles, and is reported in chapters vii. (minus verses 15-24) and viii. The third, on the occasion of the Feast of Dedication, is recounted in

⁵ These questions have been the subject of interminable discussion by the critics—British, Continental, and American—for many years, and a great variety of views, into which I cannot enter here, has been the result. I have read many of these discussions, but they are too numerous to even mention in a note. Among the most recent in English, I have found those of Streeter, Stanton, Strachan, Bacon, Moffatt, Latimer Jackson, Percy Gardner, Garvie, etc., helpful. Garvie's work, "The Beloved Disciple" (1922), is very illuminating, though I differ in some respects from his conclusions.

⁶ See, for instance, Moffatt, "Introduction," 554 f.; Bacon, "The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate," 499, 515-516; among recent commentators on this Gospel, MacGregor and Bernard.

chapters ix. and x. At the same time, in view of the indefiniteness of portions of the material of these five chapters, we can only attain to approximate accuracy in the attempt to construct a consecutive narrative out of them.

The unspecified feast (v. 1), which has been the subject of much discussion, may, for all that we definitely know about it, have been the Feast of Wood Offering, in August, for the service of the altar, or the Feast of Trumpets, in the middle of September, celebrating *inter alia* the giving of the Law and marking the beginning of the New Year.⁷ The second is explicitly stated to have been the Feast of Tabernacles, in October, commemorating for a whole week Israel's dwelling in booths during their sojourn in the wilderness and marking the ingathering of the year's harvest.⁸ The third was the Feast of Dedication, which also lasted a week and began on the 25th December, in remembrance of the rededication of the temple by Judas Maccabæus in 164 B.C., after its desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes. It was also known as the Feast of Lights. Assuming, as is highly probable, that the retirement from Galilee took place in the late summer or early autumn,⁹ there is thus time for the inclusion of these repeated visits in the course of the southern mission.

On the occasion of the visit to the unnamed feast, Jesus heals on the Sabbath day the infirm man, who has suffered from what is evidently paralysis for thirty-eight years,

⁷ See Edersheim, i. 460, ii. 768 f.; Westcott, "Gospel According to St John," i. 206. Streeter improbably concludes for Passover; MacGregor for Pentecost.

⁸ Oesterley and Box, "Synagogue," 368 f. It was second in importance only to Passover.

⁹ The episode of the payment of the temple tax at Capernaum (due annually in March) might seem to place the retirement in the early spring. But the question of the collectors suggests that it was overdue, and the incident does not, therefore, mark the exact date of the retirement. The payment might well have been omitted during Jesus' absence in the wanderings of the previous months, and the incident might thus take place in the late summer.

Since this paragraph was printed Dr O. S. Rankin informs me that he has come to the conclusion that the Feast of Dedication began on the 18th November. He thinks that it was a Jewish adaptation of the Kronos-Helios Festival, which was celebrated in Palestine under the Seleucid domination, and to which Judas Maccabæus gave a Jewish interpretation. See his forthcoming book "The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah."

at the pool of Bethesda or Bethzatha,¹⁰ by the sheep gate. The cure reminds of that of the paralytic at Capernaum, and some¹¹ have seen in it a mere doublet of this miracle which the writer has adapted to his pragmatic purpose. The Jerusalem episode seems, however, to have a basis in fact. The details are precise and the differences sufficiently distinctive. The controversy here, for instance, is not over the claim to forgive sins, as in the case of the Capernaum incident, but over Sabbath-breaking. It starts with an altercation between the man himself and "the Jews," who object to his carrying away his bed, after the cure, on the sacred day, and ultimately, on learning from him who has cured him, they continue it with Jesus himself. Jesus justifies himself by adducing the continuous working of God, his Father, in sustaining the creation without respite on the Sabbath day.¹² He further reminds them that, in healing a man on the Sabbath, he was no more contravening the Law than they themselves who circumcised a child born on the Sabbath, on the following one.¹³ In the first part of the justification his accusers see a claim to equality with God, though they marvel at his Biblical learning ;¹⁴ in the second the people see an evidence of diabolic possession.¹⁵ "The multitude answered, Thou hast a devil." The altercation over Sabbath-breaking is in keeping with the Synoptic controversy with the scribes and Pharisees. Jesus replies to the question, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" in words that might pass for a passage from the Synoptists. He is God-taught, and what he teaches is God's, not his, and whoever is really desirous of doing God's will, will recognise his message as of God, who has sent him.¹⁶ The lengthy discourse¹⁷ which he delivers, in allusion to the question of his equality with God, on his divine nature and vocation is, on the contrary, couched

¹⁰ On the locality see G. A. Smith, "Jerusalem," ii. 564 f.

¹¹ For instance, Bacon, "The Fourth Gospel," 379-380; Jones, "New Testament in the Twentieth Century," 405 (1914); Carpenter, "The Johannine Writings," 381-382 (1927).

¹² John v. 17.

¹³ John vii. 19 f.

¹⁴ John v. 18; cf. vii. 15.

¹⁵ John vii. 20. This is the view that became stereotyped in the Talmud, which does not deny the miraculous works of Jesus, but ascribes them to sorcery. Dalman and Laible, "Christ in the Talmud," 45 f.

¹⁶ John vii. 15 f.

¹⁷ John v. 19 f.

in the characteristic Johannine style. It reflects the argumentation of the writer himself in his apologetic in behalf of Christianity directed to "the Jews" of his own time, rather than that of the historic Jesus in his controversy with the scribes and the Pharisees. These unbelieving Jews, unlike this impotent man, who has suffered for thirty-eight years, are unable to find salvation because of their wilful adherence to the old diseased Judaism and their refusal to admit the claims of the Church of the writer's time in behalf of Jesus. They are like the children of Israel who had to spend thirty-eight years in the wilderness (Deut. ii. 14), which the duration of the man's illness seems to symbolise, before their deliverance came. This deliverance in the spiritual, Christian sense they cannot share, because they reject the message of the Son, who is the divine revealer of the Father, to whom equal honour is due, through whom eternal life is available, and to whom the Baptist and even Moses have testified. Jesus is thus made to reason in terms of the later developed Christology, and the reasoning is strikingly unlike that of the Synoptic controversy with the scribes and Pharisees.

Whilst the multitude is represented as sceptical, they disclaim any desire to resort to violence.¹⁸ "The Jews," on the other hand, *i.e.*, the religious leaders, are set on bringing about his death.¹⁹ Jesus, therefore, withdraws from Judæa to Galilee, which, in view of the previous and final retirement from Galilee recorded by the Synoptists, must mean Galilee in the inclusive sense,²⁰ *i.e.*, Peræa. This retreat to Peræa must have been of short duration, for the next visit takes place at the Feast of Tabernacles,²¹ which was separated from that of Trumpets by only a short interval. His retirement from Jerusalem suggests to his brothers, who are apparently on their way through Peræa to attend the feast, a flight from publicity. They advise him to go to Judæa and renew his ministry in order that his disciples there "may also behold the works which thou doest." The writer has, indeed, made no mention

¹⁸ John vii. 19-20.

¹⁹ John v. 16 f.

²⁰ The writer, who has only a confused knowledge of the Galilean mission, may mean Galilee in the restricted sense.

²¹ John vii. 10.

of the winning of disciples at Jerusalem during the previous visit. But Jesus had probably already some followers there, and his brothers contend that he should make an effort to retain them and advance his cause by an exhibition of his Messianic powers at the centre of Judaism. They themselves are not among his disciples. They are, in fact, sceptical. But they see clearly enough that a withdrawal was not the way to achieve positive results. "No man doeth anything in secret and himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou doest these things, manifest thyself to the world. For even his brethren did not believe in him."²² Jesus replies in characteristic Johannine fashion that his hour is not yet come for manifesting himself to a world that hates him, and bids them go alone. It is not at the Feast of Tabernacles (so apparently the writer wishes his readers to understand), but at that of Passover that the self-determined time will come.²³ They accordingly proceed without him. But after their departure, Jesus, having evidently reconsidered the matter, changes his mind and resolves to revisit Jerusalem, "though not publicly (during the journey at least), but as it were in secret."²⁴ There seems to be an echo in these words of the secret journey from Cæsarea Philippi to the Galilean frontier during his retreat from Galilee, as reported by Mark (ix. 30), which the author has confusedly transferred to this stage of his mission.

"The Jews," *i.e.*, the leaders, are on the outlook for him, and whilst they are hostile and regard him as a deceiver, the crowd of pilgrims is disposed to take his side. "Some said, He is a good man," though they are afraid openly to espouse his cause "for fear of the Jews."²⁵ There follows a series of dramatic scenes vividly depicted. Suddenly in the middle of this festive week he appears and teaches in the temple. Some of his Jerusalem hearers (residents in contrast to the pilgrims) ask whether after all the rulers, who allow him thus openly to teach, may not secretly recognise that he is the Christ. Nevertheless they are

²² John vii. 4-5.

²³ John vii. 6-7.

²⁴ John vii. 10. In verse 8, οὐπω, "not yet," was subsequently substituted in the text for οὐκ, "not": "I go not yet up" for "I go not up," in order to gloss over the apparent inconsistency.

²⁵ John vii. 11-13.

very dubious, and start the question, so often put in the writer's own day, of the credentials of the Christ. How can an ordinary man, whose origin all know, claim to be the Messiah, who must be a mysterious, divinely commissioned, unexpected manifestation from God? ²⁶ Jesus, in reply, claims to be this manifestation. They thereupon seek to take him, but refrain from actually laying hands on him for the Johannine reason that "his hour was not yet come." ²⁷ On the other hand, many of the pilgrims believe on him in virtue of "the signs" which he has done. "When the Christ shall come, will he do more signs than this man has done?" ²⁸ The Pharisees and the chief priests (the priestly-Sadducean hierarchy), alarmed at his popularity, send officers to seize him, whilst Jesus mystifies his hearers by announcing that in a little while they will seek him in vain, since he will shortly return to Him that sent him, and, by implication, they will be exposed to the awful consequences of their rejection of him. When the officers appear on the scene on the last day of the feast, he is proclaiming the coming of the Spirit ("the living water") and the multitude is divided in their judgment regarding him. Some conclude that he is a prophet, others that he is the Christ, whilst others ask incredulously whether the Christ can come out of Galilee, and not rather, as the Scripture teaches, out of Bethlehem, David's village. Here again there is an echo of the Synoptic scene at Cæsarea Philippi, in which Jesus asks, "Who do men say that I am?" and the disciples communicate to him the popular estimate. So great is the impression made by him that even those who would fain take him are overawed in his presence. The officers sent by the chief priests and Pharisees dare not carry out their purpose. Why did ye not bring him? ask they. "Never man so spake," is the reply. "Those who would arrest him were arrested by him," aptly remarks Muirhead.²⁹ The Pharisees emphasise the fact that none of the leading men have been taken in by him, and only

²⁶ The incredulity of the Jews in the face of this claim is reflected in the Talmud, which represents such a claimant as a liar and a fool. "Christ in the Talmud," 50.

²⁷ John vii. 30.

²⁸ John vii. 31.

²⁹ "Message of the Fourth Gospel," 109.

the contemptible multitude (the Amhaaretz),³⁰ who knoweth not the law, has allowed itself to be led astray. Whereupon Nicodemus intervenes with the caveat that the law allows no one to judge a man without first hearing what he has to say. Him also the Pharisees flout: "Art thou also of Galilee? Search and see that out of Galilee cometh no prophet."³¹ The nocturnal interview with Nicodemus, which, as we have seen, is wrongly referred to the beginning of the ministry in chapter iv., is more likely to have taken place at this later stage of it.

There follows (chapter viii. 12 f.) a long disputation with the Pharisees themselves and "the Jews," *i.e.*, the active opponents of Jesus, though it is not clear whether the account of it should precede or follow the attempt of the officers to seize him.³² It reaches its climax in unmitigated and irretrievable antagonism between the two parties, and evidently also contains features derived from the conflict between Jews and Christians in the writer's own time and reflected back into that between Jesus and the Pharisees and high-priestly hierarchy. He proclaims himself the light of the world—the light that gives life. The Pharisees reply that his witness to himself is not true. He appeals to the additional witness of the Father—the fact of his God-filled consciousness. They will not admit the force of this subjective, *ex parte* evidence. "Where is thy Father?" To him the very fact of their asking such a question is a proof of their invincible blindness and obtuseness. He tells them that there is an impassable gulf between him and them, and that they shall die in their sins in refusing to acknowledge his claim. "Ye are from beneath. I am from above. Ye are of this world. I am not of this world."³³ Belief in him is the grand condition of salvation. "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."³⁴ "Who art thou, then?" ask his opponents. "Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning,"³⁵

³⁰ On the attitude of the Pharisees towards them, see the exhaustive excursus in Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar," ii. 494 f.

³¹ John vii. 52.

³² Attempts have been made to rearrange the text here. See, for instance, MacGregor, "Commentary on John," 204-205; Bernard, "St John," ii. 291.

³³ viii. 23.

³⁴ viii. 24.

³⁵ viii. 25.

is the answer. The one sent and taught by the Father, is the further explanation. Truly said, assuredly, judging from the ethical and religious point of view. But then, their Messianic conception was very different from his, and with their prepossessions and their legalist apprehension of religion, it was hopeless to expect them to accept his, in virtue of the merely insistent assertion of it. Clearly this Messianic belief has its drawbacks when it comes to be a question of purely spiritual and religious values.

Jesus' words make, however, a deep impression on many of his hearers, who are disposed, in varying degrees, to accept his testimony.³⁶ He tells these disciples or quasi-disciples that if they abide in his word, truly remain his disciples, they shall know the truth and the truth shall make them free. His antagonists³⁷ interject, with glaring and unfounded presumption, that they have never been in (political) bondage to any man. Jesus, who uses the word in its moral, not its political meaning, proclaims, in terms of Paul, that the sinner is the bondservant of sin, and that they can only free themselves from this bondage through him, the Son, as the revealer and embodiment of the Father in the later Johannine sense. The disputation then becomes practically a violent altercation on the theme of Judaism versus Pauline-Johannine Christianity, as the author expounded it to his contemporaries in his interpretative, apologetic fashion. In the course of it the antithesis between the two becomes absolute. Jesus tells them that they are of their father, the devil. They retort by calling him a Samaritan (one who denied the exclusive privileges of the Jews), and saying that he is demon-possessed, and aspersing his presumption in making himself greater than Abraham and the prophets. "Whom makest thou thyself?" He maintains his claim to a higher knowledge of the God whom they profess to acknowledge, and to a higher signific-

³⁶ John viii. 30-31. In these would-be believers the author appears to have in mind those Jews of his own time who were prepared to favour Christianity up to a point, but would not go the length of divorcing it entirely from Judaism.

³⁷ As the text stands (viii. 31-33), it appears as if these believers make the remark about their immunity from bondage. But the controversy which follows is evidently with his Jewish antagonists, not with these believers or semi-believers.

ance, in the divine plan and purpose, than Abraham. He tells them that Abraham foresaw his day and rejoiced in it, and concludes the altercation by proclaiming his pre-existence—the grand pronouncement to which it has been leading up: “Thou art not fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.”³⁸ At this culminating enormity his infuriated antagonists prepare to stone him. “They took up stones, therefore, to cast at him. But Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple.”³⁹ How, is not explained. The writer is not concerned to answer such a natural query. He means apparently to leave the impression that Jesus in his supernatural capacity can render himself invisible.

Nor are we informed whither he went. He retired presumably to renew the southern mission in a more promising sphere (Peræa)⁴⁰ throughout the next two months, when he abruptly reappears at Jerusalem during the Feast of Dedication.⁴¹ The cure of a blind man on the Sabbath day (ix. 1 f.) once more leads to a clash with the Pharisees and the Jews. He tells the disciples, in answer to their question whether the man’s blindness was due to the sin of his parents, or of the man himself, that it was due to neither, but simply that the works of God should be made manifest in him. The cure, which is effected by smearing clay, mixed with spittle,⁴² on the eyes and washing in the pool of Siloam, is thus a demonstration of the divine power of Jesus, who once more, in keeping with the brilliance of the festive celebration, proclaims himself the light of the world. It also furnishes a text for expatiating on the spiritual blindness of “the Jews” and the Pharisees, who refuse so to regard it and seek in vain to invalidate the man’s testimony to this effect. The man persists in asserting

³⁸ John viii. 57-58.

³⁹ John viii. 59.

⁴⁰ The locality seems to have been beyond Jordan (Peræa). In x. 40, in reference to his retirement after the next visit, it is stated that “he went again beyond Jordan,” i.e., Peræa.

⁴¹ The incident in chapter ix. and its sequel are most satisfactorily connected with this visit, which is only indefinitely mentioned in chapter x. 22.

⁴² On the curative effects of this method in the East, see Bernard, ii. 327-328. On Siloam or Siloah, *ibid.*, ii. 328-329, and Dalman, “Jerusalem und sein Gelände,” 163 (1930).

his divine power. "If this man were not from God, he could do nothing."⁴³ He is consequently excommunicated, and makes profession of his faith to Jesus himself and worships him. The Pharisees, on the other hand, are proved by their unbelief to be hopelessly blind, though they boast themselves the disciples of Moses. "For judgment came I into this world that they which see not may see, and that they which see may become blind." "Are we also blind?" ask they contemptuously. "If ye were blind," replies Jesus, "ye would have no sin. But now ye say, We see, your sin remaineth."⁴⁴

The controversy produces another division of opinion among his hearers. "And many of them said, He hath a devil, and is mad. Why hear ye him? Others said, These are not the sayings of one possessed with a devil. Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?"⁴⁵ It is continued in Solomon's porch in the temple, where Jesus is walking in the cold winter weather, and where his opponents challenge him to declare plainly whether he is the Christ or not. One could wish that he had complied in the sense of giving a direct psychological explanation of his inner religious experience. Such a revelation of what his consciousness connoted as the Christ would have been a precious legacy and would have forestalled many future theological controversies. With all his literary skill the writer is too subtle a dialectician to let Jesus unveil in plain terms how he came to this conception and what it actually was and involved. For, though in the Fourth Gospel Jesus has so far spoken much of himself, it is the Jesus of the writer's experience rather than the experience of the historic Jesus that is portrayed. Instead, therefore, of a precious piece of autobiography, we have the conventional reference to the unbelief of the Jews and the appeal to the testimony of his works.⁴⁶ Only his sheep hear his voice and follow him on the strength of these works. It is on the experience of his followers that the writer lays stress as the grand

⁴³ John ix. 33.

⁴⁴ John ix. 39-41.

⁴⁵ Chapter x. 19-29 seems more in place as the conclusion of chapter ix. See Bernard, "St John," i., Introduction, 24-25, and ii. 341 f.; MacGregor, 230 f.

⁴⁶ John x. 25 f.

argument in behalf of the claim that Jesus makes, and the writer formulates in his own characteristic fashion. In illustration he gives the beautiful, but somewhat confused, allegory of the Good Shepherd and the sheep-fold,⁴⁷ so different from the Synoptic parable of the shepherd and the sheep, though there is an echo of this parable in it. Here the shepherd is not concerned with the lost sheep—their salvation is hopeless—but with the sheep within the later Christian fold. It is the Christian community in the enlarged Jewish-Gentile sense, which Jesus foresees as composing one flock under one shepherd, in contrast to the unbelieving Jews. For it the Good Shepherd has laid down his life, not of constraint, but of his own free will and power. It is conceived as entirely independent of Judaism. Jesus is directly God-taught, is not dependent on law and tradition. He contrasts “your law”⁴⁸ with his own divine, authoritative pronouncements. His is a new revelation in opposition to the old. “All who came before me are thieves and robbers” (the writer has in mind the false teachers, Gnostic heretics of his own time), who enter not by the door of the fold, but stealthily climb into it in order to steal and kill and destroy. These thieves and robbers are professedly identical with the Pharisees of Jesus’ time, and he is made to outdo even the Synoptic polemic in disowning and denouncing their legalism and their deadly unbelief.

He closes by asserting his oneness with the Father: “I and the Father are one.”⁴⁹ To the Jews this is rank blasphemy. They once more take up stones to kill him, and once more he appeals to his works as a proof of his claim, and asks for which of these they will stone him. “The Jews” retort that they would stone him, not for doing good, but for blasphemy, “because thou, being a man, makest thyself God.” Jesus replies by quoting Ps. lxxxii. 6, in which God calls the judges of Israel “gods,” *i.e.*, God’s representatives. If this language occurs in Scripture, why should it be blasphemy for the Christ to call himself Son of God? Are not the works there to

⁴⁷ John x. 1 f.

⁴⁸ John x. 34.

⁴⁹ John x. 30.

enable them to know "that the Father is in me and I in the Father"?

There is a sense in which this declaration of the working of the Father in Jesus through his good works and of his unity with Him in this collaboration expresses the great truth of the immanence of God in the godlike soul. The writer, however, in view of his Logos doctrine, undoubtedly intends to represent Jesus as more than the medium of the divine agency in this sense. He is asserting his divinity in the later enhanced sense. This unity seems, however, to be for him still ethical and mystical, rather than metaphysical, though these passages in which the unity of Father and Son is emphasised were, in subsequent theological controversy, to be interpreted in a metaphysical sense. To "the Jews" the claim to unity on the part of any mortal was blasphemous audacity. They accordingly seek again to arrest him. "And he went out of their hand."

If, in this case also, we are not told how Jesus escaped, we are informed where he went, and the intimation contains also a hint where he had gone on his retirement on the previous occasion. "He went away *again* beyond Jordan into the place where John was at first baptising, and there he abode."⁵⁰ This place the writer, as we have seen, designates Bethany (i. 28), which is not exactly identifiable. Here the fugitive attracts many followers, as in the Lukan narrative, and the writer characteristically emphasises anew the contrast between him and the Baptist. "John, indeed," remark these believers, "did no sign, but all things whatsoever John spoke of this man were true."⁵¹ From this "place" he goes to the other Bethany, where Lazarus and his sisters, Martha and Mary, dwelt, in response to the message of the sisters that their brother is ill.⁵² He announces that this sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God and that of the Son. Jesus, we are told, loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus. Yet he lingers two days before setting out, evidently to allow time for the decease of Lazarus and thus give occasion for the culminating

⁵⁰ John x. 40.

⁵¹ John x. 41.

⁵² John xi. 1 f.

miracle of his mission.⁵³ Rather a problematic course in such a case, in which the deep affection for the sufferer and his sisters is emphasised. The disciples warn him of the danger of going again into Judæa to a place so near to Jerusalem—a touch which reminds of their attitude in the Synoptic narrative near the end of the journey to Jerusalem. Jesus tells them that if a man walks in the day, *i.e.*, undertakes the duty laid upon him during the time allotted by God, there is no danger of stumbling. He announces to them the death of Lazarus in plain terms after they have misunderstood his figurative intimation (“Lazarus is fallen asleep”), and sets out with them on this great errand. After the arrival, when Lazarus has been already four days in the tomb,⁵⁴ we have the dramatic meeting first with Martha, and then with Mary, who go out to meet him, the latter accompanied by many Jewish mourners and comforters from Jerusalem, within a couple of miles distant. The story is so vividly told that we can almost see the incidents. Martha shows the stronger faith, and believes that Jesus, in answer to prayer, can restore her brother to life. Instead of undertaking to do so, he reminds her of the resurrection. Martha rather disconsolately, it would seem, professes belief in this cardinal doctrine, and Jesus proclaims himself in the culminating message of the Fourth Gospel as the conqueror of death and the assurance of life eternal to believers. “I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.”⁵⁵ Martha professes her belief in him as the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus is still holding his purpose in reserve, and Martha goes to call Mary, apparently in no very consoled frame of mind. “The Master is here, and calleth for thee.” Jesus is greatly distressed on seeing the weeping maiden and mourners. Is his distress caused by that of those around him, or

⁵³ Brooke, in Peake’s “Commentary,” thinks that this reading of the text is unwarranted, 755. Nevertheless, this does seem to be the reason. Waiting for divine guidance appears to be ruled out by what Jesus says in verse 4 about the purpose of the illness, *i.e.*, the glorifying of God and the Son of God.

⁵⁴ Apparently an allusion to the Jewish idea that the spirit lingers three days near the body, so that Lazarus was indisputably dead.

⁵⁵ xi. 25-26.

by the evidence that both Mary and those accompanying her lack the faith that he, as the Son of God, can effectively intervene to relieve it? On the way to the tomb he himself, overcome with emotion, bursts into tears. "Jesus wept." The author evidently intends us to see in this the proof of genuine humanity, though he leaves us uncertain as to the reason of the breakdown. In view of the express purpose for which he has come, his grief is, at all events, not of the same kind as theirs. At the same time, the strain is very great and the effect of it real enough. To some of those present it is an evidence of his great love for Lazarus. To others it suggests dubiety about his power to do for the dead what he had done for the blind. The writer, at all events, feels no such dubiety. The saying of Martha, who along with the others accompanies him to the tomb, that mortification must have set in, does not daunt Jesus in his purpose. "Said I not unto thee that if thou believedst, thou shouldst see the glory of God?"⁵⁶ Jesus, it seems, had been praying and is assured of the answer. Whilst the prayer has been secret, the thanksgiving for the answer is made in public for the benefit of the multitude that "they may believe that thou didst send me." Thereupon at his loud summons Lazarus comes forth bound hand and foot in the grave clothes. Instead of a joyous welcome, Jesus merely says, "Loose him and let him go." The sequel is entirely ignored. Instead we are as abruptly told, in the author's conventional strain, that many of the Jewish mourners believed in him, while some went to the Pharisees to report the stupendous occurrence.

So ends this dramatic story. In spite of its vivid wording, there is a certain artificiality about it. Jesus receives the message of his friend's illness, and yet he lingers two days before setting out to help him. He keeps Martha and Mary in suspense instead of announcing at once his purpose. He breaks down under the strain, and yet he knows that his prayer on behalf of Lazarus has been heard. He summons Lazarus from the rock tomb and Lazarus comes forth, though bound hand and foot, but disappears without a word to indicate the happy reunion. Clearly the story, though

wonderfully dramatic, cannot be regarded, in some respects, as convincingly true to life. It manifestly reflects the hand of the writer who, skilful as he undoubtedly is, never quite succeeds in obliterating himself, and therefore begets the suspicion that as an historian he does not know the difference between history and allegory, though the allegory may have some basis in the traditions relating to Jesus' psychic power over disease. For instance, the saying about Lazarus being asleep (*i.e.*, in a state of suspended animation) reminds strikingly of the Synoptic account of the raising of Jairus' daughter; the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, etc. The suspicion is all the greater, inasmuch as this crowning "sign" is passed over in silence by the Synoptists. In view of their silence over other credible facts of the career of Jesus, which this Gospel has preserved for us, their silence over this one is not necessarily a proof of the non-existence of such a tradition. On the other hand, considering the stupendous character of the miracle, which we are told was known to a large number of people, and its decisive effect on the fate of Jesus, it is most unlikely that such a tradition could have been unknown to them, and it is incredible that they should not have found a place for it in their narratives. For not only is it, in the Fourth Gospel, the crowning "sign" of the mission; it is also the factor that decided the doom of Jesus. In this respect the writer is absolutely at variance with the Synoptists, according to whom his doom was decided by the cleansing of the temple. For this the Johannine writer, who has unhistorically transferred the cleansing to the beginning of the ministry, substitutes the raising of Lazarus. He begins and ends the ministry with an act of supreme power which, in the one case, reveals Jesus as the grand antithesis of Judaism and, in the other, seals his fate.

Of this sequel, however, he leaves us in no doubt. The miracle, as reported to the Pharisees, seals the doom of Jesus. The Pharisaic members of the Sanhedrin call a meeting of the Council.⁵⁷ Though it had on a previous occasion ordered his arrest (vii. 32) and its members had frequently taken part in public disputation with him, it

⁵⁷ xi. 46 f.

now meets, for the first time apparently, to decide how to put a stop to his dangerous activity. By his "many signs," Jesus bids fair to mislead the people into a revolt against the Romans, which would be fatal both to its corporate authority and to the nation. During the discussion its members are at their wits' end how to deal with this dangerous situation until the Sadducean high priest, Caiaphas,⁵⁸ gruffly suggests the only practical solution. He points out that the life of one man cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the common interest. "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people that the whole nation perish not"⁵⁹ at the hands of the Romans. Jesus must, therefore, be destroyed, and so the Council resolves.⁶⁰ "So from that day forth they took counsel that they might put him to death." In suggesting this solution, the writer sees, in his interpretative fashion, in the high priest, who so cleverly directs the Sanhedrin, the inspired, if unwitting prophet of the divinely ordained, redeeming death of the Christ, not merely for the Jewish nation, but for all believers, Gentile as well as Jew.

Jesus once more retires to escape the deadly design of his enemies—this time north-eastwards to Ephraim, towards the Judæan wilderness, and tarries there with his disciples till shortly before the Passover, when he reappears at Bethany, whither the Synoptic narrative finally brings him, by way of Jericho.

The controversy with "the Jews" depicted in these five chapters has undoubtedly an historic basis. It is vouched for by the Synoptic narrative, of which the author has to a certain extent made use.⁶¹ In as far as it relates to law and

⁵⁸ The writer calls him "the high priest of that year," meaning not, as some have inferred, that he held the office, which was not an annual one, only for a year, but that he held office in that fateful year. The phrase thus does not betray ignorance on the part of the writer.

⁵⁹ John xi. 50.

⁶⁰ The writer is here in disagreement with the Synoptists, who put the resolution two days before the Passover (Mark xiv. 1).

⁶¹ On his use of the Synoptics, see, for instance, E. F. Scott, "The Fourth Gospel," 32 f. (1906); Carpenter, "The Johannine Writings," 227 f.; Bacon, "The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate"; Streeter, "The Four Gospels," 395 f.; Stanton, "Gospels as Historical Documents," iii. 214 f. The conclusion of recent discussion is that the writer of the Fourth Gospel knew and used Mark, and to some extent Luke, but not Matthew. I hesitate to differ on such a point from such expert critics as

practice and also to the issue arising out of Jesus' Messianic claims and his spiritual standpoint, it may be accepted as a complementary source. At the same time, the author has overlaid this controversy with later theological belief about Jesus, which entered into the controversy between Jew and Christian in his own time. The Jesus of this controversy is, accordingly, to a large extent the Jesus of his own Christian experience and of later Christian belief about him. The supernatural is greatly heightened. His pre-existence, his equality with God, are explicitly asserted. The person of the divine Christ is in the foreground. The disciples do not share in his healing power, nor are they sent to evangelise on their own account. The developed universalism of the Gospel as a world religion is reflected back from the early Catholic Church to the primitive community. The interpretative symbolism of the writer receives full play in the attempt to read the facts of the present into those of the past. In this respect he has far outrun his Synoptic predecessors. We miss the message of the kingdom, the homely parable, the more concrete popular personality, the characteristic association with publicans and sinners, the right human traits of the Galilean prophet who shares to the full the life of the common people, the coming again in person instead of through the Spirit, etc. Instead, the emphasis is on the supernal being who descends from heaven, is concerned mainly to vindicate his divine origin and rank, and becomes at times an apparition. The style and character of the narrative only occasionally resemble those of the Synoptics. In general the difference is striking. Even making allowance for the mysterious element in the Synoptic narrative, the difference cannot be explained away by saying, for instance, that the circumstances in which Jesus was placed at the centre of Judaism demanded a different message and manifestation. Jesus might adopt a different line of argument in speaking to "the Jews"—the learned representatives of Judaism at Jerusalem—from that employed by him in speaking to Galilean peasants. But he is also

Bacon, Streeter, and Stanton. But my impression is that he knew and used Matthew as well as Mark and Luke. See the comparison of passages in Chapter VII., Section II., of this work,

found addressing the local scribes and Pharisees in Galilee, yea even those who come from Jerusalem to hear him, and both the style and content of his address differ substantially from those of the Johannine controversy in the temple. We are certainly warranted and indeed bound to hesitate before accepting, let alone preferring,⁶² the Johannine account as exact history. The difference is a very real one, and we are strikingly reminded of this difference by the story of the woman taken in adultery, introduced by a strange chance from some primitive source into this Gospel (viii. 1-11) and bringing us at once into touch with the historic Jesus. It can only be explained from the personality and religious experience of the writer, and the lack of an adequate historic sense which allowed him to manipulate facts in accordance with his interpretative and apologetic purpose.

⁶² Among recent English writers who uphold its historicity to an extent which I am not prepared to admit, see Nolloth, "The Fourth Gospel," 110 f. (1925); Armitage Robinson, "Historical Character of St John's Gospel" (2nd. ed., 1929); Lord Charnwood, "According to St John." As an example of the extreme scepticism of some recent critics, see E. Meyer, "Ursprung und Anfänge des Christenthums," i. 322 f.: "Zu einer realistischen Schilderung ist eben der Verfasser ganz ungeeignet, und ein wirkliches, den irdischen Verhältnissen angepasstes Lebensbild will er garnicht geben," 325. He admits, however, that he made use of a special source in addition to the Synoptics.

CHAPTER VI

THE LAST DAYS AT JERUSALEM

I. THE ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH

ACCORDING to the Fourth Gospel, the Sanhedrin had already determined to compass the death of Jesus as a dangerous agitator and religious visionary whose continued activity, by provoking the intervention of the Roman Government, would prove fatal to them and the Jewish people.¹ According to the Synoptists, Jesus had already in Galilee divined his tragic fate at the hands of the religious authorities at Jerusalem, and had deliberately set out for the Holy City to face it, although the disciples had not fully grasped the fact. According to the Fourth Gospel, again, the pilgrims who had flocked to the city betimes from Palestine and beyond to consecrate themselves for the feast were eagerly mooting the question, before his arrival, whether he would dare to attend it. "What think ye," they ask one another dubiously, "that he will not come to the feast?" Would he appear in spite of the order of the chief priests and the Pharisees to all who should discover his presence to declare the fact? ²

They had not long to wait for an answer. About a week before the Passover (the Fourth Gospel says definitely six days), either on Saturday the 8th or Sunday the 9th of Nisan, Jesus was approaching the villages of Bethany and Bethphage, on the road from Jericho, on the eastern side of the Mount of Olives. According to the Fourth Gospel, he spent the night in Bethany, where the evening meal takes place and Mary anoints his feet with the most precious kind of ointment. According to the Synoptists, he first makes his public entry into the city before returning in the

¹ John xi. 47 f.

² John xi. 55-57.

evening to pass the night there.³ As a preliminary he sends two of his disciples into the village on the hillside opposite⁴ to fetch a colt tied to a certain house. Evidently he had prearranged this preliminary with the friendly owner, though this is not the impression conveyed by the Synoptists, who appear to regard the direction to the disciples as an instance of his miraculous prescience. The Fourth Gospel merely says that he found an ass's colt by the wayside, whilst agreeing with Matthew that the finding took place in fulfilment of prophecy, culled mainly from Zech. ix. 9, and applied to the coming of the pacific Messianic king in meekness, not in warlike array.⁵ As the result of his direction, the two disciples return with the colt, on which they place their cloaks and mount Jesus on it. He moves forward over the crest of the hill, preceded and followed by the pilgrims who have accompanied him from Jericho and spread their garments on the way and strew branches cut from the trees in the adjoining fields in honour of his royal dignity. On reaching the summit the pilgrim crowd gives vent alike to its religious aspiration and its enthusiasm in words drawn from the 118th Psalm, 25-26, which describes the entry of the long-looked-for saviour king through the open gates of the city. It both entreats salvation and acclaims the advent of the Messianic king who is at last to ensure it. "Hosanna; Save. Blessed in the name of the Lord he that cometh. Blessed the kingdom of our father David. Hosanna; Save now in the highest."⁶ Some critics⁷ doubt whether his followers saw in him the Messiah, and not rather the forerunner, the herald of the

³ Only Matthew (xxi. 17) states definitely that he returned to Bethany. Mark merely says that he went forth out of the city as he did every evening during his sojourn at Jerusalem (xi. 19). Luke does not say where he spent this or the other nights. The overcrowding of the city during the festival explains the necessity of seeking quarters outside it.

⁴ The name of the village is not given. It may have been either of the two places already mentioned, or a third one.

⁵ Matthew, by a misunderstanding of the passage, makes the disciples bring two animals instead of one.

⁶ Mark xi. 9-10. The meaning of Hosanna is "God save us," or "God save Israel."

⁷ Cadman holds that the crowd regarded him not as the Messiah, but as his forerunner. "Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem," 114 f. So also Warschauer, "Historical Life of Christ," 247 f. Their arguments do not seem to me conclusive.

Messiah and the approaching kingdom. The doubt seems to me unfounded. "He that cometh" is obviously the Messiah who is there to bring in the Davidic kingdom, and both Luke⁸ and John explicitly state what Mark and Matthew imply, that his followers acclaimed him as the Messianic king. Though Jesus himself did not so conceive his Messianic function, he accommodates himself to the popular belief on this occasion in order to force the issue over his claim with the religious authorities at Jerusalem. The great day of deliverance has dawned. For the crowd the Lord's Anointed is about to enter His house, the temple, and set up his Messianic rule over His people. Anon, according to Luke, the Pharisees in the crowd, who regard him as merely a rabbi or teacher ("Master"), resent the demonstration and appeal to Jesus to silence these visionary adherents. Jesus, who has deliberately decided on this public proclamation of his Messiahship, sternly refuses to be moved from his purpose. "If these shall hold their peace, the very stones will cry out."

By this time the south-east corner of the city has come in view, and Jesus, according to Luke, is overcome to tears by the emotions which the sight of it and the thought of its lack of spiritual insight arouse within him. In the report of his utterance, Luke represents him not only as bewailing this lack of insight, but as forecasting its future siege by the Romans and its attendant horrors.⁹ Matthew, on the other hand, places the lament at a later stage of his sojourn as the culmination of a series of woes pronounced on the scribes and Pharisees,¹⁰ and omits this definite prediction which Luke seems to have ascribed to him *post eventum*. The writer of the Fourth Gospel diverges from the Synoptic narrative in making the crowd of pilgrims, who had already arrived in Jerusalem, go out from the city with palm branches in their hands, to meet and acclaim him on the descent from the Mount of Olives. In the Synoptists, on the other hand, the applauding multitude has come with him from Jericho. The reason given by the former for this

⁸ Luke xix. 38; John xii. 13.

⁹ xix. 41-44.

¹⁰ xxiii. 37. Luke has already given this form of it in an earlier connection.

act of homage is the raising of Lazarus, of which they have heard from those who had witnessed this supreme miracle. For the writer, as we have noted, this is the dominating fact of the situation. It explains both the deadly enmity of the chief priests and Pharisees and the plaudits of the crowd. In the Synoptists there is no trace of this dominating fact. They see in the acclamation the spontaneous act of homage of his pilgrim followers. Matthew tells us, indeed, rather exaggeratedly, that on his entry "the whole city was stirred." Yet the mass of the population have apparently, according to this writer, never heard of his existence. "Who is this?" they ask the advancing procession. "This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee," is the answer of his followers.¹¹ The title "prophet" is rather surprising in view of their acclamation of him as the Messiah. If the passage is authentic, it is perhaps a relapse into the designation by which he was popularly known in his native Galilee. Or it may imply that he is the prophet who has now shown himself to be the Messiah.

According to the Synoptists, the procession ends in the temple, the appropriate objective of the Messianic king and his pilgrim followers. They differ as to what supervened on his arrival there. Mark tells us that he merely gazed round on the scene in the court of the Gentiles, and, it being eventide, retired with the Twelve to Bethany. This may seem a tame conclusion of the enthusiastic demonstration, and Matthew and Luke say that he proceeded forthwith to drive out the traffickers in the court. But Jesus never acts precipitately. He is always master of himself. He merely surveys the strange twilight scene with a view to prospective action, even at the risk of damping the ardour of the expectant crowd. Mark, with more probability, accordingly postpones the cleansing till the return on the following day, whilst the Fourth Gospel, which has transferred it to the beginning of the ministry, naturally ignores it here. The author, in fact, does not definitely bring him into touch with the temple during this last sojourn, though on the occasion of previous visits he locates the controversy between him and "the Jews" within its precincts. For

¹¹ Matt. xxi. 10-11.

him, in fact, the controversy between Jesus and the religious authorities at Jerusalem has already been fought out and his fate decided.

In what sense did Jesus thus accept the popular recognition of his Messiahship? Hitherto, except in converse with the disciples, he had shunned such recognition, because he did not share the popular conception of the Messiah. His own conception was the purely religious one, and his mission, apart from the special training of the disciples, had been to propagate by teaching and healing his spiritual message and win over the people to an understanding of it. So far, whilst gaining a considerable following in Galilee and the south, he had failed to effect the religious transformation for which he had striven from the beginning. Even the disciples, who had learned to recognise him as the Christ, found it impossible to divest themselves entirely of the current notion of Messiahship. Moreover, the failure of the religious leaders to appreciate his spiritual teaching and their insuperable antagonism and enmity had shown conclusively that, if he persisted in his purpose to establish the Messianic kingdom as he conceived it, he must inevitably become the victim of this antagonism and enmity. Hence the conviction that he must take upon himself the rôle of the suffering Messiah.¹² It was with this conviction that he deliberately chose to enter the city as the Messianic king and meet his fate in the firm faith that God would vindicate his cause in his death, if not in his life. The triumphant entry is not an acceptance of the Messianic kingship in the popular sense. It is a formal and spectacular demonstration to his enemies of his determination to settle the great issue between him and them in the centre of Judaism itself. Some have seen in the acceptance of the homage of these pilgrim followers not a mere proclamation of his Messianic kingship, as he understood it, but an attempt to win the support of the people against its religious leaders and vindicate his cause by the force of public opinion. The evidence does not lend support to this interpretation. Jesus had neither the desire nor the capacity to play the part of the popular

¹² Goguel inconclusively contends that Jesus did not come to Jerusalem to die, but to rally the people to his cause. "Jesus the Nazarene," 203.

Messianic king. His religious idealism made the failure of such an expedient a certainty. The moment he should seek to put it in practice, the pilgrim crowd would melt away in disappointment and disillusion. A spiritual kingdom cannot be established by parading through the streets and into the temple a shouting multitude who do not really comprehend what their leader stands for, and are shouting for the revived rule of their father David. Moreover, any attempt to go beyond the strictly religious sphere would inevitably compromise him with the Roman Government and play into the hands of his enemies. As it was, it was highly risky to accept, even in form, the homage to the Messianic king. Jesus only did so, and could only do so, as a proclamation of his claim to this kingship in the religious sense. He could in all sincerity disclaim any intention of playing a political part. He may himself have had in mind the prophetic passage from Zechariah which Matthew and the Fourth Gospel apply to his triumphal entry, though, according to the latter, it was only after his death that it occurred to the disciples to see in the event the fulfilment of the prophecy.¹³ If so, it had for him no political implication. For him the triumphal procession into Jerusalem was a ride to a cross, not to a crown.

Next morning he returns to the city, and on the way, feeling hungry, symbolically apostrophises the fig tree, which is found to bear leaves, but no fruit. The apostrophe is evidently a reflection on the barrenness of the Jewish religion, which tradition has transformed into what sounds like the petulant outburst of one who expects to find fruit wherewith to appease his hunger, and in his vexation curses the tree. The incident in this sense is entirely at variance with the character of Jesus, who, in the earlier Lukan parable of the fig tree in the vineyard, represents the vine-dresser as entreating the owner to give it another year's respite. Neither the curse, nor the miracle which results from it—the withering of the tree—is historical. The barrenness seems rather to have suggested to Jesus that of the false religiosity of the Pharisees, and it seems to be this, not the tree, that he imprecates. At all events, the fact that the

¹³ John xiii. 16.

recorders disagree in their accounts of the incident does not tend to induce belief in the literal accuracy of what is recorded. Whilst Mark says that they found the tree withered on the following morning,¹⁴ Matthew tells us that it withered away the moment the curse was uttered.¹⁵ The exhortation to have faith in God—the faith that could figuratively remove mountains—which the evangelists connect with the incident, seems, indeed, appropriate to the working of a miracle. But the exhortation consorts ill with a miracle of this kind, which suggests magic rather than the power of faith in God. It is, moreover, probable that the saying on the power of faith, which is also given by Matthew in a previous and more credible connection,¹⁶ is out of its proper setting here.

The cleansing of the temple, which took place on this second visit, appears in the Synoptists as the grand factor in deciding his fate. If the triumphant entry proclaims his Messianic vocation, the cleansing is an unmistakable exercise of his God-given authority. Was the daring act prophetic or Messianic? Was it inspired only by the moral indignation of the prophet, or did it imply the sovereign right of the Son of Man in his Father's House? The alternative is unnecessary. The daring act expresses both aspects of his ministry as prophet and Messiah, is, in fact, the culmination of his vocation in both its aspects. This mercenary traffic in the sacrificial animals revolts his exalted moral sense as a travesty of true religion. It outrages his instinctive sense of spiritual values. It is also a challenge to exercise his authority as Messiah, which really rests on the basis of his elevated moral and spiritual nature, rather than on a mere belief. It is this that invests his action with such a commanding power and awes these mercenary traffickers into instant retreat. "Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations? But ye have made it a den of robbers."¹⁷ An act of moral indignation, indeed, but also an act of authority, higher than, independent of

¹⁴ Mark. xi. 19 f.

¹⁵ Matt. xxi. 19.

¹⁶ Matt. xvii. 20-21; cf. Luke xvii. 6.

¹⁷ Mark xi. 17. Warschauer's notion that he cleansed the temple merely to excite a riot and bring about his death in the course of it is too fantastic to be taken seriously. "Historical Life of Christ," 258.

that of the Sanhedrin, to which it was a direct challenge. For this traffic had the sanction of the chief priests and scribes—the members of the Sanhedrin, who sold the licences to trade in the temple court, and were thus implicated in the desecration of God's House.¹⁸ This daring assertion of his authority, not the raising of Lazarus as in the Fourth Gospel, of which the Synoptic writers know nothing, is the unspeakable enormity that whets the determination of the chief priests and the scribes to destroy him.

Other factors contribute in a secondary degree. These writers mention in connection with it his teaching, by which the multitude is deeply impressed. "The people all hung upon him, listening as he daily taught in the temple," says Luke.¹⁹ Matthew, though somewhat confused in his chronology, is a little more circumstantial. Jesus not only cleanses the temple. He heals the blind and the lame, who come thither to him. The children continue the shout of "Hosanna the Son of David!" within the sacred precincts, and the chief priests and the scribes, who are present and see for themselves the wonders wrought by him and hear the shouts, are unable to repress their indignation. "Hearest thou what these are saying?" Jesus answers them with a quotation from Ps. viii., "Yea, did ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise?" The incident may, like the chronology, be a pictorial touch to make up for the lack of exact information. It is hardly likely that the children would thus presume to offend against the decorum due to the sacred place. Such a demonstration would at once have been suppressed by the captain of the temple, whose office it was to maintain order within its precincts. The incident looks like a transformed version of the appeal of the Pharisees to Jesus to silence the acclaiming multitude descending from the Mount of Olives. At all events, all three Synoptists agree in emphasising the effect of this supreme act of authority on both the people and their religious superiors. The people are on the side of Jesus.

¹⁸ Klausner holds that there is no evidence that the priests shared in this traffic. He admits, however, that the Sadducees—the priestly aristocracy—may have permitted it. "Jesus of Nazareth," 313-314.

¹⁹ xix. 47-48.

The chief priests and the scribes are his deadly enemies, and but for their fear of the people would forthwith have arrested him. "And the chief priests and the scribes heard it and sought how they might destroy him, since all the multitude was astonished at his teaching."²⁰

Their striving to bring about his destruction was natural enough. The action of this dangerous agitator was a direct defiance of their authority, and could only end in subverting the recognised religious order, and with it their power as the guardians of this order. But in view of his influence over the multitude, they are obliged to walk warily. Jesus, as we learn from the Fourth Gospel, was no stranger in the Holy City and had a number of adherents there as well as a strong following among the pilgrims from Galilee and other parts of Palestine. His public entry and his daring assumption of Messianic authority meant more than a mere histrionic gesture. Behind it were the goodwill and the genuine interest of a large and growing body of sympathisers, if not actual disciples. As in the case of John the Baptist, the multitude is for Jesus and against his opponents. A precipitate attempt to arrest him, even if they had had a sufficient force at their disposal, which they had not, would probably provoke a revolt against their authority. The crowd instinctively responds to a magnetic personality and sides with the man who dares to challenge an authority, which it does not relish and which is implicated in the nefarious trade of these traffickers, who take advantage of the feast days to extort from the people as much as they can.

II. FINAL ENCOUNTER WITH RELIGIOUS LEADERS

The writer of the Fourth Gospel not only omits the cleansing of the temple, which he has placed at the outset of the mission. He omits the long and dramatic sequel, extending over several days, during which Jesus is at grips with the religious leaders in a series of encounters with them or their emissaries. He has already devoted a number of chapters to this controversy on the occasion of previous

²⁰ Mark xi. 18.

visits to Jerusalem, and therefore ignores this, for the Synoptists, supreme and decisive conflict. During the days that follow the entry and the incident of the Greeks, Jesus remains in hiding (xii. 36), only to reappear on the evening before the Passover (xiii. 1). Veritably an astonishing divergence from the Synoptic record, which assuredly does not tend to enhance our confidence in his method of treating history.

According to the Synoptists, the cleansing of the temple led the Sanhedrin to send a deputation, consisting of elders as well as chief priests and scribes, to question him on his credentials. They accosted him "as he was walking in the temple court," according to Mark; "as he was teaching," according to Matthew and Luke. "By what authority doest thou these things, or who gave thee this authority?"¹ The question is hardly a genuine attempt to ascertain the truth, though as the supreme authority in matters religious they were quite entitled to ask it. It is rather a device to obtain some admission that would compromise him in the eyes of the Roman Government. Jesus parries the question by asking another: "The baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men?" If they will give him an answer to this question, he will tell them by what authority he so acts. The device was not a mere quibble to evade a direct answer. On the supreme issue put to him, Jesus was ready to declare himself, as the public entry had proved. But he must first be assured of their credentials before explaining his. Are you, he virtually asks them, fitted and prepared to recognise moral and spiritual authority when you see it, or are you not? If your answer to my counter-question proves that you are, I will disclose to you my authority. If it does not, I will not recognise your right to question me on such a subject. Moreover, the question was a test of their honesty as well as their capacity. If they gave a straightforward answer and replied, "From men," they would rouse the ire of the people, who had regarded John, and still regarded him, as a heaven-sent prophet. If they answered, "From heaven," they would expose their own inconsistency, since they had opposed the Baptist, as they were now opposing Jesus. "And they reasoned with

¹ Mark xi. 28; Matt. xxi. 23; Luke xx. 2.

themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven, he will say, Why then did ye not believe him? But should we say, From men, they feared the people, for all verily held John to be a prophet." ² From the dilemma they sought to extract themselves by a subterfuge, which both proved their incapacity to sit in judgment on Jesus and their dishonesty in dealing with the question put by him: "We know not." They got the answer they deserved: "Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things." ³

In the parable of the wicked husbandmen, which he addresses and applies to them, he does indirectly answer their question. ⁴ The owner of a vineyard rents it out to husbandmen and sends in due season a series of servants (the prophets) to receive his portion of the produce. These servants the husbandmen successively beat or kill, and at last the owner sends his beloved son, who thus comes invested with the Father's authority. Him also they slay in order that they may take possession of his inheritance. In so doing they ensure their own destruction at the hands of the owner of the vineyard, who will surely come himself and destroy them and give it (the kingdom of God) to another. ⁵ "God forbid!" ejaculate the representatives of the Sanhedrin at the thought of so incredible a calamity. Whereupon Jesus asks them whether they have not read in Ps. cxviii. that the stone which the builders rejected has become the corner stone, and proclaims the terrible fate of those who shall thus reject it. According to Matthew, he in conclusion discarded the figurative language of the Psalmist and plainly declared that "the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." ⁶

The parable was only one of a number illustrative of the same theme, of which Matthew gives two additional examples—that of the two sons whom the father requested

² Mark xi. 31-32.

³ Mark xi. 33.

⁴ In Mark and Matthew the parable is addressed directly to them; in Luke to the people, apparently in their presence.

⁵ In Mark and Luke Jesus himself speaks the prediction in answer to his own question. In Matthew it is given, with less probability, by the members of the Sanhedrin themselves.

⁶ xxi. 43. The prediction is quite in the manner of Jesus, and is not necessarily a later Christian reflection.

to work in the vineyard, and that of the king's invitation to the marriage feast of his son and the fate of the unbidden guest.⁷ The first illustrates the repentance of the son, who first refuses and then, bethinking himself, complies with the will of the father, whilst the other son, seeming to consent, fails to implement his promise. "Verily I say unto you that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."⁸ The second parable illustrates the truth that many are called, but few are chosen.⁹ Jesus evidently had a true presentiment of the fate that would overtake his race in consequence of their rejection of him. The chief priests and scribes and elders, in plotting to destroy him, are guilty of gross blindness and are acting against the true interest of the nation. They are more concerned to preserve their own régime than with this interest. Like so many leaders in the hour of crisis in the history of nations, they take the wrong decision at the decisive moment, because they have no real vision. Jesus had real vision, even if he appears to them as a mere visionary. In contrast to their narrow egotism, he has a true insight into the things that really matter, and on the appreciation of which the destiny of nations depends. Had his opponents accepted his spiritual conception of the Messianic kingdom, had they renounced the will-o'-the-wisp of a political Messiah, there would have been no disaster, either political or religious, such as he truly forebodes.

Worsted in this encounter, they are the more determined to compass their purpose. Whilst withdrawing behind the scene, they employ spies to dog his footsteps and entrap him in his teaching.¹⁰ To this end they seek to obtain from him a declaration of a directly political nature which will enable them to accuse him of sedition against the Roman Government. According to Mark, who is supported by Luke,¹¹ they make use of the Pharisees and the Herodian party, who had already in Galilee combined to plot his

⁷ xxi. 28 f.; xxii. 1 f.

⁸ Matt. xxi. 31. The application of verse 32 to the parable is not very apparent, and the verse, whilst containing a genuine utterance of Jesus, seems to be out of its proper setting.

⁹ xxii. 14.

¹¹ Mark xii. 13; Luke xx. 19-20.

¹⁰ So Luke xx. 19-20.

undoing, though they were keenly opposed in both politics and religion. According to Matthew, this attack originates with the Pharisees, with whom the Herodians co-operate.¹² The question on this occasion concerns the political issue, and it is craftily preceded by a hypocritical compliment to Jesus' fearless love of truth. Would he, therefore, inform them whether it is lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not? The paying of taxes involved the recognition of sovereignty, even if the sovereign were an alien. Where his money circulates, there his rule is admitted. The object of the question was too apparent to deceive the simplest. But the answer called for the utmost wariness, and Jesus shows a rare resource in disarming their purpose. He asks them to produce a denarius (equivalent to about 10d.) and, pointing to the image and the name of the Emperor (Tiberius) stamped on it, tells them to render unto the Emperor the things that are his, and to God the things that are God's. The answer is both skilful and straightforward, though it baulks their purpose. His Messiahship had absolutely nothing to do with Cæsar's rule, except from the moral standpoint. He recognises the Roman Government as the actually established authority. He has no interest in or appreciation of political liberty, since for him the kingdoms of the earth are for the present under the rule of Satan. He does not ask what right the Roman Government had to subjugate other peoples and hold them in submission by force, though its rule, being under the influence of Satan, is by implication condemned on moral grounds. The existing régime is, nevertheless, legitimate, even if it be an alien one and grate on national feeling. In this respect his outlook on life is circumscribed by his otherworldly theory of it. This theory has no place for civic rights except in as far as righteousness, the highest conception of moral duty, applies to all human conduct and ought to tell in every human sphere. His mission, though directed to his own nation, was, in principle, and as it actually developed, more than a national one. It was concerned with truths of universal scope and application, with the founding of the kingdom of God, not the vindication of an earthly kingdom. Nationalism in the

¹² xxii. 13-14.

ordinary sense and in the existing situation would have been a hopeless handicap to his mission as a religious teacher. Even as it was, in its popular Messianic form, it was constantly obtruding itself as the main obstacle to a right understanding of his spiritual message. His answer, involving the recognition of existing political authority, was in truth the only feasible alternative. Revolt against the Roman Government would have rendered his mission as a religious teacher impossible and, as he foresaw, would ultimately render disaster to the nation inevitable. In this modern age of raging nationalism, which has periodically drenched the world in blood, it is not without a poignant interest that the greatest of religious teachers calmly ignored it.

Another important party—that of the Sadducees—next appears on the scene. Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees, who represent divergent currents of thought and tendency, converge in their antagonism to Jesus, whilst “the multitude,” which represented the current expectation of a restored Davidic kingdom, though ready to espouse his cause, fail to understand it. The teaching of the Sadducees had some affinity to his in respect of their opposition to the elaborate legalism of the scribes and Pharisees. But their denial of the resurrection doctrine, in which they also differed from the Pharisees, as well as their aristocratic aloofness from the people, with whom Jesus identified himself, ranged them on the side of the opposition. In their case, too, the motive of their query on the resurrection¹³ is underhand and unfriendly. The motive is not so much to score against their rivals, the Pharisees, or to seek fresh light on the subject, as to discredit a doctrine, which he holds in common with the Pharisees, and, with it, his authority as a religious teacher. The very subject proposed for discussion seems to have been a current topic of debate between them and their rivals, the Pharisees. It concerned the successive marriage, in accordance with Deut. xxv. 5-6, with the same woman of seven brothers, each of whom dies without leaving offspring, and the concluding question, “Whose wife will she be at the resurrection?” is suggestive of flippancy and fitted to excite the ridicule of the crowd. In any case, any possible

¹³ Mark xiii. 18 f. ; Matt. xxii. 23 f. ; Luke xx. 27 f.

answer, on their assumption that present conditions must continue in the future life, could only tend to make the doctrine, and, along with it, Jesus himself, appear ridiculous in the eyes of the bystanders. In reply, he both outwits them and gives the sequel a serious turn. He attacks the current belief in the identity of the conditions of the present and the future existence, on which their assumption is based, and in doing so shows that the hypothetical dilemma is non-existent. He tells them that they neither understand Moses nor comprehend the power of God. In the life to come, such relations do not apply. They cease with death. The spiritual state will be utterly different from the current gross conception of it. Moreover, as to the doctrine itself, Moses does teach the resurrection. Is it not written in the Book of Exodus, "I am the God of Abraham," etc.? The evidence is not necessarily convincing, since the implication of the resurrection is not strictly deducible from the passage quoted. What the saying conveyed to Moses was the fact that the God speaking to him was the God of his fathers. But the further inference, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," is more forcible, considered as a general principle on which the argument for belief in a spiritual existence is based. The doctrine of immortality, which the resurrection in the spiritual sense—the sense in which Jesus holds it—involves, follows axiomatically from the nature of God. God, as Jesus conceived Him, being the eternal and beneficent Father of His children, cannot allow man, whose life is derived from, and dependent on Him, to perish.

According to Mark, the answer made such a deep impression on one of the scribes that he raised the currently discussed question—evidently with a genuine desire for enlightenment—"Which is the first of the commandments?" Matthew concurs in noting the incident, while Luke ignores it. But Matthew differs from Mark, probably wrongly, in imputing a hostile motive to the questioner. Jesus answers by quoting the passage from Deut. vi. 4-5—used at the beginning of morning and evening prayer in the temple¹⁴—emphasising the unity of God and the obligation

¹⁴ The Shema. See "Pirké Aboth" ("Sayings of the Jewish Fathers," translated by Oesterley), 26.

to love Him above all. The answer, while containing nothing new, counters the Pharisaic notion that every part of the Scripture—the ceremonial as well as the moral precepts—is of equal value. Though some of the scribes realised the falsity of this notion, Jesus is the first effectively to vindicate the opposing principle of the supremacy of the spiritual and ethical, as against the formalist element in religion. According to all three evangelists, he had previously given a substantially identical answer in the course of the southern mission. The version given on this occasion is not necessarily a doublet, since the form of the question is different and the subject was a favourite topic of discussion. In his reply, Jesus goes beyond the question and emphasises the second commandment as well as the first—love to God and man as the essence of the whole law. The scribe agrees, and adds that love is much more than burnt-offerings and sacrifice. His reasoning showed him to be a man after Jesus' own heart. "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God."¹⁵

Jesus had emerged scathless from this final encounter with his antagonists. His resource as a teacher and his quick insight had baffled these attempts to ensnare him. They had been made to feel their inferiority in the presence of this idealist, whom they took for a fanatic agitator. In spite of their specious subtlety, he had reduced them to silence and had compelled them to wonder. "And they marvelled greatly at him. And no man after that durst ask him any question."¹⁶ In the course of his teaching in the temple—not necessarily in connection with these encounters—it occurs to him to put to them a question. It, too, is of the character of a puzzle in the rabbinic style, though it is evidently not meant to secure an advantage in mere word-play.¹⁷ It is meant rather to insinuate his own Messianic claim and, if possible, win them from the more material conception of the Messiah. "How say the scribes that the Christ is the Son of David?" How can this be in the face of Ps. cx., which he, like them, regards as Messianic?

¹⁵ Mark xii. 28 f.; Matt. xxii. 34 f.

¹⁶ Mark. xii. 17, 34.

¹⁷ In Matthew the question is addressed to the Pharisees directly; in Mark to the people, but with particular reference to the scribes.

“The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.” David, in the passage quoted, speaks of the Messiah as his lord, and how then, asks Jesus, can he be his Son? The answer, which he suggests, but does not give, can only be that the Messiah must be one who has another title to honour than that of mere earthly kingship. He may, nay must, be destined to wield a dominion of a very different nature and sanction.¹⁸

“The great crowd,” the common folk (ὁ πᾶσις ὄχλος), from far and near appreciated this reasoning at the expense of the legal pundits. They “heard him gladly.”¹⁹ Its force is, however, not so patent to the critical reader. It rests on the belief that David, inspired by the Holy Spirit, actually wrote the Psalm, and this current belief was almost certainly unfounded. The Psalm belongs to a much later period, and the writer of it figures the exalted personage in whom the Messianic idea had been incorporated, as in the Book of Enoch, at the time at which he wrote. To him the writer looks for the salvation of Israel, whose enemies God Himself will reduce to submission under his rule. The reasoning, as far as David is concerned, is thus faulty. It only shows that Jesus, not David, had, in accordance with the higher development of Messianic thought, conceived of the Messiah in a different light from those who wrongly conceived him to be a warrior king of the line of David, and overlooked the more idealist aspect of him. Thus the Messiah, it is suggested, might be one whom they wot not of—the Son of Man, even the rejected Son of Man, whom God had sent to achieve His purpose in His own, if not in their way.²⁰

Mark, and Luke who copies from Mark, briefly recount a concluding outburst against the scribes.²¹ Matthew adds the Pharisees²² and elaborates the attack which Luke has

¹⁸ Mark xii. 36-37; Matt. xxii. 47 f.; Luke xx. 41 f. The incident is not necessarily meant to deny his own descent from David, but indirectly to teach that the Messiah is a different figure from what they conceive him to be.

¹⁹ Mark xii. 37.

²⁰ On the critical question raised by Jesus' use of the passage from Ps. cx., see Gould, “Commentary on Mark,” 234-236; Blunt, “St Mark,” 233-234.

²¹ Mark xii. 38 f.; Luke xx. 45 f.

²² xxiii. 1 f.

introduced, in part, in a previous setting, in connection with the southern mission. This addition culminates in the lament over Jerusalem which, again, Luke has assigned to an earlier occasion. The outburst, after this series of attempts to ensnare and discredit him, is sufficiently explicable. Jesus had once more been made to realise their inveterate antagonism and enmity and the impossibility of winning their acceptance of his spiritual message. He treats them as hopelessly blind and dishonest perverters of religion, and in scathing language denounces them to the crowd. This public exposure in the very centre of Judaism further explains the bitter hatred with which they pursue him even unto death. It is followed by the touching story of the widow, whom he observes furtively casting her last two mites into the temple treasury among the crowd of rich contributors, whose gifts cost them nothing, while she has given her all. The incident shows, in touching fashion, the transition from strong indignation to tender feeling in which the rich individuality of Jesus frequently expressed itself. It discloses, too, the quick eye that can read character and conduct even of the most unobtrusive kind. "And he called unto him his disciples and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, this poor widow cast in more than all they who are casting into the treasury. For they all did cast in of their superfluity, but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living."²³

With this incident the public activity of Jesus at Jerusalem closes. It had lasted at least three days, including the day of entry. The second and third of these he had spent teaching and discussing in the temple, retiring each evening to spend the night at Bethany.²⁴ The writer of the Fourth Gospel, who is silent on the sequel after the entry into Jerusalem, knows of only one additional incident—that of certain Greek proselytes who have come to worship at the feast and would see Jesus. They make known their desire to Philip, who in turn informs Andrew, and both tell Jesus. These disciples, as having Greek names, are made the

²³ Mark xii. 41 f.; Luke xxi. 1 f.

²⁴ Mark xi. 11, 19; xiv. 3; Matt. xxi. 12-16; xxvi. 6; Luke xix. 47; xx. 37-38.

appropriate vehicle of communication. The reader eagerly looks for an account of the interview which, if it had really occurred, would have been a precious historical moment in his career as teacher. But the writer, in his elusive manner, ignores the sequel in which we are so keenly interested. The Greeks appear only to disappear, and their appearance is merely a device to enable him to set forth against the unbelieving Pharisees of his own day the apologetic for the death of Jesus, current in the Græco-Roman world, and the conquering march of Christianity in spite of the tragedy of Calvary. "Behold," exclaim the Pharisees at the end of the preceding paragraph, as they eye the crowd advancing from the city to acclaim him, "the world is gone after him!" Jesus, accordingly, without entering into converse with these Greeks, expatiates, in words partly borrowed from Synoptic material, on the Cross as the manifestation of his glory and that of the Father, as it was being preached in the author's own time. "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified." ²⁵ As in the Synoptists, it is only through death that true life is attainable, and though there is a momentary shrinking from the prospect (the author's minimised substitute for the scene in Gethsemane), the resolution to face the terrible ordeal prevails. "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say. Father, save me from this hour. But for this cause came I to this hour. Father, glorify Thy name." ²⁶ In order to enforce his apologetic the author dramatises the teaching of the Cross. As at the beginning of Jesus' public career, the Baptist receives the supernatural testimony that Jesus is the Son of God, so now a voice from heaven authenticates his mission as the suffering Son, who glorifies the Father in his death, as in his life. The scene depicted is at the same time a subtle reflection of the Transfiguration story, which in the Synoptists supervened on the communication to the disciples of his coming suffering and death. The thought of passing through death to true life, which he had undoubtedly, in his later period, sought to convey to their minds, becomes a direct revelation from heaven, audible to the multitude. "The multitude, therefore, that

²⁵ John xii. 23.

²⁶ John xii. 27.

stood by and heard it said that it had thundered. Others said, An angel hath spoken to him." ²⁷ Jesus does not explain which impression was correct, but tells them that the communication means the end of the reign of Satan, the prince of this world (another echo of the Synoptic teaching), and the beginning of his kingdom in the expanding Christian mission. "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth (on the Cross), will draw all men unto me." ²⁸ For the multitude this reasoning is enigmatic. A crucified Messiah? Unthinkable! Impossible! "We have heard out of the law (the Scriptures) that the Christ abideth for ever, and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" ²⁹ In reply, Jesus does not, as we should expect, refer them to the suffering servant of Isaiah, but merely tells them to walk in the light as long as it is there, and shun the darkness. He ends the discourse, in a section of the text which has evidently been displaced,³⁰ by loudly proclaiming his divine nature and vocation, and requiring faith in him as the light of the world and in his message as that of the Father. Thereupon he departs and hides himself from them, and the writer takes his place as speaker and seeks to show that the unbelief of the people in a suffering Messiah is in accordance not only with prophecy (Isa. liii. 1 f.), but with the will of God (Isa. vi. 9-10). Exceptions there are among the religious leaders, though they refrain from openly confessing their belief for fear of being put out of the synagogues.³¹

III. THE SON OF MAN

On leaving the temple for the last time, one of the disciples directs Jesus' attention to the magnificent structure.

²⁷ John xii. 29.

²⁸ John xii. 31-32.

²⁹ John xii. 34. The writer, to whom the multitude stands for the Jews of his own time, seems in these words to be reporting an actual tradition, since this is exactly what the multitude would ask on discovering that Jesus had no intention of playing the part of the deliverer in the popular sense.

³⁰ John xii. 44 f. Bacon thus puts this section, along with 41-43, back to before verse 36b. "Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate," 513.

³¹ John xii. 37 f.

“Master, behold what manner of stones and what manner of buildings!” His answer takes the form of a startling prediction. “And Jesus said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings. There shall not be left here one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down.”¹ On reaching the Mount of Olives the four chief disciples—Peter, James, John, and Andrew—question him about this prediction. “Tell us when these things shall be and what shall be the sign of their coming to pass.” In reply, Jesus, seating himself on the hill over against the temple, delivers an apocalyptic discourse, in which he imparts to them a fuller revelation than he had yet attempted of the last things as he conceives them, and reviews in lurid language the events leading up to the great consummation of the world’s history and the part he will play in it as the Son of Man. The drama begins with the appearance of many impostors coming in, *i.e.*, invoking his name and leading many astray. The disciples will hear of wars and rumours of wars—wars near and far—for nations and kingdoms will rise against one another and earthquakes and famines will occur. Though these calamities, which are not unusual, are the beginning of the Messianic woes (*ὀδύρων*), they do not denote the end of the present order, and they need not be unduly alarmed at them. They will, however, be exposed to persecution during this preliminary period at the hands of both Jews and Gentiles. They will be delivered up to Jewish tribunals and synagogues and beaten. They will be called on to testify before governors and kings throughout the Roman Empire, and will be exposed to the deadly enmity of relatives and hated of all men for his name’s sake. This persecution, which they are to endure without anxiety and fear, in reliance on God, who will surely help them, will be the inevitable result of the preaching of the Gospel, which must first be proclaimed to all nations. This will happen within their own lifetime, and only then will the end—the great climax of history—come. The sign of this climax is the appearance of “the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not.”² Then, indeed, will those

¹ Mark xiii. 1-2; Matt. xxiv. 1-2; Luke xxi. 5-6.

² Dan. xii. 11; *cf.* ix. 27; xi. 31.

disciples, who are in Judæa when the catastrophe takes place, have cause to fear. They are to flee forthwith to the mountains, without a moment's thought of their possessions. For the tribulation shall be such as has not been witnessed since the creation and never again shall be. Nay, if the Lord should not shorten these days, no flesh would be saved. But let them not believe the false Christs and prophets who will arise and work many signs and wonders in order, if possible, to deceive even the elect.

After this tribulation on earth, culminating apparently in the destruction of Jerusalem (though this is only explicitly stated in Luke), the end of the old order or æon will be followed by the inauguration of the new. There will be terrible portents in the heavens, described in the usual lurid terms of Hebrew prophecy, and then shall be seen the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory and sending the angels to gather the elect from the four winds—from the extremity of earth to the extremity of heaven. This tremendous manifestation will take place within the present generation and, as the budding fig tree portends the summer, the signs will be unmistakable, though the exact time is known to no one, not even the Son, but to the Father alone. But if uncertain, it will be sudden, like that of the absent householder who suddenly returns and mayhap finds his servants sleeping. The speaker is absolutely certain of the accomplishment of his prediction. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Hence the necessity of incessant watchfulness. "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch."

Whilst the version of the discourse given by Matthew so far substantially agrees with that given by Mark, he expands it into more than double the length by incorporating sayings which Luke has given in previous connections,³ and adding the parable of the ten virgins, which is peculiar to him, and that of the talents, which, according to Luke, was spoken at or near Jericho. He himself has already partly given the section on persecution in the charge on sending out the Twelve. Moreover, he concludes the discourse with a detailed and vivid description of the judg-

³ Luke xii. 37 f. ; xii. 42 f. ; xvii. 22 f.

ment of the nations by the Son of Man in his capacity as Messianic king on the throne of his glory. Whilst the idea of a judgment is borrowed from Jewish Apocalyptic, the passage transcends the conventional Apocalyptic in the moving humanity of the address of the exalted Jesus to the righteous, which contrasts with the terrible fate meted out to the unrighteous, who are cast into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.⁴ In Luke, on the other hand, the discourse occupies about the same space as in Mark. In general he also agrees with the Markan version. But, evidently drawing on his own knowledge of the event, he definitely refers to the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army, and omits the preaching of the Gospel to all nations, the gathering of the elect at the coming, the ignorance of its exact time, and the illustration of the absent householder, which he has already given in xii. 35 f.

In view of these variations, it is evident that, while the writers so far generally agree as to the content of the discourse, they cannot be regarded as reporting it exactly as Jesus spoke it. But if not verbally exact, may the short version of Mark be accepted as substantially giving the gist of what he said to the disciples as he sat on the Mount of Olives? It is based on the prediction of the future destruction of the temple. That he should have foreboded this event is not at all unlikely. His encounters with his opponents show that he was greatly their superior in insight into the tendencies of the time. The fanatic nationalist spirit, which the extremists mingled with religion, the obtuseness of the scribes and Pharisees and chief priests, who persisted in rejecting his spiritual message and his conception of a purely spiritual Messiah, could only end in provoking such a contingency as the discourse adumbrates. In the discourse itself there are undoubtedly echoes of what, especially after Cæsarea Philippi, he had repeatedly taught in his intercourse with the disciples. He had told them that the Son of Man must suffer, and that they, like him, would be exposed to persecution.⁵ He had spoken to them of the Son of Man coming in the glory of his Father with the holy

⁴ Matt. xxiv. and xxv.

⁵ Mark viii. 31 f.; ix. 13; x. 30, and parallels.

angels, and predicted that the coming would occur in the lifetime of some of those present.⁶ He had impressed on them the necessity of watchfulness in view of his return and the imminence of this event,⁷ and had warned them of the division and strife among relatives which his teaching would arouse.⁸ He had foretold the rejection of Israel from the kingdom,⁹ and spoken of the judgment of the Son of Man.¹⁰ He had warned them against false Christs who would appear before the day of the Son of Man, and of the terrible calamities that would herald this day. There is thus no need to invent a Jewish or Jewish-Christian Apocalypse, which the Synoptic writers are supposed to have incorporated in the discourse.¹¹ Such an Apocalypse is a mere assumption to explain the apocalyptic element which is supposed to have been alien to the thought of Jesus. On the contrary, the Synoptic Gospels contain evidence enough that his mind was steeped in Jewish prophecy and was not unfamiliar with later Jewish Apocalyptic, as exemplified in the Books of Daniel and Enoch. "The abomination of desolation" is plainly borrowed from Daniel, who apparently had in mind the altar erected to Jupiter in the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B.C. There is no substantial reason why Jesus should not have made use of this figure to denote the catastrophe to Judaism of which he had the presentiment. The conception of the Son of Man coming in the clouds is evidently also derived from Dan. vii. 13, plus, probably, the Book of Enoch. In Daniel, indeed, the phrase seems to denote not a person, but a personification of "the people of the saints of the Most High" (vii. 22 and 27), *i.e.*, Israel. In the Book of Enoch, on the other hand, the Son of Man has become an individual—the

⁶ Mark ix. 1.

⁷ Luke xii. 36 f.

⁸ Matt. x. 21 f.; Luke xii. 49.

⁹ Matt. viii. 11-12; Luke xiii. 27 f.

¹⁰ Matt. xiii. 41 f.

¹¹ So Keim, Weizsäcker, Weiffenbach, Wendt, and others. In his recent book, "The Revelation of St John," 158 f. (1920), Charles upholds this theory. This assumed Jewish-Christian Apocalypse is supposed to have been composed before the siege of Jerusalem, and its existence is thought to be referred to in Mark xiii. 14; Matt. xxiv. 15 ("Let him that readeth pay attention"). Luke omits. But the saying refers not to an Apocalypse, but to the previous phrase, "the abomination of desolation." See Plummer, "Commentary on Luke," 487-488.

Messiah in person¹²—and it is in this personal sense that Jesus apprehends the designation and applies it to himself. In the later period of his mission, at all events, as we have noted, he has definitely conceived of himself as the Son of Man, the Messiah in the transcendental sense, who is destined to come in the clouds as the judge of the world. With this conception he combines that of the Suffering Servant of Isa. liii., who must first be rejected and suffer for man's salvation before he can enter on his future vocation in the transcendental sense. In this case also he individualises the Suffering Servant, who in Isaiah stands for Israel, and applies the prophecy to himself, as is evident in a number of Synoptic passages, where he speaks of the Son of Man being "rejected," "set at nought," and giving his life as a ransom for "many."¹³ He thus not only individualised the designation in applying it to himself as Messiah, but imparted to it the idea of suffering which is alien to the later Jewish Apocalyptic and was to Jesus' contemporaries absolutely incomprehensible.

Jesus' conception of the Son of Man, as it ultimately takes definite shape in his later teaching, is thus a combination of Dan. vii. and Isa. liii., plus directly or indirectly the Book of Enoch—the suffering Son of Man who, through the Cross, is about to be exalted to the right hand of God, and shall come in the clouds to judge the world. Jesus has profoundly modified the conception of the apocalyptic Son of Man by imparting to it the idea of the Suffering Servant. In this he seems to have been absolutely original. The Daniel-Enoch conception is strikingly transformed in accord-

¹² See the passages in the Book of Enoch, translated from the Ethiopic version and edited by Charles (1912), to whom all students of Jewish Apocalyptic are deeply indebted. See also Appendix II., 306 f. So also Dalman, "Words of Jesus," 242 f.; Moore, "Judaism," ii. 333 f. (1927); Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 368 f.

¹³ Mark viii. 31; ix. 12; Luke ix. 22, compared with Isa. liii. 3 and Mark x. 45; xiv. 24; Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28, compared with Isa. liii. 12. Lukyn Williams controverts the conclusion that Jesus' conception of the Son of Man, or the Man, was in part derived from Isa. liii., and would substitute the Son of Man of Ezekiel in addition to Daniel and Enoch. "The Hebrew-Christian Messiah," 304 (1916). This contention is not at all conclusive. Jackson and Lake opine that Jesus did not derive the idea of the suffering Son of Man from Isaiah. It was imputed to him by his followers as an explanation of his Passion. "Beginnings," i. 381 f. Burkitt agrees, "Christian Beginnings," 35 f. I disagree.

ance with his personal experience, which now involved death as well as subsequent glory.

This combined conception he seems to have definitely appropriated in the later stage of his career. At all events, it is only then that it becomes distinctive in the Synoptic record, and it is rather hazardous to argue with Streeter¹⁴ that he had definitely conceived of himself as the apocalyptic Son of Man from the temptation onwards, or with Manson¹⁵ that he had already at his baptism identified himself with the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. Both conceptions, it seems to me, were only gradually developed in the face of the growing antagonism of the religious leaders, which pointed to the ultimate failure of his mission and his tragic fate, and led him to envisage his destiny as the Son of Man in the future transcendental sense. He is, indeed, as we have seen, represented, even in Mark, as using in two instances the designation "Son of Man" in the earlier period. But these instances are capable of bearing the Aramaic significance of man in the general sense,¹⁶ and in the case of the early more frequent use of the term by the other two evangelists, the chronology of the passages is by no means exact. In two instances, at least, Luke has substituted the Son of Man for the original personal pronoun as used by Jesus (*cf.* Matt. v. 11 with Luke vi. 22; Matt. x. 33 with Luke xii. 8), whilst an apocalyptic significance has, in some passages, been read by Matthew¹⁷ into original sayings which had no such meaning. Similarly, in regard to the conception of the Suffering Servant, the saying about the bridegroom being taken away, which appears to be early, is not Messianic, and may not be cited as evidence that at the beginning of his mission Jesus contemplated the contingency of his death at the hands of his enemies. Both conceptions seem, in fact, to have been gradually developed as the fruit of personal experience in the course of the mission.

On the other hand, it is, I think, unhistoric to eliminate, as Wellhausen and others have attempted to do, from the

¹⁴ "Foundations," 101 (1914).

¹⁵ "Christ's View of the Kingdom of God," 128 (1918).

¹⁶ See Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 378 f.

¹⁷ For instance, the saying in the Sermon on the Mount (vii. 22), which, in Luke, who seems to give the original form (vi. 46), has no such meaning.

later teaching of Jesus the suffering Son of Man conception as merely an imputation of the primitive Christian community. That Jesus held the eschatological ideas reflected in this discourse on the last things, and other utterances of the later period of the mission, appears to rest on a solid basis of authentic tradition. Both the theory of a Jewish-Christian Apocalypse largely interpolated into this discourse, and that which regards it and other eschatological sayings of Jesus as merely a reflection of the beliefs and aspirations of the primitive community, which the Synoptic tradition has transferred back to Jesus himself,¹⁸ seem to be unwarranted. Nor is there much force in the contention that in the Son of Man passages (with the exception of Mark xiv. 62) the term, which is used in the third person, denotes, not himself, but some one different from himself, and that the identification of the two comes from the same later source.¹⁹ In the light of Mark xiv. 62, the Son of Man of the discourse and other utterances fairly prove, I think, that he did use the designation in a personal sense. Equally questionable the view of Lietzmann that the Aramaic term for man (*Barnasha*), which the Greek translators wrongly rendered Son of Man, means and could only mean man in general, and that Jesus could not have used it as a distinctive title of the Messiah.²⁰ Dalman²¹ and others have shown that in the time of Jesus it was capable of conveying the Daniel-Enoch conception of the Messiah as well as that of man in the general sense. Even if he actually used the term "the Man," instead of the Greek form "Son of Man," he used it as an apocalyptic term applicable to himself. The evidence thus tends to show that he not only in the later period habitually used the term as a distinctive title of the Messiah, in the transcendental sense, but that he applied the title to himself as the divinely chosen instrument of the imminent climax in the world's history.

¹⁸ So Wellhausen, for instance, "Evangelium Marci," 107.

¹⁹ So, it would appear, Wellhausen, "Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien," 96-97 (1905). Jackson and Lake, who conclude that Jesus did not identify himself with the Son of Man, though he undoubtedly used the designation. "Beginnings," i. 374 f.

²⁰ "Der Menschensohn," 85 (1896).

²¹ Dalman, "Words of Jesus," 238 f.; Manson, "Christ's View of the Kingdom," 145 f.

The conclusion is strongly supported by the significant fact that the designation is used only in the sayings of Jesus himself, and is generally not applied to him in the other New Testament writings, except where his sayings are referred to.²² It may therefore be said to be distinctive of his later thought. If he had not left with the disciples the conception of himself as the transcendental Messiah who, after fulfilling his vocation as the suffering Messiah, would return in glory to judge the world, even in the lifetime of that generation, it is strange that the conviction should appear as a cardinal article of their faith immediately after his death, and that it should persist throughout the lapsing years in spite of hope deferred. Such a saying, for instance, that not even the Son knoweth the day or the hour of his return would certainly not have been ascribed to him, if it had not actually been uttered by him. The absolute confidence that his death and his mission, in spite of the unpromising situation in which he was placed, the crushing tragedy that now loomed so near, would not prove fruitless, that heaven and earth would pass away, but his word would never pass away, is no mere echo of a later apologetic. Moreover, the conviction of his future rôle as the glorified Son of Man was, we may say, a necessary and natural assumption from the psychological point of view. It explains the absolute confidence, the heroic persistence with which he faced death as the only alternative open to him in the face of the deadly antagonism of his enemies. Beyond the horror of the Cross is the vista of the glory of the exalted Son of Man, who will return in triumph to complete his divinely ordained mission in the inauguration of the new age, the divine reign whose foundation he has laid in the community of his disciples. The critics who would explain away this exalted hope and conviction as an anachronism have not understood the influence of this psychological factor, which so naturally fits the situation.

At the same time, it is also evident that later belief, as represented especially by Matthew, did tend to over-emphasise the eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus. Moreover, in regard to the discourse on the last

²² Dalman, "Words," 250-251, and others.

things in particular, all three evangelists have evidently to a certain extent edited it in the light of later Christian experience. Jesus assuredly did warn them of the persecution which would befall them, as it was befalling himself. But the details of it undoubtedly reflect the actual conditions of the later Christian mission, when the Gospel was expanding in the Græco-Roman world. If he had spoken about the preaching of the Gospel to all the world in this later sense, would Peter and James have dared to enter into controversy with Paul for freely doing so? Again, Luke has undoubtedly imparted to it, *post eventum*, the bird's-eye view of the Roman armies encompassing Jerusalem and the actual horror of the fall of the Holy City, and Matthew has enlarged it with matter that it does not seem to have embodied, though it may have been uttered on other occasions. In spite of such evidence of later editing, there is no real reason for questioning its substantial authenticity. There remains the further question, Did Jesus mean the discourse, especially the coming of the Son of Man, to be understood in a literal or in a spiritual sense? He undoubtedly to a certain extent spiritualised the current eschatology and lifted it out of the grosser sphere of popular thought. As we have seen, the kingdom whose coming he proclaimed from the beginning, was not the kingdom in the sense of the restored Davidic rule, but the kingdom in the moral and spiritual sense. Similarly, argue the Spiritualists, the kingdom and the coming in this discourse are to be understood in the spiritual, not in the literal sense. In support of the former alternative, we may adduce the fact that the signs of the end detailed in the discourse, if taken literally, seem to contradict a previous declaration of Jesus to the Pharisees, who, on asking a sign from heaven, received the retort that none shall be given to this generation.²³ They seem, too, to contradict another, also made to the Pharisees, in answer to the question when the kingdom of God cometh, that it cometh not with observation, but is within or among you.²⁴ Their object in asking for a sign was, however, merely to tempt or trap him, and Jesus had learned by this

²³ Mark viii. 11-13.

²⁴ Luke xvii. 20-21. "Among you" is the most probable meaning.

time to regard them as hopelessly at variance with him and his teaching and wilfully disposed to misinterpret and cavil at whatever he might say or do. Hence his curt retort, which implies that with people of this sort nothing further is to be done. Moreover, the eschatological teaching is esoteric—for the disciples, not for the crowd. Matthew and Luke add, in reference to the first saying, “except the sign of Jonah,” and if this is authentic, it refers, as Matthew expressly says, to the resurrection.²⁵ The second saying about the inwardness of the kingdom has reference to the kingdom in the ethical and spiritual sense. But in the observations which follow and are directed to the disciples, apparently after the Pharisees have withdrawn, there is an abrupt transition to the kingdom in the eschatological sense as a catastrophic event, which will suddenly supervene “in the days of the Son of man.”

It seems, therefore, rather questionable to argue, with Mr Gould and others, that the kingdom and the coming (Parousia), which Jesus here foretells, are not to be understood in the sense of an imminent, catastrophic divine intervention and a visible return in the clouds of heaven, but are figurative of the religious transformation which will be the result of the preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom in the ethical and spiritual sense in which Jesus preached it, and which the destruction of Jerusalem, typifying the fall of Judaism, will greatly facilitate.²⁶ The interpretation is attractive, if only in view of the difficulty of seriously accepting the fantastic and often crude phraseology and frame of thought of Hebrew prophecy and Apocalyptic. Such figurative, poetic, rhapsodic descriptions were, it is contended, only the Hebrew manner of describing any special providential intervention in the world's history, and are not to be taken literally. The coming in the clouds with great power and glory, in accordance with this Hebraism, is, for instance, not to be understood in the spectacular sense. It is merely the conventional Hebrew manner of expressing the fact that the moral and spiritual kingdom, of which Jesus is the king at the right hand of God, will be set up on earth, as it was in

²⁵ Matt. xvi. 4 ; xii. 40 ; Luke xi. 29.

²⁶ See, for instance, Gould, “Commentary on Mark,” 240 f.

the extension of Christianity throughout the Græco-Roman world. In support of this interpretation, the Spiritualists cite Christ's words to the High Priest, in the Matthæan version, "Henceforth, from this time onwards (*ἀπ' ἄρτι*), you will see the Son of man seated on the right hand of the Father and coming on the clouds of heaven."²⁷ The coming, that is, is being exemplified from then onwards in the spiritual presence and effective operation of the exalted Son of Man in the expanding Christian mission throughout the centuries. There is some force in this contention, and one would fain be persuaded of its cogency as an escape from the fantastic apocalyptic notion of a spectacular and catastrophic divine intervention in history. It is certainly preferable to the interpretation which, also accepting the authenticity of the discourse, contends that, whilst the part referring to the destruction of Jerusalem was fulfilled, the part predicting the end of the world, which it assumes was not to supervene on the destruction of Jerusalem, is still awaiting fulfilment.²⁸ This reasoning is at variance with the plain evidence of the discourse itself. It certainly contemplates both events, which were bound up with the actual situation, as taking place within the present generation.

As against the purely spiritual interpretation, however, the coming does seem to be a literal appearance of the transcendental Son of Man, accompanied by the angels, to accomplish the end of the present order of things within that generation. It is for this speedy and sudden climax that the disciples are to watch, even if its exact occasion is unknown. It is hardly, therefore, the gradual and indefinite religious transformation through Christianity that is predicted, though this is what actually supervened in the history of the Christian Church, and the spectacular

²⁷ Matt. xxvi. 64.

²⁸ See, for instance, Grandmaison, "Jésus Christ," ii. 299 f. (11th ed., 1929). He assumes that the phrase, "after that tribulation" (Mark xiii. 24), *i.e.*, the fall of Jerusalem, implies a long and indefinite period. The phrase by no means necessarily suggests this assumption. Matthew has "immediately after the tribulation." Luke does seem to contemplate an interval before the coming of the Son of Man ("Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," xxi. 24). But in the sequel "these things"—the Parousia as well as the destruction of Jerusalem—are to come to pass in this generation (Luke xxi. 31-32).

coming has proved an illusion. The Markan version of the answer to the High Priest, "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Power (the Almighty) and coming with the clouds of heaven,"²⁹ does seem to convey a definite coming. Nor is it such a gradual transformation that the early Christians looked for. What they awaited with intense longing and expectation was the actual return of Jesus, even if Paul and the Fourth Gospel ultimately discouraged and modified the current belief.

In any case, it is hazardous to seek to ignore or minimise the eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus in order to harmonise it with our modern standpoint. We thereby run the risk of modernising and thus distorting the historic reality. The conception of the kingdom in the ethical and spiritual sense is, indeed, very characteristic of the earlier teaching, and it appears in parables and sayings right onward to the end. But it is not the sole characteristic, though that of the kingdom in the eschatological sense only definitely emerges in the later phase. Jesus was undoubtedly an apocalyptic seer as well as a supremely great ethical and religious teacher, and he invests his own person with an apocalyptic, transcendental significance. He shares the Jewish conception of the future æon, or order of the world, in contrast to the present æon, or order. He is conscious of the supernatural part which he is destined to play in the grand transition from the one to the other. The agent of this transition is actually there in his person. The distinction which he makes in the answer to the question of the High Priest, "Art thou the Christ?" "I am, and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven," is not to be understood in the sense that the Christ on earth is only the designated or future Messiah.³⁰ It is rather between the actual suffering and the glorified Messiah. He is already actually the Son of Man, who will return in glory, and the return is evidently conceived as a visible phenomenon.³¹ He has discovered himself and has revealed himself in this capacity to his disciples, though

²⁹ Mark xiv. 62.

³⁰ J. Weiss, "Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes," 175.

³¹ Dobschütz, "Eschatology of the Gospels," 105 f.

the disciples do not realise all that this means to him, and there is something enigmatic in the way in which he speaks of the Son of Man. He makes, however, no secret to them of his belief in the transcendental end of the present order, which is near at hand, if not definitely fixed. The coming again will bring in the great climax of the judgment and "regeneration," or renewal of the world,³² the new heaven and earth, and he left this faith and hope to the disciples and the early community as an essential element of the religious life of his followers. Within this short interval the Gospel is to be preached, if not to all nations, at any rate to all within the compass of the Christian community in the time available. The mission of the disciples after his death is evidently to be rapid and comprehensive. With this conception is combined that of the kingdom in the ethical sense, which, on the other hand, is represented as a growth, a developing thing naturally expanding like the mustard seed into the great tree from a single and insignificant grain seed, or like the leaven that leavens the measure of meal in which it is hid. Unlike the coming in the eschatological sense, it is an unobtrusive process. Even so, it is not necessarily a lengthy one. Nor is the one really contradictory of the other, for the greatest stress is laid on the ethical and spiritual state of the believer as an indispensable condition of fitness for the new order of things that he will ere long come to inaugurate. Its basis is an ethical one, as also in the Jewish apocalyptic writings, in which the ethical and the eschatological are combined, and there is no real foundation for the contention of the ultra-eschatological school that Jesus is distinctively the exponent of the kingdom in the eschatological sense from beginning to end, and that ethics play only a transient and secondary part in his teaching.

According to this school, Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God was from the beginning solely the apocalyptic one. It was not for him a moral and spiritual rule to be established in the heart and life of his followers in the present—the reign of God and His righteousness in the nation and the world. It is a thing of the future, though it is near at

³² παλιγγενεσία, Matt. xix. 28.

hand, and his vocation as Messiah is concerned solely with the divine intervention in history, the divine transformation, of which he is to be the instrument. In its extreme form, as stated by Albrecht Schweitzer, the Gospel is eschatology or nothing. "Jesus as an historical personality is to be regarded, not as the founder of a new religion, but as the final product of the eschatological and apocalyptic thought of later Judaism."³³ His ethical teaching is merely "an interim ethic," only a temporary expedient for the realisation of the kingdom in the transcendental sense, not the cardinal and perennial element of his mission and his message as a religious teacher. It is entirely subordinate to the apocalyptic purpose of the visionary seer. Such a one-sided presentation of Jesus and his mission is assuredly not in accord with the record of his life, which Schweitzer professes exclusively to follow. Jesus was a supremely great moral and religious teacher as well as an apocalyptic seer, and his message is concerned with the revelation and inculcation of principles of religion and conduct which have an eternal validity and significance, apart from the apocalyptic colouring of his teaching. The Sermon on the Mount and the practical parables are assuredly not the utterances of a visionary apocalyptic, for whom the reality of the moral and spiritual life is lost in the haze of a fantastic future state. The kingdom of God and His righteousness are something to be realised in the present and in virtue of their own eternal moral value. His absorbing concern from beginning to end is to reveal the Father-God and to invite men to enter into a filial relation to Him and serve Him by doing His will in actual

³³ "Quest of the Historic Jesus," 230. J. Weiss and A. Schweitzer stressed a side of Jesus' teaching which had been too much undervalued or overlooked by the Liberal School of theologians. But they stressed it one-sidedly by ignoring or minimising the other side of the teaching—the ethical and spiritual—and Schweitzer erred most of all in making him a pure Apocalyptic. His error was as grievous as that of the Liberal School in making of Jesus purely a prophet and modernising too much his message. Schweitzer's book was overrated and "boomed" in England by the late Prof. Sanday, for instance, as an offset to the Liberal tendency in theology ("The Life of Christ in Recent Research," 1908). Its thesis has been subjected to sustained criticism during the last quarter of a century, and it has failed to commend itself to the more objective historian. As an example of a recent concise and cogent criticism in English, see Manson, "Christ's View of the Kingdom" (1918).

life. He teaches all through his mission an inward spiritual religion in opposition to the legalism of the scribes and Pharisees, and insists on this filial relation and this service as the great imperative of actual experience. In his mission of teaching and healing, which he prosecutes even to the end, he is concerned very practically in establishing an ethical and spiritual kingdom among men, different in essential respects from the religious system of official Judaism. Throughout this mission his distinctive striving is to improve the religious life of his people and elevate it and current religious thought to a higher moral and spiritual level. In view of this distinctive striving, is it reasonable to assume that he must always have thought and spoken from the eschatological standpoint and that from the outset he was the fully fledged eschatologist of the discourse on the last things? Granting that he knows himself, at least from the baptism and the temptation, to be the Messiah in some sense, is there no development about himself, his mission, his destiny throughout his active career? If he was exclusively the impassioned eschatologist from the beginning, is it not strange that there is so much in his teaching and his activity that is concerned with the present? Is the conviction of his Messianic suffering and death so definitely apparent from the outset, and not rather the fruit of the experience of the conflict with his opponents? Had he nurtured his mind in no other atmosphere than that of the later Jewish Apocalyptic? Even if he had, was not this literature concerned with ethic as well as Apocalyptic? Had he not certainly read the prophets with their magnificent ethic as well as their Messianic message, and did he not make it his mission to energise and establish their ethical and religious teaching? Even if he appears prominently as the herald of the kingdom and the instrument of its coming realisation, is it in strict accord with the historic reality to say that the kingdom is conceived solely in the eschatological and not in the purely ethical sense? Is it so certain, as Schweitzer and others contend, that we must discard this double aspect of it and displace the prophet by the Apocalyptic? A large part of his teaching is not eschatology or solely conditioned by the eschatological conception of

things, but the reflection of his own personal religious experience in communion with God and in contact with man and nature. What he does for the most part in the earlier period, and even unto the end, is to speak to men about the Father-God, seeking to bring them into living relation to Him as His children; making religion more spiritual, personal, experimental; pointing out the right way to serve Him; emphasising this service as the great imperative; rousing the intuition of God and divine things into a reality of experience; announcing the glad message of God's nearness and love and forgiveness, and illustrating it by his activity in continually doing good; seeking and saving the lost and healing their diseases—the Gospel in the actual sense. All this is included in the preaching of the kingdom, and it is of a distinctively spiritual and ethical rather than of an eschatological character. With it is combined the revelation of God's purpose in history, and especially in the later phase of the mission, his own part as actual, and not merely prospective, Son of Man in the realisation of this purpose. But to depict him solely in the light of the impassioned eschatologist—the Son of Man who lives and moves in a visionary world of the future—is to present us with a sublimated Jesus that we do not recognise in the Jesus of the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son, the Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount, who is an essential part of the Jesus of the Gospels.

At the same time, the Jesus of the Synoptic eschatology is also there, and we must take him along with the Jesus of the parables and the Sermon on the Mount. It will not do to spiritualise or explain him away by interpreting his eschatological teaching as purely figurative, or as the reflex of the primitive Christian consciousness thrown back over his life and teaching. Nor does it avail to cling to the assumption that, while the coming predicted by him is indeed a real visible coming, it has still to take place. The coming of the transcendental Son of Man to achieve the catastrophic transformation of the present æon, or order, is undoubtedly conceived as imminent. It is to take place within the present generation. It did not take place, and the attempt to modify it is already apparent in the

Fourth Gospel, though it persisted as an integral part of Christian belief and found expression in the so-called Apostles' Creed. This has proved to be one of the beliefs about man and the world and their history which Jesus shared with his contemporaries and which time and the advance of knowledge have left behind us as relics of a bygone mentality. It was but the transient phase of the faith of a supreme religious personality, derived from that of his age and doomed to perish as part of the husk in which he clothed the eternal moral and spiritual verities. The religious life of man, even of the highest type, has always something of dreamland in it, because of the irresistible tendency to humanise by seeking to visualise the unseen. "Not even the Son" may visualise the unseen realm with exact knowledge by reason of the limitation of humanity, in virtue of which we must perforce walk by faith, not by sight (2 Cor. v. 7). By reason, too, of the law of evolution, which seems to govern the process of the gradual enlightenment of the human race, whereby what is transient of the time spirit falls away, and only the eternal and the real in thought abide. "Jewish presuppositions," aptly remarks Dean Bosworth, "were merely the incidents of Jesus' religious experience, not its essential features."³⁴

Occasionally in history the reappearance of some great historic figure to inaugurate a reformation or a revolution of the existing state of things has been the aspiration and the expectation of a dissatisfied and disconsolate generation. Now it is an Elijah, now a Jesus, now a Barbarossa. Alas! it has always proved an illusion. The betterment of the world has never lain in this direction, but in the resort to practical effort under the inspiration of a lofty ideal or a great personality, whether past or present. In Jesus the lofty ideal and the supreme personality were combined, and in this sense he has often come to a world in need of his inspiring presence. Nay, he has ever been there, in greater or less degree according to the age, in the power of his spirit and his inspiring influence, through institutions or individuals, in the uplift of humanity. The kingdom of God, if not the Son of Man in person, has thus often "come

³⁴ "Life and Teaching of Jesus," 230 (1926).

with power " in the life of the Christian community and the individual Christian. And the coming even in this sense is still a contingency, if only in view of the imperfect realisation of the divine sovereignty in the hearts and over the wills of men, even in the Christian part of this modern world of ours. Nevertheless, there is a wonderful compensation for the illusion of the personal coming in the marvellous effects, albeit still too restricted by the imperfection of the human instrument of God's sovereignty in the world, of the spiritual presence of Jesus throughout the ages.

Very impressive is the idea of suffering which Jesus imparts to this Son of Man conception. This is not only his original contribution. It is the one that is of perennial importance, abiding reality. He has grasped the cardinal fact of the necessity of suffering for the manifestation of God and the divine in the world's history, as the world is constituted. Nothing of high achievement is to be got without it. All achieving is a process of suffering. In the moral sphere it is only by the process of self-abnegation that man can attain anything like the fullness of the higher nature in conflict with the lower. Given the exalted moral nature of Jesus, it was inevitable that it should come into conflict with the lower human nature of his day. Given the strength and depth of his spiritual apprehensions, it was equally inevitable that they should antagonise the conventional legalist spirit in religion. The divine in him was before its time in beating against the spiritual obtuseness, the petty literalism, the conventionalism, and the officialism of his time. It has always been so from then till now, in the measure that God takes possession of the elect soul and seeks to take possession, through the elect soul, of the world. The divine must be crucified because the human is unequal to the appeal and the appropriation of it in its highest form. Probably we would not crucify Jesus to-day, because enlightenment has a firmer and wider hold on the general intelligence. But there is still in human nature this fatal inability to appreciate the divine at its true value, the tendency to set the things of sense above the things of the spirit. We would not crucify Jesus to-day. We would protest, ridicule, shake the head when it comes

to the question of putting in practice the Jesus ideal of the kingdom of God. Two thousand years ago, when obscurantism and fanaticism reigned in matters of religious belief, Jesus had to suffer and die. He has had to die often enough since then. For this purblind, self-sufficient, fanatic, or worldly wise Judaism, which put him to death, is typical of the frame of mind which, throughout the Middle Ages, roasted him at the stake, and persisted in spirit at least into the modern age. Suffering is thus the divine law that inevitably operates in an imperfect world. At the same time, the law operates for good as well as evil. To suffer is not to lose but to win the issue. For suffering is the highest form of service as Jesus conceived and exemplified it in giving himself a ransom, a sacrifice in some sense for others. To die in this sense is to achieve life, not merely in the sense of the transition to immortality, but in that of vitalising the higher life of humanity. Jesus assuredly achieved this immeasurable good in his death as well as his life. The Cross has been the inspiration of the higher life in the lives of myriads of men and women throughout the ages. It did inaugurate a new heaven and a new earth, even if they are still in the making. If we would gauge the vast implication of the Cross for the higher life of the world, we have only to ask, What would the world have been without it ?

CHAPTER VII

FAREWELL

I. BETRAYAL AND LAST SUPPER

AFTER the discourse to the disciples on the Mount of Olives Jesus spends two days in retirement at Bethany. According to Mark and Matthew, the incident of the anointing apparently takes place during this retirement as he is sitting at meat in the house of Simon, the leper, not, as in the Fourth Gospel, on the evening before the day of the public entry. This Simon would appear to have been cured of this disease. Perhaps he had been healed by Jesus and was showing hospitality to his benefactor. During the meal a woman disciple, whom the Fourth Gospel identifies with Mary, the sister of Lazarus, but who was probably a rich lady whom the teaching of Jesus had attracted, anoints his head with very costly ointment as an expression of her devotion. Her extravagance excites the indignation of certain of the guests. Why this extravagance when the large sum for which the ointment could be sold might have been more practically given to the poor? Mark leaves it indefinite who the angry objectors were. Matthew says explicitly that they were the disciples, while the Fourth Gospel, with evident bias, ascribes the grudge to Judas alone. Jesus is deeply touched by this revelation of loving devotion, which has for him a significance unknown to them, and takes her part against the objectors. In thus showing her devotion, she has also anointed his body beforehand for burial. They will have opportunity enough of caring for the poor, who are always there, whereas they will not always have the opportunity of thus ministering to him.¹

¹ Mark xiv. 3 f.; Matt. xxvi. 6 f.; cf. John xii. 1 f., who substantially agrees, while differing in detail. The saying in Mark and Matthew that her act would be a memorial of her wherever the Gospel should be preached throughout the whole world seems to be an editorial addition.

Luke omits the incident, and the omission lends some force to the contention that it is a doublet of that which he has already related as taking place in the house of Simon, the Pharisee,² during the Galilean ministry. The details are, however, so different that the one can hardly be a variant of the other.

By this time the Sanhedrin, as the result of a consultation in the court of the high priest, Caiaphas,³ was seeking for an opportunity to arrest him by stealth (ἐν δόχῳ) and put him to death. In view of the large number of pilgrims present in Jerusalem, they could not dare to seize him openly. It must be done in such a way as to avoid a popular tumult. Moreover, it must be done before the feast if they were to forestall the revolt against their authority on the part of his followers during the feast days, which they feared would ensue if he were left at large. Their fear was not without some foundation. They had evidence enough in the events of the last three days that the crowd of pilgrims regarded him as the Messiah, or at least as a heaven-sent prophet, and strongly resented their hostile attitude towards him. It might easily allow its enthusiasm to hurry it into a violent demonstration in his favour, unless they could succeed in clandestinely laying hands on him and thus prevent further contact between him and his followers. This is evident from Luke's version of their anxiety to get him out of the way. "They sought how they might put him to death, because they feared the people."⁴ It is also apparent from the correct reading of the passage in Mark, in which they state the motive for seeking forthwith to bring about his arrest. "For they said, There would otherwise (*i.e.*, if he were not immediately arrested) be a tumult of the people during the feast."⁵ The accepted version of

² Luke vii. 36 f. On the whole, it does not seem to be a doublet. For a discussion of the question, see Bernard, "Commentary on John," ii. 409 f. He thinks with some probability that the writer of the Fourth Gospel took his version of the incident substantially from Luke vii. His identification of the Mary of the Fourth Gospel with the sinful woman in Luke does not seem probable.

³ Matt. xxvi. 3.

⁴ xxii. 2.

⁵ Mark xiv. 2, Codex D. See on this point J. Weiss, "Schriften des N.T.," i. 201, and Klostermann in "Lietzmann's Handbuch zum N.T.," ii. 119; also M'Neile, "Commentary on Matthew," 373-374.

the saying in Mark, which is also given by Matthew (xxvi. 5), implies that they must postpone the arrest till after the feast, when the pilgrims would have departed and there would be no fear of a popular tumult.⁶ In that case, however, they ran the risk that Jesus would have gone with them and thus have frustrated their design. Their purpose was, on the contrary, to seize him at once in order to prevent the tumult they feared if they left him at large throughout the festival week, and so to carry out their purpose as to prevent any tumult, which even his seizure before the feast was liable to provoke.

How to achieve their purpose by stealth was, however, a difficult problem. It was in the face of this difficulty that Judas opportunely appeared with the proposal to betray him into their hands without the risk of any popular outbreak. Judas, the only native of Judæa among the Twelve, had been a zealous disciple before he became a traitor. Otherwise Jesus would not have selected him as one of the band of his intimate followers and helpers. By this time something in his character and conduct had led the Master to suspect his fidelity. With that insight that enabled him to penetrate behind the outward profession of both disciples and enemies, he had come to the conclusion that he was not to be relied on, though he had been entrusted with the common purse. Does this function indicate that he was specially skilled in money matters—what we should call the business side of the movement? Does it further indicate that he was disposed to set more value on material than on spiritual things? It is hazardous to dogmatise on a man's character, especially in a case in which we have, so far, nothing to guide us to a definite conclusion. The Fourth Gospel has a story that Jesus knew from the beginning that Judas would prove a traitor,⁷ and that he was a hypocrite who had all along administered the common fund for his own profit. In mentioning his grudge at the extravagance of the woman in anointing Jesus at Bethany, he calls him a thief and ascribes his protest to self-seeking

⁶ So Gould, "Commentary on Mark," 256; Klausner, "Jesus of Nazareth," 324.

⁷ John vi. 64, 70-71.

motives. Mark gives no motive for his act of treachery.⁸ Matthew implies that his sole object was to make money.⁹ Luke ascribes it to the instigation of the devil.¹⁰ Had he become an adherent of Jesus because he believed him to be the Messiah in a political sense, the heir of David's restored throne, and looked for a reward of his services, as the other disciples did, but, unlike them, was disillusioned and sought to earn a reward by betraying him to his enemies? If he were the mercenary character that the Fourth Gospel depicts, he might easily, on this account, have swung round from adherent to traitor. Or was he from the beginning a sincere adherent of the new prophet, according to his light, like the other disciples and, like them, reached the conclusion that he was the Messiah and would ultimately vindicate his claim by inaugurating the Messianic kingdom in the more material sense? Did he, then, not only fail, like the other disciples, to grasp the idea of a suffering Messiah, but utterly reject it, and, in view of the long-continued controversy with his opponents and the impossibility of establishing his Messianic claim in the accepted sense, finally come to regard him as a mere deceiver, whom it was both right and obligatory to renounce and discover to the guardians of the Jewish religion? We shall probably be near the truth if we regard Judas as continuing to harbour the thought of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi that such a Messiah as Jesus conceived himself to be was an impossibility, and that it was now useless and in fact fatal to go on adhering to such a visionary. This is, perhaps, the most feasible solution of the problem if, as we probably should, we make allowance for the bias of the early Christian tradition, whilst still allowing some weight to the mercenary trait in his character. It is one which commends itself to Jewish writers like Klausner, who argue that, once Judas lost faith in the Master, it was his duty, according to the injunction of the law, to deliver up the deceiver of the people to destruction¹¹ (Deut. xiii. 2 f.). It is thus possible to make out that he was acting in a true religious spirit, as he understood religion. His action none the less shows him in a very questionable light.

⁸ xiv. 10.
⁹ xxvi. 15.

¹⁰ xxii. 3-4.
¹¹ "Jesus of Nazareth," 325.

One who, as disciple, had followed Jesus so long and had opportunity enough to know his elevated moral and spiritual character, might be expected to retain some respect for the Master's high ethical and spiritual ideal and compelling personality, if he had any capacity for understanding and appreciating the highest goodness. Even if he came at last to regard him as a visionary whom he could no longer follow, he might well have realised that the life and teaching of such a visionary could hardly work evil to those who sincerely accepted the teaching and the obligation which it involved of seeking first and solely the kingdom of God and His righteousness. There could be no doubt on this score, and if doubt did arise on the score of his mistaken ideal of Messiahship, there was still overwhelming reason in the real greatness of Jesus as a moral and religious teacher why he should have refrained from conspiring his ruin. In such circumstances a man of even ordinary moral sense would have retired to disappointment, and would have refrained from playing the traitor. Whatever his exact motive, Judas in this episode was certainly not what we understand by a gentleman, and his despicable act sufficiently justifies us in depriving him of the instinctive honour and straightforwardness which the term in its true sense connotes. He should at least have declined the reward which, according to Mark, "the chief priests,"¹² in their joy at finding a solution of the difficulty of stealthily arresting Jesus, promised him, if he perhaps did not, as Matthew and Luke have it, directly ask how much they would give him for his betrayal. Matthew's version of the bargaining is evidently influenced by the fact that he sees in it the fulfilment of an Old Testament prophecy¹³ (Zech. xi. 12), and this assumption does not necessarily assure the accuracy of his account. At all events, it was a most fateful bargain. Within twenty-four hours they had Jesus in their grasp, all unawares to the pilgrim crowd in the city.

What did Judas reveal? He no doubt told the members of the Sanhedrin of Jesus' purpose to celebrate with the

¹² Luke adds the officials of the temple guard (*στρατηγῶν*) (Luke xxii. 4).

¹³ Matt. xxvi. 15; cf. xxvii. 9. Thirty shekels of silver, less than £5 in our money—the price of a slave, Exod. xxi. 32.

disciples the paschal meal, which was known to the Twelve, and thus enabled them to concert his arrest immediately thereafter. But was this the sole purport of his secret communication? If the controversy in the Fourth Gospel with the religious leaders is exact history, there was no need for Judas to tell them that he claimed to be the Son of God in at least the transcendental Messianic sense. Jesus had, according to this Gospel, often enough made the claim that he was the Son of God in a unique sense. But this controversy, as we have seen, is largely a medium for the expression of the author's own conception of Jesus, not a convincing revelation of the actual Jesus. In the Synoptic interviews, on the other hand, it is plain that his opponents had not got a clear and definite idea of what he actually claimed to be, though they knew that he was a popular leader with a large number of sympathisers behind him, and would fain destroy him. The question about authority shows that they were in doubt about his exact motives and aims and the character of the movement of which he was the leader. It was, it would seem, on this point that Judas definitely enlightened them, and not merely on the intention of partaking of the evening meal with his disciples. What he disclosed was the Messianic secret which he had communicated to them—the claim to be the Son of Man—and this disclosure put them in a position to frame a charge which might be so manipulated as to secure his condemnation by the Roman authority.¹⁴

According to the Synoptists, "on the first day of unleavened bread¹⁵ on which the Passover was sacrificed," the disciples asked Jesus where they were to go to prepare for the eating of the Passover meal. The words refer to the Feasts of Passover and Unleavened Bread, which com-

¹⁴ For a discussion of this question, see Cadman, "Last Journey of Jesus," 127 f., who forcibly controverts the theory of Bacon (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1921) that the anointing at Bethany was an anointing to his Messianic kingship, and that it was this that Judas betrayed.

¹⁵ The phrase is unusual. The Feast of Unleavened Bread, strictly speaking, began on the day following the Passover, and continued a week (15th to 21st Nisan), whereas the Passover was celebrated the day before, i.e., the 14th Nisan. The Passover could hardly, therefore, be said to take place on the first day of unleavened bread. But though unusual, it is not necessarily incorrect, since the phrase occurs in this sense in the Rabbinic literature. Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar zum N.T.," ii. 813-815.

memorated the great deliverance from Egyptian oppression (Exod. xii. ; Deut. xvi.). This memorial celebration lasted a week, and took place in the middle of the month of Nisan, the opening month of the Jewish year. On the first day of its celebration, the 14th of the month, the Passover feast was observed, when the paschal lambs were killed and eaten. On the following days till the 21st of Nisan, known as the Feast of Unleavened Bread, only unleavened bread was eaten in accordance with the prescription at the original institution of the Passover. The lambs for the Passover meal were killed in the temple, and the meal could only, after sundown, be partaken in Jerusalem, and therefore not in Bethany. Hence the question of the disciples, "Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the passover (meal)?" The question was evidently asked on the Thursday morning, since Jesus was crucified on the following day, the Friday, and the meal must have been partaken on the evening of Thursday. As in the case of the public entry, Jesus had, unknown to the disciples, made arrangements for eating the Passover meal (the Seder) in one of the rooms in the city lent to pilgrims for the occasion. He accordingly gives directions to two of the disciples (Peter and John, according to Luke) how and where they are to find the large upper apartment which the owner of the house had set apart for this purpose. At the gate of the city they would find a water-carrier (probably a slave), and they are to follow him to a house whose owner will show them the guest chamber (*κατάλυμα*) which has been prepared for their reception. They, therefore, proceed to the city, find the apartment as directed, and make the necessary preparations for the meal—the provision of the unleavened bread, the bitter herbs, the wine, the lamb, of which the celebrants, according to the prescribed ritual, are to partake.¹⁶

In the evening Jesus arrives with the disciples and partakes with them of the paschal supper. On the testimony of the Synoptists there can be little doubt that it was the Passover meal which they had gathered in the upper room

¹⁶ Mark xiv. 12 f. ; Matt. xxvi. 17 f. ; Luke xxii. 7 f. In Luke Jesus takes the initiative, and tells Peter and John to go and make ready.

to eat. The distinctive features of the Passover celebration were the killing of the paschal lambs in the temple on the afternoon of the 14th Nisan and the partaking of the Passover meal (the *Seder*, when the flesh of the lambs was consumed) on the following evening, in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt.¹⁷ The Jews, it should be noted, reckoned the day from sundown to sundown. On this occasion the 14th of Nisan is assumed by the Synoptists to have fallen on the Thursday, on the afternoon of which the slaying of the lambs, in accordance with the injunction of the law, had to take place. This was followed by the Passover meal on the evening of what would be the beginning of Friday, the 15th Nisan. It was, according to the Synoptists, of this Passover meal that Jesus partook with his disciples, and thereafter that his seizure took place in Gethsemane, followed by his trial and crucifixion on the Friday. The testimony of the Synoptists appears, however, to be at variance in important points with that of the Fourth Gospel. According to this Gospel, the 14th of Nisan fell, not on the Thursday, but on the Friday, on the afternoon of which the paschal lambs were being killed, and the Passover meal had still to be eaten on the evening of what is for the writer the 15th Nisan (*i.e.*, evening or beginning of the Sabbath). Two discrepancies between the Johannine account and those of the Synoptists thus emerge. According to the Fourth Gospel, the paschal lambs could not have been killed on the Thursday afternoon and the Passover meal could not have been eaten on the evening of the day preceding the crucifixion. The meal of which Jesus partook with his disciples could, therefore, not have been the Passover meal, but a farewell one specially arranged by him, and the crucifixion, in consequence of his arrest and trial thereafter, would take place, not on the 15th, but on the 14th Nisan, at the time when the paschal lambs were being slain. Both agree that the crucifixion took place on the Friday, but disagree as to the date and the character of the meal of which Jesus and his disciples partook. According to the Synoptists, the date of the crucifixion was the 15th Nisan.

¹⁷ On the details, see Moore, "Judaism," ii. 40-42; "Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," 355 f.

The slaying of the lambs had taken place on the previous afternoon (the 14th) and the Last Supper in the evening (beginning of 15th Nisan) was the Passover meal. According to the Fourth Gospel, the date of the crucifixion was the 14th Nisan, when the killing of the lambs was taking place and the Passover had still to be eaten on what was for the writer the evening of the 15th Nisan (*i.e.*, beginning of the Sabbath).

The question thus arises, Which of these versions is the correct one? It has been the subject of endless discussion, one section of the disputants adopting the Synoptic version, another the Johannine. The discussion has failed to lead to anything like general agreement. In itself it is not important. A difference in date, which is narrowed to a choice between a day sooner and a day later, may seem not worth all the print expended on it. But the difference led to very serious consequences in the later divisions between Eastern and Western Christendom over the question of the Easter celebration (the Quartodeciman or Easter Controversy). Moreover, in the case of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, it seems to have had a religious bearing, inasmuch as he appears to represent Jesus as the Lamb of God slain at the moment that the paschal lambs were being sacrificed or slain in the temple. He had begun his Gospel by making John proclaim him as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, and in the closing scene of his ministry he represents him as the same Lamb crucified for man as the Passover offering. Hence the desire to postpone the Passover meal till after the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, the Lamb of God, *i.e.*, to place the crucifixion on the afternoon of what is for him the 14th of Nisan, when the paschal lambs were being slain and the Passover had still to be partaken, instead of the 15th, when both events had already taken place, as in the Synoptists.

It seems impossible to reconcile the divergence unless we have recourse to the theory that, as between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who were both represented in the Sanhedrin, there was a difference of a day in reckoning the 14th Nisan. Such a difference appears to have existed, the Sadducean priesthood holding that the month began

a day later than that fixed on by the Pharisees. Whilst for the latter the 14th accordingly fell on the Thursday, for the former it fell on the Friday. The result would be that, in virtue of this difference in reckoning, the Passover was celebrated on both the Thursday and the Friday evening, and that thus both versions are so far correct. As the Pharisaic practice was that observed by the people, whilst that of the Sadducees was followed by only a comparatively small section, the Synoptists seem to be fully justified in representing that the Passover meal, which Jesus ate with his disciples on the evening before the crucifixion, was that generally observed by the people. While the author of the Fourth Gospel is wrong in ignoring this general celebration and placing it, for his own special reasons, on the evening following the crucifixion, he is, in view of the Sadducean practice, formally correct, inasmuch as there was, if this view is right, at least a partial celebration on that evening. There are, in truth, indications in his own narrative of the supper in which Jesus and his disciples took part on the Thursday evening, that it actually was the paschal meal, though it does not seem to be his intention to convey this impression.¹⁸

There is further divergence between the Synoptic and the Johannine version of what took place at the Supper.

¹⁸ On this subject, see Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar zum N.T.," ii., Excursus, "Der Todestag Jesu," 812 f., particularly 851 f. (1924). See also Lichtenstein, "Kommentar zum Matthæus Evangelium," 122 f., who substantially adopts the same position. The Jewish scholar, Jacobs, also offers a similar solution, which confirms the Synoptic representation of the Last Supper as the Passover meal. According to this writer, when the 15th Nisan fell on the Sabbath, as it did on this occasion, it was customary for pious Jews to antedate the Passover meal by a day and celebrate it on the Thursday evening, as in the Synoptic narratives, in order not to interfere with the celebration of the Sabbath. See also Chwolson, "Das letzte Passamahl," and Montefiore, "Synoptic Gospels," i. 312. This solution is adopted by Warschauer, "Historical Life of Christ," 300. Dalman rejects the Johannine in favour of the Synoptic version, "Jesus-Jeshua" (1929). Some are of opinion that it was not the Passover meal that Jesus took part in, but the Kiddush, a social gathering, including a meal, ordinarily held by groups of pious Jews on the Friday afternoon before the Sabbath began at 6 P.M. and also before festivals. On this occasion the killing of the lambs falling on the afternoon and the Passover meal in the evening, these groups held the Kiddush on the Thursday instead of the Friday. Hence the Last Supper (Kiddush) on the Thursday evening. Oesterley, "Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy," 156 f. This view is adopted by Blunt, "Commentary on Mark," 244 f. It does not seem to me probable. For the ritual of the Kiddush, see Oesterley and Box, "A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediæval Judaism," 188-189 (1920).

All three Synoptists agree that during the meal Jesus instituted the Eucharist, and they are confirmed by Paul, who, in 1 Cor. xi., gives the oldest written version of the tradition, if not necessarily an earlier form of it than that of the Synoptists. In Mark and Matthew, Jesus, in the early part of the meal, discloses the startling fact that one of the Twelve will betray him. The disclosure is so incredible and overwhelming that one by one they ejaculate in their consternation, "Surely it is not I!" Evidently none of them suspected Judas, who had shown no sign of treachery to his not too keen-witted fellow-disciples. Jesus indefinitely replies that it is one of those who have been sharing the meal with him—dipping in the same bowl—and refers to the departure of the Son of Man in accordance with prophecy (Isa. liii.). In consequence of this treachery, he declares in sorrow rather than in anger, "Well were it for that man if he had not been born." According to Matthew, Judas joins in the question, "Is it I?" and Jesus replies in the affirmative sense, "Thou hast said."¹⁹ It is difficult to accept this as authentic unless both question and reply were inaudible. For such a declaration would surely have led the others to seize him and prevent him from carrying out his purpose. No indication is given, as in the Fourth Gospel, of Judas leaving the feast, as he must have done in order to carry out his fell purpose. Thereafter Jesus introduces a new feature into the celebration by instituting the Eucharist, symbolic of his self-sacrifice even unto death. According to Paul, he takes a loaf of unleavened bread, breaks it with the words, "This is my body, which is for you. This do in remembrance of me." In like manner, after supper (apparently that part of the supper when the eating of the various components of the meal had been finished), he takes the cup with the words, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood," and bids the disciples also remember him whenever they repeat this rite, and at the same time proclaim to others the Lord's death till he come. Like the Passover, it is a memorial rite. But it serves the additional purpose of proclaiming the significance of Jesus' self-sacrifice for all men. The actual institution agrees

¹⁹ Matt. xxvi. 25.

generally with that of the Synoptists. But Mark and Matthew add that he gave both the bread and the wine to the disciples, whilst the Pauline account only implies this. They further add that his covenant blood is shed for many, and Matthew has besides "unto remission of sins," which is almost certainly an editorial addition. Both have further, in reference to the giving of the cup, the saying relative to the future Messianic banquet, "I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." On the other hand, both omit the memorial injunction which, in Paul, may have been an inference from the practice of the rite in the primitive community, though this inference seems to be ruled out by Luke, who follows a tradition in some respects different from that of his fellow-Synoptists, and includes the memorial injunction in connection with the giving of the bread. Mark and Matthew conclude the celebration with the singing of a hymn ²⁰ (the Hallel, or Psalm, sung on the occasion).

Luke's version varies in part from those of Mark and Matthew. The first part of the meal is evidently that of the Passover. At the beginning of it Jesus expresses the intense longing he has had to eat this Passover with them before he suffers ²¹—the last for him till the Messianic banquet in the coming kingdom or dominion of God. He takes the first cup, with which the Passover meal begins, and, giving thanks and telling them to partake of it, repeats the saying about his not again celebrating the feast before the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. Then, towards the end of the Passover meal (the various stages of which are not described), he proceeds to institute the Eucharist, following the order in 1 Cor. xi. and in Mark and Matthew. ²² Only

²⁰ Mark xiv. 18 f. ; Matt. xxvi. 20 f.

²¹ Some interpret this saying as an evidence that it was not the Passover meal that he partook with them, *i.e.*, that his desire was not fulfilled. Kennett, "Last Supper," 33-34; Burkitt and Brooke, *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1908. It seems to me rather to express a longing that was at last fulfilled. In an article in the same *Journal*, 1916, Burkitt further attempts, unsuccessfully, I think, to show that the Last Supper was not the paschal meal.

²² Westcott and Hort treat part of verse 19 and the whole of verse 20 as an interpolation ("Greek N.T.," i. 177, and ii. 64). On this view the giving of the cup in verse 17 would be part of the Eucharist, not of the Passover meal. They are supported by Nestle, "Textual Criticism of the N.T.," 277. A number of other scholars, however, accept them as genuine. On

at the conclusion of it does he disclose the treachery of Judas. Thereafter follows the contention among them who shall be the greatest, or the superior of the others in the kingdom, which Mark and Matthew have already related as taking place whilst he was on the way to Jerusalem and before he reached Jericho. Jesus emphasises service as the great distinction, as he himself has served them during the meal and indeed from the beginning of his ministry. In reward of their faithful, persistent service to him in all his trials, he assigns them, as their part in the future kingdom, thrones on which they shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel. He treats them all as equals, and gives precedence to none. There follow the warning to the enthusiastic but unstable Peter, for whom he has supplicated that his faith may not utterly fail, and the prediction of his denial of him in his hour of trial, which Mark and Matthew relate after the company has left the room, but which Luke agrees with the Fourth Gospel in including in the account of the supper. The scene closes with another warning of his impending fate in accordance with prophecy (Isa. liii. 12), and of the need for them to be prepared to meet trying emergencies in the future. The end of his career is at hand; it is theirs to continue the struggle. They will have to fight against a hostile world. "He who has no purse, let him sell his cloak and buy a sword." The sword is only figurative, but the dull-witted disciples understand it literally and produce two swords, whereupon Jesus abruptly terminates the conversation with the words, "It is enough."²³

The rite thus instituted symbolises, like the Passover, the great deliverance which Jesus by his self-sacrifice unto death operates for man. His self-sacrifice inaugurates the covenant between him and them which, as in the case of the old covenant at Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 4-8), is sealed by his blood. Through this shedding of his blood the grand object to which he has devoted his ministry and for which at last he must die—the establishment of God's kingdom, which is essential to man's salvation—will be realised. Of this

this see Plummer, "Commentary on Luke," 496-497. Nor does there seem to be sufficient ground for excising verses 17 and 18. See also Manson, "The Gospel of Luke," 239 f. (1930).

²³ Luke xxii. 14 f.

supreme benefit the rite is the present symbol and is henceforth to be the memorial and the proclamation. It is, moreover, a means of spiritual fellowship and of the final renewal of their personal fellowship, when he shall come and celebrate it at the Messianic banquet. The rite, like the Passover, has a social as well as a religious significance. A symbolic memorial of his sacrifice, it means also the continuance of fellowship between him and them in spite of his departure, which in the near future will be followed by his return. Whether it also symbolised his death as a sacrifice in the priestly sense is very questionable. Whilst observing the Jewish ritual, Jesus had made it plain enough that his thought moved in a very different sphere from that of the current priestly and scribal conception of religion. The priestly cultus in the Old Testament reeks with the blood of innocent creatures, and it is difficult to recognise in this association of God with such barbarous practices the Father God of Jesus, though he knows the reality of suffering for the ideal. He transmutes the Passover into an act of sacrifice in the spiritual sense, in obedience to what he deems the divine ordinance of suffering and self-surrendering service for others in its most exacting form. He had come to the hour of this supreme self-sacrifice in virtue of his antagonism to the priestly and scribal caste, and he undoubtedly died to vindicate that for which he had incurred their deadly enmity—the establishment of the kingdom of God in both the spiritual and the eschatological sense. Sacrifice in this sense of suffering service, not in the sense of bloodshed for sin, is what he impresses on them as he institutes this rite. “I am in the midst of you as he that serveth.”²⁴ The giving of his life as “a ransom or redemption for many,” which Mark and Matthew add to the saying on ministering in a previous connection, does not necessarily mean an expiatory offering of himself for sin, as if the Heavenly Father demanded a human sacrifice in order that man might come into a filial relation to Him. That relation is there from the outset in Jesus’ specific conception of the fatherly nature of God and His attitude towards humanity. Moreover, it appears that the term “ransom” was not used in

²⁴ Luke xxiii. 27.

connection with the Jewish sin-offering,²⁵ and the phrase was thus hardly used by Jesus in an expiatory sense. One might be said to give one's life as a ransom for others if one died to secure for them the benefit of the divine rule and an escape from the Messianic judgment, which only he by his suffering could render possible. Such a thought, taken in connection with the emphasis on sacrificing service, is more likely to convey the thought of Jesus himself than the interpretation of later theological reflection. It has further been contended with no little force that even in Judaism the Passover was regarded as a sacramental, not an expiatory celebration—"a sacrifice of communion, whose effect is conceived not as reconciliation, but as reunion."²⁶ It is, therefore, safer, in appraising the mind of Jesus, to eschew the theories that later gathered around the subject, and regard the rite, as he evidently regarded it—the giving of himself as the Suffering Servant freely unto death that the dominion of God, and therewith his own, over the souls of men might be achieved.²⁷ To read into the words, "This

²⁵ Robinson, "Gospel of Matthew," 168. "Sin-offering," says Moore, "is not, as the modern reader is accustomed to understand it, an offering for sin in our sense at all, but is prescribed as an expiation for the ignorant or inadvertent transgression of certain religious interdictions . . . things which have of themselves no moral quality." "Judaism," i. 461. See also Glazebrook on "Hebrew Conceptions of Atonement," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 109 f. (1919).

²⁶ Glazebrook, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 110 (1919).

²⁷ In the phrase *ὑπὲρ ἀντὶ πολλῶν* (Mark x. 45; Matt. xx. 28) *ἀντὶ* signifies "in exchange for," or "instead of." But *ἀντὶ* sometimes means "in behalf of" (Matt. xvii. 27), and in the words of institution Paul, Mark, and Luke have *ὑπὲρ*, Matthew *περὶ*, which mean "in behalf of." In none of the accounts is it stated that the paschal lamb was actually partaken. This is, of course, implied in the fact that it was the Passover Feast that Jesus and his disciples met to celebrate. The Passover meal might, however, be eaten without the lamb in cases where it was not procurable. The unleavened bread was an essential. Though Mark and Matthew do not contain the command to celebrate the rite in memory of Jesus, they must be held as implying this, since it appears as the practice of the Christian community from the outset. Whilst evidently partaking of the Passover meal, Jesus does not partake of the eucharistic bread and wine, but gives them to his disciples. Mark and Matthew say that Jesus took the bread during supper, and the cup apparently immediately after the bread; Paul and Luke that he took the cup after supper. For a recent discussion of the sacrificial character of the death of Jesus, see Rashdall, "The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology," 29 f. (1919). He strongly and, on the whole, forcibly controverts the view that Jesus regarded his death as a propitiatory sacrifice. See also Goguel, "L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr," 100 f.; Menzies, "The Earliest Gospel," 253-254, cf. 202.

is my body," "This is my blood," more than a symbolic significance, and regard Jesus as teaching a sacramentalism akin to that of the mystery religions, in which the flesh and blood of the Deity was sacramentally partaken, is to do violence to this rite of remembrance and fellowship as instituted by him. Equally gratuitous the assumption that these words were derived by the Synoptists from Paul, who is arbitrarily supposed to have envisaged the rite from the angle of the mystery religions, and thus to have modified its spiritual character.

II. THE JOHANNINE VERSION

In the account of the Last Supper the writer of the Fourth Gospel omits the institution of the Eucharist, which he has anticipated in the eucharistic discourse of Jesus at Capernaum. According to him, this supper took place before the Feast of Passover, which, in his view, was celebrated on the evening after the crucifixion. The supper was neither the Passover nor the eucharistic meal, but the Agape or love feast. During it, Jesus, in view of his departure to the Father through the treachery of Judas, manifests his perfect and abiding love for the disciples by performing for them the service of a slave. "Jesus, knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the uttermost."¹ The service is all the more impressive inasmuch as he performs it in his capacity as the eternal Messianic lord, in the characteristic Johannine sense, into whose hands the Father has given all things (supreme authority) and who has come forth from God and goeth unto God.² He rises from his reclining position at supper, divests himself of his upper garments, girds himself with a towel, pours water into a basin, and begins to wash the disciples' feet. It is a symbolic or acted parable, and the minute description of the scene bespeaks the eyewitness.

¹ John xiii. 1, *eis τέλος*, to an end or to the uttermost. Both meanings in the Greek.

² xiii. 3.

The impulsive Peter does not understand the parable, and when it comes to his turn, repeatedly protests that the Lord shall not perform such a menial service for him. Jesus tells him that he will understand later what his action means, and that, unless he accepts this service, he has no part or fellowship with him in his Messianic function. With characteristic impetuosity Peter instantly goes to the other extreme: "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."³ Jesus answers that this is unnecessary in the case of those who have bathed and only need to have the dust washed off their feet—the menial act which he is performing. They are otherwise all clean (inwardly) except one who, he knows (evidently supernaturally), will betray him.

Then, resuming his garments and his reclining position, he tells them in words that echo the Synoptic teaching on service, why he has performed this lowly service, which is the true test of discipleship of him whom they call their teacher and lord, and who has also made himself their servant. "Ye call me Teacher and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am. If, therefore, I, your Lord and Teacher, washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I give you an example that, as I did to you, ye also do. Verily, verily, I say unto you, A servant is not greater than his lord, nor one that is sent (*ἀπόστολος*) greater than he that sent him."⁴ He then reverts to the traitor among those whom he has chosen, and who, in fulfilment of Ps. xli. 9, has lifted up his heel against him. He forewarns them of this treachery for the purpose of meeting future doubt on the score of his Messiahship arising from his betrayal and death. They are, nevertheless, to believe that he is the eternal Christ sent by God, who has appointed Judas to play his sinister part in the drama of his death. "From henceforth I tell you before it is come to pass, that when it is come to pass ye may believe that I am he." To receive me, he adds in words borrowed from Matt. x. 40, is to receive Him that sent me.⁵ Evidently the writer is thus repelling the objection, on the score of Judas, against Christianity current in his own time.

³ xiii. 9.⁴ xiii. 13 f.⁵ xiii. 19-20.

In view of the teaching on service as the test of true discipleship, which Luke places after the institution of the Eucharist, the incident of the washing, as a concrete illustration of this teaching, is likely enough historic. It is not necessarily a mere symbolic story. Jesus himself acts a parable and explains its meaning. Luke gives the meaning without the action. Jesus also appears in the Lukan story as the Messiah, to whom the Father has appointed a kingdom and who appoints the disciples to their places in this kingdom. On the other hand, this Messiah is not the Johannine eternal Christ. And if the washing took place at the Last Supper, it is strange that Luke should have omitted it, and still stranger that his fellow-Synoptists should not only have omitted the teaching on this occasion, but should have given both it and the incident that gave rise to it in another connection.

With Luke the writer places the actual disclosure of the traitor after the supper.⁶ Jesus is greatly perturbed as he definitely announces the fact and realises the terrible crime and the awful fate it involves for him. Here is one eating in common with him in intimate fellowship, who is about to prove false and deliver him to a horrible death! The disciples on their part look on one another with bewilderment. The impression is less tragically conveyed than in Mark and Matthew. "They doubted of whom he spake." Peter alone speaks. Beckoning to the disciple reclining on the other side of Jesus, who is introduced for the first time as the one that Jesus loved,⁷ he asks him who the traitor is. The disciple in turn puts the question to Jesus, who gives to him alone, and in a different form, the answer, which in Mark and Matthew he gives to all, about the dipping of the

⁶ xiii. 21 f.

⁷ This disciple is often assumed to have been the Apostle John (see, for instance, Bernard, "Commentary on John," ii. 470 f.). But the assumption seems to me unfounded. There was evidently one in Jerusalem who, though not a member of the Twelve, was deep in the confidence of Jesus, i.e., the owner of the house where the supper took place. His presence is not contradicted by the Synoptic representation that Jesus came to the house and partook with the Twelve. The meal would certainly, it seems to me, include the host, and there is no little force in Garvie's contention that the host was the beloved disciple. "The Beloved Disciple," 144 f. Swete thinks that he was the rich young man of Mark x. 17 f., whom Jesus loved. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 374 (1916).

sop. The giving of the sop to Judas indicates the traitor to the beloved disciple, if not to the others. With the sop, Satan, we read, entered into him, although we are told in a previous passage that Satan had already put it in his heart to betray him. Jesus has quickly recovered his self-command and bids Judas forthwith perform his hideous office. "What thou doest, do quickly." He is still the master even of this terrible situation, and calmly bids him do what is God's will. The betrayal is again deprived of its offence in the eyes of the writer's cavilling opponents. It is what Jesus himself ordains and what God has willed for the fulfilment of his divine purpose. None of those present understand his purpose in thus addressing Judas, some thinking that he is directing him to go and buy what is necessary for the Passover Feast on the coming evening, or to give something to the poor.⁸ Judas straightway goes out, "and," we are dramatically reminded, "it was night" —a fitting accompaniment for his black errand. Very striking, on the other hand, is the contrast between the outer darkness and the light within. To Jesus it is the hour of victory, not the night of tenebrous treachery and defeat. Judas gone, he intones a song of triumph in the characteristic, interpretative Johannine style, the theme of which is the glorifying of the Son of Man and of God in him as the result of this dark deed, through which he passes to his heavenly glory. This glory involves departure for him, bereavement for them. "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come, so now I say unto you." But he leaves to them the legacy of his love, which is to be the distinctive feature of their corporate life, even as it has been of his intercourse with and service for them. "A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another." It is the old supreme law which he had stressed in the Synoptic sayings and parables. But it is new in the

⁸ This interpretation by some of the disciples of Jesus' direction to Judas is adduced by many as a proof that the author is right in holding that the supper was not the Passover meal, since it was forbidden to perform such acts during the feast. The conclusion does not, however, necessarily follow. Buying and selling or giving of alms on the first day of the feast was not forbidden. See Strack and Billerbeck, ii. 842-843.

sense that it is to be the distinctive note, as the Johannine writer reflects it, of the Christian brotherhood in the face of a hostile world ("the Jews"). In reality it is in style and thought the writer who utters this message to his time through these tender valedictory words. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." Once more Peter does not understand. "Lord, whither goest thou?"⁹ The question leads up to the prediction, despite his emphatic protestation of his devotion even unto death, of his threefold denial before the cock shall crow that very night, which, like Luke, he places before the retirement to Gethsemane.¹⁰

According to the writer, Jesus continues his farewell address to what has now become the Eleven, plus the beloved disciple, through the four following chapters (xiv.-xvii.). It is in this long discourse that he diverges most strikingly from the Synoptists. That the Synoptic accounts of his sayings at the Last Supper are not exhaustive is probable enough. Natural enough, too, that on such an occasion Jesus should speak not only of his death, but should seek to comfort and direct them in the face of the imminent tragedy. In Luke there is an indication that he did attempt to do so, in the addition which the evangelist makes to the accounts of Mark and Matthew. Have we in the long Johannine discourse the amplified version of what he actually uttered to this end? The first of the four chapters, the fourteenth, is complete in itself. It ends with Jesus rising and going forth to meet his fate. The following three are either an addition, for which there seems no further occasion, or have somehow been disjoined from their place in the fourteenth. The tone of chapter xiv. certainly befits the occasion. Let not your heart be troubled, we read in the exordium. Believing in God, believe also in me, and the tragedy, the mystery of what is about to happen vanishes. I am only preceding you to my Father's house, with its many abiding places, and I will come again and conduct you on the way thither. The discourse is pervaded by the farewell spirit. It breathes the mystic atmosphere of a higher world, the supramundane existence. The speaker is

⁹ xiii. 35.

¹⁰ xiii. 36-38.

not only a mystic personality. He is already thinking aloud in that mysterious beyond where his mind seems to be in its true environment. The transient, material existence merges in the spiritual, the eternal. Whither go I? It is the perennial query which forces itself on the reflecting mind and becomes for every mortal the great obsession at the approach of the time of the dissolution of body and spirit. The query is here answered with the absolute conviction of one who claims to have come from God, his Father, and to be on the point of retracing his way to the ethereal sphere. One, too, who seeks to impart this conviction to those who have shared his human life and are assured that they shall share in his eternal being. God and immortality have been manifested and have become assured verities in this human life to those who accept this manifestation and this assurance. Whither goest thou, and how know we the way? doubtfully asks Andrew, who represents the others, in reference to the saying about the way to the Father's house. "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no one cometh unto the Father but by me. If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also; from henceforth ye know him and have seen him."¹¹ Philip next speaks as the mouthpiece of his fellow-disciples. Seen the Father? If only we had seen Him, then we should need no other assurance. His interjection leads to the further development of the discourse. "Have I been so long time with you and dost thou not know me, Philip?"¹² Philip's lack of insight is inexplicable. Can it be possible that one who has heard the words of Jesus and witnessed his works has failed to perceive the manifestation of the Father-God? Not know and see God, the Father, in his words and his works! Philip's lack of insight is incredible. Let him look the facts in the face—the teaching and the works—in order that belief, insight, may take the place of ignorance. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself, but the Father abiding in me doeth his works. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me, or else believe me for

¹¹ xiv. 6-7.¹² xiv. 9.

the very works' sake."¹³ Nay, greater works than those accomplished in his short life are to come, in consequence of his going to the Father. Christianity will, through his departure, become a far mightier movement than that which he has only initiated. With prophetic vision and vim the speaker proclaims the great things that shall be accomplished through them. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to the Father."¹⁴ He will still work through them in answer to their prayers in his name, to the glorifying of the Father. For the Father at his request will send them another Helper or Advocate¹⁵ (*παράκλητος*), even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it cannot recognise him. Thus they will not be left orphans in a hostile world with none to care for them and guide them. He will through the Spirit come again, and in this spiritual coming they shall experience his continued presence with them and the mystic union with the Father in him. "Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more ; but ye behold me ; because I live, ye shall live also. In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you."¹⁶

The secret of this union is love which consists in the keeping of his commandments. In return for this love they will experience the love of the Father and his, and he will manifest himself to them in contrast to the unbelieving, blind, and hostile world, which, lacking this love, cannot behold, because it cannot receive him. The perplexed disciples now find a mouthpiece in Judas (not Iscariot). What, then, has happened that the Messiah will thus not reveal himself publicly (as the universal expectation is), but only to loving hearts?¹⁷ Jesus tells them that his manifestation is to be understood in the spiritual sense. It can only be a spiritual experience, the condition of which is love showing itself in the keeping of his word, which is not his, but the Father's who sent him. Only where

¹³ xiv. 10-11.

¹⁴ xiv. 12.

¹⁵ In the sense of Advocate used in Rabbinic literature, "Pirké Aboth," 53:

¹⁶ xiv. 19-20.

¹⁷ xiv. 22.

this active love is can the Father and he take up their abode. The Comforter, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in his name, will complete his teaching and impart to them a fuller understanding of his sayings. Meanwhile, in departing, he leaves them as his farewell his peace (the Hebrew *shalom*), and bids them not be troubled in heart nor fearful. His going away is also, as he has told them, the promise of his coming. If they truly love him, they have, therefore, cause for rejoicing rather than for fear or sorrow. He is going to the Father, who is greater than he, and the fact ensures the realisation of his word and work. He has forewarned them of the impending tragedy—the final trial for him and them—that when it comes to pass they may nevertheless believe. There is no longer time for much communing, for Satan, the prince of the world, is coming. But Satan can find nothing in him whereon he can exercise his sovereignty. Jesus, in dying, is freely fulfilling the Father's will, and is not the victim of the Devil's power. From this divinely appointed ordeal the world may recognise the supreme evidence of the love of the Father and his obedience to His will. With this exalted optimism the discourse closes. "Arise, let us go hence."¹⁸

The two following chapters amplify the teaching of chapter xiv. on their union with him, which is illustrated by the figure of the vine and the branches; on the love of one another in the keeping of his commandments; on the antagonism and hatred of a blind and persecuting world towards those who are not only his servants, but his friends; on the coming of the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, to bear witness to him in addition to their testimony as his disciples from the beginning, and to convict the hostile world of sin, righteousness, and judgment in vindication of him and his cause; on his coming again in a little while when their sorrow shall be turned into joy; on the doubt and perplexities which his veiled manner of speech engenders and which are finally dispelled by the plain intimation that he has come out from the Father into the world and is about to leave the world and return to the Father; on the assurance that even on the Cross, and in spite of this disaster,

¹⁸ xiv. 31.

he is not alone, but the Father is with him ; on their tribulation in the world which they are to face with good cheer inasmuch as he has overcome the world. There follows in chapter xvii. the final prayer in which the speaker, as the giver of eternal life and the authoritative revealer of God, continues the same train of thought in the form of an address to the Father for them and those who shall believe in him through their preaching, to the exclusion of a hostile world.

What at once strikes the reader is the similarity of the style of the speaker and the content of the discourse to those of the First Epistle of John. Equally striking is the divergence, in both respects, from the last sayings of Jesus as recorded by the Synoptists. There are indeed echoes of the Synoptic style and teaching in these valedictory utterances. The speaker has drawn here and there on these sayings recorded by the Synoptists, especially Matthew, as uttered by Jesus on various occasions. "No one cometh unto the Father but by me." "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine" (John xiv. 6 ; xvi. 18). "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father, and no one knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any one know the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27 ; Luke x. 22). "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch (of the vine) and is withered, and they gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned" (John xv. 6). "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire" (Matt. vii. 19). "Remember the word that I said unto you, A servant is not greater than his lord" (John xiii. 16 ; xv. 20). "A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord" (Matt. x. 24). "He that hateth me hateth my Father also" (John xv. 23). "He that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me" (Luke x. 16). "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit" (John xv. 8). "Even so let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. v. 16). "Because ye are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. If they perse-

cuted me, they will also persecute you." "They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the hour cometh that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth God service" (John xv. 19-20; xvi. 2). "They will deliver you up to councils, and in their synagogues they will scourge you. . . . And they shall cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake" (Matt. x. 17, 22). "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone" (John xvi. 32). "All ye shall be offended, for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad" (Mark xiv. 27; Matt. xxvi. 31).

At the same time, the conditions, the environment, the train of thought and style of the speaker do not in general seem to fit those of the Synoptic Jesus. They are those of the mystic and deeply religious Christian looking back and interpreting, in a different world and in a different situation, what he conceives to be the final message of Jesus. Jesus is not so much the suffering Messiah of the Jewish environment, but has become, through the medium of Paul and other influences, the Johannine Christ. It is this later Christ who speaks in the Christian experience and from the characteristic outlook of his later mystic follower, who expresses himself in the same style and whose mind moves in the same groove as the writer of the first Johannine Epistle. Undoubted sayings of Jesus are worked into the discourse, and thoughts are ascribed to him which are in touch with the reality. From this point of view we may say that, if not actually spoken by him, they are well invented. He has, for instance, truly reflected the fact that the works and teaching of Jesus were a manifestation of the Father-God, were in very deed the concrete embodiment of the divine in him as in no other. He has truly set forth the lack of apprehension of this manifestation on the part not only of the later world, but of the disciples who companied with him and yet failed to understand these sayings—actual or ascribed—about the immanence of God in this wondrous life and this divine message. He has, too, brought out with telling force the potential significance of Jesus and his mission in the initiation of a world-wide religious revolution,

even if Jesus himself may not have definitely envisaged the actual results which are present to the mind of the writer and which colour his words. It is not a mere phantom of his own imagination that he embodies in the figure of the speaker. Apart from the theological implications which he imparts to the ideas of the speaker and which throw the halo of his own conception of the Logos Christ on the historic Jesus, the discourse does rest on a basis of historic reality. The Jesus who could found a world-expanding religion, a religion which was capturing the Greek speaking and thinking world, if it failed to displace the Judaism of "the Jews" of his own time, or that of the writer—this Jesus must have been, potentially at least, a greater personality than the disciples could realise. No mere Rabbi he, but a religious personality of the highest order, which his immature followers, let alone his purblind priestly and scribal antagonists, could not fathom. This is what the writer, in the light of history and experience, has caught and seeks to convey in his own characteristic mystic style and reasoning. It is not exact history considered as a presentation of the actual Jesus. Jesus is strongly idealised, and in as far as it is coloured by theological prepossessions, this presentation is misleading. It lifts him out of the historic reality into that of later religious faith, and this subjective process had its disadvantages as well as its advantages from the historic point of view. Nevertheless, it is not a purely fantastic reverie that he pens. He shows a certain historic instinct in his effort to reckon with the facts. Jesus is the manifestation of God. Yet "the Father is greater than I." He makes a distinction between "Thee, the only true God, and him whom Thou didst send," even if the one sent shared in the glory of the Father before the world was, and the Logos Christ of the prologue persists even in full view of the Cross. The coming is spiritualised, the eschatology modified. Nevertheless, he will come again, not merely in the Spirit, but in person (xvi. 19; cf. I John ii. 18, 28). Theological belief is reiterated. Yet the works, the reality of the life, are added as a concrete alternative. The Spirit is the grand testimony. Yet the historic personality and the witness of the disciples are not allowed to evaporate in a

vague subjectivism. If the saying about what is written in *their* law (the Jews) clearly reveals the antagonism between Jews and Christians in the writer's own time, it also reflects the situation as it virtually existed between Jesus and his enemies at the close of his career. The supreme thing in the life of Jesus as well as in the Christian teaching about him is love, even if the writer, unlike Jesus, is disposed to limit this love to an esoteric circle of initiates and exclude the world from its scope, and to ignore the saying in the Sermon on the Mount to love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you that ye may be the sons of your Father. It is the great reality of the life of Jesus himself, and in the exemplification of it the God is not allowed to overshadow the man. Has there ever been penned a more realistic and telling summary of the spirit and life of Jesus than in these two sentences?—"This is my commandment, that ye love one another. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."¹⁹

The discourse in its extended form is a conglomerate, and its patchwork tends to show that it cannot have been delivered *in extenso* by Jesus as it stands. Jesus could not at the end of chapter xiv. have concluded his address and gone forth to be arrested and then abruptly have begun another. The attempt (by Spitta and Lewis,²⁰ for instance) to insert chapters xv. and xvi. in chapter xiii., *i.e.*, before this conclusion, is not quite convincing. There still remains chapter xvii. to be accounted for, and it is rather far fetched to account for it by saying that Jesus offered this concluding prayer whilst standing, after uttering the words at the end of chapter xiv., to which the emendators have prefixed chapters xv. and xvi. A standing posture is indeed appropriate for the supplicatory form of xvii., and it is possible that xv. and xvi. have somehow got out of their proper place and actually

¹⁹ xv. 13.

²⁰ Spitta would place chapters xv. and xvi. after xiii. 31a ("Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums," 168 f., 1893). Lewis suggests their inclusion after xiii. 32 ("Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel," 35 f., 1910). Others insert them after xiii. 20. But this involves the presence of Judas whilst they are being spoken, and it seems that they are spoken to the Eleven. "Already ye are clean" (xv. 3). "I have called you friends" (xv. 15).

stand in the Gospel as the result of the manipulation of some blundering editor, who did not notice the incongruity of making Jesus continue a discourse which he has explicitly finished at the end of chapter xiv. It is, however, more likely that the writer amplified his theme in instalments in the course of instructing his intimate circle, and that as it stands it is the result of his own intermittent composition. The whole discourse was certainly written by the same individual. The thought and style are uniform, and the repetitions and even contradictions, which it contains,²¹ are not without parallel in other parts of the Gospel. Historic sense and historic order and accuracy are not the writer's strong points, and the discourse, in spite of its impressive beauty and its high ethereal level, contains traces of its artificiality. In regard to the sameness of its style with that of First John, it might be said that the author of the Epistle has modelled his style on that of Jesus in the Gospel. But the style of the Synoptic Gospels is also the style of Jesus, and it differs from that of both the Gospel and the Epistle. It is unwarrantable to ascribe two habitual styles to the same speaker, and clearly the writer has imparted his own to Jesus.

²¹ Cf., for instance, xvi. 5 with xiii. 36 and xiv. 5.

CHAPTER VIII

THE END

I. ARREST AND INQUEST

ON leaving the supper room, Jesus leads the way across the brook Kidron towards the Mount of Olives, the disciples following.¹ As they move he predicts their desertion in accordance with a prophecy, which is adapted, probably by later tradition, to the occasion. The prediction is accompanied with the promise that after his resurrection he will precede them to Galilee.² It evokes Peter's vehement protest of fidelity even unto death, and this protest calls forth the additional prediction of his threefold denial before cock-crow, which in Luke and the Fourth Gospel is made before the departure from the upper room. Their objective was a garden of considerable extent on the other side of the valley through which the brook flowed between the city and the Mount of Olives, whither, according to the Fourth Gospel, he was wont to resort with the disciples and which was known to Judas.³ It was named Gethsemane (Oilpress), and its owner, as in the instances previously mentioned, was evidently one of his Jerusalem followers, on whose goodwill he could reckon. Arrived within the garden, he leaves the other disciples and retires with Peter, James, and John to pray. The three disciples now witness what must have been to them a unique spectacle—the threatened breakdown of the Master. They had been with him in all the trials or temptations of his active career,⁴ and he had ever

¹ Luke xxii. 39.

² Mark xiv. 27-28; Matt. xxvi. 31-32. The incident may be an inference from their later experience. Klostermann thinks its genuineness is unquestionable. "Handbuch zum N.T.," ii. 125. M'Neile inclines to doubt. "Commentary on Matthew," 389.

³ John xviii. 1-2.

⁴ Luke xxii. 28.

appeared the master of himself and the situation as well as of them. Now they see him plunged into the abyss of an overwhelming anguish—the De Profundis of one who has been habitually to them the supreme optimist, even in the face of failure and persistent antagonism. “And he began to be seized with a terrified amazement⁵ and to be sore distressed” at the spectre that forces itself into his mental vision. The Devil, who, according to Luke, had left him for a season after the first temptation, returns to put him to the final test. “My soul is encompassed with grief,” he gasps. “Remain here and watch (keep awake).” He feels the need of human nearness in the face of this awful visitation, if he must fight it alone. He moves a little apart to wrestle through this overwhelming crisis. The nervous strain of the previous week has been telling unawares. Will he be able to go through the looming ordeal which presents itself in all its grim reality, as he has not hitherto fathomed it? He is alone and, though the three are near, he knows that he will be left alone to face what is at hand—arrest, trial, mockery, the obloquy of a death made as fearful as human brutality can make it. He might still escape. Shall he seize the chance? Shall he desert his true self? There is not only the shrinking of nerves overstrained to well-nigh breaking point. There is the terrified amazement at something from which death itself would be a relief. Is, after all, the idea of a crucified Messiah the unthinkable thing that his enemies esteem it? Is he in danger of losing the conviction which hitherto he has grasped and appropriated with such intensity? Is it possible that his conception of the Messiah is a mistaken one? If not, is it not possible that the Father may intervene to effect His will without the physical and mental suffering, which is already seizing him in its awful grip? The possibility exists for God, if not for him. Thus, prostrate on the ground,⁶ he prays that, “if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto Thee. Remove this cup from me. Nevertheless, not what I will, but what Thou wilt.”⁷ The reporter could only have guessed the

⁵ Matthew tones down Mark's *ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι* into *λυπεῖσθαι*.

⁶ Luke says “kneeling.”

⁷ Mark xiv. 36.

actual words used by Jesus, since none of the disciples heard the prayer. But he has truly guessed. There is a pause in the struggle⁸ as Jesus returns to seek a momentary relief in the sympathy of the disciples and finds them asleep, instead of watching. So little are they conscious of what this awful hour, the beginning of which they have witnessed, means for him. The discovery only deepens the sense of isolation. Even so, whilst chiding and exhorting, he is ready to excuse them. "Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst thou not watch one hour? Watch and pray (all of you) that ye enter not into temptation. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." A second and a third time he goes to renew his prayer and returns to find them sleeping, repeating the second time words to the same effect, to which the disciples "wist not what to answer." The third time he comes back he has conquered both fear and doubt, prepared to confront the enemy and to endure what he is now convinced is the Father's will. He will die for what he conceives to be the truth and his vocation in relation to it. This is the inspiring, the ennobling outcome of the struggle. He is sure of God, sure of himself, and will render what he believes God to require of him, whatever the cost. "Sleep on now and take your rest. It is enough." As he speaks he evidently catches a glimpse of the approaching emissaries of the Sanhedrin. "The hour is come. See! The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of sinners (low characters). Arise, let us go. See! The betrayer is at hand!"⁹

In this scene Jesus is the hero, every inch of him. The words are perhaps spoken excitedly. But they betoken a wonderful courage. Since God requires his self-sacrifice and it has to be, he will face it unflinchingly. The idealist is no weakling, though he repudiates the use of force whether for or against his cause. He exemplifies the highest kind of courage—that springing not from the mere brute instinct, but from fidelity to spiritual things.

The scene is unvarnished by any later theological gloss.

⁸ Luke in his pictorial fashion speaks of the appearance of an angel from heaven strengthening him (xxii. 43).

⁹ Mark xiv. 32 f.; Matt. xxvi. 36 f.; Luke xxii. 39 f. Luke knows of only one return to the disciples—at the conclusion of the struggle.

The paragraph in which it is disclosed belongs to the most realistic portions of the Gospels. The human touch is there in all its unalloyed realism. Luke adds to this realism by depicting the sweat that at the height of this soul crisis or agony (*ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ*) fell from his face to the ground "like great drops of blood." The Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, significantly omits the whole scene. Such a human Jesus accorded ill with his conception of him all through his career as the eternal Logos, who is the omniscient and omnipotent agent of the divine purpose, and whose suffering is the manifestation not of human weakness, but of the divine glory.

These dim figures whom Jesus descried in the distance by the light of the full moon of the Passover season, or the torches which, according to the Fourth Gospel,¹⁰ his captors carried, were the temple guard,¹¹ reinforced by others whom the Sanhedrin had engaged for the purpose. They were armed with swords and clubs and must have been a numerous band, for all three evangelists speak of them as a multitude—Matthew in his usual style as a great multitude.¹² Whilst Mark and Matthew describe them as emissaries of the Sanhedrin, Luke implies that members of the Sanhedrin itself were among them as well as the officers of the temple guard.¹³ The Fourth Gospel adds the Roman garrison (*στραίρα*, a cohort)¹⁴ under its commander, the chiliarch, or military tribune, in addition to the officers of the temple guard. If Roman soldiers were present, the Sanhedrin must have concerted the arrest with the Roman authority, and of this we have no hint in the Synoptists, though it is,

¹⁰ John xviii. 3. Rather strangely, if it was full moon and their errand was a furtive one.

¹¹ That the temple guard were present, though not mentioned by Mark and Matthew, is evident from Luke xxiv. 52.

¹² The presence of a crowd is rather singular in a case of secret arrest, and the number may be exaggerated. It is, however, probable enough that the Sanhedrin had taken the precaution to enlist the services of a considerable body of men and to concentrate and move it to the place of arrest as quietly as possible.

¹³ Luke xxii. 53.

¹⁴ Husband assumes that the band mentioned by John was not the Roman garrison, but "the temple guard together with their captain and the police officers of the Sanhedrin." This is only an assumption to obviate the necessity of including Roman soldiers among the captors of Jesus, which Husband rules out. "Prosecution of Jesus," 90 (1916).

of course, possible that the Sanhedrin may have reported to the Roman Procurator the danger of Jesus' presence at the feast to public order, and secured the assistance of Roman soldiers in arresting him. But in that case surely the whole garrison under its commander was unnecessary for the secret arrest of a single individual, especially as there was no danger of a popular rising in his behalf in the dead of night. It looks as if the writer were enhancing the official character of the attempt in order to increase the prestige of the prisoner. This tendency does appear in the immediate sequel. According to the Synoptists, Judas guides the emissaries of the Sanhedrin and prearranges the sign by which they were to know whom to seize. This sign is the usual oriental salutation—the kiss of friendship or reverence. Judas, accordingly, at the head of the crowd, steps forward and, addressing Jesus as Rabbi, salutes him effusively. In Matthew, Jesus invites him to carry out his fell purpose. "Friend, do that for which thou art come."¹⁵ In Luke he appears to forestall the salutation with the reproach, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" Mark omits the response of Jesus, and the Fourth Gospel is silent as to it and also the sign, though the presence of Judas as the guide of the procession is noted. In Mark and Matthew the seizure takes place forthwith, and in the excitement of the moment one of those with Jesus (the Fourth Gospel says it was Peter) draws his sword to defend him and strikes off an ear of the High Priest's servant. According to Matthew, Jesus orders him to sheathe his sword. There is to be no armed resistance, which is out of keeping with his spirit and his cause. "For all that take the sword shall perish with the sword."¹⁶ It is rather surprising that Peter's violence did not precipitate a counter-attack on him and the disciples, in spite of Jesus' disclaimer of resistance. Apparently the rabble was impressed by the spirited words which Jesus directed to them. He ironically asperses them for thus treating one as a highway robber who, as they knew, had daily taught in their midst in the temple. Did this teaching

¹⁵ But the reading is uncertain. See M'Neile, "Commentary on Matthew," 394.

¹⁶ Matt. xxvi. 52. This is also indicated by Luke, though in different words, "Suffer ye thus far" (xxii. 51), whilst ignored by Mark.

merit such "a robber-hunting sally" ?¹⁷ However, this has happened in fulfilment of Scripture.¹⁸ Matthew adds the problematic saying that, but for the must-be of Scripture, he has only to entreat his Father to send twelve legions of angels to his rescue in order to foil their design. The saying is hardly in keeping with what Jesus had descried but a few minutes before to be the Father's will that he should suffer, and is evidently a late reflection. Equally dubious the healing of the ear of the High Priest's servant, which Luke found in his separate source and which appears to have interested him as a physician.

The seizure, which in Luke and the Fourth Gospel is accomplished after this interlude, not before it, as in Mark and Matthew, and the failure of Peter's impulsive intervention result, in the first two Gospels, in the flight of all the disciples. "And they all forsook him and fled."¹⁹ They had evidently to the last cherished the hope that Jesus must somehow prevail against his enemies in spite of repeated warnings of the coming tragedy, unless we are to resort to the highly improbable assumption that these warnings are apologetic inventions after the event. Now that the illusion is grimly dispelled, they lose faith and with it courage, and scatter in panic and despair. In the case of Peter and John at least, the abandonment was only partial, since they appear later in the night in proximity to their captive Master. Rather strange that his captors did not at the same time lay hands on his followers, especially as Mark has the story of the young man who had been attracted to the scene in his nightdress, apparently from some neighbouring house, and was seized whilst joining in the procession to the High Priest's house, but escaped by leaving this covering in their grasp and fleeing naked.²⁰ The reason for the escape of the disciples would seem to be that in the excitement the attention of the crowd was absorbed in securing their leader, on whose capture, as Mark reveals,²¹ they were to concentrate.

¹⁷ M'Neile, "Commentary on Matthew," 396.

¹⁸ Luke substitutes for this the saying that this nocturnal hour belongs to them and the power of darkness, *i.e.*, to Satan and his benighted crew.

¹⁹ Mark xiv. 50; Matt. xxvi. 56.

²⁰ Mark xiv. 51-52.

²¹ Mark xiv. 44.

In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, Judas only appears as guide. Jesus, who has passed through no struggle,²² stands forth in his majesty and omniscience and faces the august official array with the challenge, "Whom seek ye?" To the answer, "Jesus of Nazareth," he replies, evidently in the same impressive tone, "I am he." Whereat the Roman soldiers and the emissaries of the Sanhedrin—the representatives of the might of Rome and the religious leaders of Judaism—recede and fall overwhelmed to the ground. Undoubtedly the impression is conveyed of a supernatural presence, to which they render an involuntary homage. He repeats the question, to which the same answer comes from the prostrate figures. Jesus replies, with some impatience it would seem, "I told you that I am he," and adds an appeal in behalf of the disciples, "If, therefore, ye seek me, let these go their way," in rather forced fulfilment of the word already spoken to the disciples in the prayer in the upper chamber, "Of those whom thou hast given me, I lost not one."²³ Jesus, on the other hand, gives himself voluntarily into their hands. He is not taken by them, but offers himself in his sovereign choice to them and to the death that his self-surrender involves. As in Matthew and Luke, he forbids resistance, though the reason given is differently worded by them and is omitted by Mark. He reveals his sovereign determination to drink the cup which the Father has given him without, however, any hint of the struggle that has preceded. The flight of the disciples is passed over in silence as the Roman soldiers and the temple guard close in, seize and bind him, and lead him away. The scene is dramatically depicted. Does it also correspond to the reality, as the Synoptists depict it? It may be that Jesus, whose imposing presence and speech are at times emphasised in the Synoptic Gospels, manifested these traits in this supreme hour with overpowering effect. But it is strange that we have no trace of this supernatural manifestation in the Synoptic record, but only of calm self-possession in the presence of the enemy. Equally

²² Some have seen in xviii. 11 a hint of it. But the words are hardly intended by the author to recall it.

²³ John xvii. 12.

strange that there is no desertion of the disciples, though Luke also ignores this, but only an inferential retirement in response to his express appeal, although he himself in the last discourse had not only forewarned Peter of his fall, but had plainly predicted that they should be scattered and should leave him alone. His anxiety for the disciples recalls the figure of the good shepherd who careth for the sheep.

According to the Synoptists, Jesus is brought by his captors to the house of the High Priest Caiaphas,²⁴ who held this office for about eighteen years (A.D. 18-36). In the Fourth Gospel he is led first (*πρῶτον*) to Annas, Caiaphas' father-in-law,²⁵ who had also held this office for a number of years (A.D. 6-15), and wielded, it seems, great influence in the Sanhedrin.²⁶ The reason given for thus bringing him before Annas—his family relation to Caiaphas—is not a relevant or logical one, unless it is meant to imply his influential position in the Sanhedrin. As the account of what follows stands in the received text of the Fourth Gospel (xviii. 19-24), it is both obscure and at variance with that of Mark and Matthew. In verse 13 the writer has already told us, in reference to the bringing of Jesus first to Annas, that "Caiaphas was high priest that year."²⁷ In verse 19, where Jesus is questioned by "the high priest," and in verse 22, where this dignitary is again mentioned, the narrative leads us to infer that Caiaphas is meant. In verse 24, however, it is clear that the high priest who has been examining Jesus is Annas, not Caiaphas, since we are told that Annas, after the examination, "sent him bound unto Caiaphas, the high priest." There is here, to say the least, a puzzling lack of lucidity in the use of a title which would seem to make both the holder of an office actually invested in only one of them.²⁸ Moreover, there is no

²⁴ Matt. xxvi. 57; cf. Mark xiv. 53; Luke xxii. 54.

²⁵ John xviii. 13.

²⁶ Josephus, "Antiquities," xviii. 2. 1; xx. 9. 1; "Bell. Jud.," iv. 3. 7.

²⁷ John xviii. 13. Some have seen in the phrase "that year" an assumption by the writer that the high-priesthood was only an annual office. They find in this an evidence of his ignorance of Jewish institutions, since the office was held for a number of years. The writer, however, evidently means that *fateful year*, i.e., of the condemnation of Jesus.

²⁸ On the assumption that the writer means Annas in verses 19 and 22, it has been contended that he applies this title to him in virtue of his having formerly held the high-priestly office. If so, its application is very

mention of any further examination by Caiaphas, who, in Mark and Matthew, alone deals with the case, and whose part in it the writer thus ignores. As the text stands, the story can only be described as mystifying.²⁹ Some would, therefore, attempt to clear up the obscurity by transposing verse 24 to after verse 14, as had already been done in an early manuscript of the Fourth Gospel. According to this rearrangement, the ex-high priest Annas simply received Jesus and then sent him to Caiaphas, who alone conducts the examination in verses 19-23, as in Mark and Matthew. Others would get rid of verse 24 by pronouncing it an interpolation.³⁰ This rearrangement certainly tends to clear up the obscurity, though it is a somewhat arbitrary method of making sense of the text.

In any case, the inquest before the high priest in this Gospel is a very perfunctory one. The high priest questions Jesus about his disciples and his teaching. Jesus refers him to his public teaching "to the world" (*τῷ κόσμῳ*) in synagogue and temple. He has never spoken anything in secret (a characteristic Johannine touch, as in vii. 4 f.). He has from the beginning openly proclaimed a universal Gospel, and asks him to put questions on the subject of his teaching not to him, but to those who have heard it. This does not necessarily imply obduracy or discourtesy in answering the high priest's inquiry, for if he was conducting an authoritative investigation, he ought first, it is assumed, to have examined witnesses against him before addressing the accused himself. Jesus' answer was, therefore, on this assumption, legally the correct one.³¹ It is, however, regarded by those present as an insult to his exalted ques-

unfortunate from the point of view of the lucidity of the narrative. Luke perhaps speaks in the same sense of both Annas and Caiaphas as being high priests in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (Luke iii. 2), and again, in the early period after the death of Jesus (Acts iv. 6), speaks of Annas as high priest in conjunction with Caiaphas.

²⁹ Westcott tries to get over the mystification by suggesting that Caiaphas, in verses 19 f., is conducting the examination unofficially, and that the statement that, at the conclusion of this unofficial examination, Annas sent him to Caiaphas is to be understood that he sent him for a further examination by him in his official capacity in his own house. This official examination, which the writer of the Fourth Gospel does not describe, is, it is further inferred, the one recorded by Mark and Matthew. "St John," 275-276. Surely a rather far-fetched ratiocination.

³⁰ Bacon, for instance, "Fourth Gospel," 485-486.

³¹ The assumption is by no means above question. It is asserted by every writer on the trial of Jesus that the high priest had no right to examine

tioner, and an officer deals him a blow for his rudeness, saying, "Answerest thou the high priest so?" Jesus calmly vindicates himself as acting within his legal right. "If I speak evil, bear witness of the evil, but if well (legally right), why smitest thou me?" In a hearing of this kind it was the officer's part to testify against him, not to use violence. This is all that the writer knows of the hearing of Jesus by the Jewish authorities. The hearing is for him not a trial, but a very summary investigation of the movement and the teaching underlying it. Accordingly, he is led from Caiaphas, without intimation of any further proceedings before the Sanhedrin, straight to the palace of Pilate—the prætorium, where the Roman procurator had his quarters and executed his judicial function.³²

Very different is the hearing as depicted by Mark and Matthew. They give us a vivid description of the proceedings and also an insight into the specific accusations against him and the animus of his official pursuers. It has been objected that their accounts in turn cannot be in accord with fact, inasmuch as, on the assumption of the writers that it was the Passover Feast, such an examination could not have been held on the Passover night. Nor, on the same assumption, could even the arrest of Jesus have taken place on this night. In any case, it was illegal to take proceedings on a capital charge against an accused person by night or, in case of proved guilt, to complete them in one day,³³ although

him in the absence of witnesses, and should have directed his inquiry to them. There is, however, no trace of such a prohibition in the Mishna or Tosefta. See Danby, "The Bearing of the Rabbinical Criminal Code on the Jewish Trial Narratives in the Gospels," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 54 (1920).

³² John xviii. 28.

³³ The procedure is thus laid down in the "Tractate Sanhedrin": "In non-capital cases the trial may take place in daytime and the verdict be given in the night; but in capital cases the trial takes place in daytime and the verdict is given in daytime. In non-capital cases a verdict of acquittal or of conviction may be reached the same day, while in capital cases a verdict of acquittal may be reached the same day, but a verdict of conviction not until the following day. Therefore, such a case is not to be tried on the eve of a Sabbath or Festival." "Tractate Sanhedrin," trans. by Danby, 71 (1919). This document belongs to the end of the second century A.D., and we are not to assume that its provisions relating to procedure were directly applicable to the early part of the first century A.D. It is more an academic treatise than one applicable to the practical working of the Jewish legal system nearly two hundred years earlier. It is therefore advisable not to dogmatise on the subject. See the same writer's article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 51 f. (1920).

all the Gospels agree that this was done. In ordinary circumstances, indeed, it was inadmissible to arrest and proceed against an accused person during festivals, or conduct a trial during the night, or, if convicted, hurry him to his doom on the same day. But the circumstances were extraordinary in the case of one whose teaching and claims were evidently regarded as a grave danger to the religious and national welfare. His seizure and summary condemnation were imperative in the interest of both. The case admitted of no delay, and in such a case it seems to have been deemed advisable to ignore the law, on the principle that the end justifies the means. There is, therefore, no compelling reason for impugning the Synoptic report of the case on such grounds.³⁴

In Mark and Matthew, then, Jesus is brought to the house of Caiaphas, where the Sanhedrin is assembled. Apparently the High Priest had arranged the meeting beforehand, which takes place in his residence, not in the hall within the temple buildings, where the court ordinarily sat, which were closed at night. "The whole Sanhedrin,"³⁵ consisting of seventy-one members, of which the High Priest is president, is present, though the expression may mean only the whole of those who could be got together.³⁶ In any case, the presence of at least twenty-three members was essential in a criminal suit. If it was of national importance, the whole Sanhedrin had to be assembled.³⁷ It appears that the proceedings took the form of an investigation rather than a trial, conducted by a court invested with the full powers of life and death in a criminal cause. The powers of the Sanhedrin in the time of Jesus are not exactly known, since its jurisdiction and its procedure are described only in the later Rabbinic literature, and we are not sure how far they applied to the beginning of the first Christian century.

³⁴ See on this subject Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar," ii. 815 f., particularly 820-822. "Die Berichterstattung der Synoptiker," they conclude their detailed discussion of the question, "darf daher in dieser Hinsicht nicht als ungläubwürdig hingestellt werden," 822.

³⁵ Mark xiv. 55; Matt. xxvi. 59.

³⁶ Mark says, however (xiv. 53), that "all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes" came together. It is highly probable, however, that at least two members, Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus, were absent.

³⁷ "Tractate Sanhedrin," 36 f.

According to later tradition, it was deprived of the right to judge causes involving the capital sentence forty years before the destruction of the temple, *i.e.*, A.D. 30, or, if we take the figure as a round number, some years before this date. The tradition may seem at variance with the testimony of Josephus, who tells us that the Sanhedrin did exercise this right under the Procuratorship of Albinus in A.D. 62 in the case of the trial and death of James, the Lord's brother.³⁸ But it evidently on this occasion exceeded its powers, and in any case the question whether it could try and sentence Jesus on a capital charge hardly arises, since it appears, directly from Luke and the Fourth Gospel, and indirectly from his fellow-Synoptists, that the hearing of the suit against him was of the nature of a preliminary investigation³⁹ with a view to trial and conviction by the Roman authority, even if Mark and Matthew may not have regarded it in this light. What the Sanhedrin appears to have done was to arrest Jesus as a dangerous agitator and pretender, whom, according to all four evangelists, they had previously determined to destroy,⁴⁰ and thus to get evidence in support of a criminal charge, such as could ensure his condemnation and execution at the hands of the Roman Procurator. In carrying out their purpose they follow the procedure which

³⁸ "Antiquities," xx. 9. 1.

³⁹ On this point see Husband, "The Prosecution of Jesus," 14 f. (1916). It is compared by Husband to the proceedings before a grand jury for the purpose of preparing an indictment in the court of the Roman Governor. This is the view taken also by Danby. The usual view is that it was a trial with sentence of death as the penalty. In other words, Jesus was tried twice, which seems an improbable conclusion. See, for instance, Taylor Innes, "The Trial of Jesus Christ," 81 (1899). "There were certainly two trials." Rosadi also regards the hearing before the Sanhedrin as a trial, issuing in a formal sentence, though he holds that it was not entitled according to the law and practice of Rome to try and sentence Jesus, and that it usurped this power, which belonged solely to the Roman Procurator. "The Trial of Jesus," 140 f., trans. by Reich (1905). M. Brodrick also assumes that the hearing before the Sanhedrin was a trial in the full sense. "Trial and Crucifixion of Jesus," 72 f. (1908). In his recent monograph on the subject (1929) Lord Shaw also regards the procedure before the Sanhedrin as a full trial. Luke xxiii. 2 shows that it was an investigation which it had been conducting. "We have found (*εβραμεν*) this man," etc., it reports to Pilate as the result of the examination of Jesus. In the "Acts of Pilate" (a compilation not earlier than the fourth century) the trial is assumed to be before Pilate, after the Sanhedrin had met to draw up charges against Jesus. For the Acts, see James, "Apocryphal N.T.," 96 f. (1924).

⁴⁰ Mark xi. 18; xiv. 1; Matt. xxi. 46; xxvi. 3; Luke xix. 47; xxii. 1; John xi. 47 f.

would so far apply in a legal investigation as well as in a trial properly so called—the calling of witnesses whose testimony might enable them to substantiate a criminal indictment of the accused, and whom they had evidently cited beforehand. According to Mark and Matthew, the witnesses, who were many in number and had to be separately examined, did not agree in their testimony. Matthew calls them “false witnesses” and Mark practically agrees with this description in saying that they gave false witness. The description does not necessarily mean that they had been suborned to testify falsely, but that their testimony was not in accordance with fact—either mistakenly or intentionally on their part. It was essential in law for the validity of their evidence that two of them at least should agree in their testimony. Whilst, according to Matthew, two were at length found to agree in attributing to Jesus a saying about the destruction of the temple, according to Mark, even their testimony did not tally. The saying in question recalls that attributed to Jesus by the fourth evangelist in his account of the cleansing of the temple in the early period of the ministry: “Destroy the temple, and in three days I will raise it up,”⁴¹ which the writer refers to the resurrection, though he represents “the Jews” as interpreting it of the sanctuary itself. In the Markan version it is twisted by the witnesses in order to make Jesus express his intention to destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days, while in the Matthæan version it expresses only his ability to do so. He had undoubtedly predicted its destruction in general terms on leaving it for the last time at the close of his mission, but in a private discourse, which could have been heard only by the disciples, and though he had cleared out the traffickers, this was a purely religious and moral act and tends to show that his object was to vindicate the sanctity of God’s house, not to resort to violence against it. Possibly the prophetic words (adapted from Jeremiah) in the lament over Jerusalem about “your house being left desolate” (Matt. xxiii. 38) were interpreted by certain listeners as implying its destruction by him. At all events, the saying, from whatever source it may have been derived, made a

⁴¹ John ii. 19.

very unfavourable impression on the High Priest. If he and his fellow-members associated it with the Messianic claim of Jesus—and he might have said something in this connection about replacing the old temple in the new Jerusalem of the Messianic age—this association would only tend to aggravate his offence in their eyes. To the pious Jew the Messianic reign could only enhance the glory of the temple. Caiaphas was evidently only too disposed to read into the reported words a malevolent intention, wholly unjustified by any authentic saying of Jesus known to us. He gave the accused, however, an opportunity of rebutting the accusation in accordance with legal usage. Of this opportunity Jesus refused to take advantage. “And the high priest rose and came forward and asked Jesus, Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these have witnessed against thee? But he held his peace and answered nothing.”⁴² His refusal is regrettable from the historic point of view, inasmuch as his reply would have enabled us to judge more definitely as to the occasion and the character of the saying imputed to him. His silence, we may be certain, did not imply an admission of the sinister design attributed to him. It may denote an unuttered protest against the illegality of which the president is too hastily assumed by some to have been guilty in putting questions to the accused, which, they hold, he had no right to do.⁴³ The impression made by the record is rather that it was needless to attempt to justify himself in the presence of those who, if the evangelists have not grossly misrepresented their attitude, were his implacable enemies, bent on making out a case for his destruction.

Something in the evidence adduced against him—perhaps the Messianic significance read into the saying about the temple, or the story of his public entry—may

⁴² Mark xiv. 60-61; Matt. xxvi. 62-63.

⁴³ Taylor Innes (“Trial,” 48) and M. Brodrick (“Trial,” 89-90) maintain the illegality of the question by Jewish law. The evidence being false, according to the Synoptists, the judges were bound without further parley to let the accused go. But while Mark says that the two witnesses did not agree, Matthew says that they did. Moreover, the Jewish law of the time of Jesus was not necessarily the later Talmudic law. In putting the question Caiaphas was at least giving the accused a chance of defending himself, even if he was biased against him, and M. Brodrick admits that “the defendant might say anything he liked in his own behalf” (p. 73). The illegality, if it was founded in this case, does not really amount to much.

have suggested the next question of the High Priest. At all events, he was evidently bent on extracting from Jesus a direct admission of his Messianic claim, which could be used with effect against him in the indictment to be presented to Pilate. Without explicit evidence to the effect that he claimed to be the Messianic king in the sense that they sought, though without justification, to represent, it would be useless to send him to Pilate for trial and condemnation. "Art thou," he abruptly queried, "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?"⁴⁴ To this challenge Jesus answers for the first time in the Synoptic record with a direct affirmative. "I am, and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the Power (the Almighty) and coming with the clouds of heaven."⁴⁵ In Matthew the question and answer are somewhat differently couched. The High Priest adjures him by the living God (requires him to testify on oath)⁴⁶ to tell them whether he is the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus replies in the affirmative. "Thou sayest. Nevertheless (in spite of your scepticism and your different conception of the Messiah), I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see," etc.⁴⁷ In his horror at this audacity, the High Priest rends his garments—the usual way of expressing detestation of some enormity such as blasphemy. To him this declaration was blasphemous, and the blasphemy evidently consisted in the audacity on the part of a man in the position of Jesus in arrogating to himself an honour deemed derogatory to God. Nevertheless, it was not blasphemy for any Jew to assume the rôle of the Christ as reflected in the prophets, the Psalms, the Book of Daniel, and the later apocalyptic literature. The High Priest, as the representative of the priestly Sadducean aristocracy, may, indeed, have shared the sceptical attitude of the Sadducean party towards the Messianic idea. In the actual circumstances of the Jewish people the expectation of the Messiah, in the current political sense, might well appear a popular chimera. But this

⁴⁴ Mark xiv. 61.

⁴⁵ Mark xiv. 62.

⁴⁶ Taylor Innes (56) and M. Brodrick (92) characterise the putting of Jesus on oath in order to extract a confession as a gross illegality on the part of the High Priest. But the fact that Jesus did not protest against the adjuration, but responded to it, would show that he recognised the High Priest's right to adjure him.

⁴⁷ Matt. xxvi. 63-64.

scepticism was certainly not shared by the Pharisaic members of the Sanhedrin, who devoutly cherished the Messianic hope, as it had come down from the prophetic period, and found expression in the later apocalyptic literature. It was, in fact, an integral element of Judaism as professed in the time of Jesus, and unless it was to remain a mere visionary aspiration, it was by no means an unheard-of presumption that some one should come forward and claim to embody it in his person. Visionary it was destined to prove, if interpreted literally, whether in the political or the more transcendental form. But from the Jewish national and religious standpoint, it was not only a feasible, but a necessary belief in accordance with the conception of Jahve and of Israel as His chosen people, through whom Jahve would, nay, *must*, vindicate His own existence as sovereign of the universe, with which their rights as His people were bound up. Given this fundamental conception and the widely cherished Messianic expectation as expressed in the old prophets and the current apocalyptic literature, it was open to any descendant of David, or even, in the view of some, of Aaron, to profess this claim in the very words of Jesus, without necessarily incurring the charge of blasphemy. True, it might seem to the ruling caste and the dominant Pharisaic party that the prophet of Nazareth could not possibly be the expected Messiah in either the political or the more transcendental sense. A purely spiritual kingdom as the result of his mission on earth, plus the final transcendental consummation of this kingdom as the result of his coming with the clouds of heaven to judge the world, was not in keeping with the current Messianic expectation. Nevertheless, as proclaimed by Jesus, it was no incomprehensible conception, and it certainly was not an irreligious one. Even with due allowance for the prepossessions of his enemies as to the character of the expected Messiah and the divine authentication of his Messianic claim, the charge of irreligion on the score of this claim, as made by Jesus, was, from the Jewish religious standpoint, or even from the legal conception of blasphemy, an unfounded one. Jesus had not reviled God or His law.⁴⁸ He had even

⁴⁸ Exod. xxii. 28 ; Lev. xxiv. 11 ; Num. xv. 30.

carefully avoided the direct use of the name of God, and had referred to Him, in accordance with Jewish usage, as the Almighty. He had adduced a claim which must have been perfectly familiar to his hearers and was, therefore, neither new nor irreligious. His teaching and his works had shown that he was no religious charlatan, and even his enemies had been impressed by the uniqueness of his personality and the moral force which he wielded. If they failed to realise what he really was and what history has proved him to have been—the greatest idealist of his race—this was their misfortune as well as his, which the ecclesiastical prejudice and stupidity of the age may palliate, if not justify. To denounce him as a blasphemer for assuming the rôle of the Christ in the religious sense, and what this involved from even their own standpoint, was in reality to condemn a cardinal article of the Jewish faith. In any case, what the High Priest was bound to do as head of the judicial body, which shared this faith, was to examine the grounds of the claim instead of rending his garments and hurling at the prisoner the dread accusation of blasphemy. Instead of calling witnesses to this claim or giving the accused the opportunity of stating his reasons in support of it, he regards the investigation as closed and asks for the verdict of the court. "And the high priest, having rent his garments, says, He has blasphemed. What further need have we of witnesses? You heard the blasphemy. What is your opinion? And they all condemned him to be liable to death."⁴⁹

According to both Mark and Matthew, this was from the outset the object of their meeting. "They sought witness (Matthew says "false witness") against Jesus in order to procure his death."⁵⁰ The reports of the Synoptists may be biassed, though the action of the High Priest in calling for a summary verdict and the instantaneous response of the Sanhedrin do seem to show animus against the prisoner. The assertion that he was thereafter subjected to violence may also savour of bias, if meant, as it seems to be in Matthew (xxvi. 67),

⁴⁹ ἔνοχος, Heb. *chayyab*, "Pirké Aboth," 10; Mark xiv. 64; Matt. xxvi. 65-66. On the word, see Moulton and Milligan, "Vocabulary," 217.

⁵⁰ Mark xiv. 55; Matt. xxvi. 59, *θαραυοῦν*.

to apply to the members of the tribunal. It is hardly credible that they could thus have demeaned themselves, and in Mark the "buffeting" is not necessarily inflicted by them, but indefinitely by "certain" of those present (xiv. 65). They seem to have left the maltreatment to the officers in attendance. Both writers, too, evidently regard the process as a trial which ends with a formal sentence of death against the prisoner.⁵¹ In this representation they also appear to have been mistaken. As the result of the investigation, the Sanhedrin was rather expressing the conviction that there was ample reason for pressing for the death penalty in the court of the Roman Procurator. This inference is borne out by the version of the proceedings given by Luke and by the subsequent indictment of him before Pilate.

Luke disagrees with Mark and Matthew in ignoring the nocturnal examination and transferring it to the early morning, whilst the maltreatment of Jesus occurs during the night at the hands of those in charge of the prisoner.⁵² Here we are faced with one of those discrepancies in the Synoptic narratives which show, at times, how uncertain was the early tradition in regard to actual facts of Jesus' career. Luke, has evidently followed a different source which contained no account of a nocturnal examination, but only of one at daybreak. If this early-morning examination took place as this source records it, it would necessitate the conclusion that the Sanhedrin met in the morning merely to repeat what it had done during the night. This seems most unlikely,⁵³ and it is clear that Luke's source

⁵¹ Mark uses the word *κατακρίνω*, which expresses the formal pronouncing of a sentence. Rosadi, whilst regarding the hearing as a trial, which the Sanhedrin had no right to undertake, denies that it ended in a formal sentence of death ("Trial," 203-204).

⁵² Luke xxii. 63 f.

⁵³ Plummer and others would explain it by assuming that the proceedings of the night had to be gone over again in the morning in order to make them legal, since a criminal charge could not be held during the night. "Commentary on Luke," 518. Similarly M. Brodrick, 94. The fact seems to be that the Sanhedrin were not much concerned about legality, though they conducted their investigation in accordance with usage to a certain extent. Their object was at all hazards to get Jesus condemned and executed. Those who, like J. Weiss ("Schriften des N.T.," i. 516-518), prefer the Lukan account to that of Mark and Matthew, do so on what seems to me inconclusive arguments.

has confusedly transferred the proceedings of the night to the meeting in the morning. The only material fact that it adds to these proceedings is the enlargement of the answer made by Jesus to the question whether he was the Christ, which is here put by the Sanhedrin, not, as in Mark and Matthew, by the High Priest. "If I tell you, ye will not believe, and if I put questions to you, ye will not (fairly) answer." That a meeting did take place in the early morning is confirmed by Mark and Matthew. But the purpose of this second meeting was not to re-examine Jesus, but evidently to hold a consultation⁵⁴ about the further procedure to be adopted in his case. This consultation explains what Luke fails to explain—the fact of the detailed indictment which, he tells us, the Sanhedrin presented to Pilate and which he alone has preserved. The drawing up of this indictment was, we may almost certainly conclude, the subject of the consultation mentioned by Mark and Matthew, though they do not, like Luke, give the terms of this important document. Only on the strength of this indictment could the enemies of Jesus hope for a favourable issue of the trial before the Roman Procurator, which they immediately requested him to undertake.

All four evangelists agree in reporting the denial of Peter during these preliminary proceedings, though in this case also they disagree in detail. Luke alone relates the incident continuously. The others interrupt it by the nocturnal examination. After participating in the flight of the disciples, Peter follows "afar off" the captors of Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel he is accompanied by another disciple—probably the beloved disciple—who, we are told, was known to the High Priest. This disciple enters the forecourt of the High Priest's house and afterwards brings in Peter. Whilst the Synoptists also bring Peter into the forecourt, where, as in the Fourth Gospel, he spends the time warming himself at a fire, made by the guard owing to the coldness of the night, they say nothing about the introduction of the other disciple. All four relate the

⁵⁴ συμβούλιον. The word means both a deliberation and the preparing of a plan of action, according as the verb ποιήσαντες or ετοιμάσαντες is used along with it. The reading is uncertain.

questioning of Peter by those in the court below the hall where the examination is held, but all four differ as to the various interlocutors. All four agree that Peter three times denied that he was a disciple of the Nazarene, and that at the third time the cock crew.⁵⁵ Whereupon, in the Synoptists, he goes out and his pent-up emotions over those pitiful disclaimers find vent in bitter tears. Luke alone, who knows of no nocturnal examination and makes Jesus spend the night among the guards, adds the dramatic touch, "And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter."⁵⁶

Only Matthew⁵⁷ has the story of the fate of Judas, who repents of his treachery on perceiving that the Sanhedrin is determined to compass his death, returns the blood money with an expression of his remorse for betraying an innocent man, drops the money into the temple treasury on their contemptuous refusal to take it back, and goes and hangs himself. If the story may be trusted, it redounds to his honour, though the evangelist may not intend to rehabilitate him, suicide being regarded as a grave transgression against God, the Giver of life, and the person guilty of it as the object of loathing and contempt.⁵⁸ But it sounds rather like a piece of poetic justice, which tradition might easily have given itself the satisfaction of improvising. This is all the more likely inasmuch as the writer finds in it not only an explanation of the purchase of the Potter's Field,⁵⁹ for the burial of strangers, by the members of the Sanhedrin, with the money which they refused to accept as a temple gift, but of the fulfilment of a very problematic Old Testament prophecy.

II. TRIAL AND CRUCIFIXION

On the completion of the early-morning council, Jesus is led bound to the Prætorium¹—probably the palace of Herod the Great, in which the Procurator, whose head-

⁵⁵ Mark has two cock-crows accompanying the first and third denials.

⁵⁶ xxii. 61.

⁵⁷ xxvii. 3 f.

⁵⁸ Josephus, "Bell. Jud.," iii. 8, 5.

⁵⁹ Hence called the Field of Blood. For a variant of the story, see Acts i. 18-19.

¹ The Prætorium was the building where the Procurator happened to be residing for the time being, not a specific building.

quarters were at Cæsarea, on the coast, resided during the great feast days, when there was more danger of disorder. It was large enough to house him and his guards (the *cohors prætorialis*), who are not to be confused with the ordinary garrison, which was quartered in the Tower of Antonia. Though subordinate in rank to the Governor of Syria, of which Palestine was a province, Pilate in his capacity of Procurator was the direct representative of the Emperor,² and was responsible to him in the exercise of his jurisdiction in civil, criminal, and military affairs. He had already been Procurator for at least three years, and both Philo and Josephus give him a very bad character as an administrator and attribute to him ruthless tyranny, cruelty, and corruption.³ In the Gospel record of the trial of Jesus, on the other hand, he appears as a just and humane, if weak man, who was too inclined to sacrifice justice to the clamour of the fanatic populace and their leaders. Probably both are coloured by the desire to make out a case for or against him, and in the representation of the evangelists allowance must be made for the influence of the later anti-Jewish feeling and apologetic of the writers.

The scene, as represented by the reporters, is the Prætorium, the headquarters of the Procurator for the time being. Pilate is the judge. The Sanhedrin, headed by the High Priest, is the prosecuting party. According to the Fourth Gospel, its members are prevented from entering the building, because it is the day of preparation for the Passover Feast in the evening—in accord with his assumption that the Passover meal had not yet been celebrated. The trial, as far as the prosecution takes part in it, is, therefore, held outside the palace, whilst, as far as Jesus is concerned, it takes place inside, where the prisoner is interrogated. According to Mark and Matthew, the whole proceedings take place in the open air, and only after the trial is finished do the soldiers take Jesus into the palace.⁴

² He was the Emperor's Procurator with delegated power (*cum potestate*). See Taylor Innes, "Trial," 69-70; Husband, "Prosecution of Jesus," 29.

³ Philo, "De Legatione ad Caium (Caligula)," section 38, gives the letter of Herod Agrippa I. in which his régime is severely criticised. Josephus, "Antiquities," xviii. 3. 1 and 4. 1. The Jewish indictment is, however, hardly an objective criticism.

⁴ Mark xv. 16; Matt. xxvii. 27.

Luke is silent on the subject. There was nothing unusual in holding the court outside the building, and the reason for doing so, as stated in the Fourth Gospel, does not exist for the Synoptists, and seems to be an inference in accordance with the view of the writer of the celebration of the Passover. It was against the Roman practice that Pilate should conduct the trial except in the presence of both accused and accusers. Both had the right to hear and answer what was said by either party. Instead of strictly observing the prescribed practice, Pilate, in the Fourth Gospel, comes and goes between the two parties to the suit. In this respect the Synoptic account must decidedly be allowed the preference over the Johannine. We hear nothing of a jury sitting along with the Procurator or of the calling of witnesses in accordance with the Roman practice in criminal trials, unless the words "they witness against thee"⁵ may imply the presence of witnesses. Pilate is evidently the sole judge of the evidence presented.

In the Fourth Gospel he commences the trial, in accordance with usage, by calling for the accusation against the prisoner. "What accusation bring ye against this man?"⁶ This does not necessarily betoken complete lack of knowledge of the case. It was the ordinary way of opening the proceedings. The reply of the prosecution, in the Fourth Gospel, is, however, hardly credible. Instead of bringing a specific charge, which it was their office and their duty to do, they merely take refuge in the vague assertion that, if Jesus were not an evil-doer, they would not have brought him before the Procurator. This sounds really too simple, not to say stupid, as a cogent reason for instituting a process before the supreme secular judge. What they answered is far more pertinently given by Luke, who has preserved the formal indictment presented by them, which Mark and Matthew assume in their general statement, that they accused him of many things.⁷ "And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation,

⁵ Καταμαρτυροῦσιν, Matt. xxvii. 13. It seems, however, to be used of the accusation of the members of the Sanhedrin (xxvii. 12).

⁶ John xviii. 30.

⁷ Mark xv. 3; Matt. xxvii. 13. The Fourth Gospel also assumes it in reporting Pilate's question to Jesus on the kingship (xviii. 33).

and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king." ⁸ The first accusation is in accord with what was the current and became the fixed Jewish belief that Jesus was a deceiver of the people. The assertion about the forbidding of taxes is so glaring a perversion of Jesus' words that one wonders how it could possibly be made. Some one must have lied shamelessly in reporting the words on the subject, if we are to avoid the conclusion that the Sanhedrin deliberately "perverted" the saying in their thirst for his blood. The word "king" in the third clause was evidently added in explanation of the word "Christ" for the information of the Procurator, and it is this part of the indictment, which covers that about the refusal of taxes to the Emperor, that Pilate naturally seizes as the all-important charge. To claim the Jewish kingship purported treason (*crimen læsæ majestatis*), and he, therefore, according to all four Gospels, puts the question to the prisoner, perhaps in a surprised, if not in an ironic tone, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" To this query Jesus, in the three Synoptists, returns the affirmative, "Thou sayest," without any explanation, and in Mark and Matthew, who relate the sequel very briefly, he persists in his silence in spite of the further questions of Pilate, who cannot understand his refusal to defend himself in the face of the accusations of his enemies. "And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing? Behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered anything, insomuch that Pilate marvelled." ⁹

Luke is more fully informed than his fellow-Synoptists on this stage of the trial. When Jesus answers the question on the kingship in the affirmative, Pilate is evidently convinced, from the appearance and bearing of the prisoner, that his Messianic claim has no political significance. Jesus is at most a religious idealist, whose teaching is politically harmless. Otherwise, from the Roman point of view, such an admission would have settled the matter, and Pilate would have had no alternative but to pronounce sentence. "I find no fault in this man," he tells the chief priests and

⁸ Luke xxiii. 2.

⁹ Mark xv. 4-5; cf. Matt. xxvii. 12-14.

the crowd, who has by this time gathered, evidently attracted by the public hearing of the suit. Whereupon the accusers redouble their efforts to obtain a conviction and amplify the indictment somewhat in order to emphasise the seditious character of Jesus' activity as a teacher. "He stirreth up the people throughout the whole of Judæa (Palestine), and beginning from Galilee even unto this place."¹⁰ Pilate inquires whether he is a Galilean, and being answered in the affirmative, sends him to Herod Antipas, who had come to Jerusalem for the feast, and whose immediate subject he was.

In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, this stage of the trial is differently reported. Jesus does not directly answer the question about his kingship, but himself asks one. He desires to know whether Pilate asks the question of his own accord, or has been coached by his enemies on the subject. In other words, in what sense is the kingship to be understood—in the Roman or the Jewish Messianic sense? Pilate rebuts rather impatiently the assumption that he has any concern with a mere question of Jewish theology, as he has already been represented by the writer to have done in replying to the vague charge of "evil-doing," in the Jewish religious sense, brought by his accusers at the outset of the prosecution, "Take him yourselves and judge him according to your law."¹¹ "Am I a Jew?" he now replies to Jesus himself. "Thine own nation and the chief priests delivered thee unto me. What hast thou done?"¹² As supreme judge he wants to know what he has done to justify his enemies in bringing him there on a charge involving the penalty of death, which they themselves have previously confessed their ability to inflict.¹³ Still Jesus does not give a direct answer, but in the characteristic Johannine style declares that his is a spiritual, not a political kingdom. Jesus is speaking here to the later Roman world of his persecuted followers in vindication of the political loyalty, which can unquestionably accord with their allegiance to him as their heavenly king. "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world,

¹⁰ Luke xxiii. 4-5.

¹¹ John xviii. 31.

¹² John xviii. 35.

¹³ John xviii. 31.

then would my officers fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But now my kingdom is not from hence."¹⁴ This fine saying is true to fact, even if it is rather the reflection of the author than a verbatim report of what Jesus said. That he should have said something like it in explanation of his Messianic claim, in spite of the Synoptic silence as to this preliminary colloquy, is not incredible, since one feels that his refusal to enter into any discussion with Pilate, as in the Synoptic representation, is rather inexplicable. Pilate then returns to the question, which, if apparently sceptically intoned, is essential for an understanding of the case, "Art thou a king then?" It is at this point that Jesus replies with the Synoptic affirmative, "Thou sayest that I am a king." But the elaboration of the reply is unmistakably Johannine. "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world that I should bear witness to the truth. Every one who is of the truth heareth my voice."¹⁵ The impressive answer evokes the sardonic question, "What is truth?" We are made to feel, without being told, the striking contrast between the impassioned idealist and the matter-of-fact sceptic. However sceptical as to the truth, judged by his experience as practical administrator, he has at any rate convinced himself that Jesus is no sedition monger, and, as in Luke, he tells his accusers that he finds him guilty of no crime.¹⁶

Equally with Mark and Matthew, the Johannine writer knows nothing of the sending of Jesus to Antipas, which Luke gives as the next stage of the process. This episode is somewhat problematic. The reason adduced by the evangelist is that Pilate had discovered that Jesus was a Galilean and was, therefore, subject to Antipas' "jurisdiction." The reason has been questioned on the ground that, according to Roman law, the prisoner in a case like that of Jesus, who was accused of stirring up sedition in all Judæa (Palestine), not merely in Galilee, was tried where he was arrested and by the Governor of the territory in which the arrest took place.¹⁷ In Jerusalem Antipas had no jurisdic-

¹⁴ John xviii. 36.

¹⁶ John xviii. 37.

¹⁵ John xviii. 38.

¹⁷ Husband, "Prosecution," 264-265.

tion and was, therefore, not entitled to take any part in the case, though, as a Galilean, Jesus was his subject. The reason for sending him to Antipas, given by Luke, thus did not apply. Moreover, Antipas and Pilate are stated (Luke xxiii. 12) to have been enemies before this incident, and the Roman Procurator would hardly have asked the aid of one with whom he was not on speaking terms. On the other side, it has been contended by Dr Verrall¹⁸ that the term translated "jurisdiction" does not here mean more than that Jesus was "of the dominion of Antipas," and that the sending did not imply a recognition of his judicial jurisdiction in the case. Jesus was sent merely for the purpose of obtaining a report on it, not to decide the question of his fate. Pilate may, further, have desired for some special reason to woo the tetrarch's friendship by this act of courtesy, as Luke seems to imply. If so, the overture was successful, for, according to Luke, "Herod and Pilate became friends with each other from that very day; for before they were at enmity with themselves." But apart from this possible personal motive, there is no little force in the contention that he should adopt this course in order thereby to elicit additional information and obtain a better understanding of the charge against the prisoner. The reference by Festus of Paul's case to King Agrippa at Cæsarea tends, it seems to me, to support the similar action of Pilate in the case of Jesus. Antipas appears, indeed, in the Synoptic narratives, as suspicious of and even hostile to Jesus and his mission in Galilee, and this does not seem to accord with the Lukan representation of his attitude towards the prisoner at Jerusalem. Jesus' refusal to answer his questions was certainly not fitted to disarm his hostility. Even so, it is quite possible that he might have concluded from the appearance of the prisoner, as Pilate himself had done, that he was not politically dangerous. This seems to be implied in the phrase, "He thought him of no importance," and on this ground convinced himself that the case was not one of serious concern. He seems, accordingly, to have made light of the indictment and, jestingly arraying

¹⁸ "Christ Before Herod," in his collection of essays entitled "The Bacchants of Euripides," 335 f. (1910).

Jesus in regal attire,¹⁹ sent him back to Pilate, with the intimation, apparently, that he had done "nothing worthy of death" (Luke xxiii. 15).

Fortified with this confirmation of his own impression that Jesus has been guilty of "nothing worthy of death," Pilate is concerned, in the third stage of the trial, to save him from this fate. In Luke he proposes to chastise and release him. In his view, apparently, Jesus, by his claim to be a king, had been formally guilty of an offence against the Roman Government. But as he evidently made this claim with no treasonable intent, a milder penalty than death would meet the case and ought to satisfy his accusers. According to Luke, they would by no means listen to this proposal. Thereupon he suggests that he should release him, in accordance with the custom of amnestying a prisoner during the feast at the request of the people. Nothing is otherwise known of such a custom, and the right of Pilate to pardon a condemned man has been questioned, and has led some to discard the whole incident as spurious. It is only inferentially²⁰ that we learn of this custom from Luke. But the other three reporters explicitly assert it, and though Pilate had not the power to release a condemned person, Barabbas is described by all three Synoptists as a prisoner who would appear to have been awaiting his trial. The proceedings then centre in the efforts of Pilate to save Jesus by this expedient, which all four evangelists report—the writer of the Fourth Gospel in more detailed fashion than the other three. Pilate is represented by all of them as struggling hard, against the fanatic prejudice and hatred of Jesus' enemies, to prevent the death of one whom he regards as practically, if not technically, innocent. According to Matthew, his resistance is strengthened by a dream of his wife, warning him to beware of sending "that righteous man" to death.²¹ Whilst this may be a popular tale, such dream experiences are by no means unprecedented,

¹⁹ Verrall thinks that the splendid apparel was a mark of his favour, not of derision. This is rather far fetched. This rough jocosity is not unlikely, though the mockery may be an attempt of the tradition which Luke followed to transfer the odium of the mockery of the Roman soldiers, at a later stage of the process, which Luke ignores, to the Jews.

²⁰ Luke xxiii. 18.

²¹ Matt. xxvii. 19.

and the Procurator's spies were probably on the alert at this Passover season and reporting to their master the events of the last few days. The story of this struggle, especially as related by Luke and the fourth evangelist, reflects the apologetic aim of the writers to represent the Roman Government, in the person of Pilate, as favourable to Jesus and, therefore, to Christianity, and thus lay the chief responsibility for the miscarriage of justice on the Jewish people and their leaders. But this does not necessarily invalidate the fact of Pilate's reluctance to sacrifice Jesus to mob passion, even if it does not accord with the Jewish representation of his character as a ruthless and unscrupulous administrator. He evidently saw through the attempt of the Sanhedrin to use him as the instrument of their religious bigotry. In the demand for the release of Barabbas the clamour of the people mingles with that of the members of the Sanhedrin, and in Mark and Matthew "the multitude" are stirred up by the chief priests and elders to ask for Barabbas and demand the death of Jesus.²² Nor is this sudden revulsion against one, who now appeared to have signally failed to fill the rôle of the popular Messiah, inherently impossible. In the prisoner arraigned before the Roman tribunal and palpably impotent to save himself and vindicate his cause, the enthusiasm of the pilgrims for the triumphant Messianic king might easily melt away and be transformed into unreasoning and bitter hostility. But it is not necessary to posit such a complete revulsion. The multitude here may well mean the Jerusalem rabble, who had taken no part in the triumphal demonstration of the pilgrims, and were ready enough to take sides against him at the behest of the constituted religious authority. Moreover, the clamour does not necessarily exclude the possibility that in the crowd there were some who retained at least sympathy for the prisoner, but who were unable, amid the fierce uproar of his enemies, to make their predilection prevail. According to the Synoptists, Pilate, in the face of this insistent outcry for Barabbas, asks, "What, then, shall I do unto him whom ye call the king of the

²² Mark xv. 11 ; Matt. xxvii. 20.

Jews ? ” ²³ He is answered with reiterated shouts, “ Crucify him.” “ Why, what evil hath he done ? ” he queries anew, adding, according to Luke, “ I have found no cause of death in him, and will, therefore, chastise him and let him go.” ²⁴ In response the multitude renew the shout, “ Crucify him,” still more clamorously. At last Pilate gives way, “ willing to content the multitude,” says Mark ; ²⁵ “ seeing that he prevailed nothing and fearing the outbreak of a tumult,” says Matthew ; ²⁶ “ delivering Jesus up to their will,” according to Luke, ²⁷ who alone records the formal sentence of crucifixion. ²⁸ Matthew’s source enables him to add that “ he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man. See ye to it. And all the people answered and said, His blood be on us and on our children.” ²⁹ Though the action looks like a piece of later Christian apologetic, such washing as a sign of innocence was not unknown in the Græco-Roman world, ³⁰ and Pilate may have resorted to this Jewish custom as a rebuke to the raging Jewish multitude, and a last, if unheroic, attestation of his own belief in Jesus’ innocence. Both he and Mark add the scourging, which was involved in the penalty of crucifixion. ³¹

In thus yielding to the fanaticism of the raving crowd in front of him, he acts a cowardly part and one utterly unworthy of the representative of an Empire which professed to dispense impartial justice, and, in virtue of its material force, could afford to enforce it irrespective of popular passion and prejudice. Unfortunately, Pilate, if fair minded, was lacking in the moral courage, the fidelity to conviction which, as in the case of a Gallio, would have enabled him to oppose to Jewish bigotry the inflexible will of the bearer of Roman justice.

²³ Mark xv. 12. Matt. xxvii. 22 has “ unto Jesus who is called Christ.” Luke does not give the question, but says that he spake unto them again, desiring to release Jesus (xxiii. 20).

²⁴ Luke xxiii. 22.

²⁵ xv. 15.

²⁶ xxvii. 24.

²⁷ See Strack and Billerbeck, “ Kommentar,” i. 1032.

²⁸ On the Roman custom of scourging before crucifixion, see Josephus, “ Bell. Jud.,” ii. 14, 9. Some object that it is a mark of the lack of historicity in the tradition that Pilate himself is said to have scourged him. But this need not be taken literally.

²⁹ xxiii. 25.

³⁰ ἐπέκρινεν (xxiii. 24).

³¹ Matt. xxvii. 24-25.

After sentence and scourging, the soldiers, according to Mark and Matthew, bring Jesus into the inner court of the Prætorium, where they array him in royal garb and mock and maltreat him, and then lead him away to be crucified. Whilst Luke's source omits this outrageous scene and transfers the mockery of the soldiers to the place of execution, the Fourth Gospel agrees with the other two Synoptists in placing it after the scourging. But for this writer the rôle of Pilate in the case has not yet ended. He has, in fact, not yet pronounced sentence, and the scourging precedes the interlocution with "the Jews" as related by the Synoptists. There is evidently confusion here, since scourging was involved in the penalty of crucifixion and only inflicted after the sentence was pronounced. What follows in the Fourth Gospel is, therefore, very mystifying. In this report Pilate leaves the brutal scene of the mockery by the soldiers after the scourging—so revolting to our modern conception of the administration of justice—to announce to his accusers that he is bringing their victim forth in order that they may know that he finds no crime in him. He has thus not yet sentenced him to death, and has scourged him apparently in the hope of getting him off with this lighter penalty, which, in Luke, he proposes to his accusers to do, but is prevented from doing by their refusal to accept this form of punishment as a substitute for the death penalty. Jesus then appears arrayed in the purple garb of mock royalty and the crown of thorns. Pilate, pointing to the tragic figure, exclaims, "Behold the man!" It is a masterly stroke of the author's pen, revealing both his dramatic sense and the pathos, the tragedy of unmerited suffering patiently, steadfastly borne. The appeal is lost on his fanatic persecutors, who continue to vociferate, "Crucify him."³² Thereupon the interlocution between them and Pilate, already described by the Synoptists and partly by the writer himself as having taken place before the scourging, is elaborated with characteristic Johannine variations. Pilate, in reply to their bloodthirsty vociferation, tells them to take him and crucify him themselves. "For I find no crime in him."³³ "The Jews," shifting the accusation from sedition

³² xix. 1-6.³³ xix. 6.

against the Roman Government, now reveal the real cause of their bitter animus against him. By their law he ought to die because he has made himself the Son of God. Pilate is more troubled than ever, and goes back to Jesus in the Prætorium (the author has forgotten to tell us that Jesus must have returned to the interior) and asks, "Whence art thou?" —a real Johannine touch, reminding of the old controversy with "the Jews" during previous feasts. Jesus deigns no answer. "Speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that I have authority³⁴ to release thee and authority to crucify thee?" Then Jesus speaks out as the representative of the later Christian assurance that he has suffered death only because God has willed it, not because Pilate claims to have authority to inflict it, and at the same time pillories the enormity of the sin of those who have compassed his doom (though the reasoning is not quite clear). "Thou wouldest have no authority against me unless it were given thee from above. Therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin."³⁵ Pilate is deeply impressed, and tries anew to acquit him. But "the Jews," again changing their ground, counter his efforts by working on his fear of the consequences at Rome. "If thou release this man," they shout, "thou art not Cæsar's friend. Every one that maketh himself a king opposeth Cæsar."³⁶ This dangerous reasoning finally baulks Pilate's well-meant persistence, which has not only braved Jewish prejudice and passion, but struggled on against the silence of Jesus. He takes his place on the judgment seat, which was in the open. The writer's local knowledge enables him to locate the spot. It was the Pavement (Hebrew, Gabbatha³⁷), probably a paved terrace in front of the Prætorium, where he was wont to proclaim official decisions.³⁸ In weakly yielding to the religious fanaticism of the mob and its leaders, he at least gives expression to his contempt for them and their religion. "Behold, your king!"³⁹ His words evoke another storm of blind hatred. In the final interchange between him and them the writer indirectly conveys the conviction that, in their

³⁴ ἐξουσίαν.

³⁵ xix. 11.

³⁶ xix. 12.

³⁷ More correctly Gabbeta.

³⁸ Dalman, "Orte und Wege Jesu," 355.

³⁹ John xix. 14.

blind rejection of the Messianic claim of Jesus, they were virtually renouncing a fundamental tenet of their own religion and gratifying their animosity at the expense of a hollow profession of allegiance to the Roman conqueror, who, on the other hand, is made to appear right to the end as the protector, not the persecutor of Christianity. "Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your king? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Cæsar. Then, therefore, he delivered him unto them to be crucified."⁴⁰

The reality of this elaboration of the trial has been forcibly questioned on both legal and historic grounds. The characteristic Johannine apologetic is at all events very marked. It is a telling sample of the author's creative genius and his method of writing history, which, with a rare skill, makes history the medium of the author's apologetic purpose. His apologetic explanation of the crucifixion of Jesus as a common malefactor and as the victim of the implacable and odious hostility of the Jews is legitimate enough as a defence of Christianity. But to make Pilate and the Jews so obviously the media of this apologetic is rather overdoing the liberty he considers himself entitled to take with historic fact.

The Synoptists agree in stating that Simon of Cyrene was impressed by the soldiers to bear the cross (probably only the cross-beam) on the way to Golgotha,⁴¹ the place of execution, whereas, in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus himself bears it.⁴² Luke alone has, in his characteristic fashion, the lamentation of the women in the multitude, which accompanied him, and the prophetic forecast of the calamities that will issue for them and the Jews from this tragedy.⁴³ Arrived at the place of execution, the soldiers offer him wine mixed with myrrh⁴⁴ as a narcotic, which, after tasting, he refuses. On the top of the cross was a scroll with the

⁴⁰ xix. 15-16.

⁴¹ On the locality of Golgotha, see Dalman, "Orte und Wege Jesu," 364. Probably so named from its resemblance to a skull.

⁴² The assertion is apparently meant as a corrective of the Synoptists, in accordance with the teaching of Jesus on the necessity of following him in bearing the cross (Mark viii. 34; Matt. xvi. 24).

⁴³ Luke xxiii. 27 f.

⁴⁴ Mark xv. 23; Matt. xxvii. 34. This corresponds with Jewish custom, Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar," i. 1037.

words, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, "The King of the Jews," inscribed on it, which, according to the Fourth Gospel, Pilate curtly refused to alter, at the request of the Jews, to "He said, I am King of the Jews." "What I have written I have written."⁴⁵ In Mark the crucifixion takes place at the third hour (9 o'clock), though Jesus only dies at the ninth hour (3 o'clock). Matthew and Luke seem to agree, whilst, in the Fourth Gospel, the trial only ends about the sixth hour (12 o'clock), when, in the view of the writer, the preparation for the Passover Feast began.⁴⁶ He may be right, since the trial, especially if it was interrupted by the reference to Antipas, could hardly have been finished by 9 o'clock,⁴⁷ though the writer was evidently concerned to associate the death of Jesus with the preparation for the feast. All four concur in stating that two malefactors were crucified along with him, and that, as was usual, the soldiers, after the crucifixion, cast lots for his garments. The Fourth Gospel explains the latter statement by saying that, whilst the four soldiers present divided the outer garment into four parts—one for each—it was only for the inner seamless tunic that they cast lots, and thus fulfilled Ps. xxii. 18. The Synoptists further agree in stating that Jesus was exposed to the mocking gibes of the chief priests and others, which the Fourth Gospel ignores. But while Mark and Matthew make the two malefactors and the passers-by also indulge in this revolting conduct, Luke says that "the people stood looking on,"⁴⁸ and substitutes the soldiers for the passers-by. According to him, too, only one of the malefactors⁴⁹ railed at Jesus. The other rebukes him and begs Jesus to remember him

⁴⁵ John xix. 19 f. The inscription is variously worded, and it is from the Fourth Gospel that we learn that it was trilingual. It was usual to signify the crime of a condemned person by hanging a placard round his neck.

⁴⁶ John xix. 14.

⁴⁷ If the trial had taken place at Rome, it would not have been conducted so summarily. It would certainly not have been decided in a few hours. The defendant would have been given ample time to prepare and submit his defence. In the provinces the procedure was more expeditious, and in the case of Pilate, who only spent a short time in the city on such occasions, the judge had to dispose of a large number of suits in a limited time. Husband, "Prosecution of Jesus," 252-253.

⁴⁸ Luke xxiii. 35.

⁴⁹ According to Jewish law, two persons could not be condemned and executed on the same day. But this was a Roman, not a Jewish execution.

when he comes in his kingdom—a request which conveys the recognition of his Messianic kingship. To him Jesus addresses one of the sayings on the Cross, “Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.”⁵⁰ The final saying recorded by Luke, “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,” which is lacking in the best manuscripts, is generally regarded as a later addition, though it is completely in accord with the spirit of Jesus. The Synoptists further agree in mentioning the darkness which brooded over the scene from the sixth to the ninth hour, *i.e.*, from midday to mid-afternoon—an eclipse of the sun.

It was in this nocturnal atmosphere that Jesus expired. His last words were, according to Mark and Matthew, the cry of anguish that opens Ps. xxii., “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” In Mark one of the bystanders, concluding from the Aramaic *Eloi* that he was calling *Elijah*, believed to be the helper in need, to his assistance, seeks to prolong his existence by holding a sponge dipped in vinegar (sour wine) to his lips, in order to see whether *Elijah* will appear and take him from the cross. The misunderstanding is surprising on the part of Jewish listeners, if the cry was uttered in the popular Aramaic dialect, as Mark records. In Matthew, on the other hand, it is uttered not in the Aramaic, but in the Hebrew version, and the term “*Eli*” (not *Eloi*) might thus easily be confused by those unfamiliar with the Hebrew with the name of the prophet. Thereafter Jesus utters something in a loud voice which Mark and Matthew have failed to record,⁵¹ but which Luke has preserved as his last utterance—likewise a quotation from a Psalm (xxx. 5)—“Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” The isolation from God as well as man was but momentary, and the authentic note of absolute trust in the Father, which runs all through his life, is the fitting note of its conclusion. The Fourth Gospel accords with Luke in depicting the serene aspect of his last moments. Jesus knows that he is fulfilling the will of God as forecasted in the Scripture. The only sign of weakness is

⁵⁰ Luke xxiii. 43.

⁵¹ In Mark the cry is inarticulate; in Matthew it is evidently an utterance, though the words are not given.

physical, "I thirst." The soldiers ⁵² reach up the sponge full of vinegar, and Jesus, after receiving it, bows his head and dies with words, calmly and confidently spoken, "It is finished."

Among the portents that signalise his death, all three Synoptists tell of the rending of the vail of the temple, which separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies,⁵³ and Matthew in addition pictures, in the lurid style of Hebrew fantasy, the earthquake that rent the rocks and opened the tombs, and the temporary rising of many of the dead saints who, after the resurrection of Jesus, enter the city and are recognised by many.⁵⁴ These supernatural phenomena have all the features of the legendary tale which, springing from current belief in such happenings as signs of God's anger, grows up in connection with extraordinary events, and which the Fourth Gospel passes over in silence. They further agree in recording the verdict of the centurion, though the version of the words varies. In Mark and Matthew the verdict is "a son of God," in Luke, "a righteous man," and Luke stands alone in recording the favourable impression of the crowd of spectators who "returned smiting their breasts."⁵⁵ The Fourth Gospel again ignores, and tells instead of the piercing of his side and the flow of blood and water, in place of the breaking of the legs, as the Jews requested of Pilate. The addition is meant to show that Jesus died at the time that the paschal lambs were being slain, as the paschal lamb for the sins of the world, in accordance with the scriptural injunction that no bone of the paschal lamb should be broken (Exod. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12). The piercing of his side is also in accordance with Scripture (Zech. xii. 10). In his characteristic, indirect way the writer thus emphasises the sacrificial aspect of the death of Jesus, as he conceives it. For him the water and the blood have also a sacramental significance, on which he lays the greatest stress, and he invokes the testimony of one who hath seen and hath borne testimony to the

⁵² Unlike Luke, and according with Mark and Matthew, there is no mockery by the soldiers.

⁵³ See on this, Strack and Billerbeck, i. 1043 f.

⁵⁴ Matt. xxvii. 52-53.

⁵⁵ Luke xxiii. 48.

truth of the occurrence,⁵⁶ in order to confirm the faith of the later generation that the death of Jesus is the guarantee of the regeneration, the life eternal which the sacraments symbolise. He agrees with the Synoptists in noting the presence of some of his Galilean women followers, to whom Luke adds "his acquaintances" (οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτοῦ)⁵⁷—apparently the friends and adherents whom he had undoubtedly gained in Jerusalem. But in the Synoptic reports they look on from afar; in the Fourth Gospel they are standing by, and include the mother of Jesus and the beloved disciple, to whose care he commends her.

Among "the acquaintances" of Jesus, who view the crucifixion scene from afar, we may reckon Joseph of Arimathæa,⁵⁸ a member of the Sanhedrin and, according to the Fourth Gospel, "one of the rulers"⁵⁹ who, while accepting Jesus as the Messiah, refrained from professing their belief for fear of being put out of the synagogue.⁶⁰ In this Gospel, and also in Matthew,⁶¹ he is a secret disciple. In Mark and Luke he is at most a sympathiser—one of those "who was looking for the kingdom of God"⁶²—and had been deeply impressed by the Messianic message of Jesus. Whilst we are not told that he had actually taken part in the proceedings of the Sanhedrin, Luke seems to imply this. "A good man and a just," he describes him, "who had not consented to their counsel and action."⁶³ If not actually present to record his vote on the verdict against him, he had at all events disapproved of their tactics in conspiring his arrest and prosecution. If he had failed actively to oppose his arraignment, he had at least the courage openly to show his sympathy with the victim of the injustice of his fellow-councillors by "boldly" going to Pilate and asking the body of Jesus.⁶⁴ The motive of the request was evidently to prevent it from being thrown, along with those of the two malefactors, into the common pit, as would have been done but for his kindly intervention,

⁵⁶ John xix. 35. Probably an editorial addition.

⁵⁷ Luke xxiii. 49.

⁵⁸ Usually identified with Ramah, the birthplace of Samuel.

⁵⁹ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων.

⁶² Mark xv. 43; Luke xxiii. 51.

⁶⁰ John xii. 42.

⁶³ Luke xxiii. 50-51.

⁶¹ John xix. 38; Matt. xxvii. 57.

⁶⁴ Mark xv. 43, *τολμήσας*.

in accordance with the law (Deut. xxi. 23), which prescribed the burial of a condemned person on the day of his execution. Pilate was astonished to hear that Jesus had already expired, and sent for the centurion to confirm the fact. Whereupon he grants the request without exacting any payment for this favour.⁶⁵ In the short interval before sunset, when the Sabbath would begin, Joseph hurriedly buys a lincn cloth, takes down the body from the cross, wraps it in the cloth, lays it in the rock tomb which he had constructed for his own burial,⁶⁶ and rolls a stone up against the entrance for its protection from robbers and wild animals. In the Synoptists it is apparently only a temporary interment, and the hasty operation is observed by Mary Magdalene and other Galilean women followers, who mark the spot with the intention of returning after the Sabbath to anoint the body.

With the Synoptic account the Fourth Gospel is in some respects at variance. The writer gives Joseph a like-minded helper in Nicodemus, who, like him, was a member of the Sanhedrin and a sympathiser, and had intervened to rebuke the rabid bigotry of the Pharisees in their conflict with Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles, and bespeak a fair hearing of his claims. He, too, must have been absent from the inquest against him, and now, for the second time, openly shows his sympathy and his sense of his kingly dignity by providing 100 lbs. weight of myrrh and aloes for the embalming of the body (the powdered spices apparently being placed in the wrappings of the linen cloth). The co-operation of Nicodemus, if authentic, was unknown to the Synoptists. On the other hand, the writer omits to mention the presence of the women, which is noted by the Synoptists. Those women watch the proceedings with a view (in Mark and Luke) of returning after the Sabbath to embalm the body with spices which they had already prepared—according to the latter, on the evening of the crucifixion; according to the former, after the Sabbath is ended.⁶⁷ If Nicodemus

⁶⁵ ἐδώρησατο το πτώμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ (Mark xv. 45).

⁶⁶ Only Matthew mentions this fact. The other three only refer to the fact that it had not hitherto been used, and the Fourth Gospel adds the detail that it was situated in a garden near the place of execution (xix. 41).

⁶⁷ Luke xxiii. 56; Mark xvi. 1.

had actually played the part in the burial described by the Fourth Gospel, it is singular that the women should not be aware of it and should later return with the spices for the purpose of doing what he had already performed. While the Fourth Gospel mentions this return,⁶⁸ it ignores this purpose.

The comparatively large space allotted to the death of Jesus in all four Gospels⁶⁹ shows that for the writers, as for the early Christians, his death was the supreme event of his career. It was the great fact of the tradition about him, and from it the significance of his life was read. It is not the end of a career that has culminated in tragedy and dishonour. Nor is it the evidence of final failure. It is rather one of those defeats that, in their effects, are in reality the greatest of victories. Moreover, it is only a transition to the resurrection, of which it was the inexorable condition, and which henceforth becomes alike the foundation and the guarantee of the revived faith of the fugitive disciples.

⁶⁸ John xx. 1. Burial of the dead on the day of death was customary, and the dead were placed in rock graves or caves. They were visited by their relatives during the first days after burial, and guards were placed at the graves. Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar," i. 1047.

⁶⁹ Some critics hold that the Synoptic writers, in their accounts of the arrest and trial of Jesus, sought more or less to depict Pilate, as the representative of the Roman Government, in a friendly light in order to court its goodwill for the Christians of their own time, and on the other hand, to represent the Sanhedrin as his biased and embittered foe. The fate of Jesus is thus ascribable solely to the inveterate and wholly baseless enmity of the Jews. The critics in question think that the Synoptists have, therefore, coloured the story in order to cast odium on the Jewish people and credit Pilate with an insight into their reprehensible tactics. On this account they excise a good deal from the contents of the story as unhistoric. There are, too, discrepancies in the narratives which it is difficult to harmonise, and features which may with some reason be ascribed to the influence of prophecy and of later belief about Jesus. The main facts are, however, fairly clear, and one can hardly maintain, in the face of them, that, as far as the Sanhedrin was concerned, the case was conducted in anything like a judicial spirit. Pilate, too, being convinced that Jesus was not a criminal, was really guilty of a miscarriage of justice in yielding to the popular clamour for his destruction. Mr H. P. Cooke discusses the question whether Jesus was crucified by the Romans, or whether he was put to death by stoning and hanging by the Jews. Article in the *Hibbert Journal*, October 1930, 61 f. He reviews the Gospel evidence and concludes that there were two distinct and conflicting traditions on the subject. He does not definitely answer the questions he asks. It seems to me that both Pilate and the Jews were concerned in the death of Jesus, and that there is no reasonable doubt that he was crucified as the result of Pilate's sentence, after the Roman method of dealing with malefactors.

CHAPTER IX

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

I. SPIRITUAL OR BODILY ?

IN Hebrew thought the conception of a resurrection assumes the continuance of personal existence after death in an intermediate state to which the spirit of man passes, and from which it ultimately rises to experience the final decision of its destiny. In the case of the righteous it means the attainment of a higher, a deathless life in communion with God in heaven, in which the limitations and imperfections of the earthly life are overpassed. Ultimately in Hellenist Judaism, in virtue of the influence of Greek thought, and in contrast to Palestinian Judaism, the belief in a resurrection becomes equivalent to the belief in immortality. The assumption of an intermediate state of the departed gives place to that of an immediate transition, in the case of the righteous, of the spirit from the body to a life of eternal bliss. The resurrection, in the traditional sense of a rising of the dead from an intermediate state, is thus practically discarded.

The more mature Jewish conception of a resurrection was the result of a long development of Hebrew thought. In the primitive form the belief in a future life meant merely the more or less shadowy existence of the departed in Sheol, the under-world, which was regarded as beyond the jurisdiction of Jahve, as primitive Hebrew thought conceived him. For long Jahve was only the God of Israel, a national God, the God to whom Israel owed allegiance, in contrast to the Gods of other peoples (Henotheism), and whose rule did not extend beyond his own people. From this particularistic conception Hebrew thought ultimately broadened into the monotheistic one, which transformed Jahve into the one and

only God, and invested Him with the sole and universal sway over both the world and the under-world, the living and the dead. With the universalising of Jahve in the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries there was a heightening of the ethical attributes ascribed to Him. With this advance in the conception of God there is a corresponding advance in the conception of man and his destiny. Like the divine personality, the human personality is ethically conceived. It is capable of the higher divine life in communion with Jahve. Not merely the people, but the individual is brought into responsible personal relation to Him,¹ and stress is laid on the value of the individual soul in His sight. The foundation was thus laid for the belief in the immortality of the soul, in the case of the righteous at least, and in a future blessed life in virtue of this relation to the eternal God, who will requite the righteous for the sufferings of this transient life.

This belief definitely emerges in the post-exilic period, perhaps under Babylonian influence, though it appears rather as an aspiration than a definite and permanent conviction, and its development is of a fluid character, according to the view of the particular writer. In Job it finds at least a passing expression in the affirmation that his avenger or redeemer liveth and that after death he will experience in a bodiless state the vision of God and the vindication of his sufferings in the body.² It seems to be implied in Ps. xlix. and lxxiii. At the same time, there is evidence in Job as well as Ecclesiastes of a sceptical mood which denied the existence of the spirit after death. In the late post-exilic writers the belief in a future blessed life is associated with the hope of the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, in which the righteous dead shall share in common with the living. To this end the righteous departed will arise from their intermediate abode in Sheol or in paradise in which they are conceived to await this consummation.

¹ The new covenant of Jer. xxxi. 31-34, written in the hearts of the people from the least to the greatest, which was developed by Ezek. xviii. 4 f.

² Job xix. 25-27. Some, however, doubt the implication of personal immortality in this passage. In any case, the continuance of the spirit after death is a very limited one. See Charles, "The Resurrection of Man," 17 (1929).

This development of the belief in the attainment of a future life of bliss by means of a resurrection is first explicitly expressed in Isa. xxvi. 19,³ in which the righteous departed will arise to participate in the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, and Dan. xii. 2.⁴ In Daniel many wicked will rise, with many righteous, for judgment.

It is henceforth characteristic, in varying forms, of the apocalyptic writings of the second and first centuries B.C. and the first Christian century. In the first Book of Enoch—a composite apocalypse written during the first two pre-Christian centuries—the rising is mainly, though not wholly, limited to the righteous. While it also vacillates between a rising in the body and a rising in the spirit only, the later parts of the book teach only a spiritual resurrection.⁵ In Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon the bodily resurrection is also rejected.⁶ “Thus the doctrine of the resurrection,” says Dr Charles, “which was current among the cultured Pharisees in the century immediately preceding the Christian era, was of a truly spiritual nature.”⁷ In 2 Maccabees, on the other hand, the writer clings to the belief in a resurrection of the body to eternal life in an earthly Messianic kingdom. The Palestinian apocalyptic teaching of the first half of the first Christian century, as represented by the Assumption of Moses, agrees with that of the pre-Christian writers in rejecting the bodily resurrection. In 2 Baruch, on the other hand, belonging to the second half of the century, the righteous rise in the bodies in which they were buried in order that they may be recognised (as in Matt. xxvii.), but after this recognition their bodies will be transformed, and “they shall be made like unto the angels, in keeping with their unending spiritual existence.” According to Josephus, the Pharisees believed that the righteous rise in a body wholly different from the present material body (*ἕτερον σῶμα*).⁸ In Jewish Hellenist Apocalyptic, of

³ Usually assigned by the critics to the fourth century B.C. On the passage see G. A. Smith, “The Book of Isaiah,” i. 464 f. (1927).

⁴ 168 B.C.

⁵ Charles, “The Book of Enoch,” chapters xci.-civ.

⁶ See “The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,” translated and annotated by Dr Charles (1913).

⁷ “Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life,” 295 (2nd ed., 1913).

⁸ “Bell. Jud.,” ii. 8, 14.

the same period (Alexandria), as represented by the Book of Wisdom⁹ and Philo, there is an immediate transition of the soul, which pre-existed before entering the body, to heaven as the final abode of the righteous, whilst in 2 Enoch they are invested with a spiritual form (clothed with the glory of God) as in the Pharisaic doctrine.

It is essential to keep in mind this train of Hebrew thought in approaching the subject of the resurrection of Jesus. It is reflected in his own thought, though it is adapted and modified in accordance with his conception of himself as the Messiah and of his Messianic mission and destiny. For him the kingdom in the spiritual and ethical sense has come, and all are invited to enter it and thereby obtain eternal life. In this spiritual and ethical sense the believer has already the assurance of a life beyond the grave,¹⁰ though its full attainment lies in the future, when, through him, the kingdom shall be established in the eschatological sense. But in the later phase of his mission this consummation can only come through his death and resurrection. Hence the emphasis, in the incident at Cæsarea Philippi, on the idea of a personal resurrection immediately after his death, which is essential to the advent of the Messianic kingdom in the future sense. This resurrection takes place on the third day, or, in Mark, after three days, in accordance with the Jewish belief that the spirit lingers near the body for a short interval before corruption takes place. It recurs in subsequent utterances to the disciples in his progress towards Jerusalem.¹¹ In view of these repeated declarations, it appears to form a cardinal element in the later teaching, though the disciples do not seem to have grasped the meaning of it in connection with the person of the Messiah, and there seems no good ground for the contention that the prediction was afterwards put in circulation in order to support the later assumption of a bodily rising. True, Luke has the saying to the malefactor on the Cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise," and this saying has been held to indicate the

⁹ Dr Charles would assign the Book of Wisdom to the first century B.C. "Critical History," 298.

¹⁰ Mark x. 23 f.; Matt. xix. 23 f.; Luke xviii. 25 f.

¹¹ Mark ix. 9, 31; x. 34; cf. xiv. 28; Matt. xvii. 9, 23; xx. 19; cf. xxvi. 32; Luke xviii. 23.

final conviction on the part of Jesus of an immediate transition at death to heaven. But it is probable that paradise here means only the intermediate state between death and resurrection, in which sense it occurs in Jewish Apocalyptic, though it may also mean at times heaven as the final abode of the righteous. In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus the beggar is carried away at death by angels to "Abraham's bosom," where he enjoys a state of felicity, and the rich man is in Hades. But here again "Abraham's bosom" appears to denote an intermediate state.¹² Both sayings are, therefore, not incompatible with the inference that Jesus continued to the last to believe in a resurrection on the third day, *i.e.*, his exaltation to heaven from this intermediate state.

Granting this probability, there remains the further question, In what sense did he conceive of the resurrection? Did he think of a resurrection in the body, or only in the spirit? He has left us in ignorance on the subject, and has given us no definite indication of what the rising on the third day actually involved. From the controversy with the Sadducees, we may, I think, infer that he shared the current Pharisaic doctrine of a resurrection in the spiritual sense. He emphatically distinguishes between the earthly state and the new existence resulting from the resurrection. The earthly existence gives place to a spiritual existence in which human relationships disappear. With these relationships the material body is relinquished and "those raised are as the angels in heaven."¹³ This seems to rule out a bodily resurrection, though those raised might possibly be raised in the body, which would then be transformed. But it is far more probable that it betokens a spiritual rising, and the argument that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is not the God of the dead, but of the living, points in this direction, whilst the addition by Luke, "For all live unto him," gives cogency to this conclusion. He is made, indeed, in the Fourth Gospel, to speak of the dead coming out of the tombs at the resurrection.¹⁴ But this is merely a

¹² In one apocalyptic book (4 Maccabees) of the first Christian century Abraham's bosom means heaven itself. Charles, "Critical History," 322.

¹³ Mark xii. 25; Matt. xxii. 30; Luke xx. 36.

¹⁴ John v. 28-29.

reflection of the crass apocalyptic attributed to him in this passage by the writer, and is at variance with the writer's own idea of a spiritual resurrection, which begins even in this life in the spiritual experience of the believer. In the Lazarus story, Jesus is, in fact, represented as spiritualising the resurrection in reply to the saying of Martha, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die."¹⁵ Though he speaks of the body as well as the soul being cast into Gehenna,¹⁶ this is a rhetoric expression, and the figurative sense also applies to the saying about eating and drinking in the kingdom of heaven.¹⁷ That he spiritualised the conception of the resurrection in the direction of the more advanced Apocalyptic, we should naturally infer from his spiritual conception of the kingdom, from which he eliminated the crasser belief of his age.

The detailed attestation of the resurrection, which he had predicted, forms the conclusion of all four Gospels. On the morning of the third day after his death the tomb, in which he had been buried, was found to be empty. The empty tomb is, for the writers, the guarantee that he had risen in the body. The earliest attestation is, however, that given by Paul,¹⁸ who derived his information from members of the primitive community at Jerusalem as the result of his converse with Peter and James, whom he visited after his conversion—at most within ten years after the crucifixion. Granted the fact of the primitive belief in the resurrection, what did it imply in its earliest form? In the earliest notice of the resurrection in 1 Thessalonians (about A.D. 50), Paul refers generally to the resurrection from the dead without specifying what it actually involved. God raised Jesus from the dead. Jesus died and rose again.¹⁹ He is apparently repeating

¹⁵ John xi. 23-26.

¹⁶ Matt. x. 28; *cf.* v. 29 f.

¹⁷ Mark xiv. 25; Matt. xxvi. 29; Luke xxii. 18.

¹⁸ An attempt has been made by Harnack and others to contest the priority of Paul's Epistles to the Gospels of Mark and Luke. This attempt does not seem to me convincing. See on this question, Bacon, "The Gospel of Mark," 16 f. (1925).

¹⁹ 1 Thess. i. 10; iv. 14.

the proclamation of the primitive preaching of Peter, that God raised Jesus from the dead.²⁰ Whether in this primitive preaching a resurrection of the actual material body is implied is not clear. The preacher quotes Ps. xvi. 10 as a rather problematic proof that the body of Jesus did not suffer corruption before the resurrection on the third day, but, strangely enough, he does not mention his own experience at the tomb, as depicted in Luke and the Fourth Gospel, but ignored by Mark and Matthew. In any case, the "witness" of the disciples adduced in support of the "raising up," which is more to the point as a proof of the resurrection, very probably refers to the appearance of Jesus to them. He does not explicitly declare that the raised body was the actual one that had been buried, does not, in fact, explain the nature of the resurrection body. In his later preaching to the proselyte, Cornelius, and his circle at Cæsarea, he is represented as again speaking of God raising him up on the third day, and of his manifestation to the disciples, "who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead."²¹ This may only mean that Jesus appeared to them during a meal, or it may mean that he actually ate and drank with them. In the latter case it must be regarded, not as conveying the actual words of Peter, but as a later addition, when the tradition had developed, as in Luke xxiv. 42-43, into the belief in an actual bodily resurrection. In the First Epistle of Peter the resurrection is spiritually conceived, Christ being "put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit."²²

Paul, in repeating in 1 Thessalonians the primitive formula, is equally silent about the discovery of the empty tomb by the women, which is so prominent in the Gospel stories. If he had known of it from the lips of Peter and James, it is rather remarkable that he does not mention it, as an additional piece of evidence, among the proofs that he ultimately gives of the fact of the resurrection. Among those whom he definitely enumerates as having seen the risen Lord, the women at the tomb are significantly ignored—evidently

²⁰ Acts ii. 24, 32; iii. 15, 26; cf. Acts v. 30. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus."

²¹ Acts x. 40-41.

²² 1 Pet. iii. 18.

because the tradition had not yet come into existence, or was unknown to Paul. It may be said that the empty tomb is implied, if not expressly stated, in the declaration that he was buried and raised from the dead. It may be so. But, if so, he has abandoned this implication in the next notice of the resurrection in 1 Cor. xv. 35 f. In this passage the resurrection is undoubtedly spiritually conceived. Jesus is raised in a spiritual body, and Paul shares the Pharisaic view of a spiritual resurrection. He even uses the illustration of the seed that dies and, in dying, gives birth to new life, current in Pharisaic circles.²³ In doing so, he evidently believed that he was in harmony with the primitive doctrine which he mentions in the beginning of the chapter. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received—how that Christ died for our sins, and that he was buried, and that he hath been raised on the third day."²⁴ In seeking to disarm the scepticism prevailing in the Corinthian Church regarding the possibility of a resurrection from the dead, he reasons out his conception of what actually takes place, and by implication what took place in the case of that of Jesus, which for him involves the resurrection of his followers. "But some will say, How are the dead raised, and with what manner of body do they come?"²⁵ In answering the question he makes use of the analogy of the grain of wheat sown in the ground and quickening, in the process of the mortification of what is perishable in it, the germ of a new life contained within it. So the death of the human body is the indispensable condition of the new spiritual existence which the resurrection connotes. The analogy does not, indeed, strictly apply, for the new grain which springs from the death of the old, whilst distinct, is not different in its properties from the old. It is, in fact, an exact reproduction of the old. On the other hand, the new form of existence begotten in the resurrection is not only distinct, but different from the old, and the difference is the point that Paul stresses. It is a spiritual, not a material body that results from this process. "It is sown in corrup-

²³ The argument from the grain of wheat is used in *San. 90b*. "Jewish Encyclopædia," art. "Resurrection." See also Moore, "Judaism," ii. 381.

²⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 3-4.

²⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 35.

tion ; it is raised in incorruption . . . it is sown a natural (psychical) body ; it is raised a spiritual (pneumatic) body." ²⁶ It is not a body composed of flesh and blood, but immaterial, incorruptible ; not earthly, but heavenly. But apart from the flaw in the analogy (the new grain being really a reproduction of the old), the point which he strives to make is clear enough. There is no resurrection of the material body, and the analogy itself tends to this conclusion in as far as the decay of the old grain in the earth is concerned. The material wrapping of what becomes the new grain decays and dies, whilst the living germ bursts into new life. So in the case of the human body. Its flesh and bones are decomposed in the grave. "Flesh and blood," it is roundly asserted, "cannot inherit the kingdom of God ; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Only the spirit survives in the spiritual vesture "which God giveth it." Paul seems to have retained the doctrine which taught, not a bodily resurrection, but the vivification of a new (spiritual) body with the old soul. "The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall all be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." ²⁷ The mortal gives place to a spiritual existence, mortality to immortality. The spirit is emancipated from perishable matter and takes on an immaterial form in keeping with its ethereal being. What seems to happen is that the body as body remains in the earth, but the person that had tabernacled in it rises or persists in the spiritual form which God gives it.²⁸ The

²⁶ 1 Cor. xv. 42-44. For the view that Paul is referring in this passage not to the body after death, but to the living body, in which the spirit is "sown" at birth and tabernacles throughout the earthly, corruptible life, see Charles, "Resurrection of Man," 37 f. Rather problematic.

²⁷ 1 Cor. xv. 52-53. On the resemblance of the Pauline and the Pharisaic doctrine, see Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 113.

²⁸ Lake ("The Resurrection of Christ," 21 f., 193, 1912) holds that Paul believed in a transubstantiation of flesh and blood into spirit, and that this implied a belief in an empty tomb. But this does not seem to follow, for Paul's reasoning is that what was perishable and corruptible in the body remained, whilst the spirit was raised to an immaterial existence in a purely spiritual body, which God gives it. Mr Storr ("Christianity and Immortality," 68, 1918) labours to prove a bodily resurrection, which involved the empty tomb. He does not succeed in making the resultant body intelligible, but leaves the subject in a mist. The same may be said of the older attempts of Dr Westcott ("The Gospel of the Resurrection") and Mr Latham ("The Risen Master"). Another recent writer, Dr Darragh, also champions the bodily resurrection. "The Resurrection of the Flesh" (1921).

tomb of Jesus could, therefore, on this reasoning, not have been empty.

This is the essential thought that the Jewish conception of a resurrection, at its highest, expresses. A spiritual body may sound to us a contradiction in terms. It is at least one way of expressing the immaterial and immortal permanence of personality, and we can hardly expect Paul to anticipate modern scientific and philosophic phraseology. Moreover, he himself seems to have advanced to a less traditional conception of the subject. The resurrection ultimately becomes for him the immediate transition from this life to the next, from earth to heaven, without any intermediate awaiting for a rising from the dead. And the spiritual vesture it takes on is not associated with the earthly body at all, but is fashioned for it and awaits it in heaven. At death the spirit of the believer passes to the habitation or tabernacle prepared for it in heaven. "We know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens (the spiritual body). . . . Knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. . . . We are willing rather to be absent from the body, and be at home with the Lord."²⁹

His belief in the resurrection is strengthened by the fact that, as in the early preaching of Peter, he found it to be "according to the Scriptures." He does not particularise the passage or passages on which he founds this conclusion, and an explicit prophecy that can be historically referred to the resurrection of Jesus is not to be found in the Old Testament, though such an inference might be read into certain texts. He is probably thinking of Ps. xvi., quoted by Peter, and Hos. vi. 2. What is for him the real and concrete proof is the fact of the appearances of the risen Jesus to the disciples, of which he gives specific instances—first to Peter, then to the Twelve, then to over 500 brethren at one time, of whom the greater part remained alive, then to James, then to all the apostles (apostles generally, as distinguished from the Twelve), and lastly to Paul himself.³⁰ These appearances are stated in the most explicit terms as

²⁹ 2 Cor. v. 1 f.

³⁰ 1 Cor. xv. 5-8.

actual occurrences. In his own case the manifestation apparently took the form of the vision on the road near Damascus, and the other appearances referred to were evidently of the same nature. It was not a material form, but a spiritual being with whom those who experienced them came into contact. Here again the deliverance about flesh and blood is decisive. The first of these appearances was made to Peter, the others in the order related, and the impression made by the narrative is that these were all known to Paul and, therefore, to the earliest tradition, which he professes to hand on. Where they took place is not stated.

The sum of his testimony is that the bereaved disciples, within a very short period after the death of Jesus, obtained the unshakable conviction, by means of these appearances, that he had triumphed over death, and that he survived in a spiritual body and was capable of making his existence known to his disciples. He says nothing of the finding of the tomb empty, and his reasoning on the rising in a spiritual body seems to preclude this inference from the words, "was buried and hath been raised on the third day." The decisive proof is these repeated appearances in an immaterial body to the disciples.

Turning now to the later accounts—those of the Gospels—there is no doubt about the belief in the empty tomb in the tradition, or traditions, preserved in them. The simplest and the earliest form of it is that of Mark, though it is unfortunately incomplete, the conclusion of this Gospel being spurious. According to Mark, Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James the Little, who had witnessed both the crucifixion and the burial, having previously bought spices, come, along with Salome, after sunrise to the tomb on the first day of the week (Sunday) to anoint the body. They are wondering who will roll away the massive stone for them, when, on looking up, they suddenly observe that it has been already rolled away from the door of the tomb. On entering they are utterly amazed to see a young man arrayed in a white robe sitting on the right-hand side. The young man tells them not to be amazed, and, guessing their errand, informs them that the crucified Jesus is

risen. "He is risen ; he is not here. Behold the place where they laid him." He bids them announce the fact to his disciples and to Peter, and adds that Jesus is going before them into Galilee,³¹ where they shall see him, as he had previously told the disciples.³² They are seized with trembling and bewilderment and take to flight, "saying nothing to any one ; for they were afraid."³³ Here the story abruptly ends, leaving the impression that they were afraid, temporarily at least, to tell what they had seen and heard, because they were in the midst of the enemies of Jesus. Whether the disciples were still in Jerusalem does not explicitly appear from the story, though this may be implied in the message which they are to convey to them. On the other hand, the prediction by Jesus of the scattering of the disciples after the arrest, and his preceding them to Galilee after the resurrection,³⁴ rather tends to the conclusion that they were already on their way thither. At all events, as far as the Markan narrative goes, the women keep their secret to themselves, and it is legitimate to infer from the narrative that they hastened to get away from Jerusalem as quickly as possible, and only divulged it on rejoining the disciples in Galilee. It is clear that the manifestation of the risen Jesus was to take place in Galilee. It is also clear that, in the view of the writer and the tradition which he follows, Jesus had risen in the body. The tomb was empty.

The other three Gospels agree in attesting the empty tomb, but vary more or less in the details of the discovery, and amplify the sequel in accordance with the varying traditions which they follow. In Matthew the young man becomes an angel who descends from heaven in the midst of an earthquake, rolls away the stone, and sits upon it. This evangelist introduces a guard at the tomb in accordance with the story, which he has previously related (xxvii. 42 f.), of the application of the chief priests and the Pharisees to Pilate, the sealing of the stone, and the stationing of some

³¹ That there was a place called Galilee near Jerusalem, and that Galilee here means this place, is nothing more than a guess. This is the contention of Resch, "Aussercanonische Paralleltexte," 381 f.

³² Mark xiv. 28 ; Matt. xxvi. 52.

³³ Mark xvi. 1-10.

³⁴ Mark xiv. 27-28.

soldiers to watch the tomb. The soldiers are seized with deadly fright at the appearance of the angel, who addresses the women in much the same terms as the young man in Mark, and shows them the empty tomb, which, owing to the presence of the soldiers, they had not entered, as in Mark, and which is regarded as the confirmation of previous sayings of Jesus on his resurrection. The effect of the inspection of the tomb and the announcement of the angel on the women is modified into mingled fear and great joy as they hasten away. Still more at variance with Mark is the appearance of Jesus to them as they run to apprise the disciples of the angelic message. Jesus merely repeats what the angel has already told them about the meeting in Galilee.³⁵ The apparition takes place in the body, for the women take hold of his feet. It may have been included, as is often assumed, in the lost ending of Mark. But the way in which Mark actually ends does not incline one to the acceptance of this inference. It appears rather to be an addition which the gathering tradition took on in the striving to connect the finding of the empty tomb with an actual appearance of Jesus there, as a proof of the bodily resurrection, so characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, or at least in or near Jerusalem, as in Luke. We are not expressly told that the women actually carried out the injunction, but, unlike Mark, it seems to be assumed that the disciples were still in Jerusalem (verse 16), and that they did so. There follows the story of the bribery of the soldiers by the Sanhedrin to say that the disciples had stolen the body overnight, and the narrative closes with the departure of the Eleven to Galilee, their meeting with Jesus on the mountain, as directed by him beforehand (where and when, we are not informed), their worshipful recognition of him, the doubts of others of his followers, who had apparently not shared in their experience, and his commission to them, which forms his last words in this Gospel and which the evangelist has edited in the light of the later Christian mission. The miraculous element in the story, which has grown in circumstantiality, is greatly heightened by the writer, who has a predilection for the pictorial representation of the super-

³⁵ Matt. xxviii. 1 f.

natural. His angelology is vividly expressed, and he emphasises the bodily resurrection in the grasping of the feet of Jesus by the women.

Luke's account also tallies in the main with that of Mark, up to the announcement of the resurrection. Only, besides Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James, he has all his Galilean women followers, and two men, instead of one, in the tomb. The announcement differs materially from that of Mark. "Why," ask they, "seek ye the living among the dead?"³⁶ Instead of telling them of the promised rendezvous in Galilee, they merely remind them that Jesus had, whilst in Galilee, foretold his resurrection on the third day—an evident perversion of the Markan and Matthæan saying about his preceding them to Galilee. Unlike Mark and Matthew, there is accordingly no message to the disciples, and he ignores the fright of the women, whilst adding that they actually communicated their discovery to "the Eleven and to all the rest," who received it in a sceptical spirit. There seems to be a reflection here of the disbelief, in the primitive tradition, in the incipient story of the empty tomb. "And these words appeared in their sight as idle talk, and they disbelieved them."³⁷ Even Peter, who hurries to the tomb to find only the linen cloths, which emphasise the bodily resurrection, is not absolutely convinced, but merely wonders what has happened.³⁸ The tendency, already apparent in Matthew, to connect the finding of the empty tomb with appearances in or near Jerusalem is more marked. The tradition followed by the writer adjusts the story in this direction to the extent of ruling out Galilee altogether as the scene of the appearances. These take place in or near Jerusalem—to two of the disciples on the way to Emmaus,³⁹ to Peter without any particulars,⁴⁰ and to the Eleven, to whom he delivers his final message, in a room at Jerusalem.⁴¹

³⁶ Luke xxiv. 5. Some ancient MSS. omit the words, "He is not here, but is risen."

³⁷ Luke xxiv. 14.

³⁸ The text here is of doubtful authenticity, but it is confirmed by the statement in Luke xxiv. 24.

³⁹ Luke xxiv. 13 f.

⁴⁰ xxiv. 34.

⁴¹ xxiv. 36 f.

After these appearances Jesus ascends⁴² to heaven from opposite Bethany, whither he leads them out, apparently on the evening of the third day—the Sunday evening. The writer emphasises the raising of the actual body by the leaving of the linen cloths in the tomb and by making Jesus invite the Eleven to handle his “flesh and bones” and eat a piece of broiled fish in order to convince them that he is not a mere spirit or ghost. In the opening chapter of the Acts he postponed the ascension for forty days, during which Jesus continues to appear to them, and these appearances also take place in Jerusalem.

The discrepancies are even more pronounced in the account of the Fourth Gospel. Mary alone comes to the tomb while it is still dark, and nothing is said about her intention to anoint the body or about the announcement of the angel or angels to her. She merely sees that the stone has been moved, and hurries away to announce the fact of the empty tomb, under the belief that Jesus' body has been extracted, to Peter and the beloved disciple, who hasten thither to convince themselves of the fact. They find only the linen cloths and the napkin that had enwrapped the head, and “the other disciple” in particular sees in this a proof of the bodily resurrection as taught in Scripture, of which the disciples had hitherto been ignorant, not merely of the truth of Mary's statement. Here again the emphasis on the belief of the other disciple in the bodily resurrection, coupled with the fact that nothing is said of the belief of his companion, seems to point to a time when the primitive tradition did not involve this belief. It looks, in fact, as if this tradition only assumed the extraction of the body and the placing of it elsewhere, and as if the conviction of the other disciple is a later corrective of the primitive view. Moreover, the immediate sequel of the appearance of Jesus in the body to Mary at the tomb is apparently meant to strengthen the belief in the bodily resurrection. Mary, who had followed the two disciples, stands weeping outside the tomb after their departure.

⁴² It is questionable whether the words “and was carried up into heaven” (xxiv. 51) are not an interpolation. By omitting them the text simply reads, “he was parted from them.”

Looking in, she sees two angels, who merely ask her why she weeps and have no message about the risen Jesus to announce. She tells them the reason—the extraction of the body—and, looking behind her, sees one whom she mistakes for the gardener. Then follow the episodes of the recognition of Jesus, beautifully told; the announcement of Mary to the disciples, in accordance with Jesus' directions, of the meeting with him and of his impending ascension; the appearance in the actual body to them in the room in the evening, and to them and the doubting Thomas in the same room eight days later, apparently after the ascension. Though the body is material—capable of being touched and handled—Jesus appears and disappears as if he were spirit, not matter. These "signs" were multiplied, without being specified, and the author concludes by saying that he has written these particulars in order that his readers may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The ascension evidently takes place after the meeting with Mary and before these appearances to the disciples. In a postscript (chapter xxi.) by what seems another hand, the writer describes what he calls the third appearance to the disciples after his resurrection. This takes place in Galilee in connection with a miraculous catch of fishes, which looks like a reminiscence of the episode in the early Galilean ministry related by Luke—the evident intention being to supplement the tradition of the Jerusalem appearances by that of the Galilean appearance noted in Matthew and implied in Mark. The suggestion that this postscript borrows from a tradition that may have formed the lost conclusion of Mark is little more than a guess.

In all these narratives the actual resurrection is assumed, not described. Even Matthew, who tells of the earthquake and the descent of the angel to roll away the stone, says nothing of the actual raising. No one witnessed it, and only in the Gospel of Peter,⁴³ a late compilation, do we find a fantastic description of the coming forth from the tomb, worthy of a nursery tale.

It is clear that all these narratives are influenced by the assumption that there was a bodily resurrection. It further

⁴³ See James, "Apocryphal New Testament," 90 f.

appears that there are features in three of them which reflect the existence of disbelief or doubt in the earliest tradition in regard to such a resurrection. It is likewise clear that there was no definite, coherent tradition from which the writers could draw, and that it varied even to the point of inconsistency, and grew in marvellous, discrepant detail with the lapse of time.⁴⁴ The basal facts are the visit of the women to the tomb in the early morning of the third day, and the strange experience which leads to the conclusion that the body of Jesus was not in the place where they expected to find it. In Mark this conclusion is reached on the testimony of a young man who, in the writer's view, was apparently an angel, but may have been a young man in the literal sense, whom their excited fancy transformed into an angelic being. In Matthew he is undoubtedly an angel, and in Luke, who duplicates him, the angelic nature of their informants is clearly assumed. In the Fourth Gospel, Mary, at the first visit, sees no one. But the two angels appear at the second visit, though they have not the function of witnesses and do not contradict her conviction that the body has been extracted. It requires the appearance of Jesus himself and his assurance that he has risen in the body to disabuse her mind of this conviction. Is it not possible that the writer, in conveying her impression that the body has been extracted, is expressing what had actually taken place? Had Joseph, after the conclusion of the Sabbath on the previous evening, removed the body, which had been hastily buried in his own tomb, to another, and did Mary, after all, ground her belief in the resurrection, not on the empty tomb, but on an appearance of Jesus, which the writer regards as a bodily one? The inference of the extraction of the body is not necessarily a modern assumption. It has at least the impression of the first visitant to the tomb to support it.

Or, following the Synoptic form of the story, was the experience of the nature of a vision, which, in the overstrained condition of the women and in view of the current

⁴⁴ An attempt to explain the actual development, on the principle of combination or synthesis, is made by Lake ("The Resurrection of Jesus Christ," 166 f.). It is ingenious and in some respects illuminating, but not always convincing.

angelology*, is by no means unthinkable? The belief in angelic appearances certainly enters into the story, and the question forces itself on the historian whether he can take this belief as a basis of actual fact, or whether psychologically such a vision is not explicable from the psychic point of view. In this case, too, the inference is not necessarily an assumption, but is derivable from a study of the relative evidence. Luke himself speaks of the women having "seen (or experienced) a vision of angels."⁴⁵ The visionary character of the experience is, in fact, suggested by all the narratives.

These stories further reflect the current belief that the spirit of the deceased hovers near the body for three days after death, and that the resuscitation of the body is necessary for the continuance of personal identity⁴⁶ and the recognition of the departed by their friends—the transformation of the body taking place either immediately after or at the subsequent judgment. But, as we have seen, a resurrection in the material body is at variance with Paul's conception of the raising of a spiritual body, and even in the Gospels the belief in a spiritual, bodiless existence finds expression. In Luke, for instance, Jesus commends his spirit to the Father. In the Fourth Gospel he speaks of going directly to the Father, and in 1 Peter (iii. 19) he is represented as preaching to the spirits in Hades. His power to appear and disappear at will virtually betokens a spiritual existence, though this might be explained by the belief in the miraculous, like the ability to walk on the water, and is not necessarily a proof of an exclusively spiritual existence. At the same time, a purely spiritual existence appears in these stories insufficient to satisfy the craving for more tangible proof that he had overcome death and had vindicated his Messianic mission and destiny, and this proof is found in the bodily raising and appearance. This craving was so strong that it apparently found no difficulty in accepting the varying and discrepant traditions of what it assumed to have happened and what it, in fact, contributed to create. This difficulty is, however, for the cautious historian a very real one, and it is certainly

⁴⁵ Luke xxiv. 23.

⁴⁶ On this belief see Dobschütz, "Eschatology of the Gospels," 64-65.

risky to base Christian faith on them as a *sine qua non*. There is so much in them that is puzzling and problematic that it is very inadvisable to stress them as an indispensable basis of faith.

Moreover, there is clearly an apologetic element in them which it would be unwise to overlook or minimise. Indirectly the tradition is influenced by the desire to maintain the real humanity of Jesus against the Docetic view that he only appeared on earth in a seeming body—an apologetic especially characteristic of the Johannine writings. Apologetic, too, is the incident of the armed guard, which is intended to disprove the later contention of the Jews (in opposition to the apostolic preaching of the risen Lord) that the disciples stole the body. Equally noticeable is the tendency to find in prophecy the proof of the raising of the body as part of God's redemptive purpose. This is especially apparent in the Lukan tradition, which makes the risen Jesus expound to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus the prophecies relating to this event. "Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."⁴⁷ It is also emphasised by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. in support of a spiritual resurrection. Here we are in the sphere of dogma, not of history.

II. REALITY OF THE RESURRECTION

Those who cling to a bodily resurrection, as related in these stories, assume that, if they are questioned, the resurrection faith falls to the ground. They agree that the belief could not otherwise have come into existence. "For them (the disciples) as Jews," says a recent writer, "a resurrection without an empty grave was unthinkable."¹ This statement is certainly an exaggeration. The idea of a

⁴⁷ Luke xxiv. 26-27.

¹ Shaw, "The Resurrection of Christ," 193 (1920); cf. Darragh, "The Resurrection of the Flesh," who argues strongly, but rather dogmatically, in behalf of the resurrection of the body as an essential of the resurrection belief, 25 f.

spiritual resurrection was by no means inconceivable to those who, like the disciples, were familiar with current Pharisaic belief, which Jesus himself shared, and it is by no means a foregone conclusion that such a resurrection was to them "unthinkable." Nor does it inevitably follow that, if we question the belief in a bodily resurrection, we give away the fact of a resurrection in its most developed form. It is merely a question of evidence, and the evidence of the appearances, which is not open to the same objections, remains, and is not indissolubly bound up with that for the crass form of it. We may question the one and yet, on good grounds, accept the other as conclusive.

For the real proof for Paul and, we may infer, for the disciples, was not the empty tomb, but the manifestations of Jesus himself which they experienced. We are not told where these experiences—whether in Galilee or at Jerusalem—took place, and the evidence of the Gospels is unfortunately conflicting, that of Luke in particular being vitiated by a pronounced tendency to limit them to Jerusalem. He and the Fourth Gospel definitely shelve the Galilean appearance of Mark. Matthew, whilst following Mark, admits of one at Jerusalem, and the supplement of the Fourth Gospel attempts a compromise. But, whilst this discrepancy on such an important point is disconcerting, it does not invalidate the earlier testimony of Paul to the fact of these experiences, which are, indeed, quite independent of time or place, and may quite well have occurred in both Galilee and Jerusalem. It is, I think, reasonably certain, on this testimony, that the disciples had such experiences, and they are all the more credible inasmuch as Paul does not ground them on legendary phenomena, but simply contents himself with attesting their reality. Equally certain that they gave rise to the unshakable conviction that their faith in the Jesus they had known on earth and in his God-sent mission was not a vain faith, however difficult it may be for us to decide what these experiences actually connote. Were they purely mental, or were they visual? The references to these manifestations, for which St Paul vouches at a comparatively early period, and one of which he himself experienced, tend to the latter alternative. Thereby,

at all events, the early disciples attained to a consciousness of his spiritual existence as real as had been that of his presence among them in the flesh. Such a consciousness is not an isolated thing; it is within the compass of every human being in the more profound experiences of the inner life, even without the aid of any appearance of a visual kind. Moments may come when we are in real, conscious contact with the unseen spiritual realm and know for a certainty that we are so. It is a fact of this kind—the certainty that Jesus has not been held captive by the death on the Cross—on which the Christian community was founded, in which the expanding Church had its beginning. Whether spiritually or visually grasped, is really secondary, though in the case in question, it seems to have been the latter. That such a fact is possible, that it actually took place, no one has a right to deny offhand. The fact has, indeed, been questioned, and we know only too sadly from history that in religious phenomena, self-deception, hasty conclusions, based on ill-regulated fancy and emotion, are common enough. There is also the phenomenon of spiritualism, old and new, necromancy, to be reckoned with, which seeks to establish by mechanical or magical means contact with the dead, and of which we are justly suspicious and distrustful in the present state of the evidence at least. Religious credulity has been far too prone to accept what, in Luke, is called “an idle tale,” and has burdened religion with a mass of legendary, or mythical, or purely traditional data without discriminating between current belief and actual history. But have we a right to question facts of the kind referred to above on what I may term dogmatic grounds—on the ground of the belief that such things are pure hallucinations, and that death is the end of both body and spirit? This is an assumption which amounts to begging the question, and results from the unwarrantable dogmatism that pronounces spiritual phenomena to be absolutely illusory. Such an altitude is very superficial, and scientists are happily to-day emphasising the spiritual reality underlying the material manifestation of it. It ignores the spiritual realm and the spiritual side of human nature. We can from experience point to the certainty of spiritual com-

munion. We know as a fact that through our moral and mental nature we are in contact with what is beyond the senses, and that a life beyond that of sense is a reality for those who exercise all the faculties of their being in the striving to realise it. "In Him we live and move and have our being" is as much a reality for those who give scope to the spiritual side of their being as seeing, hearing, sleeping. That the material is the only real and the spiritual necessarily illusory is a purely dogmatic conclusion, a one-sided and unreasonable interpretation of that double life of sense and spirit of which we are, or may be, conscious if we give a reasonable scope to the conditions of it.

Moreover, to descend to a lower level, there are facts vouched by experience which tend to establish the reality of communion of spirit with spirit. Telepathy is an established experience, and of itself proves the direct intercourse of mind with mind without a sensible medium. Nor is this experience confined to the contact of spirit with spirit in the case of those living in the body. One has heard of experiences of this contact of the living with the departed, apart altogether from the intervention of professed mediums, which can only be explained by the capacity of the departing or departed spirit to make known through telepathy, say, the fact of the departure from this life, it may be thousands of miles at a distance from the object of this communication.²

It may be objected that these manifestations occur only to disciples, if we except the case of Paul, who, however, was evidently already less an enemy than an incipient friend. The question, as old as Celsus in the second century, is asked, Why not to enemies, and thus decisively settle the question? A weighty answer is that in the case of enemies the conditions are not there to make such conviction possible. Sympathy with, aspiration after, the object are indispensable, as our own experience teaches us. We cannot come by these experiences without the receptive mind, the spiritual

² In one case known to the writer, the communication came suddenly to the mind of a father from his distant departing son in the form of a vision of the dead one, and in this case the recipient of the communication was not a professed spiritualist, but a level-headed and eminently rational man, who was not even thinking of the departed at the time of its occurrence.

atmosphere to which they belong. For there is really nothing supernatural in them. They are facts of the spiritual life, and without the conditions of them they cannot be, as it were, extemporised. When the Jews rejected Jesus and his spiritual teaching, they made it impossible for themselves to attain such apprehensions as can only come by spiritual means. Let them change their attitude and the experience, directly or indirectly, becomes possible, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles.

Of course, the crude tendency is there to seek material proofs for what is spiritual. Hence such beliefs as that of a material resurrection and the attempt to produce adventitious evidence in support of it. The belief, it must be remembered, was in the atmosphere of the time. It was not, in fact, confined to the Jews.³ Nothing is easier at a certain stage of enlightenment, or rather lack of enlightenment, than to start and grow a legend, and such tales are not unknown, even in our own day, at times of popular excitement. Hence, too, the desperate attempts to explain away the undoubted obstacles in these stories to the credibility of such evidence. But this does not invalidate the reality of the conviction derived from spiritual experience, and we may, nevertheless, cherish the joy of the resurrection message which the Lukan tradition puts into the mouth of the angelic messengers. "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen." Only we do not think of the dead Jesus, as the women were thinking. We think of the living Jesus whose life and personality, as the highest reflection of the divine among men, were not blighted by death, but are the fullest embodiment of the imperishable divine spirit which matter may limit, but which the dissolution of matter does not extinguish. So also the women and the disciples ere long came to think of him, and not without compelling

³ The idea of a God who dies and is resurrected on the third day is found among the Babylonians (Tammuz), the Phœnicians (Esmun-Adonis), the Egyptians (Osiris), the Greeks (the Phrygian Attis). Attempts have been made to trace the Jewish-Christian belief in the resurrection of Jesus to this source. But, whilst Babylonian or Zoroastrian influence may be traced in the gradual development of the Jewish belief in immortality, it is far fetched to seek the origin of the Christian belief in the bodily resurrection of Jesus in these myths. It could well arise within the limits of contemporary Jewish thought.

reasons. They do not seem at first to have grasped the fact that their Master could possibly die the death of a common malefactor, without surrendering all the hopes and aspirations centring in him. For their Master to die such a death might well seem to belie their belief in him as the God-sent Messiah and Saviour. His failure to vindicate his claim undoubtedly tended to undermine their faith in him and his mission and beget the thought that they had been the victims of an illusion. This is the mood that is plainly reflected in the Lukan and Johannine stories, and it is at least hinted at in Matthew's, "But some doubted." And yet they came very soon after the catastrophe, and in spite of it, to believe in his glorified existence. Paul ascribes this belief to the appearances. But psychologically these appearances presuppose at least a subconscious condition favourable to their recurrence in the impression which the wonderful life of the Master had left in their minds. The appearances only quickened into activity the latent thought that such a life could not be destroyed by death. Given the life, the conclusion had real, concrete grounds to rest on in the person and mission of Jesus as the highest embodiment of the divine in the human. The revulsion from despair to unswerving faith was, in this case, no mere result of unreasoning emotion. When the disciples forsook him and fled, they could not leave behind them the tragic blank of an illusion. They could not score out of their memory the personality and the life of the Master, or finally ignore the repeated assurance that even the Cross would only be the passage to life eternal in God—the realisation of the destiny of the Son of Man. Jesus was great enough to induce the restitution and the transformation of their faith in spite of the Cross, to replace the living converse by a spiritual communion. Assuredly no illusory, incredible transition, in view of the historic reality underlying it. The resurrection faith is, in fact, the only rational faith for those who are conscious and capable of the divine life. "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," Jesus had told the Sadducees in defence of the belief in a future life. In this capacity for the higher divine life, exemplified at its highest by him, lies the strength of the belief in a

blessed immortality, and in the face of this fact, the burden of proof is on the side of those who deny this belief and with it the divine life of the human spirit. Only let those who cherish this belief not risk it by resting it on other than rational, spiritual grounds.

CHAPTER X

THE MASTER

I. HIS ORIGINALITY

IN the Gospels Jesus is addressed as Master, Teacher, Rabbi—the title applied, though not restricted to the scribes. He accepts the title, but he claims to be and becomes for the disciples more than the ordinary Rabbi. To himself and ultimately to them he is the unique Master in virtue of his character and vocation as the Messiah. He is the creator of a new era in the religious history of his race, and claims to be endowed with a knowledge of God and an authority far surpassing those of all its seers and wise men. “All the prophets and the law prophesied until John,” the last of the prophets. John is the Elijah who was to come and has proclaimed the advent of one greater than all his predecessors.¹ Jesus claims to be this one, though at first only in suggestive fashion. “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.”² A greater than the prophet Jonah is here; a greater even than Solomon, yea than the temple itself.³ His teaching is the full and final revelation of the character and purpose of God in the salvation of His people, and, inferentially at least, of humanity, which the seers of Israel had adumbrated, and of which he is the fulfilment. Hence the note of personal authority in the teaching, which so powerfully impressed his hearers and still haunts the mind of the reader of the record of it. As he is greater than all his predecessors, so he can have no

¹ Matt. xi. 13-14. On the titles applied to Jesus in the Gospels, see Burkitt, “Christian Beginnings,” 42 f. He concludes that, while the disciples during the lifetime of Jesus spoke of him as their Rabbi or Teacher, the sense was rather “Chief” than Teacher. For them it implies more than the ordinary title Rabbi.

² Matt. xi. 15.

³ Matt. xiii. 6, 41 f.; Luke xi. 31-32.

rival and no successor. "One is your Master, your Leader, even the Christ,"⁴ he tells the disciples. Startling though it is, the claim was not a visionary one. In reality Jesus proved to be the founder of a movement which ultimately dwarfed and superseded the old Jewish religion in the extent and power of its influence on the history of the world. It is only as we view this magisterial claim in the light of its effects that we can truly appreciate the wonder of it and the personality of the Master who made it.

Mark is more concerned with the works than with the teaching of Jesus, which he reports mainly in incidental fashion. Only in chapter iv. on the parables and in the eschatological discourse in chapter xiii. does Jesus speak at length on a set theme or themes. Matthew, on the other hand, arranges the teaching in consecutive discourses, which are, however, largely compilations of sayings preserved by tradition and evidently not uttered in this consecutive fashion. Hence the set discourse known as the Sermon on the Mount (chapters v.-vii.) and those on the sending out of the Twelve (chapter x.), on the kingdom of heaven (chapter xiii.), on the child mind and the forgiving spirit (chapter xviii.), on the Pharisees (chapter xxiii.), and the long eschatological discourse in chapters xxiv.-xxv. Luke agrees with Matthew in devoting much space to the teaching, and, in doing so, borrowed liberally from a source peculiar to himself. But whilst giving the Sermon on the Mount in abbreviated form, he introduces sayings, which Matthew includes in it, as spoken on various occasions. He follows Mark in his brief version of the discourse to the Twelve, and gives part of the Matthæan version of it as addressed to the Seventy. He confines the parables, to which he adds, in incidental fashion, a number from his special source, chiefly to what purports to be the later phase of the ministry, though some of the incidents show that the teaching belongs to the earlier period of it. He gives the eschatological discourse and the denunciation of the Pharisees more briefly than Matthew, and in reflecting the incidental character of the teaching he is evidently more faithful to the method of Jesus.

⁴ Matt. xxiii. 10. Some critics doubt the use of these words by him, and ascribe them to a later time. M'Neile, "Commentary on Matthew," 331.

This method was the intensive rather than the expansive one, though Jesus doubtless on occasion spoke at considerable length. His style is terse, aphoristic, paradoxical, pregnant. It strikes and grips the hearer and also the reader. "The popular style and natural poetry of his speech have never been equalled. This is true even after his words have travelled from the East to the more sober West, and have been translated from the original Aramaic into late Greek, and thence into the German of Luther and the English of the Authorised Version. Thumbed hundreds and thousands of times by the people, handled and applied hundreds and thousands of times by great and small persons alike, they shine like the purest gold, but with ever-renewed brilliancy."⁵ In this case the word is pre-eminently the expression of the personality. In the Rabbinic literature there is a waste of verbiage, with occasional pungent sayings. In the Synoptic Gospels there is no verbiage. Jesus seems never to have uttered a superfluous word. In this sense, too, he is the Master. What he has to say is the fruit of profound meditation and conviction, and he knows how to say it briefly, and yet to arrest and overmaster his hearers. The parables in which he conveys much of his thought are matchless in their terseness, simplicity, and power of suggestion, even if some of them, like that of the unjust steward,⁶ suggest difficulties which they do not solve. Dr Swete does not exaggerate when he says that "Jesus by a spiritual alchemy transformed into gold all that he touched."⁷ Though their message might not always be so obvious to the hearers of it as to us, who read them in their historic perspective, it is not difficult to divine the thought that he intends to impart, even if at times the parable had an esoteric element which he reserved for the inner circle of the disciples. "Without a parable spake he not unto them, but privately to his disciples he expounded all things."⁸ In general their drift is clear enough, and it is to misread them to say with Mark⁹ and Luke, in accordance with a saying of Isaiah,

⁵ Arno Neumann, "Jesus," 77 (1906).

⁶ Luke xvi. 1 f. See W. H. Robinson, "The Parables of Jesus," 104 f. (1928).

⁷ "Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord," 184 (1903).

⁸ Mark iv. 33-34.

⁹ Mark iv. 11-12.

that he spake them in order to mystify, not to enlighten, his hearers, or, as Matthew¹⁰ has it, because his hearers were already beyond the possibility of enlightenment. This would have been to frustrate his purpose of preparing them for the advent of the kingdom, and is plainly a piece of later apologetic in order to explain to a later generation why the Jews did not accept his teaching and why it won only the adhesion of the comparatively small circle of his disciples in the lifetime of the Master. Mark himself supplies in another passage¹¹ the refutation of this apologetic assumption, "With many such parables spake he the word unto them as they were able to hear it."¹²

To the people the message is "a new teaching,"¹³ which differs both in its content and its supremely authoritative tone from that of the scribes. It is described as the Gospel, good tidings. According to Mark,¹⁴ he himself so described it, "Repent, and believe the Gospel." The writer seems here to be applying the term which had come to connote the Christian preaching of his own time. It is lacking in this connection in Matthew, who appears to record the more authentic form of it, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."¹⁵ In Luke's account of the discourse at Nazareth, however, he is represented as proclaiming the good tidings of Isa. lxi. 1 f., and claiming that his message is the fulfilment of the prophet's proclamation. The term "Gospel" may thus have been used by the new prophet to characterise his own teaching, though in the apostolic preaching it came to denote the specific message about him and his mission, and at a later time was applied to the records of his life and teaching as embodied in written form by the evangelists. But, whether actually used by Jesus or not, the term aptly conveys the spirit and content of his message.

This Gospel is represented as something new, original. It is, however, not original in the sense of being unfamiliar. It is cast in the mould of Hebrew thought, and Jewish

¹⁰ Matt. xiii. 13.

¹¹ Mark iv. 34.

¹² The parabolic method was not original to Jesus. It seems to have been in use in the religious instruction of the synagogue. See Introduction to "Pirké Aboth," 17.

¹³ Mark i. 27.

¹⁴ Mark i. 15.

¹⁵ Matt. iv. 7.

scholars have questioned its originality and have emphasised the identity of Jesus' teaching in many respects with that of the religious teachers of his race. This is characteristic of those who, like Mr Montefiore,¹⁶ if critical, are sympathetic towards Christianity and its founder, as well as those who, like Schechter,¹⁷ are staunch adherents and apologists of the religion of the Rabbis which Jesus opposed. "A good deal of that teaching moves, as a Jew at any rate will usually hold, within a Jewish framework, and is in harmony with some fundamental doctrines of Judaism and with doctrines enunciated by Jewish teachers and seers."¹⁸ Whether sympathetic or antipathetic in their attitude towards the prophet of Galilee, these writers are undoubtedly right in thus emphasising the common element of Hebrew thought from which he drew and which Christian writers have tended too often to ignore or minimise. Historically his teaching is a product of the Hebrew mind, and he is not original in the sense of being absolutely independent of previous and current religious thought. His familiarity with the prophetic and later apocalyptic literature, as well as the Law in the narrower sense and the scribal development of it, is writ large in the Gospels. Some of his utterances directly reveal that his mind was steeped in the ethical and spiritual teaching of the prophets,¹⁹ and parallels to them have been found in the later Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, for instance.²⁰

Whilst granting this dependence on inherited Hebrew thought, it is none the less evident that he moulds it in the crucible of his own mind and religious experience and has impressed on it the stamp of his own personality and genius. He modifies it, and both rejects and adds in accordance

¹⁶ "The Religious Teaching of Jesus" (1910). Cf. his "Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching" (1930).

¹⁷ "Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology" (1909). This is also the line taken by Moore, "Judaism," ii. 90 f., 151 f., 168, 267, etc. So also Foakes-Jackson, and Lake, "Beginnings of Christianity," i. 288. Jesus taught nothing about God "essentially new to Jewish ears." There were, however, important differences, which they point out.

¹⁸ "Religious Teaching," 6.

¹⁹ See, for instance, Matt. xii. 7; cf. ix. 13.

²⁰ See the examples given by Charles in "Pseudepigrapha," ii. 227, and his "Critical History of the Doctrine of the Future Life," 226 f. See also Walker, "Jesus and Jewish Teaching" (1923).

with his God-inspired intuition. He is to a wonderful degree the master, not the slave, of the ideas and the beliefs of his race and his time. With what a telling yet simple elevation of mind does he rise above the religious prejudice of his narrow Jewish contemporaries in the parable of the good Samaritan, for instance! He challenges the dominant legalism and proclaims a new righteousness which has its root in the heart, and totally differs, in spirit and quality, from that of the scribes and Pharisees. He treats the Law itself, as well as tradition, with a magisterial freedom. Distinctive, too, is the appeal to the religious outcast in contrast to the religiously respectable class, which alone counts in the sight of God and man. The Master is there not to call the righteous, but sinners, to seek the one sheep out of the hundred that has strayed on the mountains, to bring the publicans and harlots into the kingdom in preference to the chief priests and elders of the people, to send out the Twelve to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.²¹ This loving care for the pariahs of religious society is indeed "something new in the religious history of Israel," as Mr Montefiore acknowledges. "Surely Jesus has received no grander or more glorious title to fame than these words ('the friend of sinners') coined in mockery and opprobrium, which recoiled upon the heads of those who coined them."²² Unlike some of his co-religionists, Mr Montefiore rightly finds in characteristic sayings of Jesus, like Mark ix. 35, "If any man desire to be first, let him be last of all," the ring of a profound and original religious genius. "It is these simple and profound sayings which seem best to reflect the historical Jesus. How can anyone fairly and honestly argue that such an ethical and religious saying is not over and above the great ethical and religious stories of the Old Testament? And if it could be shown that all the great sayings of Jesus were verbally and textually contained in the Talmud, it might still be justly argued that the lack of familiarity with the New Testament is a great loss to the Jews. For most Jews do not know the Talmud. Their religious literature is confined to the Old Testament and

²¹ Matt. ix. 13; x. 6; xviii. 12 f.; xxi. 31-32.

²² "Religious Teaching," 57.

the Prayer Book. And in the huge bulk of the Talmud the great passages are overwhelmed and lost to view by the mass of trivial, worthless, or second-class matter. Moreover, no collection of Rabbinical sayings that I am acquainted with can rival the sayings of Jesus in impressiveness, profundity, and power. . . . Kindness and charity are familiar enough in the Rabbinical literature. But I do not think I am wrong in supposing that this touch of eager personal service, especially towards the sinner and the outcast, was a special characteristic of the religion of Jesus and a new thing when he preached it." ²³

In view of the evidence of the Gospels, even making allowance for the later tendency to apotheosis, which has to a certain extent been allowed to colour them, it is, I think, evident that Jesus stands in a category by himself, and, in respect both of his religious experience and the teaching which was the outcome of it, may be, on substantial grounds, differentiated from all the religious teachers of his race. "It is not the Law, nor the Talmud, that has conquered and changed the world," rightly says Renan.²⁴ None of his predecessors among the prophets claimed to be the Messiah, and Jesus, in making this claim, assuredly stands apart from and above them. It may be said, as Jewish critics hold, that the claim was a visionary one and that it was also made by Jewish nationalist fanatics of the time, and was thus by no means a new phenomenon. But in the case of Jesus it was the fruit of a genuine, if mysterious, religious experience, and was coupled with a spiritual significance and a moral elevation supreme in Jewish religious history. Out of this personal experience and this wondrous spiritual and ethical teaching came an epoch-making movement, such as only a creative religious genius of the highest order could have inspired. In view of this fact alone, it is futile and feeble to seek to lower him to the level of the Rabbis of his time, even the most distinguished of them. A Hillel and a Shammai, for instance, might found distinctive schools and attract disciples. But Jesus was far more than the founder of a school. He became the

²³ "The Synoptic Gospels," i. 225.

²⁴ "Vie de Jésus," 88.

founder of a religion, a fellowship, a church which ere long developed into a universal brotherhood, embracing Gentile as well as Jew, reaching out to the utmost bounds of the Roman Empire and even beyond, and dwarfing the racial religion from which it sprang. His greatness as Master, the originality, the power of his teaching, cannot be rightly appraised without taking due account of this stupendous achievement, to which he gave the impulse. So appraised, how comparatively limited is the significance of even the most famous of the religious teachers of his race, ancient and contemporary !

II. GOD AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Jesus' teaching is concerned with God and the kingdom of God, and it is his distinctive message on these themes and their relative implications with which the Gospels are concerned. His conception of God is markedly the paternal one (*Abba*). It is, in one form or another, a universal conception of the religious instinct, and it is not peculiar to Hebrew religious thought, from which Jesus derived it. To the Hebrew seer and singer, *Jahve* is the Father of Israel, or Israel's kings, or, though less characteristically, the individual Israelite, as in Ps. lxxviii. 5 ; ciii. 13 ; Mal. ii. 10. With Jesus, on the other hand, the individual sense becomes the distinctive one. The keynote of his conception of the Father-God appears in the frequent use of the personal possessive "My Father," "Thy Father," "Your Father," as in the Sermon on the Mount. The filial relation is predicable of all, and is assumed as a fundamental fact, of which the pious soul is conscious, and to which human experience and the beneficent order of nature alike testify. Of this filial relation Jesus himself is conscious in a special degree, and it is from his own experience that this conception acquires such force and intensity. God displays His fatherly character in the care of His children, to whose wants He ministers, for whose benefit He has ordered the world, and whose prayers He is ever at hand to answer. Life in sunny, fruitful Galilee was less careworn and gloomy

than in our northern clime, and the immanence of the Father-God was less of a problem than it may appear, where the struggle for existence is harder and social conditions are often depressing and disheartening. To the filial faith of Jesus there is no problem at all about God's fatherly providence. The God who makes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust alike, must be infinite goodness, and will feed and clothe His children out of the fullness which He has provided for man and beast. "For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things."¹ Jesus is the serene optimist, and this optimism is rooted in his invincible faith, in his confident reliance on the power of believing prayer. This optimism casts its brightness over the sombre realism of evil in man and the world, and lifts above the anxieties of life. "Be not anxious" is the motto of the life of the disciple, in spite of its suffering and self-abnegation. Leave the cares of life to the Father, and let your care centre in His kingdom and its righteousness. All else God will add.² The love of the Father, which is the very fibre of His being, is not withheld even from those who have estranged themselves from Him by their evil-doing. It is ready to overflow in forgiveness, freely and gladly given, as in the parable of the prodigal son or that of the king and his debtor servant.³ Sin, if repented, is no barrier between Him and His erring children, and Jesus is so sure of the Father's love for all his creatures that he does not hesitate to proclaim this forgiveness in response to persistent faith.

Whilst the emphasis is on the paternal character of God, His justice is by no means ignored or minimised. The divine grace is offset by the divine righteousness. The Father-God is also the absolute Good,⁴ the moral sovereign of the kingdom, the guardian and dispenser of justice, who rewards the good and punishes the evil, who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.⁵ Between good and evil, between those who ensue the good and those who ensue the evil, there is a fundamental distinction. On

¹ Matt. vi. 32.

² Matt. vi. 33.

³ Matt. xviii. 23 f.

⁴ Mark x. 18.

⁵ Matt. x. 28.

the one side, God—the perfect Good—and His children, who live in filial obedience to His will. On the other, the Devil as the incarnation of evil, and the sons of the Devil, who do his will. Between these there is uncompromising antagonism and conflict, and the destiny of the individual depends on the choice he makes between God and the Devil. Man is responsible for the choice that makes or unmakes his character and his eternal weal, for the use he makes of his powers and opportunities for good or for evil, and will be rewarded or punished accordingly, as in the parables of the talents and the pounds.⁶ For Jesus sin—wilful transgression or neglect of the Lord's will—is a terrible reality in itself and in its consequences. The door of the banqueting chamber is inexorably shut on the foolish virgins.⁷ Between the rich man and Lazarus there is a great gulf fixed in the world beyond.⁸ For the workers of iniquity, those who, as the sons of Satan, are regarded as the enemies of God, there is no place in the kingdom of heaven, which is reserved for those who do the will of the Father.⁹ On the throne of his glory the Son of Man will separate the sheep from the goats on his right and his left hand, and implacably consign those on his left, as accursed, to the eternal fire of Gehenna.¹⁰ The passage seems to be overcoloured by the evangelist. But Jesus undoubtedly shared in the current belief in Gehenna as the place of punishment for those that do iniquity, as the parable of the tares and the wheat¹¹ and his genuine utterances in the Sermon on the Mount show.¹² Gehenna is the place of destruction, to which the way is broad and whither the many are tending, whilst narrow is the gate that leads to life and few those who find it.¹³ The doom of hell is denounced against the Pharisees who set themselves against his teaching, who neither enter the kingdom themselves nor suffer to enter those who are minded to do so; who are the true offspring of those who slew the prophets. “Ye serpents, ye vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of Gehenna?”¹⁴

⁶ Matt. xxiii. 14 f.; Luke xix. 12 f.

⁷ Matt. xxi. 11-12.

⁸ Luke xvi. 26.

¹² Matt. v. 22, 29, 30; vii. 13; cf. xviii. 8-9.

¹³ Matt. vii. 13-14.

⁹ Matt. vii. 21 f.

¹⁰ Matt. xxv. 31 f.

¹¹ Matt. xiii. 40 f.

¹⁴ Matt. xxiii. 13, 31-33.

But this doom is not reserved for them alone. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," is his comment on the tragic tales of the fate of the Galileans whom Pilate had slain, or those on whom the tower of Siloam fell. In this case the doom is represented as that of the ordinary sinner who fails to understand the significance of his mission.¹⁵

In his preaching of repentance he could be as blunt and uncompromising at times, in his representation of the divine retribution, as the Baptist himself. The mood of the Master and his message about God evidently varied with the occasion and the circumstances. Whether he conceived of this doom as eternal in our sense of unending time is not definitely apparent,¹⁶ and, to the modern mind at least, an eternal, in the sense of an endless, doom is not easily reconcilable with the infinite goodness and forbearance which he postulates of God. Something must be allowed for the fact that he speaks in terms of current Jewish belief and in figurative, oriental style, and by way of warning and appeal, rather than of dogmatic deliverance, on the future state of the wicked. At all events, he does not allow the paternal conception of God to overshadow the conviction of His retributive justice in the face of wilful, unrepented "iniquity," as embodied in the refusal to accept his revelation of God and His will and purpose, which thus sets itself against and seeks to frustrate His rule. At the same time, there is a tendency to discriminate degrees of guilt and punishment, as in the parable of the servants of the absent lord, who neglect their charge. "And that servant, who knew his master's will and did not make ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not and did many things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few. And to whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required, and to whom they entrust much, far more will they ask from him."¹⁷ Here, at least, the retribution is tempered by a sense of proportion.

The kingdom or rule of God is conceived in a twofold sense—in the present, ethical sense, and in the future,

¹⁵ Luke xiii. 1 f.; cf. xii. 56.

¹⁶ The future æon or age, in contrast to the present age, was not necessarily conceived as everlasting, but might denote only a period of time.

¹⁷ Luke xii. 42 f.

eschatological sense. Both conceptions, as we have noted, are present to the mind of Jesus from the outset, though the eschatological element in the teaching on the kingdom becomes more prominent in the later phase of his mission, in consequence of the conviction of his imminent death, which leads him to concern himself more intensively with the future age or æon. Both are derived from Jewish religious thought, whilst transformed in accordance with his individual religious experience. The kingdom in the present, ethical sense has begun with the advent of the Master himself, who is laying the foundation of it in the new righteousness which he proclaims and the new community which he is engaged in forming. It will eventuate in the full and final establishment of the rule of God in the future age or æon, when the Son of Man shall reappear to exercise judgment and inaugurate the new order in all its fullness.¹⁸ Both these aspects of the kingdom—the present, ethical, and the future, eschatological—are discernible in the Master's teaching, and we do violence to this teaching if, with the extreme eschatological school, we over-emphasise the latter at the expense of the former, on the assumption that his absorbing concern from beginning to end was with the kingdom in the purely eschatological sense, and that his ethical teaching is dominated by this conception of it, and is, therefore, of the nature of a merely temporary or interim ethic. As we have noted in a previous chapter, Jesus was no mere apocalyptic seer, whose mind was exclusively occupied with the future order. It is only in the later stage of his mission that, for the reason adduced above, the eschatological element in his teaching becomes so marked, though even then he continues to dwell on the kingdom in the present, ethical sense. Viewing his teaching on this subject as a whole, a large part of it is undoubtedly concerned with present conditions and present conduct, even if, especially in the later stage, it is influenced by the eschatological outlook. It is thus misleading to represent it as solely conditioned by this outlook, to evaluate the new righteousness

¹⁸ The kingdom of the Age to Come is thus not the kingdom in the popular view of the reign of the Davidic Messiah. On this point, see Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 280 f.

pertaining to the kingdom mainly or exclusively from the eschatological point of view. The new righteousness is no mere passport to a future, transcendental existence. It is a good in itself, of permanent value and obligation, of present as well as future importance. A large part of this ethical teaching is not concerned with eschatology, but with the actual life of the disciple in relation to God and his fellow-men, with the kingdom as it is taking shape, in the present age, in his mission of healing and teaching and in the hearts of those who receive it and are being transformed by a new faith and hope. In this sense the kingdom or rule of God is already in being. "The kingdom of God is come upon you,"¹⁹ he tells the Pharisees in reference to his healing ministry. His power over the demons, over the kingdom of Satan, is an evidence of its reality. "The kingdom of God," he tells them again, "is in the midst of you," and "the publicans and harlots go into it before you."²⁰ It is there, in the presence of him and his circle of disciples. The new wine is being poured into the fresh wineskins. The old age has ended with the preaching of John and a new one has begun with that of Jesus, in which the kingdom suffereth violence and violent men take it by force—apparently in their eagerness to enter it.²¹ A number of the parables express the same thought of its actuality—the parable of the sower and the good seed, the seed cast into the ground and steadily, mysteriously growing till the harvest, the good seed and the tares growing together, the grain of mustard developing into a great tree, the treasure hid in a field, the merchant seeking and finding a pearl of great price.

In the present, ethical sense the kingdom may be described as the realisation of God's will and rule in the individual life and in the community of his disciples. This is what Jesus is mainly concerned to achieve throughout his actual mission, and the kingdom in the future sense will only be the completion of the rule of God, the new spiritual life, which he is striving to found and which is

¹⁹ Matt. xii. 28.

²⁰ Luke xvii. 21 ; Matt. xxi. 31.

²¹ Matt. xi. 12 ; Luke xvi. 16.

already operating in the lives of his followers. Eternal life in the future age or *æon* takes its rise, in the present age or *æon*, in the new righteousness, on which it is based and which is its indispensable condition. It may be the case that in some of his ethical utterances he has in view the ideal order, which is to supervene on the present order, and pitches his moral teaching in accordance with this otherworldly ideal. But it is one-sided and fallacious to represent him as mainly influenced by a purely otherworldly outlook on life. His teaching is concerned with the actual as well as the prospective order, and his moral ideal is meant to be exemplified in the concrete life of his followers, if it is also envisaged in the light of a higher destiny. Jewish apocalyptic, by which the Master was powerfully influenced, was embedded in a solid ethical framework, and, like it, Jesus concerns himself to the end with ethics as well as eschatology. The parables and sayings are concerned with practical life as well as with his Messianic mission, and if we eliminate from the Synoptic narratives this side of his teaching and make him an apocalyptic pure and simple, we misread these narratives in the light of a one-sided conception both of him and his teaching.

III. THE NEW RIGHTEOUSNESS

The new righteousness expresses the highest moral ideal. "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."¹ It is founded on repentance and involves a new spirit, in keeping with the nascent kingdom, in those who respond to the call to repentance and who mainly belong to the despised class outside Judaism or the spiritually minded section of the people—the poor in spirit and others of the beatitudes. "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is near." Jesus' ethical teaching is concerned first and foremost with the inward disposition, the state of mind and heart which must undergo a radical change of attitude towards God and the things of God. For him the ethical realities—faith in God and love of God and our neighbour,

¹ Matt. v. 48.

which this faith engenders—are infinitely more important than mere external religious observance. On the love of God and our neighbour “hangeth the whole law and the prophets.”² In its inwardness it is systematically contrasted with that of the scribes and Pharisees, the representatives of the current legalism, which is delineated as concerned with the external and formal side of the religious life, embodied in the Law and its scribal development, rather than with the spiritual side of it, the inward disposition and motive. These two tendencies in the current religious life are sharply differentiated, and even if the scribes and Pharisees, as their modern apologists contend, did not entirely ignore the spiritual side, they undoubtedly tended unduly to obscure it by their excessive formalism, the tendency to sacrifice the spirit to the system. In spirit and quality, too, it totally differs from the Pharisaic self-righteousness inherent in this tendency, though we need not conclude that all Pharisees were of the purely self-righteous type, or that Jesus himself meant us to infer this. “Except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.”³

The new righteousness demands the utmost self-sacrifice, which is the test and fruit of love. The disciple of the Master must be prepared to lose his life in order to save it⁴ in thus renouncing self, in which true life consists. When it is a question of the attainment of the righteousness that qualifies for entrance into the kingdom, whether present or future, sacrifice and suffering for its sake is the inexorable imperative. To the young man who had great possessions and was eager to inherit eternal life, Jesus says that it is not enough even to keep all the commandments. He must be ready to renounce his possessions if he would gain the heavenly treasure. “One thing thou lackest. Go and sell whatsoever thou hast and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and give to the poor, and come and follow me.”⁵

² Matt. xxii. 40.

³ Matt. v. 20.

⁴ Mark viii. 34 f.

⁵ Mark x. 21. In this case the abandonment of wealth is demanded because the young man is summoned to take an active part in his mission, with which the care of wealth is incompatible. It is not implied as an invariable condition of discipleship, or as an imperative feature of a Christian society, though the possession of wealth is for Jesus a difficulty in the way of true discipleship, as other references to the subject show.

The obligation of the righteousness of the kingdom is superior to even that of kinship. "Whoever shall do the will of God, he is my brother and sister and mother," is the reply to those who inform him that his mother and his brothers would fain intervene to put a stop to his mission.⁶ "If a man cometh unto me and does not hate his father and mother, etc. (*i.e.*, disapprove of their antagonism to the Master), he cannot be my disciple."⁷ Devotion to God and His righteousness is the sovereign consideration, even if it involves the renunciation of the family tie. He himself, as the suffering servant, has learned to reckon with, and is prepared to exemplify, what the sacrifice of self involves in the service of the kingdom. "Let the dead bury their dead," is the answer to the would-be follower, who would first bury his father.⁸ "No one, having set his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."⁹ Self and self-seeking are sternly ruled out of the kingdom. The disciple who would strive for first place in it must eschew all thought of personal greatness and become as a little child in his single-mindedness and lack of selfish pre-occupation.¹⁰ The life of the disciple is the life of the Cross, and in setting the life of imperative self-renunciation in the pursuit of the new righteousness in the forefront, Jesus was sounding a new note in the synagogue preaching.¹¹ No wonder, in view of the exacting character of this righteousness that the gate to this higher life is narrow, the way to it is the way taken only by the few. It is, for instance, "easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."¹²

This self-sacrifice in pursuit of the new righteousness is absolute. It involves unmitigated devotion to the ideal, thoroughgoing consistency in carrying it out. It admits

⁶ Mark iii. 35.

⁷ Luke xiv. 26.

⁸ Matt. viii. 22; Luke ix. 60. This demand certainly seems unreasonable, if taken literally. The probable meaning of the words of the would-be follower, "Let me first bury my father," is "Let me wait till my old father dies," *i.e.*, an indefinite interval. It is this procrastination that Jesus rules out. Rashdall, "Conscience and Christ," 179 (1916); Morgan, "Teaching of Christ," 241 (1920, 2nd ed.).

⁹ Luke ix. 62.

¹⁰ Matt. xviii. 1 f.; *cf.* Mark ix. 34 f.; Luke ix. 46 f.

¹¹ Montefiore, "Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels," i. 523.

¹² Mark x. 23 f.; Matt. xix. 23 f.; Luke xviii. 24 f.

of no reservations, no compromise with the lower instincts of human nature. It dominates intention, disposition as well as act. Jesus, we might say, is mercilessly logical in enforcing the new righteousness. The disciple must not be content with simply observing the positive commands of the Law, and thus merely avoiding what it penalises. It is not sufficient to abstain from murder in order to escape the punishment of the local court which administers the Law. To be angry with a brother is equally to incur this charge in the sight of God. Similarly, other forms of opprobrious language than Raka, which is actionable under the Law, equally incur the divine judgment. To offer a gift in the inner court of the temple, without first being reconciled to an offending brother, invalidates its efficacy from the moral point of view. Love of the enemy is equally imperative with love of our neighbour, and the forgiving spirit must be unlimited. It is not sufficient with Peter to forgive seven times—four beyond the Rabbinic three—but seventy times seven.¹³ To observe the law forbidding adultery and yet look on a woman to lust after her, is to be guilty of this sin, and if the eye or the hand would sin in this and other respects, the disciple must pluck out or cut off the offending member rather than be consigned to Gehenna with a whole body. In order to fulfil the new righteousness, he must be prepared even to ignore, or go beyond the Law. Swearing in any form, which the Law allows in certain cases, is, for instance, inadmissible. So also divorce, according to Mark, though not according to Matthew, who allows it in case of fornication, whilst the *Lex Talionis* is absolutely ruled out. The disciple is not to resist violence, but to turn the other cheek to the smiter, to give without question to him that asks or would borrow, and instead of going to law with a man who demands his coat, he is to make him welcome to his cloak also. Nor must he concern himself with the accumulation of riches, but primarily with the laying up of treasure in heaven.¹⁴ For him who would enrol himself as a member of the kingdom there can be no divided adhesion and no double morality—one for the higher life

¹³ Matt. xviii. 21-22; cf. vi. 14 and Mark xi. 25.

¹⁴ Matt. vi. 19; Luke xii. 33.

of the kingdom, another for the life in the world. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."

It is the manner of the Master, like the prophet, to speak in absolute terms, and some aspects of the new righteousness have been criticised as extreme, impracticable, visionary.¹⁵ Some of its demands seem, indeed, counsels of perfection for those who, if members of the kingdom, are also members of an imperfect human society. The absolute non-resistance to injustice—so original a feature of the teaching¹⁶—the turning of the other cheek to the undeserved blow, the giving not only of the coat, but the cloak also to him that would unjustly deprive us of them, show a sublime disregard of ordinary human nature, and may, in some respects, be questionable from the ethical point of view. Strictly practised, such idealism would tend to accentuate rather than frustrate the evil in the world. Indiscriminate almsgiving might easily put a premium on laziness and beggary ; unresisted violence on anarchy and tyranny. Jesus, we may infer, did not intend to encourage such evils, which the coming of the kingdom was to nullify. In these utterances it is a question of the righteousness, the spirit and general principles of conduct qualifying for entrance into the kingdom in the perfect society of God, which is strongly differentiated from this world. In this perfect society, which is ere long to take the place of this imperfect one, nothing short of the absolute ideal is of avail. He has in view the highest ethical development of the individual, not that which might fit a ruder state, in which the element of self has perforce its place, but one in which the highest of which human nature is capable is the norm of conduct. It is the contrast between these, in the matter of conduct, that he emphasises in such absolute

¹⁵ For a strong plea for the possibility and the imperative necessity of a literal application of the teaching of Jesus, see "Christus Futurus," by the author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia" (1907). Warschauer, on the other hand, has some illuminating remarks on the advisability of relating Jesus' utterances to the conditions of the time, and discriminating between what is of permanent and what is of passing value and obligation in these utterances. "Hist. Life of Christ," 179. Anderson Scott contends that Jesus himself did not intend some of his sayings to be taken literally, and at times implied this. "New Testament Ethics," 13 f. (1930). There is no little force in this contention.

¹⁶ On this originality, see Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 289 f.

terms, and in view of the proneness of ordinary human nature to give vent to the lower passions at the expense of the higher, it is well that the ideal should be held up even in this extreme categorical fashion. Moreover, Jesus, who imposed on himself this ideal, to the extent of the most complete self-sacrifice in life and death, certainly had the right to impose it on his disciples. Nor does it necessarily follow, for the individual at any rate, that such far-reaching idealism is of questionable benefit. It is only in attempting and achieving the sternest self-denial that the individual realises the highest self-mastery, and this sense of mastery is not a moral laxative, but a moral tonic. Ordinary human nature does too little to test its efficacy in practice to sit in judgment on the Master in this respect.

At the same time, whilst expressing the ideal righteousness befitting the perfect society in this absolute fashion, he does, in other connections, take account of actual conditions in relation to the life of the disciple, and we shall not err in implying, where needful, reservations, or in interpreting the more extreme utterances in the light of sayings which tend to qualify them. Jesus respects the constituted order of society and enjoins the doing of the Law as the guardian of this order. Whilst family ties may not come between the disciple and the pursuit of the new righteousness, he bids the rich young man honour father and mother, and condemns the unfilial treatment of parents.¹⁷ Whilst forgiveness is unlimited in the Sermon on the Mount, it is conditioned by the repentance of the offending brother in the Lukan version of the saying on forgiveness.¹⁸ He takes part in the social life of the time and does not demand an ascetic, an absolutely otherworldly attitude to life. His teaching need not result in the renunciation of property except in the case of those who, like the rich young man, are called to take an active part in his mission. It need not make his followers less useful members of society. In his characteristic negative attitude towards the getting of wealth and its possessors, he does not necessarily condemn industry and the holding of property honestly acquired thereby. He has evidently in view the evils inherent in the

¹⁷ Mark vii. 10.

¹⁸ Luke xvii. 3-4.

dominant inequitable social and the oppressive fiscal system, which bore so hardly on the mass of the people and made it so difficult, if not impossible, for the rich man, who profited from this system, to serve God in selfless service for his fellows. In these circumstances the acquisition of wealth by the comparatively few at the expense of the suffering and oppression of the many was incompatible with the pursuit of the higher life of the kingdom. It is this rather than honest industry that he condemns. Moreover, it is the case that the getting of wealth, under any circumstances, has its moral dangers, which are not dependent on passing conditions and need ever to be emphasised. In the parables the ordinary activities of life are, otherwise, assumed to be worthy of human effort, and he can at times give a practical as well as an idealist reason for his commands. "Give diligence to be quit of thine adversary on the way to the judge, etc., lest the judge shall deliver thee to the officer and the officer shall cast thee into prison."¹⁹ "Make friends to yourselves of the mammon of unrighteousness,"²⁰ he exhorts the disciples. They are to seek *first* the kingdom of God, without presumably neglecting what is needful for this life.²¹ The Twelve in the conduct of their mission are to be "wise as serpents."²²

The new righteousness is markedly individualist²³ and, inferentially at least, universalist. It is concerned with the individual, not the state. It is the ethical perfection, the salvation of the soul, that seems to count most with Jesus. He emphasises the individualism which Jeremiah and Ezekiel had enunciated and the apocalyptic successors of the prophets had developed. The parables deal largely with individuals in relation to the kingdom—the man that buildeth on the rock and the man that buildeth on the sand, the sower and the individual receivers of the seed, the merchant seeking goodly pearls, the compassionate lord and the merciless servant, the generous householder and his dissatisfied labourers in the vineyard, the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, the rich fool, etc. With it is combined

¹⁹ Luke xii. 58. ²⁰ Luke xvi. 9. ²¹ Matt. vi. 33. ²² Matt. x. 16.

²³ Bultmann is surely on the wrong track in maintaining that Jesus had no concern with the individual, but only with the community. "Jesus," 44 f.

the universalist spirit, which had also been growing in a certain section of Jewish religious thought since the collapse of the kingdom, though it is implied rather than specifically taught. It is not specifically Jews, but types of human character that his ethical teaching contemplates. The conception of God as Father and men as His children, of the kingdom as an ethical force involves universalism, and this universalist feature appears even in some of his earlier sayings. "God maketh the sun to rise on the evil and the good." "The Sabbath was made for man." "Out of the heart of man evil thoughts proceed." In the Lukan parables especially the kingdom is open to the Samaritan and the Gentile as well as the Jew. To the great supper the outsiders are ultimately made welcome, and fill the places of the absentee friends of the host. In the kingdom, in fact, "they that are last shall be first, and they that are first shall be last."²⁴

There is little about the state, the social organism, and the political and social aspects of life. Jesus lived in a narrow world, and to modern thought his moral teaching is rather circumscribed. It is with the kingdom of God and the place of the individual in it, not with the state or the political and social relations of the individual with it, that he is mainly concerned. The kingdom, in fact, is not of this world (John xviii. 36), and he sharply distinguishes between the two, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."²⁵ The state, the empire, is recognised as a fact, but in such a way as if Jesus and those he addressed had nothing to do with it but to conform to its enactments. Not a word of sympathy with Jewish nationalism, nothing at all that would satisfy the ebullient patriots of the day; neither expressed approval nor disapproval of the Roman régime, founded on conquest and representing the right of force. Jesus stands aloof from both, absorbed in a kingdom that transcends both. This aloofness may seem an undue narrowing of the righteousness of the kingdom and betoken a lack of insight into the civic functions and responsibility of the individual. There was, however, little in the political conditions of the time

²⁴ Luke xiii. 29.

²⁵ Mark xii. 17.

to widen the horizon of the Master or to lead him to dwell on this aspect of the individual life. The spectacle of the Roman Empire aggrandising itself by force and craft might well repel the idealist and beget the thought of the absolute separation between the kingdom of Cæsar and that of God. The attitude of one to whom God's kingdom is the highest good, the great issue of human destiny, might well be that of revulsion, isolation from the kingdoms of this world, founded and maintained by force rather than righteousness, and regarded as under the rule of Satan. Moreover, there was little in the political conditions of the time in Palestine to call forth the activity of the social or political reformer. The Jewish state had practically ceased to exist. Jewish nationalism of the activist type was too visionary, too alien to his spiritual conception of his mission to be countenanced. The only practical course in the circumstances was to ignore it. The Jews were subject to an alien power, whose empire seemed the irrevocable law, and it might well appear futile as well as dangerous to set oneself in antagonism to this law, to mingle political and social with religious reform. His teaching in this respect, we may say, was conditioned for him by these conditions. The kingdom he would found must perforce be not of this world, if it had any chance at all of establishment. It must be a kingdom of the Spirit, and he was careful to frustrate the attempt of the Pharisees and the Herodians to inveigle him into any compromising political commitments.²⁶

Apart, however, from the political conditions of the time, the eschatological conception of the kingdom contained in itself this attitude of aloofness. In the later phase of his teaching, at least, the world, the present æon is near its end, is about to undergo a supernatural transformation. Reform of an order of things that is doomed to speedy destruction is superfluous, even were it possible. All earthly relations are about to be transformed by the hand of God. Therefore, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth . . . but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven . . . for where thy treasure is, there will thy

²⁶ Mark xii. 13 f.

heart be also." ²⁷ In this respect the eschatological influence might not be altogether a healthy one, and it accounts, in part at least, for what is the limitation as well as the thoroughgoing idealism of Jesus' conception of the kingdom. At the same time, his teaching is far from being that of a visionary transcendentalism. It is pronouncedly practical, concerned with the good, the practical life, as exemplified by real men and women who, in striving to realise the highest individual life, do so in fellowship with all and for the good of all. Thus the influence of the life of the individual disciple must tell, indirectly at least, on the political and social organism. The poor in spirit, the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, are the salt of the earth, the light of the world that is not to be hid under a bushel, but to shine from the lampstand before men, "that they may see your good works and glorify your heavenly Father." ²⁸ This life is not a self-centred life, though the emphasis on the individual might lead to a one-sided concern for the salvation of the soul. It is not the life of isolation. It is rather the life of self-denial manifesting itself in the active principle of love, and thus, indirectly at any rate, rendering its service to the common good of the state and society. Love, the keynote of his teaching, is not a self-centred virtue, and Jesus himself sets the example of its active exercise by devoting a great part of his mission to the task of alleviating the ills of life and sending out the Twelve to do likewise.

Moreover, the kingdom has its social side in the community of the disciples, who are not isolated units, but members of a fraternity. It is not necessarily as yet an institution, an organisation. It is characteristically the rule of God in the hearts and lives of His children, a great ethical and religious force expanding like the mustard seed into a great tree, leavening society like the leaven in the meal, growing in spite of the weeds till the end of the world, the final judgment. Yet it already begins, potentially at least, to take form in the community of disciples who are knit together in a spiritual fellowship as children of the common

²⁷ Matt. vi. 19.

²⁸ Matt. v. 14-16.

Father in heaven, as disciples of the one Master. It is, however, not necessarily conceived as a separate society outside Judaism, though in gathering a community of disciples, Jesus was virtually founding the Christian Church. The term "Church" is, indeed, thrice applied to it by the writer of the First Gospel,²⁹ though throughout the Gospel Jesus characteristically speaks of the kingdom, not of the Church. It is, however, absent from Mark, who seems to give the oldest version of the incident at Cæsarea Philippi, and the writer appears to have in mind the Church as it existed when he wrote,³⁰ and to be transferring it back to the time of Jesus. The expansion, the leavening, seems to take place within Judaism until it dominates the whole fellowship, such as Judaism was tending to become in the wide arena of the Diaspora, which maintained close relations with its Palestinian centre. The Twelve are sent out to preach the kingdom and to heal, not to found communities apart from the synagogue. At the same time, Jesus himself ultimately ceases to teach in these local assemblies, and distinguishes his followers from "those who are without"³¹ the kingdom. Practically, in attaching to himself a band of disciples and training them in the new righteousness, he was forming the distinctive society, which was ere long to take organised shape in the Church of the Jewish-Christian communities of Palestine and the Gentile-Christian communities of the Græco-Roman world.

IV. JESUS AND THE LAW

Jesus' conception of the new righteousness brought him, as we have seen, into conflict with the current Judaism, as represented by the scribes and the Pharisees. The antagonism between him and them is represented in the

²⁹ Matt. xvi. and xviii.

³⁰ See Welhausen, "Einleitung," 105-106, and "Evangelium Mat.," 84; Burkitt, "Gospel History," 192-195. The Church, in Matt. xviii. 17, is apparently the synagogue. Allen thinks that Jesus (xvi. 18) did use an Aramaic word equivalent to *Eccelesia* to denote the distinctive community of the disciples, though the evangelist had in mind the Church as it existed in his day. "Commentary on Matthew," 176.

³¹ Mark iv. 11.

Gospels as fundamental, though there were sympathetic as well as hostile scribes and Pharisees. It arose from his divergent conception of what constitutes religion and the religious life. For him religion in the deeper, spiritual sense is based on intuition—the inherent faculty of the soul to seek after and find God and the higher life—and is independent of, though not necessarily opposed to, religious form. The children of the Father, in virtue of their filial relation to Him, know Him directly, spontaneously maintain communion with Him, apart from temple or even synagogue, in the consciousness of doing His will in every good act and emotion of the soul. He, therefore, claims to act independently of the current religious system, if, and where, it interferes with the God-inspired spiritual life. The personal element in religion—personal faith, the religious spirit rather than its form—is the supreme thing. This is its own sanction and vindication. To the authority of the scribes and the practice of tradition he opposes the authority of his God-inspired intuition, and this magisterial note finds characteristic expression in the “Ye have heard. . . . But I say unto you” of the Sermon on the Mount. This it is that lies at the root of the antagonism between him and his opponents. In their view the Law—the Torah as contained in “the Law and the prophets”—is divine and absolutely binding. Jesus admits the divine sanction and obligation of the written law, and evidently shares the common view of the Mosaic authorship of the Law in the stricter sense. Not one jot or tittle of it shall pass away as the supreme norm of the religious life.¹ He claims, according to Matthew, that he has come not to destroy, but to fulfil it, in the sense of exemplifying its ethical teaching and bringing out fully its implications.² He appeals to the Law in the broad sense of the recognised sacred writings—“the Law and the prophets”³—as the authoritative divine

¹ Matt. v. 18 ; Luke xvi. 17.

² This claim is possibly, but not necessarily, an inference of the Jewish Christian writer of the First Gospel, who shows a more pronounced legal spirit than his fellow-evangelists.

³ On the extended meaning of the Torah, see Schechter, “Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology,” 116 f. (1909). For the latest detailed discussion of Jesus’ attitude to the Law, see Branscombe, “Jesus and the Law of Moses” (1930).

standard. "What is written in the Law? How readest thou?" he asks the lawyer, who would test him on the question of eternal life.⁴ He adduces the Ten Commandments as containing the gist of the highest religious obligation. He respects the hierarchy and the religious institutions which the Law in the narrower sense has sanctioned, as when he tells the leper to go and show himself to the priest and offer for his cleansing the things that Moses commanded.⁵ He speaks of the temple as his "Father's house," and enjoins Peter to pay the annual offering of the half-shekel to it. He is careful to celebrate the Passover with his disciples. He even tells the people to observe the teaching of the scribes and the Pharisees, as far at least as "they sit in Moses' seat."

On the other hand, he rejects the scribal tradition as far as it is detrimental to the true spiritual life, and habitually emphasises against the Pharisees the prophetic teaching on mercy instead of sacrifice. "The ceremonial expression of reverence for God he wholly subordinated to the humanitarian expression of it."⁶ If he respects the priesthood, it is none the less true that the priest as well as the scribe is found in the ranks of the implacable opponents of his teaching. He claims for himself the right, like the householder, to bring out of the treasure of his religious experience things new as well as old.⁷ He contrasts the Law and even the prophets with the Gospel of the kingdom which he proclaims.⁸ Some have seen in such sayings a contradiction of those in which he shows a more conservative attitude towards the Law. Probably the attitude varied with the circumstances or the point of view. Possible, too, that, like that of many reformers, his teaching on the subject underwent a development, as in the case of his later wider view of the scope of his mission, which ultimately shed its earlier Jewish restrictions and became pronouncedly universalist. At all events, he has no hesitation on occasion in ignoring and overriding, in the spirit of the prophets, the ceremonial law, which he regards as a thing of secondary

⁴ Luke x. 26.

⁵ Mark i. 44; *cf.* Luke xvii. 14, in the case of the cleansing of the ten lepers.

⁶ Walker, "Jesus and Jewish Teaching," 306.

⁷ Matt. xiii. 52.

⁸ Matt. xi. 12, 13; Luke xvi. 16.

importance, if, and when, it becomes a hindrance of the spiritual life and a burden on the conscience. His free attitude practically, in fact, implies its abrogation.⁹ That it was either burdensome or unspiritual is denied by Jewish scholars. They contend that it was not a burden to the people, and they assert that it was compatible with a deeply religious spirit. "Upon the whole," says Mr Montefiore, "the Law was a popular Law, observed and cared for by the nation at large."¹⁰ In the writer's view, Judaism could be "a combination of the purest and most saintly piety with the most careful and minute observance of every detail of the ceremonial law."¹¹ Schechter¹² has a chapter on the joyousness of the observance of the Law, as reflected in the Rabbinic literature, and both he and Montefiore controvert the New Testament representation of it as burdensome and grievous to be borne. That the Torah, as the service of God, was a delight to many in the time of Jesus need not be denied. Jesus himself seems to have shared in it and to have emphasised the obligation of observing it in this sense. He was brought up in and breathed the atmosphere of the spiritually minded circle represented by Zacharias and Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna, and many others who were "worshipping with fastings and supplications night and day," "looking for the redemption of Jerusalem," "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless."¹³ But that, as developed by the scribes and represented by at least a section of the Pharisees, it had another aspect can only be denied by those who ignore the evidence of his incontestable sayings or reject them as later Christian additions. It was against the excessive externalism and legalism which undoubtedly entered into the religious profession of the time, as his conflict with its representatives shows, that he protested. From this intricate and burdensome prescription he claimed the right to dissent and emancipate, in the spirit of the prophets, and in conformity with his own spiritual experience. It is a new law in the prophetic spirit that, especially in the view of

⁹ Klausner, "Jesus," 275-276.

¹⁰ "Teaching," 31.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 37.

¹² "Aspects," 148 f.

¹³ Luke i. 6; ii. 37-38.

the first evangelist, he proclaims, though it would be to misread his mission to regard him as a sort of reforming legislator, whose aim was to substitute a rival system for that of the Rabbis. He was too far removed from the current legalist spirit to fill such a part. Perhaps the lower conception of the Law in Galilee, as compared with Judæa, had something to do with it. At all events, religion, revelation, is not a thing apart from his own experience. With him an independent, free, formative force enters most potently into religion, and we might justly describe him as the great free-thinker, the religious emancipator of his age.

Hence the long and embittered controversy over Sabbath-breaking, washing of hands, fastings, and other external observances. To their objections to his Sabbath-breaking or the doing of works of mercy on that day, he replies that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, and claims that the Son of Man (here in the sense of Man) is lord even of the Sabbath.¹⁴ Even the law of Moses is thus not absolute. He joins issue with it over the question of clean and unclean foods as ordained in Lev. xi. He cuts right through this ceremonial legislation and tells his opponents that it is not what we eat, but what we think that really defiles.¹⁵ He thereby anticipated Paul by "making all meats clean," as Mark comments, though he himself did not explicitly draw this inference. This was revolutionary enough, and the disciples seem to have failed to grasp the prospective significance of these words, as we learn from the attitude of Peter at a later time in the story of the clean and unclean things in the Acts of the Apostles. He refuses to conform to the ceremonial washings (washing of hands before meals, and household utensils, etc.) imposed by the legalists, in addition to those prescribed by the Mosaic law,¹⁶ and denies their right thus to equate their prescriptions with the commandments of God.¹⁷ Hygienically there might be a good deal of force in such regulations. But it was a question not of hygiene, but of religious obliga-

¹⁴ Mark ii. 27-28.

¹⁵ Mark vii. 15; Matt. xv. 18.

¹⁶ Lev. xiv. and xv. Washings in the case of those coming in contact with certain diseases, such as leprosy.

¹⁷ Mark vii. 6; Matt. xv. 7.

tion. To the objection that his disciples do not fast, he replies that it is no time to fast when the bridegroom is here, and speaks of the futility of putting the new wine into the old wineskins, the new cloth on the old garment. On the question of divorce, which the Mosaic law allowed (Deut. xxiv. 1) and which Hillel and his school, in opposition to that of Shammai, made very easy, he reminds them that there is a higher law than that of Moses, and appeals to Gen. ii. 24, "They two shall be one flesh." According to Mark, divorce is thus inadmissible, and second marriage is adultery. "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."¹⁸ In the Matthæan version of the saying (xix. 9) and in the Sermon on the Mount he is represented as allowing divorce in the case of fornication, in accordance with Deut. xxiv. 1—the view of Shammai. The Markan version is, however, supported by Luke (xvi. 18), and seems to reflect his uncompromising attitude on the subject¹⁹ more correctly than that of the legally minded first evangelist, though he was ready to treat the erring with a large-hearted charity, as the story of the woman taken in adultery shows. In the case of the taking of oaths and the practice of the *Lex Talionis* (Law of Retaliation), there can be no doubt about his assumption of the right to improve on the Mosaic law to the extent even of disallowing it. "But I say unto you, Swear not at all. . . . But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; and whatsoever is more than these is evil."²⁰ In opposition to the *Lex Talionis* he inculcates the principle of non-resistance, and carries his opposition to its spirit the length of insisting even on the love of an enemy. "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your

¹⁸ Mark x. 9.

¹⁹ Rashdall thinks that he was laying down the general principle of the sacredness of monogamous marriage, which the lax usage of the time endangered, rather than considering whether, in the case of serious offence like fornication, divorce might be permissible. "Conscience and Christ," 104. Montefiore also assumes that he would on this question have taken the side of Shammai. "Synoptic Gospels," i. 240. These are only, at most, probable conjectures. See also Allen ("Commentary on Matthew," 201-203), who holds that the Matthæan version is an editorial insertion into the original saying, as given by Mark. Jesus is stating the ideal of marriage, not legislating on the subject. King, "The Ethics of Jesus," 69 (1917).

²⁰ Matt. v. 33 f.

enemies, and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven.”²¹ The first part of the passage is a quotation from Lev. xix. 18. The second is not explicitly found in the Pentateuch. But the vindictive and inhuman spirit of parts of the Old Testament towards the alien and the current tendency to “an inveterate hatred towards all other peoples,” attributed to the Jews by Tacitus,²² lend support to the inference that Jesus must have had in view some definite saying to this effect, though it cannot be traced to the recorded teaching of the Rabbis. Some of the Rabbis, indeed, agreed with him in repudiating the spirit of revenge,²³ and Hillel and his school modified the *Lex Talionis* to the extent of allowing compensation for injury, in opposition to Shammai, who strictly insisted on its principle.²⁴ Montefiore is of opinion that Jesus himself, though he enjoined his disciples to love their enemies, showed no love for the Pharisees and made no attempt to gain them, and was thus incapable of practising his own principle.²⁵ The evidence points, however, to the fact that it was hopeless to seek to win those over to his spiritual teaching, who in their hatred utterly renounced his fellowship and conspired to destroy him. It is surely going too far to imply personal rancour and hatred towards his opponents in one who, even on the Cross, uttered the prayer, “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.”²⁶

It is a new Law, in the spirit of the prophets, that, especially in the view of the first evangelist, he promulgates in the form of the new righteousness, and in a tone of authority superior even to that of Moses and the ancients, as well as the representatives of the current legalism. He might be appealed to as a witness to the relative value of the Scriptures and of the independent and critical handling of them, and could, therefore, hardly fail to appear, in the eyes

²¹ Matt. v. 43-45.

²² “History,” 5, 5.
²³ See Abrahams, “Studies in Phariseism and the Gospels,” 150; Walker, “Jesus and Jewish Teaching.” Humanitarian treatment of the enemy is explicitly taught in Prov. xxv. 21. But it is the enemy within the people of Israel, *i.e.*, the Israelite enemy, that is understood, not the enemy of Israel. See Kleinert, “Theolog. Stud. und Krit.,” 6 f. (1913).

²⁴ In the Talmud the *Lex Talionis* is not applied in practical Jewish law.

²⁵ “Teaching of Jesus,” 53-54.

²⁶ Luke xxiii. 34.

of the priests and scribes, as a dangerous and presumptuous innovator. He goes a long way, in fact, in the direction of dejudaising Judaism and supplanting it in favour of a religion of the spirit.

In his free attitude towards the Law he anticipates, to a certain extent, Paul and the development of the free Gentile Christianity of the future. Unlike Paul, however, he has no theory of the impossibility of living in accordance with its precepts in virtue of original sin and its paralysing effects on human nature. There is no dogmatic assertion of the impotence of the will, on this account, to do the good, or the innate necessity for sinners to do the evil. He assumes that those who are seeking God and the things of God can bend their hearts and wills Godward. The new righteousness is attainable by intensive effort. "Would you enter into life, keep the commandments."²⁷ "All things, therefore, whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them, for this is the law and the prophets."²⁸ At the same time, he recognises the fact that absolute goodness can be predicated only of God. He realises the fact of sin, the evil inclination (*Yetzer*) and its potent influence in the heart and in the world. "God be merciful to me, a sinner," is the only true attitude in the divine presence, not the "I thank thee that I am not as other men" of the self-righteous.²⁹ Repentance is the indispensable condition of attaining the new righteousness, and the need for faith, for prayer, and for God's grace, generously bestowed in response to believing prayer, in the effort to attain acceptance in His sight, is emphasised. It is the publican, who confesses himself a sinner and relies on God's mercy, that goes to his house "justified," "acquitted," "forgiven," in God's sight,³⁰ not the Pharisee, who prides himself on his own righteousness. Nor does he share the idea of merit and reward in the current religious sense.³¹ The reward of his followers is not a recognition

²⁷ Matt. xix. 17; cf. Luke x. 28.

²⁹ Luke xviii. 9 f.

²⁸ Matt. vii. 12.

³⁰ Luke xviii. 14.

³¹ In the Rabbinic literature itself there is heard at times a note of protest against serving the Lord for reward ("Pirké Aboth," 13), and in some of the Apocalypics salvation is due to the mercy of God in accepting the works of the sinner.

of merits for keeping the Law, but rather compensation for the sufferings which they endure in their devotion to the new righteousness. The servant in the parable, who only does his duty—"the things that were commanded"—has no right to speak of merit. "Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do."³² In these respects he does prepare the way for the Pauline teaching on grace and works.³³

The Master is a marvellous optimist. He firmly believes in the efficacy and the permanence of his message and his mission. It is his part to sow the seed of the word, the gospel of the kingdom. It is God's part to bring it to fruition through a gradual process of growth in the soil that has been prepared for it—first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear, and at last the harvest.³⁴ Even if the tares grow up with the corn—for the power of evil is also at work hindering the growth of the good seed—the harvest will be gathered in due time. He has an invincible faith in the ultimate triumph of the good over the evil. This is the inalterable purpose of the divine scheme which he has set himself to accomplish. Through him the power of Satan is being assailed and will ultimately be shattered, and this optimism prevails even in prospect of the looming Cross. Beyond the Cross is the Master transformed into the triumphant Son of Man. There may be a visionary element in this apocalyptic hope and vision of the future. But there was also a solid foundation for this optimism in the potential efficacy of his mission and his message, which was to verify itself in the rise of Christianity and the Christian Church as a potent force in the history of the world, in spite of the smallness, the unobtrusiveness of the beginnings. From him went forth a new life which the Cross was not to end, but only to set free for the operation of a marvellous moral and spiritual influence on the life and destiny of humanity.

³² Luke xvii. 10.

³³ See M'Neile, "New Testament Teaching in the Light of St Paul's," 23-25.

³⁴ Mark iv. 28.

CHAPTER XI

THE HEALER

I. THE HEALING MINISTRY

JESUS shares the Hebrew theistic conception of God in its most realistic sense. For him God's immanence and His fatherly providence are a fact, not a problem. Belief in an all-wise, loving Father-God is an intuition, an axiom alike of thought and experience. He is not troubled with doubts on the score of the presence and power of evil in the world, the difficulty of reconciling the calamities and misery of human life, the destructive and seemingly malevolent forces in Nature with the belief in a divine ruler, who is perfect goodness, and whose will is supreme in ruling and overruling all things. He is the irrefragable optimist as far as the Father-God and His relation to man are concerned, and resolutely fixes his gaze on the beneficent aspect of Nature which, to the receptive observer, is a manifestation of the divine wisdom and benevolence. He himself is there to wage war with evil and overthrow Satan, the prince of evil, and secure the ultimate vindication and triumph of the good. He cherishes this belief even in the face of the terrible doom that ultimately looms up as the tragic climax of his career. He accepts the doom as the Father's will, as the veiled promise of infinite blessing to men, in the full confidence that good will ultimately come out of the evil. This optimism, which carries him fixedly to the Cross and beyond the Cross, is rooted in his faith in the Father's wisdom and love, to which he gives all through most realistic expression. He thereby gave the most convincing proof of the reality of his belief in thus remaining true to it even in the face of the Cross, and assuredly won the right to proclaim it as a fundamental verity of the religious life. God cares for His children not

merely in the general order of the world, but in the minutest details of life. He clothes the world in its beautiful vesture and orders and sustains Nature for their benefit. He provides out of the fullness of its fertility for their wants. His Spirit is present in all things, and especially in the hearts and minds of His children. He is accessible to their prayers and will surely, in His own way, answer the prayer of faith. Jesus' intimate communion with God is reflected in this conception. He is wrapt in the consciousness of God as He reveals Himself in his elevated moral nature and spiritual life. That the Father can and does work, through him and through others as well, the accomplishment of His fatherly ends is a fundamental conviction.

It is this fundamental conviction that underlies his mission as a healer as well as a teacher. He is sent by the Father-God not merely to inaugurate the kingdom, but to heal and help the sick and the needy. The latter is as much an essential of his mission as the former. It is an integral part of the preaching of the kingdom which "is come nigh unto you,"¹ and from which sin, disease, and death are to be eliminated. From the outset the mission is concerned with the alleviation of human suffering and misery. He knows by experience the life of the common people—its toil, its anxieties, its sorrows, its privations, its liability to want and disease—and he makes it an integral part of his mission to help and lift up his fellow-men. It is one of the wonderful traits of his character that he, the religious idealist, had such a keen sense of the realities of life. He will heal the body, and in healing the body will heal the soul. His healing ministry derives from the rich humanity of the Son of Man, who is closely in touch with his fellow-men and is deeply conscious of the tragic element in human life. Hence the prominence of this ministry in the Synoptic Gospels, as it is delineated in repeated general statements and exemplified in a series of detailed cases. In one of these general statements, for instance, Mark vividly sets before us his curative work at Gennesaret, between Capernaum and Magdala. "And when they were come out of the boat, straightway the people knew him, and

¹ Luke x. 9.

ran round about the whole region, and began to carry about on their beds those that were sick, where they heard he was. And wheresoever he entered, into villages, or into cities, or into the country, they laid the sick in the market-places, and besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment ; and as many as touched him were made whole.”² Matthew is equally explicit as to the mass healings which took place on the eastern side of the lake. “ And there came unto him great multitudes, having with them the lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and they cast them down at his feet ; and he healed them ; insomuch that the multitude wondered when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking, and the blind seeing ; and they glorified the God of Israel.”³ Luke agrees with them in noting the mass healings which characterised the beginning of the mission at Capernaum. “ And when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him ; and he laid hands on every one of them (Mark has only “ many of them ”), and healed them.”⁴

The exemplification of these general statements is furnished in the detailed cases which recur throughout all three Gospels, though Matthew and Luke have a number peculiar to their narratives. All three narratives agree in emphasising on occasion the profound sympathy with human suffering that actuates the healer. These “ mighty works ” (*δυνάμεις*) are generally the outcome of the compassion of Jesus. In Mark, Jesus himself gives us the key to the motive that leads him to seek to provide for the hungry multitude that had gathered around him in the desert place on the eastern side of the lake. “ I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days and have nothing to eat ; and if I send them away fasting to their home, they will faint in the way, and some of them are come from far.”⁵ A truly moving self-revelation of the human Jesus. Not less illuminating is the glimpse, given by Matthew, of this deeply human figure as he moves about in the cities and villages and the synagogues, teaching and

² Mark vi. 54-56 ; cf. Matt. xiv. 35-36.

³ Matt. xv. 30-31 ; cf. iv. 23-24.

⁴ Luke iv. 40.

⁵ Mark viii. 2-3.

preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing all manner of disease and sickness. "But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd."⁶ That this compassion is aroused by the thought of their bodily, as well as their spiritual, need is shown in the context in which he sends out the Twelve not merely to preach the kingdom, but to heal all manner of disease and sickness.⁷ In the desert place by the Sea of Galilee, whither the multitude follow him and where the feeding of the 5,000 takes place, at the sight of the sufferers whom they have brought with them, "he had compassion on them and healed their sick."⁸ The same motive is perceptible in the case of the individual works of healing, though it is usually implied rather than explicitly stated. In the story of the healing of the leper in the course of what seems his first mission tour in the Galilean towns, he is "moved with compassion" and instantly responds to his appeal. When he sees the weeping widow of Nain walking before the bier of her only son, "he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not,"⁹ and restores the lad to his mother. "Weep not" is also the spontaneous utterance which the sight of the mourners evokes on entering the house of the stricken Jairus.

Clearly Jesus thus made it an essential part of his mission to grapple with human suffering, and he does so because he realises so keenly the tragic side of life. Moreover, for the Hebrew mind disease is due to sin,¹⁰ the power of evil in the world, though the idea is also found that it exists in order that God may show his miraculous power in the exercise of the curative skill given to men.¹¹ Jesus shared this Hebrew conception, and gave expression to it on the occasion of some of his cures. From the beginning the healing ministry is, therefore, a genuine product alike of his intense sympathy with suffering humanity and of his warfare against the

⁶ Matt. ix. 36; cf. Mark vi. 34, where the utterance is noted before the feeding of the 5,000.

⁷ Matt. x. 1.

⁸ Matt. xiv. 14.

⁹ Luke vii. 13.

¹⁰ Exod. xv. 26.

¹¹ "Wisdom of Jesus, Ben Sirach," 38. This idea also occurs in the saying attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel that the blindness of the man born blind was not due to his own sin, or that of his parents, "but that the works of God should be made manifest in him" (John ix. 3).

power of evil. It is no mere evidential adjunct of his Messianic claim and activity, though in fighting evil he is also preparing the way for the coming of the kingdom, and so far his works of healing have a Messianic significance. In the Synoptic narratives he heals mainly because he is appealed to for help, and his fellow-feeling for the sufferer prompts the response to the appeal. "Jesus," as Principal Cairns aptly says, "works his miracles because he cannot help working them."¹² The writer of the Fourth Gospel has obscured and distorted this side of his healing activity in his striving to represent his works as proofs of his divinity. The first of them—the turning of water into wine—is a manifestation of his glory. It is as the divine Son, not as a compassionate man among his fellow-men, that he does them. They bear witness to his divinity, and their object is to compel the admission of his divine claim. In the story of the feeding of the 5,000, the writer says nothing of his compassion with the multitude.¹³ It is "the sign," the evidential demonstration of his divinity, that is emphasised. Even where he follows the Synoptic tradition, this is the impression which he seeks to create and convey, directly or indirectly. In this tradition, on the other hand, it is the humanity rather than the divinity of Jesus that is manifested in these stories of his mighty works, though the evidential significance of them also appears on rare occasions. The Synoptic writers, like the writer of the Fourth Gospel, doubtless shared the developing belief of their time in his divinity, and there is in Matthew, and especially in Luke, traces of the tendency to magnify the supernatural character of these mighty works and to improve on Mark in this respect. On the whole, however, they are faithful to the early tradition, and emphasise on occasion the pity for human distress that evokes his healing power. In the Synoptists the miracles are rather the proof of his humanity than of his divinity. He habitually discourages the tendency to magnify his gift of healing, to enhance his reputation as a

¹² "The Faith That Rebels," 29 (1928).

¹³ Dr Strachan seems to have overlooked this feature when he says that there is no difference between the Synoptic and the Fourth Gospel miracles "except in the grandeur and power of the Lord, whom they are intended to reveal." "Fourth Evangelist," 165 (1925).

wonder-worker, to spread sensational tales about him and his work as fitted to frustrate his spiritual teaching, to aggravate the popular astonishment and beget visionary hopes of a purely popular Messiah. He rebukes the demons who proclaim him to be the Holy One of God, or the Son of God, because, in their naïve fashion, "they knew that he was the Christ." He enjoins silence on those whom he heals, though evidently without result. He refuses to give the Pharisees a sign of his supernatural power.¹⁴ He ascribes his healing power to God, bidding the Gerasene demoniac, for instance, go and tell his relatives what great things the Lord (Jahve; in Luke, God) has done for him. He credits his opponents, the Pharisees, with the power to cast out devils. "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?" False Christs and false prophets are able to "show great signs and wonders."¹⁵ He speaks of himself as a prophet in connection with the works done by him at Capernaum.¹⁶ Only once does he directly make use of the cure effected by him as an evidence of his Messiahship—in the reply to the Pharisaic accusation of blasphemy in claiming authority to forgive sin.¹⁷ There is, too, a trace of the evidential character of his works in the reply to the messengers of John, whom he directs to tell the Baptist "the things which ye do see and hear," and mentions generally the works he is doing as fitted to speak for themselves. He upbraids the cities, in which so many of these works were done, for their indifference and their unbelief in his Messianic vocation. But such evidence of his Messiahship is of quite a different character from the reasonings in which he is made to speak of them as manifestations of the Son of God in the later Johannine sense. It is rather in accordance with that of the primitive apostolic preaching, in which Jesus is described as "a man approved of God unto you by mighty works, wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know."¹⁸

¹⁴ Mark viii. 11 f.; Matt. xii. 38-39; xvi. 1-4; Luke xi. 29-32.

¹⁵ Matt. xxiv. 24.

¹⁶ Luke iv. 24.

¹⁷ Mark ii. 10. It is, however, a fair question whether the term "Son of Man" in this passage does not mean "man" in general in the original Aramaic. See Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 379.

¹⁸ Acts ii. 22. *δυνάμεις, τέρατα, σημεῖα.*

These mighty works are regarded, in the Synoptic tradition, as miracles in the sense of being manifestations of the power of God working in Jesus as a new and wonderful prophet. They are in harmony with the belief in the miraculous inherent in the Hebrew conception of God. God can and does intervene in the life of man, and even in the operations of Nature, and thus influence both in accordance with His will and purpose. It is in virtue of this conception that the miracles of Jesus are so readily acclaimed as a wonderful visitation of God. The Synoptists, indeed, record the amazement of the people at his mighty works. But the amazement is not that such works are possible, but that in Jesus a new prophet has arisen with power to do them. This at once invests his mission with a divine authority in the eyes of the people generally, if not of their religious leaders. Such works any prophet can do—must, in fact, be capable of doing. The power to work miracles is so engrained in the belief of the time that it can be exercised by others as well as a prophet. Jesus entrusts his disciples with this power and, in commissioning them to preach, authorises them to exorcise the demons and heal disease.¹⁹ Pharisees, false Christs, and false prophets can exercise it, and, in the current belief, the Devil's agents are invested with it, as the inference of the Pharisees from the works of Jesus shows. In the belief of the time miracles happen as a matter of course as the result of the special exercise of divine or even diabolic power. Healing as the result of faith was part of the Hebrew creed. To the Rabbis every recovery from dangerous disease was miraculous, and the prayer for healing is found in the prophets,²⁰ and formed a part of the synagogue liturgy.²¹ In the Messianic age, in particular, God will show his mighty power by opening the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf, and making the dumb to speak and the lame to leap as a hart.²² In view of this universal belief, it is not surprising that the Gospels are full of stories of miraculous happenings. Instead of being a proof of the mythical character of these

¹⁹ Mark iii. 15 ; Matt. x. 11 ; Luke ix. 1-2.

²⁰ Jer. xvii. 14 ; cf. Ps. ciii. 3.

²¹ Abrahams, "Studies in Phariseism," 111-112.

²² Isa. xxxv. 5-6.

narratives, as some have assumed, they afford a presumption of the harmony of the narratives in this respect with the prevailing mental attitude of the age of Jesus. A tradition lacking in the reflection of this universal belief would be out of touch with the conditions of the time. Whether the belief is to be regarded as a guarantee of the actuality of these wonderful occurrences is a different question, which we shall examine presently.

Meanwhile, it is clear from the documents that the healing ministry produced a tremendous impression on the people as a special manifestation of the presence and power of God. The evangelists repeatedly emphasise in vivid language the profound effect of the exercise of this power by Jesus. The emphasis is not necessarily a mere attempt to throw an unreal halo on the divine Jesus in the spirit of the Fourth Gospel. It is in harmony with current belief, and strikes one as a genuine reflection of the popular feeling. The fame of Jesus as a healer does not rest on the mirage of later belief, even making allowance for the tendency of tradition to swell and magnify the reputation of its hero. The healing mission does seem to have had an electrifying effect, either of attraction or repulsion, on his environment. It was so real that, on the one hand, it drew to him, as a rule, the wonder and admiration of the multitude, for the time being at least; on the other, the deadly enmity of the scribes and Pharisees. Both the attraction and the repulsion are a striking testimony to the arresting individuality of the healer and his work. Of the attraction there can be no reasonable doubt. "And straightway they were amazed with a great amazement," is the effect of the restoration of Jairus' daughter.²³ "And they were astonished beyond measure, saying, He hath done all things well," is the comment on another healing incident.²⁴ "And they were all astonished at the majesty of God," Luke informs us in reference to the healing of the epileptic at Cæsarea Philippi.²⁵ On other occasions the healing is regarded as something unique. "They were all amazed, and glorified God, saying,

²³ Matt. v. 42; cf. Luke viii. 56.

²⁴ Matt. vii. 37.

²⁵ Luke ix. 43. *μεγαλειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ.*

this lack of effect, the reason does not hold of other places, where the incipient enthusiasm seems to have died away rather quickly. Jesus himself is found in the later period of the Galilean mission upbraiding several of the cities on the lake, including Capernaum, in which the healing ministry evoked the greatest excitement. There is anti-climax as well as climax in the drama. The growing hostility of the religious leaders of the people, the fear of Herod Antipas, account in part for this slackening into indifference or unbelief. The Gerasene miracle, being connected with the loss of the herd of swine, was evidently regarded as a sinister portent by the people, who were of mixed Jewish and Greek race. "And they besought him to depart from their borders."³² But even the disciples, who are the constant spectators of these manifestations of the divine power, seem to forget them on occasion, and are found wondering how they are to make the one loaf suffice for their nourishment, and this in spite of the recent miracle of the feeding of the 5,000. In the two stories of the storm on the lake they are equally forgetful, and expose themselves to the reproaches of Jesus. If the faith of the disciples was thus liable to slack in the face of untoward circumstances, it is hardly surprising that in too many other cases it was like the seed sown on shallow ground, which straightway sprang up, but, because it had no root, withered away.³³

II. METHOD AND MEANS OF HEALING

The cases reported include a variety of diseases—mental derangement, fever, blindness, deaf-muteness, leprosy, dropsy, hæmorrhage, epilepsy, paralysis. The method of cure frequently applied is by touching the sufferer. Jesus takes the mother of Peter's wife, who is suffering from fever, by the hand, raises her up, and the fever leaves her.¹ So in the case of Jairus' daughter, reputed to be dead, but evidently lying in a swoon, he takes the child by the hand

³² Mark v. 17.

³³ Mark iv. 5-6.

¹ Mark i. 31. Matthew agrees, but Luke omits the touching and magnifies the miracle by saying that he rebuked the fever (iv. 39).

We never saw it in this fashion.”²⁶ “And the multitudes marvelled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel.”²⁷ “And when the multitude saw it,” says Matthew, of the cure of the paralytic at Capernaum, “they were afraid, and glorified God, who had given such power unto men.”²⁸ “And they glorified the God of Israel, who had given such power unto men,” we read of the effect of the healings on the eastern side of the lake.²⁹ “And fear took hold of all,” Luke tells us of the incident at Nain, “and they glorified God, saying, A great prophet is risen among us, and God hath visited His people.”³⁰ “Is this man possibly David’s son?” (*i.e.*, the Messiah in the popular sense), ask the amazed multitude on another occasion.³¹

In view of these repeated indications of the popular estimate of the beneficent work of Jesus, it is evident that he was regarded as no ordinary miracle worker. In the popular view he ranks with the greatest of the prophets of old, with Elijah, or Jeremiah, or others of the great line of Hebrew seers; or, he is the successor of John the Baptist. Though there are cases of indifference, or unbelief, or hostility, it is widely recognised that his work bears the stamp of special divine authority, and that, with his activity, God has opened a new epoch in the history of His people. The Pharisees, indeed, profess to see in this activity the arts of the magician in alliance with the prince of the demons, and this inference became the current view of the Jews, who ascribed his healing power to the magic which he had learned in Egypt, and with which he sought to deceive the people. This inference is utterly at variance with the general estimate of Jesus’ own time, and is merely the judgment of the blind animosity which religious bigotry inspires, and which persists in mistaking the divine for the diabolic in the character or the movement which it fears or hates.

On the other hand, it is no less clear that the mighty works sometimes fail to impress. At Nazareth, for instance, there is hardly any response, and if the reason given, *i.e.*, that a prophet has no honour in his own locality, may explain

²⁶ Mark ii. 12, the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum.

²⁷ Matt. ix. 33, the healing of a dumb man.

²⁸ Matt. ix. 8.

²⁹ Luke vii. 16; *cf.* vii. 39.

²⁹ Matt. xv. 31.

³¹ Matt. xii. 23.

and enjoins her to arise.² Again, after exorcising the demon, he grasps the hand of the prostrate epileptic in the region of Cæsarea Philippi and raises him up.³ He touches a leper and he is straightway made clean, and is bidden go and show himself to the priest and make the prescribed offering.⁴ The touching of the eyes results in the cure of a number of cases of blindness. But in certain cases—that of the blind man at Bethsaida, who had evidently not been born blind—the procedure is more complicated. He isolates him from the crowd in order, apparently, to rivet his attention on himself, and, in accordance with current custom, applies saliva to the eyes, as well as twice lays his hands on them, before the sight is completely restored.⁵ The cure, which is reported by Mark only, evidently involves, in addition, great exertion of will on the part of both healer and healed. The healing of the deaf stammerer, whom he also draws apart from the crowd, is similarly effected by the application of saliva and the touching of the ears and the tongue with his moistened fingers, and here again the cure involves great exertion of will power, Jesus looking up to heaven and sighing deeply before uttering the command, “Be opened” (*Effatha*).⁶ In the case of the woman suffering from an infirmity of eighteen years’ duration, peculiar to Luke—evidently a case of paralysis—the cure is instantaneously produced by the laying on of his hands,⁷ after the patient has been authoritatively told that she is loosed from her infirmity. In the case of the dropsical man, also peculiar to Luke, “he took him and healed him and let him go.”⁸ In other cases of paralysis—the man with the withered hand and the paralytic at Capernaum—contact is lacking, and the cure is effected by a mere command, evidently in response to the faith of the sufferer.⁹ Contact is also lacking in the case of the healing of the ten lepers on the road to Jerusalem, reported only by Luke,¹⁰ and of

² Mark v. 41; Matt. viii. 25; Luke viii. 54.

³ Mark ix. 27.

⁴ Mark i. 41; Matt. viii. 3; Luke v. 13.

⁵ Mark viii. 22 f.

⁶ Mark vii. 32 f.

⁷ Luke xiii. 13, peculiar to Luke.

⁸ Luke xiii. 4.

⁹ Mark ii. 11; iii. 5.

¹⁰ Luke xvii. 12 f.

the blind Bartimæus at Jericho.¹¹ In the latter case the cure is instantaneous ; in the former, it takes place whilst the lepers are on the way to show themselves to the priests in obedience to his command. In both cases it is the result of faith in the healer.

On the other hand, there appear to have been numerous cases in which the cure results from the touching of Jesus by the sufferer. Of this method the most striking detailed instance is that of the woman suffering from persistent hæmorrhage over a period of twelve years, who furtively touches the border of his garment, in the midst of the crowd that accompanies him to the house of Jairus, and experiences instant relief.¹² In such cases auto-suggestion produces the ardently desired physical effect. Such incidents were evidently of frequent occurrence. "As many as had plagues pressed upon him that they might touch him," we read in connection with the healings at Capernaum.¹³ Again, in the Gennesaret region, where the people similarly crowd around him, "as many as touched him were made whole."¹⁴ Very peculiar are the instances in which the healing takes place at a distance and direct contact is impossible, as in the healing of the centurion's servant and the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman. Here the alleviation is wrought in response to the faith of second persons, who plead on behalf of the sufferers.

How are we to explain this remarkable power of healing which enables Jesus to perform these numerous cures ? In accord with current belief, he himself, as well as the writers of the Gospels, attribute this power to God or the Spirit of God operating through him. "If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils," he tells the Pharisees in meeting the charge of diabolic influence, "then is the kingdom of God come upon you."¹⁵ In answering the Pharisees he assumes that his healing power is due to the Holy Spirit.¹⁶ "And the power

¹¹ Mark x. 52 ; Luke xviii. 43. In Matthew there are two blind men, and the cure is operated by touching the eyes (xx. 34). Mark and Luke appear, however, to give the more reliable account.

¹² Mark v. 29 ; Matt. ix. 22 ; Luke viii. 44.

¹³ Mark iii. 10.

¹⁴ Mark vi. 56 ; Matt. xiv. 34.

¹⁵ Matt. xii. 28 ; Luke (xi. 20) has "finger of God." The phrase seems to denote heavenly power.

¹⁶ Mark iii. 29-30 ; Matt. xiv. 31-32 ; Luke xii. 10. See also E. F. Scott, "The Spirit in the New Testament," 75-76 (1923).

of the Lord was with him to heal," says Luke.¹⁷ He is both endowed with a divine power—possessed by the divine Spirit—and acts by divine authority in exercising it. This is the root conviction that enables him to carry on this strenuous warfare with disease and suffering. The possibility of these "mighty works" lies in the absolute faith in an immanent God, which inspires him to do them. "If thou canst do anything," implores the father of the epileptic boy, "have compassion on us and help us." "If thou canst!" remonstrates Jesus. "All things are possible to him that believeth."¹⁸ "Why," ask the disciples, in reference to their failure to exorcise the demon in this case, "could not we cast it out?" "Because," he replies, "of your little faith. For verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you."¹⁹ "Who then can be saved?" they ask on another occasion. "With men it is impossible, but not with God; for all things are possible with God."²⁰ In other words, he recognises no limit to the beneficent power of God over disease, if men are prepared to rely implicitly on it. For its exercise depends not only on the confidence of Jesus in his curative gift. It is virtually, if not always explicitly, dependent on the faith of the sufferer, or those who intercede in the sufferer's behalf. The faith must be mutual, and where this is lacking, as at Nazareth, he can do no mighty work. He resolutely refuses to gratify the desire of the Pharisees for a mere demonstration of his miraculous power, apart from this beneficent activity in adapting means to ends. It is not, as a rule, a one-sided process, dependent on the will of Jesus. The will of the sufferer must co-operate on the common basis of unquestioning faith. "If thou wilt," says the leper, "thou canst make me clean." "I will," returns Jesus, as he touches him; "be thou made clean."²¹ The necessary psychic condition is present in the faith of the patient that Jesus, by the power of God as a prophet

¹⁷ Luke v. 17.

¹⁸ Mark ix. 22-23.

²¹ Mark i. 40-41; Matt. viii. 2-3; Luke v. 12-13.

¹⁹ Matt. xvii. 19-20.

²⁰ Mark x. 26-27.

or as the Messiah, can heal disease, and this faith is heightened by the sympathy which he shows with human suffering. There is a magnetism not only in the personality which impressed the multitude, but in the manifestation of it which attracted the suffering and the miserable, and inspired an unbounded confidence. "Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole," he assures the woman with the issue of blood, who had furtively touched his garment. "For she said, If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole."²² "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" he asks the two blind men who beseech his mercy. "According to your faith be it done unto you," is the reward of their unhesitating affirmation.²³ Most potently operative is the faith of Jesus himself. He has no hesitation that he can do what is asked of him, though some of the cures are not instantaneous, and some may not have been permanent, as we may infer from the return of the malady of demoniac possession in an aggravated form, to which he graphically refers in his controversy with the scribes and Pharisees.²⁴ Moreover, there was the discouraging reflection that they were often failures as far as the reception by others of his message was concerned. Even so, there is in Jesus, with his overpowering sense of the reality of God and his own divine commission, a consciousness of mastery and strength that hesitates not to grapple with the power of evil in mind and body and to overcome it.

At the same time it is clear that, in addition to the exercise of what we might call an almighty faith in God, Jesus possessed the power of communicating to the believing recipient a vital force, which actually effected the cure in a large number of cases. One has heard of what appear to be genuine instances of the healing of a variety of diseases in modern times by means of this force, thus transfused from the person of the healer to the sufferer. In the Gospel narratives the possession of this force by Jesus is plainly indicated. "And all the multitude," says Luke, "sought to touch him, for power (*δύναμις*) came forth from him and healed them all."²⁵ So in the case of the cure of the infirm woman in the crowd. "And straightway Jesus,

²² Mark v. 28, 34.

²³ Matt. ix. 28, 29.

²⁴ Matt. xii. 43 f.; Luke xi. 24 f.

²⁵ Luke vi. 19.

perceiving in himself that the power had gone forth from him, turned him about in the crowd and said, Who touched my garments?"²⁶ Clearly, too, he makes use of suggestion in his striving to make this magnetic force effective, as in the case of the laboured healing of the deaf stammerer and the blind man at Bethsaida. In other cases, where the sufferer is not present, this power seems to be communicated by telepathy. In cases of mental derangement, the dominating will, the power of personality takes a grip of the sufferer and enforces deliverance from the malady. In that of the epileptic lad, he ascribes the cure to prayer,²⁷ and in prayer he nurtures and strengthens the faith that sustains the confidence in his ability to heal, whatever the peculiarity of the case, to which he adjusts the treatment. He frequently retires from the crowding people, and even from the disciples, for the spiritual recuperation from the nervous strain of this wearing effort. His whole mission is a constant communion with the Father-God, and therefore he never hesitates to essay the things required of him in his absolute confidence that God will always avail. At the baptism he receives the Messianic consciousness in prayer. In the task and the toil of this commission he finds in prayer the strength of mind and purpose that never wavers or doubts. In Gethsemane, where there is, indeed, an interval of dread struggle, he wrestles through in prayer to the resolution to face the last terrible ordeal. On the Cross he is in communion with God to the last cry, in which he commends his spirit to Him.

III. CREDIBILITY OF THE HEALING MINISTRY

Now arises the question, Did Jesus really accomplish these numerous healings of a variety of disease? Did he actually cure insanity, blindness, dumbness, deafness, leprosy, fever, paralysis, epilepsy, hæmorrhage, dropsy, by a touch, an adjuration, and the exercise of will power, intensified by an absolute faith, with the use on occasion of current healing methods? The Synoptists found this belief in the

²⁶ Mark v. 30.

²⁷ Mark ix. 29.

tradition which they profess to give, and they evidently shared it themselves. To the tradition and the reporters of it these mighty works are miracles in the sense that God, or the Spirit of God, operates them through Jesus. In virtue of this divine power, Jesus can heal all manner of disease. Nay, it is part of his mission, as the founder of the kingdom, to do this, since they are an integral feature of its establishment. When God reigns on earth, disease and sin, or the power of evil, which is the cause of the ills of suffering, erring humanity, will be overcome and vanish away. This attack on sin, and disease, and death is but a prelude of the kingdom and a feature of its reality as actually in the coming. "If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom come upon you."

But is the tradition trustworthy? Do the great works, of which it tells, correspond to actual facts, or are they simply a reflection of what tradition came to believe, and the reporters of it tended, in any case, to exaggerate? Are they, in other words, not largely legendary, and is not the healing ministry, which is reported as an integral part of Jesus' prophetic and Messianic mission, accordingly largely an assumption of later belief? Has the tradition not magnified and distorted a few incidents into a sustained and largely adventitious exhibition of supernatural power by the God-man in the later theological sense?

Well, in the first place, the healing ministry, as we have noted, is not, in the Synoptists, generally speaking, of an evidential character. It is the fruit of the genuine humanity of Jesus, of his deep compassion with human suffering, and of his conception of his mission as a warfare with evil, with the nefarious effects, bodily as well as spiritual, of sin. But is this ministry not incompatible with the ordered course of things, in which what are called the Laws of Nature work out their fixed and uniform results in a universe, which functions with the regularity, the inevitability of a machine, independently of the influence or control of volition, divine or human? For the purely mechanistic theory of the universe, which has somehow evolved its own laws, leaves no room for God and His providence in its operations. It accordingly rules out the theistic assumption of

the possibility of an effective providential activity of God in and through Nature, or of man as the agent of His providence. This theory is, however, only a generalisation based on what appears to its exponents as a self-evolved, absolute order of a purely mechanical character.

Is this theory an adequate, self-evident conclusion, which the uniform order of Nature compels us to adopt? Granting the fact of this order, is the theory of its mechanical, godless character the only rational and compelling inference from this order? Is it compatible with the infinite, designing intelligence, which, in spite of this sceptical dogmatism, Nature also reveals and which begets in the reflective observer the conviction of a Supreme Will immanent in the universe—ordering, sustaining, and controlling it? Is it not a necessity of reason to infer that where this Supreme Will exists, it cannot conceivably be regarded as limited by what is. Is not freedom an essential of its being, and must we not postulate this freedom even in the face of the uniformity of Nature? Abstractly considered, there is, therefore, no compelling reason for rejecting a divine providence such as the theistic conception of God assumes and accepts; whilst concretely there is overwhelming evidence in support of the conviction of an Infinite Intelligence, a Supreme Will in and behind all things. That an omnipotent, if mysterious Power is there, is borne in upon us with all the force of a mathematical axiom. That this Power is, by its very nature, that of a Supreme and Beneficent Will stands revealed to every receptive soul in the order, beauty, and adaptation of the universe, even if there are traces of destructive forces which, to our limited knowledge, seem difficult to reconcile with its exercise. The general impression derived from the manifestation of this Power is in accordance with the Hebrew theistic conception of God, despite its anthropomorphism, its proneness to assume and assert, in its characteristic temperamental fashion, what it deems the supernatural, magical intervention of God in Nature and human history. In view of the marvellous adaptation of means to ends, displayed in the world around and beyond us, the providence of God seems to be writ large on the face of things, and it is no mere assumption that He is present in Nature, ruling and

controlling it, by means of this adaptation, in His infinite wisdom and love. Even the limited intelligence and will of man can and do, by means of observation, discover and to a certain extent control Nature for the purposes of human well-being. The wonderful discoveries and adaptation of its forces in recent times afford magnificent proof of this capacity to influence and adapt them, of which our fathers had no conception and which they would have scouted as impossible and incredible.

Hence the present widespread disposition to discount or discard the metaphysical dogmatism of the scientists of the latter half of the nineteenth century. The assumption of a hard-and-fast mechanistic theory of the universe has to-day lost its infallibility even for the scientific mind. Even what are known as "miracles" are no longer treated with a contemptuous wave of the scientific hand. Nature itself is the standing miracle. In it marvellous forces are working before our eyes or hidden in things, and the miracle is being continuously augmented by the discovery of these forces and their adaptation to human needs, and by the ever more astounding manifestations of God's providence. Compared with this, the miracles claimed to be wrought through human agency are small things indeed to the mind and imagination that contemplate the overpowering spectacle of the divine power and will, as displayed in the universe. Of all these miracles the greatest is man himself—the supreme combination of spirit and matter, the rational and moral personality tabernacling in a body marvellously adapted for the purpose of man's being; the crown, the supreme marvel of God's creation; the marvellous thing, for which it is surely no illusion to believe that God should show special concern, even in the face of the immensity of the universe. If by miracle is understood the exhibition of this power and will, then to the reflective mind everything is miraculous and, most of all, man himself.

There is, therefore, no compelling reason for scepticism, based on the mechanistic theory, as to the mighty works of Jesus. It has by no means succeeded, even in the eyes of distinguished men of science, in undermining the theistic conception of God and His providential relation to Nature

and human life. We are perfectly entitled to hold this conception in the face of scientific generalisations of this kind, which are purely dogmatic assumptions and change with the widening of knowledge and the mental attitude and outlook of the age. Nor does the widely held theory of evolution preclude the operation of a supreme will in Nature and life, inasmuch as it may be regarded as the method by which this will accomplishes its ends.

So much granted to the theistic conception of God and His providence, there remains the question whether the Hebrew form of this conception, which assumes not only the manifestation of the divine wisdom and will in Nature, but its supernatural intervention in history as well as Nature, is tenable and credible. Both are assumed to be proved by the miracle stories of the Old Testament. Both may be admitted as within the range of the power of a supreme divine will. But the sifting of the evidence does not tend to substantiate all that the naïve belief of the age saw in such reports. As far as our experience guides us, God does not intervene in Nature and history in the magical, theurgic fashion, which such a naïve belief assumes. He works His will by adapting means to ends through the quickening of latent conditions or forces which are fitted to produce the desired result. This appears to be the secret of the healing mission of Jesus, who heals a variety of diseases in the absolute confidence that God will give fruition to his efforts to alleviate human suffering in accordance with His method of adapting means to ends. The will of a God-inspired personality, operating in faith on the patient and, as a rule, though not exclusively, with the patient's co-operating will, did achieve the cure of a variety of diseases. The modern study of psycho-therapeutics, or healing by mental and spiritual means, has incontestably gone far to vindicate the reality of these cures, which an older generation of critical writers, like Strauss and Renan, too readily assumed to be the creations of myth or legend. It is an accepted maxim of modern medical science that the mind can work very remarkable effects on the body and achieve the cure of both physical and mental disease. "It has been shown," says Professor MacDougall, "that under certain

conditions (especially in the hypnotic and post-hypnotic states) the mind may exert an influence over the organic processes of the body far greater than any that had been generally recognised by physiologists. Especially noteworthy are the production of blisters, erythemata, and ecchymoses of the skin (the so-called stigmata) in positions and of definite shapes determined by verbal suggestions, and the rapid healing of wounds or burns with almost complete suppression of inflammation; and with these may be put the complete suppression or prevention of pain of even such severity as normally accompanies a major surgical operation."¹ "We gladly admit," says Dr Brown, "that purely physical illnesses, *i.e.*, illnesses that are purely physical from the point of view of modern medical knowledge, do often respond to mental treatment in ways that are a surprise to the medical faculty as well as to the general public, and that at the present day we cannot set any fixed limits to the power of the mind over the body."² "Modern medical science has been showing that sometimes even to-day the lame walk, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, the blind see."³

Such tested evidence is also forthcoming in a number of expert medical reports on the healing of various diseases by spiritual means, which one would otherwise naturally regard with suspicion, if only reported in a narrative which one has not the means of testing by actual expert examination of the cases in question. In the case of the exhibition of the Holy Coat at Trier in 1891, for instance, the medical report testifies to the fact that, under the influence of religious faith, a certain number of cures of an extraordinary kind did take place. Though the Coat is a pious fraud due to the credulity of a former age, it may well be the means of arousing genuine religious fervour. Here is a summary of the evidence. "When the Holy Coat was displayed at Treves in the year 1891, the sight of the relic, seen with the eye of faith, did, as an actual fact, according to the perfectly trustworthy evidence of German physicians of unimpeachable

¹ "Body and Mind," 350-351 (6th ed., 1923); cf. Thompson, "Miracles in the New Testament," 36.

² "Talks on Psychotherapy," 13 (1923).

³ Wright, "Miracle in History and in Modern Thought," 156 (1930).

reputation, effect in eleven cases cures for which no other medical reasons whatever could be offered, though in twenty-seven other cases another explanation of the cure did not seem to the physicians to be excluded. The eleven cases, for which no medical explanation could be offered, included atrophy of the optic nerve of many years' standing, lupus, paralysis of the arm as a consequence of dislocation, complete loss of the use of the arms and legs as a consequence of rheumatic gout, St Vitus's dance, a serious abdominal complaint, blindness of one eye and paralysis of one arm as a consequence of brain fever, chronic intestinal disorder, a cancerous tumour, caries of the spine, and a chronic inflammation of the spinal marrow. Facts like these, which are not really open to question, will make Jesus' works of healing also seem not impossible." ⁴

Cures of this kind are also reported as having taken place, over a long series of years, at Lourdes. One would require to be quite sure as to the exactness of the diagnosis, which is, of course, liable to error, and even Dearmer, the enthusiastic champion of healing by spiritual means and the author of a suggestive work on the subject, concludes that the evidence "is not all we could desire." With this reservation, it seems that religious emotion or conviction on the part of individual sufferers has effected remarkable results, whilst there are, of course, many failures, and the percentage of cures to failures is very low. During the long period from 1858 to 1904 a large number of cures or improvements were registered, including diseases of the brain, lungs, eyes, bones, joints, skin, nerves, digestive organs, etc. Competent investigators like Dr A. T. Myers and his brother admit that remarkable cures have taken place, whilst regarding them as the natural results of psycho-therapeutics "which produce by obscure, but natural agencies, for which at present we have no better terms than suggestion and self-suggestion, effects to which no definite limitation can as yet be assigned." They add that none of the cures examined by them "has yet produced evidence definite enough to satisfy reasonable men of

⁴ Holtzmann, "Life of Jesus," 193-194.

any *miraculous* agency, however surprising the cure may sound." ⁵

Such a conclusion has been strongly rebutted in more recent times by the doctors of the Lourdes Medical Bureau, which was established in 1885 to investigate reputed cures of organic disease. These doctors appear to examine the patients only after the cure has taken place as the result of immersion in the piscina, or religious fervour (the invocation of the Madonna or of Christ during the procession of the Sacrament). Their knowledge of the actual disease from which the patient has been freed is derived from the medical certificates subsequently submitted to them, which are admittedly often unsatisfactory. The nature of the disease is, therefore, not as a rule known to them from personal experience of the previous condition of those reputed to be cured. A comparatively limited number of grave organic ailments (suppurating fracture, cancer, tuberculosis, Pott's disease, for instance) are, however, adduced by the Medical Bureau as cases in which a cure has been effected either instantaneously or within a short time after immersion, and there is no reason to doubt the good faith of the averments thus officially made.⁶ The only question, in such cases, is as to the interpretation of the cause of the cure. Both Dr Le Bec, the President of the Lourdes Bureau des Constatations, and Dr Marchand, who lately succeeded Dr Boisserie as President of the Medical Bureau, are devout Roman Catholic physicians. They unquestioningly believe, for instance, in the literal apparitions of the Madonna to the fourteen-year-old girl, Bernadette Soubirons, in 1858, and in the communications made by the phantom, which Dr Marchand rather naïvely describes as "the Queen of Heaven," "the beautiful lady, the immaculate Virgin." Such terminology is hardly fitted to beget in the reader the impression of a strictly scientific mentality on the part of those sincerely pious, but evidently rather impressionable

⁵ "Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research," ix. (1893); see also F. W. N. Myers, "Human Personality," i. 214 f. (1903); Dearthmer, "Body and Soul," 308 f. (1912); Johnson, "The Great Problem," 220 f. (1927).

⁶ See, for instance, Le Bec, "Medical Proof of the Miraculous," Eng. trans. by Dom Izard (no date, but evidently a recent publication); Marchand, "The Facts of Lourdes," Eng. trans. by Izard (1924).

medical investigators. They accept without question the Roman Church's definition of the miraculous as something above and contrary to Nature. As fervent Roman Catholics they are ready to subordinate their own judgment in such matters to that of the theologians, and unhesitatingly ascribe the miracles in question solely to the intercession of the Virgin, or the actual bodily presence of Christ in the Sacrament, whose aid the patients invoke. They can find no other explanation in any natural force and, therefore, have recourse to the ecclesiastical solution of the problem as the only possible one.

In support of this solution they insist again and again that the evidence, which they evidently seek to test in a careful manner, admits of no other explanation. In short, only a divine, supernatural intervention, in the circumstances described, can account for the facts as they have observed them. They will not admit that science may still discover the operation of natural forces, as yet unknown, in those marvellous healings, which, in accordance with the teaching of the Roman Church, they pronounce to be above and contrary to natural law. It is, however, rather hazardous to posit as a self-evident truth that medical science has reached finality in its knowledge and treatment of such organic disease, and that it is inconceivable that it may not be able to discover forces tending to achieve the results described in these cases. In view of the marvellous progress of the knowledge and treatment of disease within, say, the last fifty years, it is too much to ask us to accept such a dogmatic deliverance as the last word on the subject. In absolutely ruling out the influence of the psychic element in such cases, they seem to be going beyond the evidence itself. It is clear that, on their own admission, many such cases of grave organic disease are not cured at Lourdes by the methods described, whilst the comparatively few experience a remarkable deliverance. One would naturally conclude that there seems to be something in both the psychic and physical condition of those patients, who are thus remarkably cured, that is responsible for the strange differentiation. Moreover, if, as is assumed and dogmatically asserted, the relatively few are cured without the operation of any

human factor, and solely by divine intervention in the form of the intercession of the Virgin or the real presence in the Sacrament, and that among the few selected are some of questionable moral character, it does seem arbitrary that these benefits are refused to the many who equally appeal to the divine mercy. We do not read in the New Testament that Jesus thus selected only the relatively few out of the crowd of sufferers for the exercise of his curative power.

In criticising this dogmatic deliverance, it appears that the objectors include physicians of the same religious persuasion as the members of the Lourdes Medical Bureau, as well as those who do not share the cult of the Madonna, on which this Lourdes business really rests. Certain also that many so-called miracles operated there are not regarded, even by these doctors themselves, as miraculous. The rather credulous Canon Bertrin⁷ chronicles from the Lourdes Registers several thousand "healings and ameliorations" up to 1913. Since then the number has largely increased, and a Roman Catholic critic takes strong exception to Canon Bertrin's representation of wholesale miracles on the ground of a too ready credulity. As the result of his own recent examination of the Registers, he reduces the number of what he would pronounce cures by direct divine intervention to between 200 and 300.⁸

Modern medical science now acknowledges, and even emphasises, the cure of disease by spiritual means. But it also limits the scope of mind or faith cure, and it evidently is the case that this cure only succeeds in as far as the predisposing conditions are present. Faith, spiritual power,

⁷ "Histoire Critique des Événements de Lourdes," translated by Mrs Gibbs under the title, "Lourdes, A History of Its Apparitions and Cures," 3rd impression (1928). The book professes to be a critical history. The first part, dealing with the apparitions of 1858, is very crude, and the remainder, dealing with the cures, is anything but critical.

⁸ Communication of Dom Izard, O.S.B., to the author. Dom Izard was himself formerly a physician. It is only fair to add that he, like Drs Le Bec and Marchand, firmly believes that some of the cures can only be accounted for by supernatural intervention. He even rules out faith healing in these cases. On the relatively small number of cures, see also Dr Butlin in *British Medical Journal*, 18th June 1910, and Bishop Henson, who refers to this testimony in his "Notes on Spiritual Healing," 55 f. (1925). On the possibility of the operation of the psychic factor even in cases of organic disease, see *ibid.*, 78, in which Bishop Henson quotes the judgments of Sir Clifford Allbutt and Drs Rivers and Butlin.

may cure or help to cure disease of even a deadly nature. But who will say that it will make an amputated leg grow again, where the co-operation of Nature with mental and spiritual power is an impossibility? Luke, indeed, asserts that Jesus touched and healed the wounded ear which one of the disciples had cut off with his sword. But Mark, Matthew, and even the Fourth Gospel are significantly silent on the subject. It is only necessary to adduce the fact mentioned above to reduce the faith cure enthusiast to a more sober frame of mind.

In studying the New Testament cures we come upon traces of popular superstition which clearly show that we must reckon with the possibility of faulty diagnosis and consequent error in estimating the miracle. The age in which Jesus appeared was an age of relative ignorance of the facts of life and Nature and of superstitious beliefs about both. Whilst the Jews, to their credit, rejected the religious mythology of their time in their jealous devotion to their monotheistic faith, they absorbed this mythology to a certain extent in their angelology and demonology. Short of endangering their monotheism, they shared in this respect the mythological frame of mind. We have unfortunately to reckon with this element of Jewish and pagan superstition, which intruded itself into Christianity and impressed itself on the history of Jesus. This is part of the impedimenta with which Christianity has burdened faith from the outset, and the weight of the burden has increased in the course of its development.

The most common cure in the Gospels is that described in the phrase "casting out of devils." The conception is based on the belief that disease is produced by an evil spirit or spirits within the body.⁹ The possession by demons is, in a considerable number of these, what a more scientific age terms insanity, or mental derangement. In the Synoptics it is, however, not confined to the mentally deranged. Deaf, dumb, epileptic, and even blind persons are represented as demon-possessed, though there are

⁹ On this and other features of Jewish demonology, see Strack and Billerbeck, "Kommentar," iv., "Exkurs. zur altjüdischen Dämonologie," 501 f.

diseases which are not ascribed to this cause—paralysis, fever, leprosy, for instance. Whilst the belief in demonology may take very crude forms, it may be more or less universal among peoples of even a relatively high civilisation. The age of Jesus is a case in point. The belief in demons and demoniacal activity prevailed throughout the Græco-Roman world, and persisted through the Middle Ages into modern times. James VI. of Scotland, for instance, was an expert on the subject, and even a philosopher like Bodin, who was, in part, his contemporary, equally believed in and wrote on demonology. In more recent times, what has been termed the phenomenon of dual personality has been accepted as an established fact by psychologists. But this is generally regarded not as the introduction of a new personality, but as the result of “the splitting” of the individual personality.¹⁰ Myers, indeed, goes the length of assuming the possession of the body by a different personality or spirit, though he disbelieves in demonic possession.¹¹ This seems, however, to be no more than a speculative idea, and the patent fact is that demonic possession in the Gospel narratives is a naïve way of expressing what to us is a diseased condition of the tissues. Jesus seems to have shared the current belief in demonology. He knows, for instance, what happens to the exorcised unclean spirits, who roam about waterless places after being cast out.¹² He accepts the reality of these evil beings and their power to afflict both mind and body, and makes use of the conventional method of exorcism to expel them. The first miracle recorded by Mark is, in fact, the exorcism of a demoniac. In this and other cases of what is evidently insanity, the patient is thrown into a violent agitation at the presence of Jesus, and the agitation is supposed to arise from the fact that the demon recognises in him his master, one who has come to put an end to his power of mischief. He addresses him as the holy one of God, or as the son of God¹³ in the Messianic sense, the mind of the maniac evidently working, in its own fashion, on the Messianic idea

¹⁰ Dearmer, “Body and Soul,” 148-149.

¹¹ “Human Personality,” ii. 198.

¹² Matt. xii. 43; Luke xi. 24.

¹³ Mark i. 24; v. 7; Luke iv. 34, 41, etc.

of the time. The devils, we are told, "knew that he was the Christ."¹⁴ Jesus apostrophises the demon and he is fain to obey, though very reluctantly, and the reluctance is supposed to be indicated by the violent convulsions which precede the cure¹⁵ (the departure of the demon). All this is very naïvely set forth (the demon speaking and Jesus even asking his name in the Gerasene case), and is not to be taken as an accurate diagnosis of the condition of the patient. What seems to have happened in such cases is that the patient, who is suffering from severe nervous disorder, is deeply impressed by the potent personality of Jesus, and that Jesus makes use of this impression to effect by spiritual means the cure of this disorder. In the case of the Gerasene cure, the sufferer shows the strength of this impression by worshipping him, and the cure is really wrought in these cases by a powerful will acting in the strength of a commanding faith and assisted by the psychic condition of the patient, who, in his own deranged fashion, has got the conviction of Jesus' power. There is not necessarily anything miraculous about such exorcisms. There are many stories of such effects in early and mediæval Church history, and the experienced neurologist of to-day can, by the application of appropriate psychic treatment, bring about the cure or the alleviation of such maladies. What is remarkable is that Jesus cures by the power of his personality, in co-operation with a certain idea operative in the mind of the patient, without, apparently, any real understanding of the cause of the disease, apart from the general inference that disease is due to sin. For the bystanders and the writers of the Synoptic narratives, at all events, the miraculous consists in the driving out of the demon. But what is supposed to have happened does not take place, the demon being a fanciful creation. The miracle is really a case of misapprehension. Jesus is, however, no thaumaturgist of the conventional order. The cure is, in fact, a triumph of moral force over human misery, not of any mere superstitious incantation, though the

¹⁴ Luke iv. 41.

¹⁵ Matthew suppresses the miracle of the cure of the demoniac at Capernaum, regarding the convulsions apparently as derogatory to Jesus' power to give instant relief.

method is of the conventional kind. In this sense even the devils are constrained to obey him, to use the language of the evangelists.

In the case of the Gerasene maniac, reported by all three Synoptists, the popular character of the belief is very naively and realistically reflected. It is a case of mania of the most violent type. The victim is subject to violent paroxysms, and in these paroxysms breaks his fetters, and is left at large to roam about the tombs and the mountains. At his appeal Jesus exorcises the unclean spirit, which turns out to be not one, but a legion. Where are these devils, who do not wish to be "sent out of the country," to go? They are evidently reluctant to be sent back to the demon-world, which appears to be a very undesirable region. At their request Jesus allows them to enter a herd of swine feeding on the mountain-side, swine-breeding being the prime industry of the district. The swine, 2,000 in number, go mad and stampede down the mountain into the lake and are drowned, while their keepers take to their heels and spread the tale far and near as they go. Naturally the people rush to the scene of the miracle and find the maniac cured, but the swine, as well as the devils, gone. Naturally, too, they beseech Jesus, whom they regard as a dangerous magician, to remove from their district, fearing, apparently, that a few more such cures will be fatal to every pig in the region. Jesus consents, whilst telling the man, who would fain accompany him, to remain and make known his deliverance throughout the Decapolis. "And all men," we read, "did marvel." The naïve, uncritical character both of the belief and the narrative is patent at a glance. Jesus did effect the cure of the maniac, but only after a prolonged convulsion which frightens the swine and causes them to rush helter-skelter over the precipice into the lake.

IV. THE SUPERNATURAL WORKS OF JESUS

By far the larger number of the mighty works of Jesus are concerned with the healing of disease. Only in a very few cases is he credited with what is evidently regarded by

the tradition as miraculous power over inanimate Nature. In these cases there is no question of the operation of moral or psychological factors. They are acts of omnipotence pure and simple. In them he appears in possession of superhuman power, and the work is a miracle of the magical kind. He brings about certain results in virtue, not of the adaptation of available means to ends, but of the superhuman overruling of the laws or ordinary course of Nature. He walks on the water, stills the storm on the lake by a word, feeds over 5,000 and 4,000 people on two occasions from a few loaves and fishes (unless the second incident is merely a doublet of the first), blasts a fig tree by a mere command (though this interpretation of the passage is disputable), raises the dead. He is thus represented as endowed with the power to suspend the operation of cause and effect, as made known to us in our observation of Nature, and to work miracles in the sense of effecting what is contrary to our observation of natural phenomena. If he did the things thus ascribed to him, it could only have been as the result of a daring faith that God Himself, in answer to his prayer, could suspend the ordinary course of Nature either in his own behalf or for the benefit of others. For the application of methods, which might be effective in the case of rational, conscious beings, would not hold in that of inanimate things. He could not suspend the law of gravitation, for instance, by an exertion of the will, energised by faith, on the object, as he could influence by moral and physical means a diseased body or mind. It is, indeed, conceivable that the power of God working through him could effect this suspension. In this case, however, this power would make of the human medium merely the channel of divine omnipotence, and this is not how Jesus acts in his capacity as healer. His whole being is intensely absorbed in this healing work, and it is not as God, but as man in dependence on God, that he achieves them in accordance with the divine principle of the adaptation of existing means to ends. His faith was, indeed, infinite, and we are not justified, even from the scientific point of view, in saying that it is impossible to arrest the operation of natural laws, to dogmatise *a priori* on the impossibility of

this or that happening. But it is legitimate to ask whether the faith of Jesus was of such a character that it would deliberately risk experiments of this kind. One has grave doubts whether the Jesus who refused, in the temptation story, to turn stones into bread, or entertain the thought of casting himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, in reliance on the divine protection, would set out to walk on the water or attempt to multiply a few loaves and fishes in the manner reported. He refused to the Pharisees, as to the Devil, an exhibition of his miraculous power, though there was some reason in this case for complying with the request, and thus demonstrate to the cavillers the divine authority of his mission. On the contrary, he emphatically declined to enter on this magical sphere, to play the vulgar part of the conventional wonder-worker, in his reverence for the divinely ordered course of Nature. In the Sermon on the Mount, God's providence is ever at work in the service of His children. But it is by natural means that He works, and it seems to me that we have in such utterances the key to the real mind of Jesus. In these sayings he recognises the will of God as expressed in Nature and the providential ordering of life, and he acts in accordance with it without presuming to depart from it.

Hence the caution with which we scrutinise such stories as those of the walking on the water, stilling the storm, feeding the 5,000 by an exertion of purely supernatural power, whilst leaving room for the possibility of their occurrence, on the assumption that even here latent forces, of which we are as yet ignorant, may have been brought into operation. In such cases we are amply justified in demanding that the evidence should be absolutely conclusive. It is not sufficient to say with a recent writer on the subject, "There is only one question that we have the right as honest inquirers to ask: What did this writer think and what did he mean to say?"¹ There are other questions which, as historians, we have not only a right, but a duty to consider in connection with these reports. The thought and the meaning of the writer may be clear enough. But this does not preclude the question, for instance, whether

¹ Cairns, "The Faith That Rebels," 77.

he may not be reporting (doubtless in all good faith) a belief instead of a fact, and in the interest of truth the duty remains of critically examining his statement from this point of view. Otherwise, on the principle of accepting professedly historic statements at their face value, we should have to swallow the marvellous tales with which hagiological literature teems from early Christian times down to the present day. Infallibility as to historic facts is not the prerogative of the writers of the Gospels any more than it is of any other historian, more especially in view of the tendency of tradition to grow and to absorb, in course of time, just this kind of marvellous tale. Hence the legendary accretion which has so often marred actual history and to which such tales have a *prima facie* affinity. Miracles of this kind are, in fact, not peculiar to the Gospels, but are found in the folklore of other races.² Given the belief in such magical happenings and they will undoubtedly be reported as having actually happened. In the cases in question there are probably underlying them incidents which came to take on a miraculous character as rumour spread and grew in the telling. In the Synoptic accounts of the feeding on the eastern side of the lake, nothing is directly said about its being miraculously accomplished, though this is evidently the belief of the writers. In the evening, after teaching the people in the desert place, Jesus makes use of the disciples' supply of fish and bread, consisting of five loaves and two fishes, to feed the multitude of several thousand persons, as they sit in relays on the grass. He takes the viands, and looking up to heaven, blesses them, breaks them, and hands the portions to the disciples, who distribute them to the people. "And they did all eat and were filled," leaving a surplus of twelve basketfuls of fragments. How was it done? We are not told, though this is just what we want to know. There is a strong resemblance to the story of the feeding of 100 men by Elisha, with a residue of fragments.³ Strangely enough, whilst the incident is undoubtedly

² See on this subject, Saintyves, "Essais de Folklore Biblique," 307 f. (1922). Notre miracle (the walking on the water) appartient non seulement à la tradition Judéo-chrétienne et Zoroastrienne, mais il fut certainement connu des dévôts de Mithra, 348.

³ 2 Kings iv. 42-44.

regarded as a miracle by the writers, nothing is said about the astonishment of the disciples at so astounding a feat, and the disciples are even represented in the sequel as quite unimpressed by it. "For they understood not concerning the loaves, but their hearts were hardened."⁴ A truly inexplicable frame of mind, if only some hours before Jesus had miraculously fed several thousand people out of a few loaves and fishes. The feeding evokes no sensation, as in other cases of his beneficent action. It is not on the miracle, but on the blessing of the viands, the breaking and giving them to the people, the common meal, that the emphasis seems to be laid. The minds of the writers seem to dwell on the likeness of the meal to the Last Supper with the disciples, in which there is nothing of a miraculous nature to record. There is, in fact, a striking resemblance in the phraseology describing the action of Jesus in both incidents. In both he takes the bread, blesses it, breaks it, and gives the fragments to those present. The sacramental feature appears very strikingly in the Fourth Gospel, which not only accentuates the miracle as "a sign" of his divinity and the effects of it on the people,⁵ but far more pointedly relates it to the later Eucharist in the discourse delivered by Jesus in the synagogue at Capernaum. On the other hand, in the original tradition, as reflected by the Synoptists, the meal is not really a symbol or anticipation of the Eucharist, but a full repast and an exhibition of the compassionate care and resource of Jesus in improvising this repast for the hungry and exhausted people, before sending them away on the return journey. It is significant of the mode of this improvisation that, according to John vi. 9, there was a lad there who had five loaves and two fishes. Is it unlikely that there were others in the crowd who had brought provisions with them, and that the solicitude of Jesus resulted in the production of sufficient viands to supply a frugal meal for the whole? In the growing tradition this kindly action was evidently made the subject of later implications, which reach their full development in the Fourth Gospel, but do not appear to have been contained in the original version of the story.

⁴ Mark vi. 52.

⁵ John vi. 14.

In the walking on the water, which follows the feeding, the emphasis is, in Mark and Matthew, undoubtedly on the miracle—Matthew heightening it by bringing in the mis-carried attempt of Peter to follow the example of Jesus. The Fourth Gospel agrees in the emphasis, while Luke omits the whole incident. But was the original experience really a miracle and not rather an optical illusion? Possibly Jesus, who had retired to the mountain to pray, after sending the disciples on their passage across the lake, had set out during the night on foot to rejoin them. In the haze and dimness of the early morning the disciples, who are labouring towards the land against a contrary wind and are in a perturbed state of mind, descry what they take to be an apparition on the water, but which is, in reality, the moving figure of Jesus on the shore. The boat is evidently near enough to the shore for Jesus to call out to them not to be afraid. Whilst in Mark and Matthew the story has it that he walked towards and entered the boat, in the Fourth Gospel it is only said that they were prepared to receive him into it, followed by the additional statement that the boat was immediately thereafter at the land,⁶ where Jesus was evidently awaiting them. This is at least a possible explanation of the incident out of which the miracle developed, and those who have experienced the wonders of the mirage in a hot country will not be disposed to impugn offhand the explanation of an optical illusion. In the account of the feeding of the 4,000, which is now generally regarded as a doublet of that of the 5,000, there is no storm and no walking on the water. Is this the more primitive form of the tradition?

There are two stories in the Synoptic account of the Galilean mission of the restoration of the dead to life, and the raising of the dead is included in the general statements of the mighty works operated by him. Jesus himself is represented by Matthew and Luke in the message to John as including the restoration of the dead among these works.⁷ The answer to John is, however, largely composed of metaphorical expressions derived from Isaiah,⁸ which the

⁶ John vi. 21.

⁷ Matt. xi. 15; Luke vii. 22.

⁸ xxxv. 5-6; cf. chapters xliii. and lxi.

evangelists evidently understand in a literal sense, and there is some difficulty as to the exact sense in which Jesus used them. The specific incidents given are the restoration of Jairus' daughter, which is reported by all three evangelists,⁹ and of the widow's son at Nain, probably a village about an hour's distance from Endor, recorded only by Luke.¹⁰ The former is evidently a case of restoration from swoon, as Jesus' words show: "The child is not dead, but sleeps." The latter, which is beautifully and circumstantially related, is a case of restoration from what in the story purports to be actual death, but which may be a case of suspended animation. According to Jewish custom, burial took place on the day of death, and it is at least possible that the appearance of the face may have led so keen an observer as Jesus to divine that the young man was not actually dead, and that the commanding tone of the words, "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise," roused his dormant consciousness into activity. Granting that the story has a basis in fact, if it was a genuine case of raising the dead, and not of suspended animation, we are left wondering why such a unique event—the only one of the kind depicted in the Synoptic Gospels—was ignored by Luke's fellow-evangelists. The wonder is increased by the extraordinary effect which it produced, and which does not tend to make the silence of Mark and Matthew easy to explain. Equally strange, in view of its unique significance as an evidence of the supernatural power of Jesus, that it failed to establish his divine vocation beyond further dispute. Those present, we read, "glorified God, saying, A great prophet is arisen among us, and God hath visited his people." The report of the saying and the incident spread, we are further told, far and near—"in the whole of Judæa (equivalent here to the whole of Palestine) and all the region round about." It may be said that the people might hear the report and refuse to believe it. But the young man and a large number of witnesses were there to attest the miracle. In the face of such available concrete testimony, it is strange that even the scribes and the Pharisees were not reduced to silence. True, they might reply that the raising was an

⁹ Mark v. 22 ; Matt. ix. 18 ; Luke viii. 40.

¹⁰ vii. 11 f.

act of Beelzebub, the prince of the demons, as in the case of the exorcism of the demoniacs. Moreover, there is the saying of Jesus in the Lazarus parable that the rich man's relatives would not be persuaded even if one rose from the dead. At all events, it is not easy to see how they could have succeeded in compassing the death of one whose divine power and mission had been vindicated by overwhelming manifestations of this kind, which were capable of concrete proof to those who had not witnessed them. It may be said that the evangelist gives adequate proof in reporting the effect of the miracle on the people, and that this is all that we can reasonably expect of him, since he himself was not in a position to verify the fact by expert examination. But this is just what we to-day should in such a case require as a condition of implicit belief, and unfortunately this is not available. That doubt on this ground is legitimate, no reasonable person will deny. There appears, moreover, to be a trace in the narrative of the influence of the Old Testament stories of the raising of the son of the widow of Zarephath by Elijah and of the son of the Shunnamite woman by Elisha.¹¹ Luke vii. 15, "And he gave him to his mother," looks like a reproduction of 1 Kings xvii. 23, "And he (Elijah) delivered him to his mother." The Jewish mind, which was familiar with these stories, could easily develop the supernatural element in the Nain incident. Moreover, in the Lukan narrative the story is related immediately before the account of the coming of the two disciples of John the Baptist to inquire whether Jesus is the Messiah or only his forerunner. It is evidently intended to give point to his answer to the inquiry, in which Jesus mentions the raising of the dead, which may quite well be figuratively meant, in the summary of his Messianic works.

In scrutinising such tales it is unscientific to ignore the possibility of the exaggeration of certain incidents into miracles as the result of imagination or belief. That this tendency influenced the tradition may be shown from the tradition itself. In commissioning the Twelve to preach and heal, Jesus, according to Mark, "gave them authority over the unclean spirits" (vi. 7). In reporting the address

¹¹ 1 Kings xvii. ; 2 Kings iv.

to them on this occasion, Matthew amplifies the commission, "Heal the sick, *raise the dead*, etc." (x. 8), and thus exaggerates the miraculous element in the mission. Similarly, whilst Mark says of the hostile reception at Nazareth that "he could not (*οὐκ ἔδύνατο*) do there any mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them," Matthew significantly alters the original to, "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief" (xiii. 58). Again, in Mark, he is told by Jairus, who beseeches his help, that his daughter "is at the point of death." In Matthew he tells him that she "is even now dead." In Mark he heals at Capernaum "many that were sick." In Matthew he "heals all that were sick." In view of this tendency, it would not be surprising that miracles of this kind should develop and crystallise around the personality of a great religious figure like that of Jesus. Attempts have been made by Wellhausen, Loisy, and others to explain such stories as purely symbolic or apologetic. Loisy, for instance, opines that as the healing of the centurion's servant, operated at a distance from Jesus, symbolises the salvation of the Gentiles,¹² so the widow of Nain sorrowing for her son is the afflicted daughter of Jerusalem sorrowing for lost Israel and regaining him by the miraculous power of Jesus.¹³ The feeding of the 5,000 is supposed to be symbolic of the later Agape and Eucharist ;¹⁴ the walking on the water and the necessity of faith, of the apostles' experiences at the resurrection ;¹⁵ the withering of the fig tree, the rejection of Judaism.¹⁶ Possibly. But these attempts appear to me rather far fetched, and I should be disposed to lay more weight on the indisputable tendency for such stories to arise and get into circulation as expressions of the popular evaluation of a great personality like Jesus, of the working of the popular imagination on the reminiscences in tradition of this personality. Such tales are common enough in the legendary lore of the ages. Some of them could be paralleled from the biographies of St Columba, St Martin, and other saints, for instance,

¹² "Evangiles Synoptiques," i. 647.

¹³ *Ibid.*, i. 655-656.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, i. 929 f.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, i. 942.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, ii. 285.

which were written even by contemporaries or from materials supplied by contemporaries.

It may be generally said, in regard to stories which may be classed as tales of the wonderful or magical kind, that something more substantial, in the way of proof, than the writers furnish is both desirable and needful. So at least it appears to the experienced historian, and the conviction is a quite legitimate one. It is a question of our standard of adequate evidence. Some may find no difficulty in concluding that these stories are veraciously told, and accepting the fact as sufficient proof of actuality in all respects. Others have difficulty in accepting the facts recorded without further substantial evidence, such as that which submission to an expert jury would have provided, and this attitude is not an unreasonable one. Caution and hesitation of this kind are not the fruit of scepticism, but of experience in dealing with historic evidence. The writers may have believed, and doubtless did believe, that these things actually happened as they were related, and as they wrote them down after an interval more or less lengthy. There is not necessarily, or even probably, any question of conscious imposture on the part of the writers. They believed them to be true. But their belief is not necessarily a guarantee of their reality, while it may be an evidence of credulity or self-deception. It is certain that in the age of Jesus the phenomena of human life and nature were imperfectly understood. The view of them was influenced by such beliefs as demonology and necromancy, which flourished on superstition and ignorance, and which the progress of knowledge has tended to set in their true perspective. The wonder is not that miracles of this kind are reported as having happened in the age of Jesus. The wonder would be if they had not been reported. Where such beliefs exist, the miraculous inevitably exists. But apart from such beliefs, nothing is easier in times of excitement than to start and put in circulation tales, even circumstantial tales, of what has not actually happened and what the critical historian of a later time can show did not really happen. It is not necessary to assume even a long lapse of time for these stories to grow and circulate. A few weeks

or days may produce quite a crop of them. Rumour, in fact, is often a product of overnight. We read in the morning, in some quite circumstantial description, of an event which took place yesterday, to find it officially contradicted to-morrow morning. Even in the absence of this contradiction, the falsehood of the story ere long leaks out. It will, therefore, not do to say that these stories are early, that they may be traced back to the early mission of the apostles, even to the time of Jesus himself. This may be true, and yet the stories may not be true in the sense of conveying actual fact. In the religious sphere the tendency to accept rumour arising from belief has ever been powerfully operative, because in this sphere the tendency, as every critical Church historian knows, to take things for granted has shown itself to be inveterate.

It is very unfortunate for the modern inquirer into the truth of such stories that the writers of them do not seem to have contemplated the needs of an age different from their own in knowledge and critical insight. How they would strike such an age which does not believe in demonology and necromancy is a question they did not ask, were really incapable of asking, and could not reasonably be expected to ask. They had no conception that proofs of a more substantial kind than that of mere relation would be demanded, and they have failed to provide what would have constituted for us really adequate proofs. They write on the assumption that every one naturally finds it easy to believe in such marvels, because they find it so easy themselves to do so. The marvellous is for them, as a matter of course, the miraculous. In this respect the stories are suited to the time and the circumstances. But they do not so naturally fit into ours, and the adequacy of the proof of their truth is, therefore, not so apparent. They do not provide answers to the questions of evidence we may legitimately ask, because such questions did not occur to them, and because they did not reflect what would be the nature of the evidence demanded by us in order to get at the facts of the matter. Unfortunately, these questions do occur to the modern reader. Questions, for instance, as to the diagnosis of disease, as to the exact nature or the stage

of the ailment, whether such and such an occurrence is of the nature of a coincidence or not, whether the apparition of Jesus on the water was only the figure of an overwrought imagination, producing a rumour and eventuating in a popular tale, etc.

It has been averred, as a sufficient guarantee of the actuality of the supernatural works of Jesus, that God can, if He chooses, operate such a miracle as the walking on the water or the stilling of a storm by a word. It is further urged that such happenings are perfectly in accord with the unique personality of Jesus. We may not, indeed, set a limit to the divine working in Nature and history, if only on the score of the limitation of our knowledge of the ways of God in the actual government of the universe. The question is not, however, can, but does God rule and overrule both Nature and history by methods of this magical sort? We do not, like the Deists, conceive of Him as extraneous to the universe, inaccessible to the behests of the human spirit. In Him we live and move and have our being. Both reason and intuition as well as faith, which is the fruit of these, testify to the reality of His immanence in the world, of the spiritual communion with an invisible Presence and Power which, in virtue of reason and intuition, we experience or may experience. This consciousness of an immanent God, which in Jesus found its unique expression, is an essential quality or capacity of human personality, which for the reverent, reflective mind puts the reality of God in Nature and history above question. It is there, gainsay it, explain it away as we will. But this conviction does not necessarily involve the conclusion that a human body, subject to the law of gravitation, may, in virtue of God's providence, venture to walk on the water. The evidence for this kind of happening has by no means the same force as the evidence for the reality of an immanent God in our spiritual experience, and unlike this evidence, challenges rather than compels assent. At all events Jesus himself, in the temptation story, rejected the suggestion of such a magical exercise of God's providence, and refused to the Pharisees the supernatural exhibitions or "signs" of this kind which they demanded, and on which the Fourth Gospel lays habitual stress. Even

if he stood in a unique relation to Him in virtue of his supreme moral and spiritual elevation, he was, nevertheless, a real human being, and we are in danger of reducing him to a mere docetic figure and surrendering his real humanity if we exempt his body from the law of gravitation, as such stories naively do.¹⁷

The time is now past when, in eliminating from the Gospel the miraculous in the traditional sense, we may seriously expose ourselves to the charge of eliminating what is essential to Christianity. On the contrary, we are really strengthening, not weakening, the Christian faith. The essential value of Christianity, as the new Apologetic is tending more and more to emphasise, is to be sought in the moral and spiritual, not the magical sphere. "Miracle," judges the most recent and discriminating writer in English on the subject, "may be given up without detriment to the Christian faith."¹⁸ God's working in Nature is at once natural and supernatural. It is natural because God works through means to ends. It is supernatural because He, who is above Nature, is present in this working. To explain the miraculous in terms of the natural is not, therefore, to explain away the supernatural in and behind all Nature. "The truth is," to quote the same writer, "that Nature's ways are God's ways; that, in other words,

¹⁷ Recent writers like Dr Illingworth ("The Gospel Miracles," 1916), Dr Headlam ("The Miracles of the New Testament," 1914), Dr Cairns ("The Faith That Rebels," 1928), defend the nature miracles on the ground that they are in harmony with and deducible from the Incarnation of the God-man. They regard the tendency to question their occurrence as due to *a priori* considerations. The inference does not necessarily follow, and they lay themselves open to the retort that they in turn are too much inclined to view the subject under the influence of certain theological prepossessions. Apart from the influence of the subjective element on either side, their reasoning as to the actuality of these miracles does not seem to me conclusive, since they are too much inclined to take the evidence at its face value, and do not really grapple with the difficulties of the problem. Moreover, there are other views, even in the New Testament, of the Incarnation (for instance, Acts ii. 22, the most primitive one) than the later orthodox one, which is not necessarily deducible from the actual life and teaching of Jesus. Dr Headlam is positive that there was nothing magical about the works of Jesus. "Although he works miracles, he always avoids on all occasions any appearance of thaumaturgic or magical display" (204). I agree. But is not the representation of him walking on the water, etc., magical enough? It is because of this and for other convincing reasons that I am disposed to be more critical than these estimable writers.

¹⁸ C. J. Wright, "Miracle in History and in Modern Thought," 28 (1930).

the natural is the supernatural mode of working . . . what we call Nature is a manifestation of His activities. Immanence stands for the refusal to 'grudge God His own universe.' " 19

¹⁹ C. J. Wright, "Miracle in History and in Modern Thought," 211. This book, just published, is a weighty and open-minded contribution to the new Apologetic. Its standpoint is opposed to the traditional one. This chapter was written before its publication. I am glad to find myself largely in agreement with the writer.

CHAPTER XII

THE SELF-MANIFESTATION OF JESUS

I. WAS JESUS CONSCIOUS OF PRE-EXISTENCE ?

ALL three Synoptists emphasise the special vocation and the unique status of Jesus as the Christ—the Son of Man or the Son of God in the Messianic sense—from the Baptism onwards, though the secret of his high destiny is at first known only to himself. The proof of his Messiahship is found in the profound impression which his teaching and his mighty works have made on his immediate disciples, and also in prophecy which has been fulfilled in him. In Mark, Jesus himself rarely appeals to prophecy in reference to his Messianic claim, and only in the later stage of his mission. In the region of Cæsarea Philippi he reminds the questioning disciples that it is written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at nought,¹ evidently referring to Isa. liii. In his controversy with the members of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem he is represented as quoting Ps. cxviii. in reference to himself.² But the quotation seems to be a reflection of the writer in explanation of the growing strength of the Christian Church at the time at which he wrote. The only other instances in Mark, in which the application of a prophecy to himself occurs, are the sayings about David's Lord, in which he challenges the received scribal view, and a couple of references to prophetic passages in the intercourse with the Twelve on the last evening of his life,³ and in the words addressed to his captors in Gethsemane.⁴

Matthew, on the other hand, shows a distinct tendency

¹ Mark ix. 12. The attempt to explain away this reference as a later implication does not seem to me conclusive. It exactly fits the situation.

² Mark xii. 10-11.

³ Mark xii. 35-37; xiv. 21, 27.

⁴ Mark xiv. 49.

to view the mission in the light of prophecy, and represents Jesus as more frequently quoting passages in elucidation or vindication of it,⁵ whilst Luke expressly makes him begin his mission at Nazareth⁶ by applying Isa. lxi. 1-2 to himself, and after its close represents him as expounding to the disciples on the way to Emmaus the prophecies concerning himself.⁷

That Jesus, whose mind was steeped in the prophets, derived his Messianic conception from the common Hebrew source is patent. That he should seek, especially in the later phase of the mission, to emphasise his claim to be the fulfiller of prophecy is natural enough. At the same time, the later tendency to elaborate his teaching in this respect is no less clear in Matthew and Luke,⁸ and to give it a prominence which it does not seem to have possessed in the earliest record of his life.

Whilst his Messianic mission is thus rooted in prophecy, to which Jesus himself appeals in attestation of it, it does not appear that he assumed or ascribed to himself a pre-temporal existence. His Messianic vocation, though derived from the past, is concerned with the present and the future, and it is from this point of view that he speaks of himself and it, and the Synoptic record envisages both. Neither he nor the Synoptic recorders of his mission affirm his pre-existence, though some think that it is implied in the record.⁹ The question does not, in fact, seem to have occurred to either, and does not intrude itself into the earliest tradition which, unlike the Pauline Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Gospel, is silent on the subject.

The pre-existence of the soul before generation is, indeed, a legitimate speculation, and has been discussed by theologians and philosophers. It is a cardinal doctrine of the Platonic philosophy, and it has found support among modern philosophers and scientists. Sir Oliver Lodge, for instance, holds that, even from the scientific point of view,

⁵ Matthew (xvii. 12) omits the first instance given by Mark, but he quotes it later (xxvi. 24).

⁶ Luke iv. 18.

⁷ Cf. Acts ii. 25 f. ; iii. 21 f.

⁸ See, for instance, Macintosh, "Person of Christ," 29-30 (1912).

⁹ Luke xxiv. 27.

it is not to be negated offhand. "The utterance of science is not loud and is not positive," says Sir Oliver, "but I claim that it is at least not negative. No science asserts that our personality will cease a quarter of a century hence, nor does any science assert that it began half a century ago. Spiritual existence 'before all worlds' is a legitimate creed. We may be all partial incarnations of a larger self."¹⁰ Here we are in the realm of speculation, whereas the question with which we are confronted is the concrete historic one, Was Jesus, as far as he is known to us from the early authentic tradition reported by the Synoptists, conscious of personal pre-existence?

According to what Matthew and Luke relate of his origin, he is divinely generated. But he has not pre-existed. He is represented as coming into being in the womb of the Virgin by the generation of the Holy Spirit. We have found reasons, from the historical point of view, for discarding this belief. But even if these reasons are deemed insufficient, no one can reasonably maintain that, according to the versions of his supernatural generation given by Matthew and Luke, Jesus existed before this creative divine act. It is at his baptism that he evidently first becomes definitely conscious of his sonship in the Messianic sense, and the reference to Ps. ii. 2 in connection with the apprehension, on this occasion, of his Messianic sonship implies its temporal origin. Nor is there any explicit indication in his own utterances that he himself was conscious of personal pre-existence. To argue pre-existence from the saying in Mark at the beginning of his mission, "To this end (the preaching of the Gospel) came I out,"¹¹ which Luke alters to "was I sent,"¹² is plainly to read into the saying what it does not imply. In Mark it simply means that he had just left Capernaum for the purpose of preaching in other cities; in Luke, merely commissioned (evidently at the baptism). He assumes the title Son of Man, and, as in the later Jewish Apocalyptic (Enoch), the Son of Man is pre-existent.¹³ But it does not follow that, in applying to himself this designation, he accepted all that it connoted

¹⁰ "Man and the Universe," 226 (1908).

¹¹ Mark i. 39.

¹² Luke iv. 43.

¹³ "Book of Enoch" (Charles' ed.), 93-94, 141, and other passages.

in current Apocalyptic. It is in the rôle of the Son of Man in the present and the future—his suffering here and his glory hereafter as the exalted judge—that, in his thought of this transcendental figure, the identity lies. He certainly modified it in imparting to it the idea of the Suffering Servant, which he took from Isaiah and which became for him the distinctive conception of the Messiah, as he came in prospect of the Cross. In the Isaiah conception there is no thought of a pre-existent being, who is to suffer for the people. The Suffering Servant seems to be Israel, who has become individualised and whom he interprets of himself. He was, indeed, according to 1 Peter, foreknown before the foundation of the world.¹⁴ But he is only manifested, or comes into being at the end of time.¹⁵ In the episode of his reception at Nazareth he speaks of himself as a prophet,¹⁶ without implying any mysterious origin, and bases his divine commission on the passage from Isaiah, which he applies to himself.¹⁷ In answer to John's inquiry who he is, he similarly adduces no recondite theory of his person, but appeals to the concrete testimony of his works and his teaching in proof of his Messianic mission,¹⁸ and this concrete testimony is very different from the ethereal reasonings of the answer to a similar question put by the scribes in the Fourth Gospel. In the immediate sequel, in which he enlarges on the significance of the Baptist's mission in connection with his own as Son of Man, he speaks of Wisdom being justified by her children,¹⁹ and Bacon sees in this the hint of a doctrine of the incarnation in Jesus of the eternal Wisdom of God.²⁰ The inference seems to me very far fetched, for the phrase much more probably refers simply to the divine wisdom in sending the Baptist and the Christ, whose works have justified the plan which God is accomplishing through them. In the transfiguration scene he is again, as at the Baptism, proclaimed by a heavenly voice the beloved Son, and is invested with an ethereal glory. But this visionary experience of the three disciples is an

¹⁴ 1 Pet. i. 20. Smith interprets Is. 53 in the personal sense, "Bk. of Is.," ii. 283 f.

¹⁵ See Bacon, "The Gospel of Mark," 225; cf. 251-252 (1925).

¹⁶ Luke iv. 24.

¹⁷ Luke iv. 21.

¹⁸ Matt. xi. 4 f.; Luke vii. 22-23.

¹⁹ Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 35.

²⁰ "Gospel of Mark," 227-228.

attestation to them of the truth of Peter's confession of him as the Christ and an anticipation of the future glory of which he had spoken to them in announcing, in connection with this confession, his destiny as the suffering and glorified Son of Man.²¹ Again, there is in the cryptic question in the temple about David's Lord an indirect reference to his own person. Here also the implication is concerned with his Messianic vocation, not his eternal origin. As the Messiah he is more than the lineal descendant of David, more than the restorer of David's kingdom in the political sense. As Lord of the Messianic kingdom in the wider ethical and eschatological sense, he is the superior of the kings of his race. Moreover, the allusion to his sitting on the right hand of God seems to point to his future transcendental state, not to a pre-temporal existence. He is the Messianic Lord whom David foresaw, though not in the national sense of the scribes, and through whom God's redemptive purpose will ultimately be realised.

In all these passages the designation, the Christ, the Son of Man, the Son of God, is used by Jesus or his disciples in the vocational, not the metaphysical sense. It does not cover a pre-temporal existence, but is concerned with his present or his future vocation as the agent of God's redemptive purpose, which, if it involves suffering and death, also involves the glory and the triumph that await him beyond the Cross and the grave. At the same time, he also uses the title in the filial sense. It is evident that he had an intense sense of his sonship in this sense before he came to realise his sonship in the Messianic sense. We may, indeed, assume that it was by way of this filial consciousness that he came to the conviction of his Messiahship, and the combination of Father and Son in certain passages shows that his filial conviction was a fundamental strand of his religious life from beginning to end. It finds its most definite expression in Matt. xi. 25-27 and Luke x. 21 f.²² Whether these passages involve a doctrine of the divine incarnation in the Johannine sense is a much-debated question, to which we shall refer later. Here let it suffice

²¹ Mark viii. 38 ; Matt. xvi. 27 ; Luke ix. 26.

²² Cf. Mark xiii. 32 ; Matt. xxiv. 36.

to say that they do not necessarily go beyond the sense of a unique filial relation to God, commensurate with the exalted plane of his moral and spiritual life, to which he attained in the course of his actual religious experience and which was an essential pre-condition of his Messianic consciousness. The conviction of filial sonship is a concrete reality of present experience, not a speculative reflection bearing on his divine origin.

It is thus not with a pre-existent, ethereal being, incarnate in human form, that we have to do in the Synoptic Gospels, but with one, who, albeit divinely invested with an exalted vocation and destiny, enters on both in time, and is wholly subject to the conditions of human existence from birth to death.

II. JESUS AS HISTORIC PERSONALITY

How exactly he conceived of himself in relation to the Father-God and of his Messianic function and destiny, it is difficult to say. An historic personality can only be known through speech and action as recorded by the person in question or by others. Jesus did not write his autobiography, and in his case one is dependent entirely on the record of others. Happily the earliest record consists to a large extent of accounts of what he thought and spoke and did, even if only in incidental fashion. It is concerned with what he was as well as what he achieved, and though in part this may reflect later belief about him and his works, only the ultra-sceptic will question the substantial genuineness of the Synoptic record. It is, indeed, an arresting, a marvellous personality that these simple records present to us. From the outset he attracts a growing band of disciples, who see in him the unique Master and manifest a progressive faith—not unmingled at times with dubiety or lack of adequate understanding—until it culminates in the confession that lifts him above even the unique Master. This faith survives even the shock of the crucifixion to rally them as the confirmed and daring believers in the risen and glorified Christ and to organise and extend a new religious com-

munity, of which he is the focus and the inspiration. The belief in the resurrection is, indeed, a cardinal factor in the perpetuation of his power and his work and in the rise of the cult, of which this belief is the kernel. But this belief in the resurrection would hardly have been possible without the historic personality that underlay it. It is an indisputable testimony to the unique impression made by Jesus on the hearts and minds of those who knew him intimately and could enforce their preaching of the resurrection by appealing to the personality and works of their risen Lord, in spite of the tragic finale of his earthly career. The impression on the people is not so personal, because there was not the same inwardness of fellowship and understanding, and in part, at least, the power to work miracles is responsible for the popular excitement and enthusiasm, which tend to miss the real significance of the Master and his message. But it is evident, even from the parable of the sower, that there were not a few who not merely " marvelled " at his works, but surrendered themselves to his teaching because of the authoritative personality of the teacher and the arresting character of his teaching. " For he taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes." ¹ The note of authority impresses even his enemies and rivets the mentally deranged, who are strangely excited in his presence. From first to last he is the master of men's souls. He is sure of himself and of his Gospel as the envoy and representative of God among men, and speaks and acts accordingly. He never doubts, for, like all initiators of great movements, he is a great believer even in the impossible. He never hesitates, but ever knows how to meet, to command the situation. Relying absolutely on his God-given commission and his Father's omnipotent will, he calmly accepts and puts in practice all the implications of his office. He claims the authority to declare the forgiveness of sins.² He has the keys to the kingdom of heaven, which he transmits to his

¹ Matt. vii. 29.

² The question here is whether Jesus claims in this passage the authority to forgive sins exclusively for himself as Son of Man, or whether Barnasha means, in this instance, man in general. Critics like Jackson and Lake conclude in favour of the latter interpretation. In its support is the Matthean version of the incident, which affirms that the multitude glorified God, who had given such power unto *men*. " Beginnings of Christianity," i. 379.

disciples.³ He claims victory over Satan, whose kingdom he has come to destroy. He implies a rank above that of the angels.⁴ He denounces the refusal to accept the evidence of the divine power operating in him and the imputation of this power to the Devil as the unpardonable sin against the Holy Spirit, by whom he is inspired. He claims to reveal out of his profound religious experience and consciousness of God the Father's will as no one has done before him. He is the unique epoch-maker in religious history. With him begins the new age to which all the prophets and righteous men have looked forward and which has come with him.⁵ He pits his message against that of the scribes and even against the Law and the prophets. He habitually confronts the current beliefs and teaching with his personal alternative as the revealer of the Father, his own conception of the ethical and religious life. For the prophetic "Thus saith the Lord," we have the constant "But I say unto you," in contrast to the "Ye have heard that it was said of old time." The pre-eminence of which he is thus conscious in the long line of those who have proclaimed the will of God is no presumptuous make-believe. It rests on a solid basis of reality, inasmuch as he is the embodiment of the highest moral and spiritual ideal, which is for all time, for every class and race of the children of men. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but his words shall not pass away.⁶ An exalted self-consciousness finds expression in such magisterial sayings and underlies his activity. He is sent by God to accomplish His will in man's salvation, and man's destiny in eternity depends on his attitude towards him here. Denial of him before men involves denial of him before his Father in heaven.⁷ In the great day of his reappearance he will be the judge, who will render unto every man according to his deeds, as tested by his own exacting ideal of human conduct. He exacts the most absolute devotion to himself, superior to that owing to

³ The genuineness of the passage in Matthew is, however, not above question. See "Beginnings," i. 328-329; Robinson, "Commentary on Matthew," 154. It appears to reflect the later Church organisation.

⁴ Mark xiii. 32.

⁵ Matt. xiii. 17; Luke x. 24.

⁶ Matt. xxiv. 35; Luke xxi. 33.

⁷ Mark viii. 38.

parents or to children. Anything less is unworthy of him.⁸ Whoever causes one of those who believe in him to stumble is guilty of an unspeakable offence. He implicitly, if not expressly, requires unlimited faith in him, and rebukes the lack of it,⁹ though in the Synoptists, unlike the Fourth Gospel, it is faith in the Father-God, whose representative he is, that is habitually emphasised. What he specifically demands is faith in God as made known by him, his emissary and revealer.

In keeping with this note of authority is the inflexible, uncompromising spirit in which he exercises it in conflict with error and evil, falsehood and wilful misrepresentation. He can be terrible and imperious, blunt and inexorable, when it boots to enforce and vindicate his ethical and religious ideal in opposition to its gainsayers. For him and his followers there can be no accommodation with the enemy of this ideal, but implacable antagonism and strife. Devotion to it and to him involves this inflexible negative. "Think ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay, but rather division."¹⁰ In this uncompromising conflict discipleship means not peace, but a sword in the spiritual sense. "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that doth not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."¹¹ This imperiousness may savour of egoism and intolerance to the modern reader. But Jesus had learned in his own experience of temptation the absolute obligation of the intolerant attitude, in this compelling sense, in the pursuit of the ideal, and had earned the right to be imperious in its service. In this categoric

⁸ Matt. x. 37.

⁹ Mark iv. 40; viii. 17 f.; cf. Matt. viii. 10; Luke vii. 9.

¹⁰ Luke xii. 49-51.

¹¹ Matt. x. 34-39.

self-assertion there is no alloy of egoism. Jesus had only one passion—the passion for God and the things of God. Nor does it betoken a lack of mental balance. The most striking feature of his character and life is, in fact, his marvellous self-possession and mastery. He assumes his Messianic function in obedience to his Father's declared will, and this vocation is a terrifically exacting and testing one. It must have overwhelmed all but a man of unique mental and spiritual calibre. It involved an indescribable sense of responsibility which only the supremely strong man could have borne. Though it was in harmony with past and current Hebrew thought, the claim to be the Messiah was liable to misrepresentation and, in the spiritual sense in which he adopted it, it exposed him to misapprehension, antagonism, hatred, suffering, and martyrdom. Nevertheless, he carries the burden of it with a supreme mastery, and never yields to fear or fails in his inflexible purpose to bear the burden to the bitter end. His spirit is that of the superlatively strong personality, because his faith in God, his mastery of himself, take and keep the upper hand all through. He has attained, and he maintains throughout, the most exacting, the hardest of all achievements—absolute self-dominion in devotion to the highest moral ideal. Whilst he has reason enough for anxious foreboding, the keynote of his message to the careworn sons of men is "Be not anxious." "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." In these words there is a revelation of marvellous strength of character, the unflinching self-mastery which lie in the hidden depths of the soul of Jesus, and serve to explain and justify the absolute authority which he claims to wield, the inflexible "either-or" of its exercise.

On the other hand, whilst standing immovably, imperiously for the ideal against the gainsayer, his idealism is permeated with a broad and deep sympathy with erring and suffering humanity. His passion for God is combined with an immense love of humanity, which brings him into magnetic touch with his fellow-men. He is a marvellous combination of the idealist and the realist in thought and life. He lives with and for his fellow-men, though he also

loves the solitude of the desert place, or the mountain-top and the far-spanning sky, where prayer becomes an instinctive converse with God. He is no ascetic like John the Baptist, and does not hesitate to shock the respectability of his time and excite its antagonism by his freedom from convention and prejudice. He shares the joys and feels the sorrows of others as if they were his own. To serve among suffering, sinning men and women, not to rule, is the supreme obligation for him as for his disciples. "Whoever would be first among you shall be the servant of all. For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered to, but to minister."¹² In this service he shows a limitless love, forbearance, compassion, insight, and understanding. Human frailty is no bar to his ministering fellowship with the erring, who are drawn to better things in his gracious, kindly presence, and it is where human hearts feel the need of his message of help and hope and find no occasion of stumbling in him that he is most at home—among those who have fallen by the way, whom the priest and the Levite pass by on the other side of the road ; among those who have no shepherd and are strayed and lost ; among the sinners and the hated tax-collectors. He accepts the devoted service of the woman who was a sinner and anointed his feet in the house of Simon the Pharisee, and tells the self-righteous Simon that she loved much because her sins, which are many, are forgiven.¹³ He refuses to condemn, at the behest of the scribes and Pharisees, the woman taken in adultery, to be stoned in accordance with the law of Moses, and simply tells her to go and sin no more.¹⁴ He is as alert to feed as to teach the hungry multitude. He stands very near the people, "the poor," to whom he preaches the Gospel, and twits the Pharisees with their lack of logic in condemning both him as the friend of "sinners" and the Baptist, who held himself aloof from the life of the people.¹⁵ He attracts and holds the love and devotion of women. He loves the children and tells the disciples, who would fain keep them away, that to receive them "is to receive me and Him that sent me." The purity, the trustfulness, the ingenuousness of the child soul are of the kingdom of heaven. They

¹² Mark x. 44-45.¹³ Luke vii. 47.¹⁴ John viii. 7.¹⁵ Luke vii. 30 f.

are, too, akin to the innate simplicity of his own, which intuitively knows God in his inner life and in the beauty and goodness of the divine handiwork in Nature. Jesus is a great mystic, and yet his religion is singularly simple and human.

The human traits in the self-manifestation of Jesus among men are thus very marked in the Synoptists. They depict a real man and a real life. There is, indeed, a mysterious background of his being, and the writers undoubtedly regard him as a unique personality. At the same time, it is not a theophany, but a real human life that they depict, though the theophany may more or less be in their minds, and Matthew and Luke, as compared with Mark, show at times a tendency to tone down or eliminate the human traits of Jesus' personality.¹⁶ Jesus undergoes development—physical, mental, spiritual—from birth to manhood. He grows in stature and in wisdom and in the favour or grace of God and man. Even after the definite conception of his Messianic sonship, he only gradually attains from experience the ultimate significance of his vocation. He is learning step by step to interpret his Father's will in profound communion with Him. He is subject to the limitations of human nature. His knowledge is limited and contingent. He is not omniscient, as in the Fourth Gospel. He confesses his ignorance. He asks, for instance, who in the crowd has touched him, and such questions, betokening ignorance of circumstances, are not infrequent.¹⁷ He confesses his ignorance of the exact time of the future consummation of the world's history. He marvels at the centurion's faith and is astonished at the unbelief of others. He shares current beliefs and superstitions. His knowledge of the sacred history is traditional, not critical, though he disputes the scribal interpretation or elaboration of it. Whilst he enlarges the Hebrew conception of God, he shares its limited view of the universe. He holds the faulty cosmogony of his time.¹⁸

¹⁶ See the detailed instances given by Allen, "Commentary on Matthew," Introduction, 31-33, 37-38.

¹⁷ Mark v. 30; Luke viii. 45.

¹⁸ On Jesus' conception of the world of his time, see W. Schubart, "Das Weltbild Jesu," in "Beihefte zum Alten Orient," 1927.

Schleiermacher's notion that he was free from intellectual error cannot be maintained. To the science and philosophy of the Græco-Roman world he was a stranger. The senses and the emotions are those of ordinary humanity. He hungers, is weary, is strained and burdened by the load of his mission, is distressed by the sins and sufferings of humanity, is angered by the unbelief of his opponents and even at times by the disciples' lack of insight, rejoices at success, is exposed to temptation to the end, and constantly feels the need of prayer for strength and guidance. He experiences a natural shrinking from pain and death. His ability to heal is dependent on the belief in his claims, and he is at times unable to effect his wish or purpose.¹⁹

III. JESUS AND GOD

Later speculation about him has tended to blur or ignore the picture of the historic Jesus. With the resurrection he entered on a higher existence. Previous to this transition to a spiritual existence, it is the man Jesus of Nazareth that the primitive tradition has, in spite of later subjective influence, preserved with a wonderful fidelity, considering the circumstances of the case. Discounting this subjective influence on the recorders of the traditions, how did Jesus himself conceive of his relation, as Son in the filial sense, to God, the Father? Is there anything in the original tradition to justify us in assuming that he held and taught the later doctrine of the Trinity as elaborated by the patristic theologians? Can we recognise the Jesus of the primitive tradition in the metaphysical abstraction which, developing the conception of the Logos-Son of the Fourth Gospel, these theologians argued into the later creeds, and, as the result of violent party struggles, strove to impose on the Church from the fourth century onwards? Did Jesus, who in thought and expression was as estranged from the laboured subtleties of Græco-Roman theological thought as he was from scribal pedantry, conceive of himself as the second "hypostasis," or "person," of the Godhead

¹⁹ Mark vii. 34.

in the developed credal sense? There is one passage in particular, recorded by Matthew and Luke, which has been held to indicate that he did: "In that season Jesus answered and said, I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes; yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father, and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."¹

The context of the utterance differs in the two sources. In Matthew it follows immediately on the woes denounced on the cities of the lake region, which had proved indifferent to his mighty works. The phrase, "in that season," is, however, chronologically vague, and need not lead to the conclusion that "these things" for which Jesus was thanking God were the failure of his mission in these cities. In Luke the utterance follows the return of the Seventy and the efficacy of their mission, which he gives after the woes denounced on the cities. Its conclusion also differs in both writers. In Matthew it consists of the invitation to the weary and heavy laden. In Luke it is concerned with the privilege of those who, in contrast to the prophets and kings of old, have experienced the benefits of this fuller revelation. In the tradition from which both quote, there was, therefore, no concordant version of the circumstances and the context of the whole utterance, though in the version of the main passage both writers generally agree.

The utterance is absent from Mark, and the only passage in the Markan Gospel, in which Jesus refers to his filial relation to the Father in similar fashion, has reference to the Parousia, or Coming of the Son of Man. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."² Whilst the passage is undoubtedly authentic and reflects the same filial conception as in the utterance preserved by Matthew

¹ Matt. xi. 25-27; Luke x. 21-22.

² Mark xiii. 32; cf. Matt. xxiv. 36. Luke omits. "The beloved Son" of the announcements at the Baptism and the Transfiguration are clearly Messianic, and need not be taken into consideration in this connection.

and Luke, it differs from it in emphasising the limitation of the knowledge of the Son compared to the Father, in this particular matter at least. This special filial relation also finds expression in the phrase "My Father," which Matthew habitually ascribes to him, though it does not occur in Mark, and very sparingly in Luke. In the numerous Matthæan passages in which it occurs, the phrase clearly expresses only the fact of his unique experience of God in his capacity as the instrument of the Father's redemptive purpose.

The second half of the utterance recorded by Matthew and Luke (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22) resembles in style and thought some of those ascribed in the Fourth Gospel to the Logos-Son in his controversy with "the Jews." Some critics are, accordingly, disposed to question its genuineness and regard it as a reflection of later Greek-Christian thought on the lines of the Fourth Gospel, rather than a representation of the mind of Jesus himself.³ Hase also regards it in this light, and pronounces it "an aerolite from the Johannine heaven,"⁴ whilst Harnack would excise the clause, "And no one knoweth the Son, save the Father," as an interpolation, and make the utterance refer exclusively to the revelation of the Father by the Son.⁵ Neither of these expedients for getting rid of what seems an anomalous utterance of the Synoptic Jesus is convincing, especially in the light of the Markan saying, which is undoubtedly genuine. Others very hazardously see in the utterance an implication of "the whole of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel."⁶ At the same time, it does strike one as singular that Jesus, as Son, should seem to claim an exclusive knowledge of the Father and a monopoly of the revelation of the Father. This is clearly at variance with the Old Testament prophetic teaching, which he himself accepts

³ See, for instance, Jackson and Lake, "Beginnings," i. 396. They argue that it found its way into the Greek version of Q. used by Matthew and Luke.

⁴ "Geschichte Jesu," 527 (2nd ed., 1891).

⁵ "Sayings of Jesus," 293 f. For the objections to this and other versions of the Greek text, see M'Neile, "Commentary on Matthew," 162 f. See also Norden, "Agnostos Theos" (1913); Easton, "Gospel According to Luke," 166 f. (1926).

⁶ Plummer, "Commentary on Luke," 282. See also Bernard, "Commentary on John," i., Introduction, 136. "What is implicit in the earlier Gospels has become explicit in John." Surely an all too sanguine view.

and quotes in support of his specific divine mission. Moreover, it seems to contradict his own representation of the Father who, in sayings and parables, is naturally and spiritually accessible to His children in communion with Him, and as immanent in all His wondrous works. In the Sermon on the Mount he speaks of the peacemakers, for instance, as "sons of God." He exhorts his hearers to love their enemies "that ye may be the sons of your Father, which is in heaven." Sonship is thus predicable of all who realise God's fatherly character, and to whom the filial consciousness is an intuitive fact. It is, indeed, an essential truth of Hebrew religious thought, which Jesus assumes and accentuates in his ethical teaching from beginning to end.

There is thus reason, on other grounds than those adduced by the negative critics, to question the authenticity of this utterance. In any case, on the assumption of its genuineness, the claim to special sonship, to exclusive knowledge of God, must be relatively understood—in relation, that is, to his divinely appointed vocation as Son and revealer of "all things" pertaining to it. Only he can fill this function and only he knows the mind and nature of God in His infinite wisdom and love in thus bringing to fruition His redemptive purpose through him. In his purely spiritual conception of his Messianic mission, of suffering and the supreme fidelity of the Cross as an essential of its realisation, Jesus did envisage and reveal a new aspect of God and His redemptive purpose, which was hidden from the wise and understanding of his age and apprehended only by the simple-minded, who responded to his word and his works. This was his unique discovery to his age, and in itself justifies the claim made in this exalted utterance. Nor is the utterance in this sense an unwarrantable and presumptuous one, in view of the unique moral and spiritual personality of the claimant. That Jesus stood in unique nearness to God in virtue of his Godlike character and profound communion with Him, that he possessed in a superlative degree the vision of God that accrues from the perfection of the spiritual life, that he realised, as the fruit of this personal experience, a compelling supremacy over the hearts and minds of men, that he rose to the conception of a destiny, in the providence

of God, unique in human history—this is amply borne out by what we know of his life and mission. An intense consciousness of God is also characteristic of the prophets of old, who claimed to speak out of their experience the divine word and will. In Jesus the prophetic experience rises to a higher level. It attains its most complete spiritual and ethical exemplification. In his person and function as Messianic Son he is the culmination of prophecy.

Whether the passage implies more than this and yields an indication of his divine origin, lifts him out of the sphere of human life into that of the divine being, in the later metaphysical and Trinitarian sense, is a much-debated problem. Jesus, it seems to me, is speaking in reference to his actual vocation and experience as Son, of which he has definitely become conscious in time; not necessarily of a pre-temporal state and relation to the Father. He is uniquely the Son and the revealer of the Father, and to no other has it been given to stand in this exalted relation and fulfil this function. Historically the utterance thus seems to refer solely to a fact of present experience, not to cover a recondite, metaphysical conception of his person. I think Harnack is right when he says,⁷ "The passage throughout deals with circumstances of actual historic fact." It displays to us in what relation Jesus conceived himself as actually standing, as Son and revealer, to the Father, and reflects his distinct individuality as the fulfiller of God's will and purpose in his divinely appointed vocation among men. To go further and apply the term "metaphysical" to this relation in the sense that "this special Sonship is part of the ultimate realities of being,"⁸ is to enter the realm of speculation, and seems not to be warranted by a realistic interpretation of the passage. The relation is religious and ethical, not metaphysical. Jesus is not yet touched by philosophy, and his conception of God and himself is the religious, not the metaphysical one. "In the New Testament," says Loofs, in reference to the general usage of the term "Son," "it is applied to the historical Jesus, either with reference to his birth out of the Spirit of God, or because the Spirit

⁷ "Sayings of Jesus," 300.

⁸ Macintosh, "Person of Christ," 28 (1912).

came down upon him at his baptism, or—without reference to the date of its entrance—because the Spirit of God lived in him, or because he stood in a unique position of love towards God.”⁹ In the passage in question Father and Son are related in a profound and special spiritual relation, the exact nature of which we may not be able adequately to reflect in words, and in which the infinite divine love and wisdom, the divine will and purpose are revealed. But it is perfectly clear even in this saying that the individuality of the Son is not identical with that of God. Father and Son are distinct in person as well as function. The basic fact of his individuality, as distinct from God and as manifested in a human life identical with men—unique though in character and vocation it undoubtedly is—underlies his life, works, and teaching. He is the highest manifestation of the divine in the human. What the actual record reveals is not a divine being becoming human, but a human being becoming divine in the sense of developing in the highest degree a sonship of which, in his own teaching, all are capable, though only he has actually attained to the fullness of this filial consciousness, and only he is chosen to be the Son in the distinctive Messianic sense. It is thus not as God that he acts and teaches, but as the One sent and inspired by God, the Servant, the Son of God, the Christ elected from among the sons of men to proclaim and exemplify God’s way of salvation, endowed with the spiritual and moral equipment for this supreme mission, and accomplishing it in limitless love, faith, obedience, and self-surrender unto death. From first to last he distinguishes between himself and God. “Why callest thou me good? There is none good save one, God.”¹⁰ This is the explicit and assuredly genuine declaration recorded by Mark, and its significance is all the more illuminating in view of the attempt of Matthew to tone it down.¹¹ He explicitly asserts his subordination to the Father, in whose hands is the supreme ordering of the kingdom. “To sit on my right hand or on my left,” he tells the sons of Zebedee, “is not mine to give, but is for whom it hath been prepared (by

⁹ “What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?” 178.

¹⁰ Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19.

¹¹ Matt. xix. 17.

the Father),” adds Matthew.¹² He repels the Devil with the words, “Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God,” and the words show that for him God alone is the absolute sovereign, to whom all being, including his own, is subject and subordinate. He prays to God as his Father, and the prayer is not a monologue with himself as an integral part of Deity, but a real appeal to the Father-God, on whom he is dependent and whose will, not his own, he seeks to follow. “*Thy* will be done.” “Not what *I* will, but what *Thou* wilt.” In such utterances two distinct beings stand in essential contrast in a real and not a formal sense, and though linked in a specially intimate communion, they are not one in the ontological sense. Jesus’ relation to God and his revelation of God are conditioned by and remain within the limit of Jewish monotheism, with which Jewish apocalyptic thought was assumed to be in harmony. The conception of a divinely commissioned Messiah as the instrument of the divine will and purpose is not allowed to subvert the absolute oneness of God, which is a fundamental of Judaism. On the other hand, to read into a couple of Jesus’ utterances an ontological significance is to create a real difficulty for modern thought, for which the strictly monotheistic conception of God is elemental. Its dubiousness about the conventional dogma of the absolute divinity of Jesus is not actuated by any desire to undervalue his supreme historic personality, but by the heightened conception of the overpowering marvel of God and the universe manifested by modern science. It is only reasonable that we should be free to revise our conception of the Incarnation as enunciated in creeds, based on later subtle speculation rather than on concrete historic fact, and out of touch with the historic Jesus and with the actuality of God and the universe as we have learned to envisage them. Moreover, such a significance is not necessarily contained in these utterances, and the conception Son of God in the filial or the Messianic sense does not necessarily involve it. We can with the primitive tradition, as embodied in the early apostolic preaching, enthrone Jesus as the exalted Lord in virtue of his vocation and function as the revealer of the Father-God and the chosen and

¹² Mark x. 40 ; Matt. xx. 23.

exalted vicegerent of His spiritual rule, whilst eliminating from it the contemporary Hebrew Messianic conception in its more visionary sense as a transient phase of a great idea. We can also respond to the Pauline saying that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself.¹³ We may also regard Jesus with a modern theologian as "the personal manifestation of a redeeming God,"¹⁴ on the understanding that this manifestation is made through him as the highest embodiment of the divine in the human, and is not encumbered with merely speculative implications. But the modern mind, which does not move in the groove of Hebrew-Hellenist thought, represented by Philo of Alexandria, the Fourth Gospel, and later theological speculation under the influence of Greek Philosophy, has a real difficulty in equating the historic Jesus with God as a hypostasis of the Godhead, which came long afterwards to be deemed and imposed as the orthodox belief. It is not in accordance with the strictly historic record of his thought, and there is no authentic utterance in this record that involves such a claim.¹⁵ Jesus' sonship is religious and ethical, not metaphysical; functional, not essential. The assumption that Father and Son embody a divine duality, and the attempt to reduce this duality into an absolute unity on later Trinitarian lines, is not warranted by his own authentic teaching or the primitive apostolic preaching, which, after all, besides his own teaching, is the weightiest, the most solid historic evidence we have in forming a judgment on the question. According to this preaching, Jesus of Nazareth was "a man approved of God by mighty works and wonders and

¹³ 2 Cor. v. 19.

¹⁴ Macintosh, "Person of Christ," 315.

¹⁵ "It is simply not the fact that the Christian message contains, though for the speculative thinker it may imply, an articulated Trinitarian dogma." Macintosh, "The Originality of the Christian Message," 30-31 (1920). The writer, it is only fair to say, does think that it is implied. Dr Gore, adhering to the literal Incarnationist view, speaks of Jesus "as God himself in the reality of manhood," "Jesus of Nazareth," 240 (1929). I should rather speak of Jesus as a manifestation of God in the reality of manhood. For a concise but illuminating discussion of the question, see Pringle-Pattison, "Studies in the Philosophy of Religion," particularly chapter xvii (1930), in which he pointedly shows the problematic character of the literal Incarnationist theory. The book only came into my hands after the last chapter of my own book was in print. His standpoint is practically my own. For the most recent theological presentation of this subject, see Creed and Micklem in "Mysterium Christi," ed. by Bell and Deissmann (1930), which also came into my hands after this chapter was printed.

signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know."¹⁶ In this statement Peter is speaking from personal knowledge of the Jesus who had companied with him and his fellow-apostles on earth. He is not, like the writer of the Fourth Gospel seventy or eighty years later, applying to Jesus a Greek philosophic conception and arbitrarily evaluating him in the light of this extraneous conception, to which Jesus himself was an entire stranger. Even Paul, who has little to tell us of the historic Jesus, does not go the length of equating the exalted Christ with God in the absolute sense.¹⁷ Whilst he goes beyond the primitive tradition of him as exalted Lord and invests him with pre-existence and a cosmic significance, he does not, like the Fourth Gospel, identify him with God in the absolute sense. His pre-eminence is vocational, and after he has completed his exalted function he will vacate this function "that God may be all in all." "For Christ must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. . . . And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected unto him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all."¹⁸ "There is one Lord . . . one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."¹⁹ Even the Fourth Gospel only equates him with the Father in certain passages at the cost of contradicting himself in others.

Whilst Jesus, even for Paul, is thus, in his being and function as Son and Lord, distinct from and subordinate to God, he is immeasurably great in the spiritual and ethical sphere; great in himself in the unique elevation of his moral and spiritual life; great in the mystery and wonder of his personality and his religious experience; great also in the marvellous results of his life and teaching, his death, his exaltation, and personal inspiration. The New Testament writings are a convincing evidence of the inspiration which he communicated to his disciples. Where can we find anything approaching the moral elevation, the

¹⁶ Acts ii. 22.

¹⁷ Phil. ii. 6, f. does not really do so. Christ is the image of God, as in Philo (2 Cor. iv. 4). But man, too, was created in God's image (Gen. i. 26-27).

¹⁸ 1 Cor. xv. 25 f.

¹⁹ Eph. iv. 5-6.

enthusiasm in well-doing, the spiritual dynamic of the New Testament ethic? Here is the secret of the power of Christianity in its early form, and wherever it has later given scope to this power in the striving to realise, in self-discipline and service, the highest good. Whilst what he accomplished in his own mission is relatively meagre, its potentiality is incalculable. It contained the germ of a world religion, the larger lordship over an ever-widening spiritual kingdom, matchless in its moral impact, uplifting, regenerating, dynamic. The idealist anticipates and has to suffer for his anticipations. It is the tragedy of his fate to be in advance of his age. But it is also his glory that he anticipates only ultimately to realise. The combination of the highest moral and spiritual ideal with the firm belief in an ultimate renewal of the world was, in itself, a potent inspiration towards the realisation of this ideal. Jesus laid hold of the ideal as a means of transforming the real. This was the tremendous task which he took upon himself and transmitted to his followers in the firm faith that it would ultimately prevail. He is the greatest of Utopians. But out of this divine Utopia was evolved the Church—the greatest organised force in history in fostering the higher life, even if it has often fallen far below the ideal set up and exemplified by its founder himself. Humble son of a carpenter and himself plying his father's craft, Son of Man who had nowhere to lay his head in his wanderings in Galilee and beyond, from him went forth the greatest spiritual force in human civilisation. Through the missionary work of his disciples, which he inspired, he became the founder of a spiritual empire, which ere long burst the narrow groove of Judaism, won the moral leadership of the ancient world, widened with the centuries its conquest over culture and barbarism alike, and in spite of all too frequent aberration from his spirit and his teaching, has made and moulded history to the highest ends wherever his spirit and his teaching have taken a grip of men's souls. The real Jesus needs no apologetic. His life and his influence are their own all-sufficient attestation. Here assuredly is the supreme life on earth, the most compelling personality, the king of us all, the greatest inspiration to the highest

things in the whole range of religious history. Our homage is all the more spontaneous inasmuch as we instinctively feel that his life is alike the standing reproach and the inspiration of our own, however highly endowed intellectually and morally. No one can afford to ignore him in either respect. Surely the highest tribute to the arresting personality in which God reveals Himself as in no other. In him we have the highest product in the spiritual realm, not only of his race, but of humanity. No abstraction he, as the orthodox theologians have too often made of him. But whilst his human existence is that of ourselves, it touches the sublime and leaves us by contrast on the lower level of aspiration, of discipleship, of adoration of the divine in him, in whom the Father-God has manifested Himself and come nigh unto us and imparted the power to rise above and overcome the sin and the sorrow, the darkness and the dread of this life in the flesh.

Whilst the orthodox theologians have tended to transform him into an abstraction in the course of their dogmatic controversies, the mythicists have sought to deny his historical existence and transform him into the unreal creation of a Christ cult. They eliminate the real Jesus from the Gospel and make it a mere system of belief, which was developed by the votaries of this cult, and on which Christianity and the Church were founded. "There is no room for the man Jesus," says Mr Crompton, the latest of these conjurers. "He is divine. He is God, who was never regarded as a man till some years after John and the early Fathers of the Church were dead."²⁰ The myth craze, on which so much has been written, has been refuted again and again,²¹ and need no longer waste our time. Without the historic Jesus there would have been no Christianity and no Church to found. Both owe their existence to the historic personality, the historic mission, the death and resurrection of a real, a concrete being who was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, though later reflection contributed to etherealise his earthly existence and provide a specious plea for such wild themes. Jesus is not a creation of the religious consciousness

²⁰ "Synoptic Problem," 73 (1928).

²¹ See, for instance, Loofs, "What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?" (1913).

of others, but the creator of a religion out of the matrix of his own personality. He was, we may say, the highest product of his race, but he was far more than the mere product of his time. What we have in this sublime, yet real Synoptic figure is not a mere reflection of a mystery cult, or of the personification of certain ideas, or of the meditation of his disciples, but a creative personality who in himself is greater than the Gospel which he enunciates and exemplifies in an ideal life. This is the haunting thing that impresses itself on every page of the simple records of this life and still arrests and grips the mind of the reader. For the wonderful power of this personality is not circumscribed by the short span of his actual existence on earth. It has made itself felt in the hearts and lives of successive generations of his followers, appealing to the souls of men with a perennial force, inspiring, uplifting, illuminating, and directing them in their aspiration after God and the highest good, and verifying itself in the moral and spiritual progress of humanity. Without the operation of this superlative influence, how much feebler would the moral and spiritual uplift of the world have been. In and through him the spiritual side of man has attained its highest development in conflict with the lower animal side of his being. In this upward evolutionary process Jesus has been, and is, the greatest factor. In this respect the greatest of idealists has approved himself as the greatest of realists. "The Jesus of the New Testament," pertinently remarks Mr Moore, "shows a firmness of religious conviction, a clearness of moral judgment, a purity and force of will such as are not found united in any other figure in history. We have the image of a man who is conscious that he does not fall short of the ideal for which he offers himself. It is this consciousness which is yet united in him with the most perfect humility. He lives out his life and faces death in a confidence and independence which have never been approached. He has confidence that he can lift men to such a height that they also will partake with him in the highest good, through their full surrender to God and their life of love for their fellows."²²

²² "History of Christian Thought Since Kant," 101 (1912).

INDEX

A

Abba, 308 f.
 Abraham, 160-161, 280
 Abrahams, Mr, 137, 139
 Advent of Jesus, date of, 53
 Advocate or Paraclete, 211
 Ænon, 69, 80
 Agapé, the, 225, 368
 Agrippa, King, 263
 Albinus, Procurator of Judæa, 249
 Alexander the Great, 31
 Alexandria, 279
 Alphæus, 92
 Amhaaretz, the, 37
 Andrew, apostle, 71, 76-77, 188, 191, 230
 Anna, Prophetess, 16, 21-22, 52, 327
 Annas, High Priest, 245-246
 Antigonus, last of Hasmonæans, 27
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 154, 194
 Antipas, son of Herod, 28-29, 31-32, 40, 54, 56-57, 69, 73, 93 f., 97-99, 121, 123-124, 132, 261 f.
 Antonia, Tower of, 258
 Apocalyptic, 57, 193 f., 200, 203, 205, 278 f., 305, 376
 — discourse of Jesus, 191 f.
 Apollon of Alexandria, 58, 70
 Apostles, Acts of, 298, 328
 Arabia, 69, 94, 144
 Aramaic, 32, 37, 303
 Archelaus, son of Herod, 23, 28
 Aretas, King of Arabia, 69, 94
 Ascension, the, 290
 Assumption of Moses, 278
 Assyrians, the, 31
 Augustus, Emperor, 18, 28-29, 53
 Aurantius, 28

B

Bacon, Professor, 377
 Baptism as practised by John, 56, 58
 — in the later Christian sense, 84
 — of Jesus, 60 f., 374, 376-377
 Baptist Sect, 53, 70
 Barabbas, 264-265
 Barbarossa, 207
 Barnasha, 197
 Bartholomew, 71, 92
 Bartimæus, 133, 344
 Baruch, Second Book of, 278
 Batanæa, 28
 Beelzebub, 110, 338
 Bertrin, Canon, 356
 Bethany, 44, 124, 131, 151-152, 164, 168, 171, 174, 188, 210, 212, 216, 290
 — beyond Jordan, 69, 71-72, 164
 Bethesda, 155
 Bethlehem, 17 f., 158
 Bethphage, 171
 Bethsaida, 71, 76, 92, 95-96, 343, 347
 Bethzatha, 155
 Blasphemy, 163-164, 252 f.
 Blind man, cure of, at Jerusalem, 161-162
 Bodin, philosopher, 358
 Boisserie, Dr, 354
 Bosworth, Dean, 207
 Box, Canon, 5, 21
 Brown, Dr, 352
 Bultmann, 107
 Bureau des Constatations, 354
 Burkitt, Mr, 138, 143

C

- Cæsarea, 28, 258, 263, 282
 — Philippi, 98, 102, 108, 147, 157-158, 193, 213, 279, 324, 340, 343, 374
 Caiaphas, High Priest, 168, 201, 211, 242-243, 245 f., 258
 Cairns, Principal, 337
 Calvary, 189
 Cana, 9, 74-75, 80 f., 92, 118
 Canon, Old Testament, 38
 Capernaum, 10, 74 f., 79, 81, 90 f., 97, 99 f., 103, 110, 112-113 f., 119, 121, 132, 145, 155, 225, 334, 338, 340, 342 f., 364, 368, 376
 Celsus, 297
 Cephas, 71
 Charles, Dr, 278
 Children, Jesus' love of, 44
 Chorazin, 76, 96
 Christ, the, 7, 21, 54, 64, 72, 80, 84, 157-158, 162 f., 202, 227, 234-235, 252, 254, 260, 359, 374, 378, 391
 Christianity, Pauline-Johannine, 160
 Christology, 156, 388
 Chronology of Synoptic Gospels, 86 f., 196
 Church, Corinthian, 283
 — history, 359
 — the, 150, 156, 169, 201-202, 323-324, 332, 386, 396
 Chuza, Antipas' steward, 93
 Coat, the Holy, 352-353
 Columba, 368
 Comforter, the, 232
 Coming One, the, 55, 57, 59, 66, 69-70
 Compassion of Jesus, 334 f.
 Corban, 114
 Cornelius, 282
 Creed, Apostles', 2, 207
 Crompton, Mr, 396
 Crucifixion, date of, 216-217, 266, 269 f.

D

- Dalman, 197
 Damascus, 40, 286

- Daniel, Book of, 39, 194 f., 252, 278
 David, King, 2, 6, 8, 19, 158, 172, 173, 176, 187, 374, 378
 Dead Sea, the, 54
 Dearmer, Dr, 353
 Decapolis, the, 31, 51, 97, 116, 360
 Demiourgos, the, 51
 Demonology, 357 f., 369
 Deissmann, 84, 87
 Deuteronomy, 68
 Diaspora, the, 324
 Disciple, the beloved, 227, 273
 Discourses of Jesus, 302
 Disease, Hebrew conception of, 336
 — Jesus' power to cure, 347 f.
 Docetic view of Jesus, 16, 294

E

- Ebionites, the, 12
 Ecclesiastes, 277
 Edersheim, Dr, 12
 Education of Jesus, 34 f.
 Egypt, 24, 25, 40, 217, 341
 Elders, the, 180
 Elijah, 53-54, 67, 94, 102, 207, 271, 301, 341, 367
 Elisha, 367
 Elizabeth, wife of Zacharias, 13, 16, 52-53, 327
 Eloi, 271
 Emmæus, 289, 294
 Endor, 366
 Enoch, Book of, 39, 187, 194 f., 278, 376
 Ephesus, 58, 70
 Ephraim, 168
 Epileptic, cure of, 100, 340, 345
 Epiphanius, 52
 Eschatology of Jesus, 108, 199, 200 f., 279, 312 f., 322-323
 Esdræon, Plain of, 40
 Essenes, the, 50-51
 Eucharist, the, 114, 220-221, 225, 227, 364, 368
 Evaluation of Jesus, 394 f.
 Exorcism, 78, 97, 111, 119, 357 f.

F

- Fasting, 113
 Father and Son, distinction between, 391
 Fatherhood of God, 308 f., 333 f.
 Feast, an unnamed, 153 f.
 — of Dedication, 153-154, 161
 — of Lights, 154
 — of Passover (see under Passover)
 — of Tabernacles, 153-154, 156 f., 274
 — of Trumpets, 154, 156
 — of Unleavened Bread, 215-216
 — of Wood Offering, 154
 Feeding of the 5,000, miracle of, 363-364
 Friedländer on Jesus and the Nazarenes, 50 f., 139

G

- Gabbatha, 268
 Gabriel, Angel, 4
 Gadarene demoniac, 92, 106, 338, 342, 359-360
 Galilee, 28 f., 31 f., 40, 51, 61, 70 f., 79 f., 86 f., 97 f., 100-101, 103, 116, 119 f., 151 f., 174-175, 182, 238, 262-263, 289, 291, 308, 328, 336
 Gallio, 266
 Gaul, 28
 Gehenna, 310
 Gennesaret, 96, 344
 Gentiles, the, 31, 115-116, 128, 145, 174, 191, 368
 Gersa, 92
 Gethsemane, 229, 238, 374
 Golgotha, 269
 Good, the absolute, 309-310, 391
 Gospel, the Fourth, rearrangement of parts of, 153, 236-237, 246
 Gospels, the Apocryphal, 24, 35
 Gould, Mr., 200
 Gnosticism, 50, 163
 Greece, 65
 Greeks, the, 180, 188-189

H

- Hades, 280, 293
 Hallel, the, 221
 Harnack, A. von, 10, 13, 388, 390
 Hase, 388
 Hasmonæan dynasty, 27
 Hebron, 92
 Hellenism, 46, 50, 52
 Henotheism, 276
 Herford, Mr., 115, 138
 Hermon, Mount, 98
 Herod, King, 17 f., 23 f., 27 f., 34, 56, 257
 Herodians, the, 90, 101, 114, 182, 184, 322
 Herodias, 69
 Hillel, 307, 329-330
 Hillman, 2
 Historical *versus* metaphysical view of Jesus, 390
 Holy of Holies, 272
 Home life of Jesus, 42-44
 Hosea, 114
 Humanity of Jesus, 383,

I

- Idealism of Jesus, 49-50
 Idumæa, 27-28, 91
 Immanence of God, 371
 Imperiousness of Jesus, 382
 Incarnation, the, 392
 Individualism, 320-321
 Isaac, 280
 Isaiah, 114, 377

J

- Jacob, father of Joseph, 7
 — patriarch, 280
 Jahve, 253, 276-277, 308, 338
 Jairus, 93, 342, 344, 366
 James, Apostle, 76-78, 92, 99, 148, 191, 238, 281
 James, brother of Jesus, 92-93, 199, 285
 James the Little, 92

James VI. of Scotland, 358
 Japha, 40
 Jeremiah, 341
 Jericho, 121-122, 125, 133-134, 168,
 173, 192, 222, 344
 Jerusalem, 10 f., 22 f., 25, 28, 33, 35,
 39, 40, 46, 54-55, 58, 79 f., 86, 88,
 90, 96, 100-101, 114, 121 f., 137,
 146-147, 149, 151 f., 165, 169, 171 f.,
 188, 199, 201, 211, 216, 222, 238,
 262-263, 279, 281, 287, 289 f., 295,
 343, 374, 384
 Jesus and God, 386 f.
 Jews, Jesus and the, 79-80, 138, 151 f.,
 168 f., 179 f., 298
 Joanna, wife of Chuza, 93
 Job, 277
 John, Apostle, 71, 76-78, 99, 148,
 152-153, 191, 216, 238
 John the Baptist, 8, 30, 35, 51-52, 53 f.,
 69-71 f., 76, 80, 82, 84, 91, 94-95,
 105-107, 111, 113, 130-131, 156,
 164, 179-180, 189, 301, 311, 341,
 365, 367, 377, 384
 Jonah, 144, 200, 361
 Jordan, the, 40, 54, 57, 59, 61, 71-73,
 97-98, 121 f., 164
 Joseph, father of Jesus, 1, 4, 6 f.,
 16, 18 f., 23, 25, 33, 43, 52, 97,
 104
 Joseph of Arimathea, 273-274,
 292
 Josephus, 19, 24, 32, 34, 36, 54,
 56, 69, 123, 138-139, 249, 258,
 278
 Josias, brother of Jesus, 93
 Judaea, 20, 23, 28-29, 31-32, 40, 54,
 79-81, 92, 121 f., 153, 156, 261, 328,
 366
 Judaism, Jesus' attitude to, 45-46, 79,
 83, 114-115, 137 f., 150, 157, 160,
 163, 165, 168-169, 175, 188, 204,
 209, 244, 253, 276, 302, 305, 314,
 324, 331, 368
 Judas, brother of Jesus, 93
 Judas of Gamala, 30
 Judas Iscariot, 92, 212 f., 220, 222,
 228, 238, 242, 257
 Judas, son of Jacob, 92
 Jupiter, 194

K

Keim, "Life of Jesus," 65
 Kerioth, 92
 Kidron, 238
 "King of the Jews," 270
 Kingdom of God, 44, 53 f., 62, 64, 99,
 131, 140, 141, 199-200, 202 f.,
 207-209, 261-262, 279, 308, 311 f.,
 320 f.
 Klausner, 27, 34, 139, 142, 213

L

Law, the, 155, 186, 307, 315, 317,
 319, 324 f.
 Lazarus, 164 f., 174, 178, 210, 281,
 310, 367
 Le Bec, Dr, 354
 Lebanon, 31
 Legendary tales, growth of, 370
 — — need of critical examination of,
 369 f.
 Leper, cure of a, 90
 Lepers, cure of the ten, 133
 Levites, 55, 58
 Lewis, Mr, 236
Lex Talionis, 317, 329-330
 Lietzmann, 197
 Life, Jesus and, 40 f., 334
 Lodge, Sir Oliver, 375-376
 Logos, the, 9, 61, 63-64, 69, 71-72,
 75, 82, 84-85, 118, 164, 235, 388
 Loisy, M., 368
 Loofs, Prof., 390
 Lord, title applied to Jesus, 226
 Lot, 147
 Lourdes, 353 f.
 Luther, 303

M

Maccabæans, the, 27, 31
 Maccabæus, Judas, 154
 Maccabees, Book of, 278
 Madonna, the, 354 f.
 Magadan, 98

- Magdala, 76, 98, 334
 Magi, visit of, 3, 22 f.
 Manson, Mr, 196
 Marchand, Dr, 354
 Martha of Bethany, 44, 123, 131, 134,
 152, 165 f., 281
 Martin, St, 368
 Mary Magdalene, 93, 274, 286, 289 f.
 Mary, mother of James the Little, 286,
 289
 Mary, mother of Jesus, 1, 4, 6-7, 9-11,
 14, 16, 18 f., 22-23, 25, 43, 52,
 97
 Mary, sister of Martha, 123, 131, 134,
 152, 165 f., 171, 210
 Master, the, originality of, 301 f.
 — title applied to Jesus, 113, 130,
 173, 190, 213-214, 238, 243, 299,
 301 f., 315-316, 379-380
 Matthew (Levi), publican, 76-78, 92,
 113
 Medical science and spiritual healing,
 351 f., 356-357
 Mediterranean, the, 31, 40
 Messiah, creator of a new era, 301
 — Jesus the actual, 202-203
 — miracles and, 337-339, 346
 — the, Davidic descent of, 2, 5-6,
 8-9, 15, 111, 134, 172-173, 176, 178,
 186-187, 213, 341, 374, 378
 — the, entry of, into Jerusalem, 172 f.
 — the, expectation of, 17, 20, 38, 50,
 94, 252-253
 — the, forerunner of, 54 f.
 — the, in the national sense, 30, 38,
 57, 183-184, 213
 — the, Jesus becomes conscious of his
 vocation as, 62 f.
 — the, Jesus' conception of, 49, 64-65,
 95, 175-176, 182, 187
 — the, Jesus' Galilean mission,
 preparation for, 103 f.
 — the, kingdom of, 148-150, 199,
 277-279
 — the, non-political, 260 f.
 — the, Peter's confession of, 98-99
 — the, recognition of, by demoniacs,
 78-79
 — the, suffering of, 22, 147 f., 175,
 189-190, 195 f., 224, 239, 377
 Messiah, the, the Baptist's conception
 of, 55, 57-60
 — the, the future coming of, as judge,
 192-193
 — the, the secret of, 65-66, 105 f.,
 117
 — the, to be born at Bethlehem,
 23
 — the, virgin birth of, 1-2, 5, 7, 12 f.,
 36
 — the, what his dawning Messianic
 consciousness implied, 63-64
 Meyer, Ed., 3, 18
 Midrash, 5, 24
 Minim, the, 50, 143
 Ministry, the healing, 333 f.
 — credibility of, 347 f.
 Miracles of Jesus, 337 f.
 — — — legendary accretions, 362 f.,
 369 f.
 Mission, beginning of Jesus', 71 f.
 — the Christian, 201
 — the Galilean, 127, 130, 133, 134-
 135, 144-145, 153, 211
 — — course of, 86 f., 127
 — — character of, 102 f.
 — — duration of, 101-102
 — — only indirectly Messianic, 105
 — — popular-humanitarian char-
 acter of, 109 f.
 — — racial character of, 114-115
 — — universalist implications of, 115-
 116
 — Samaritan, 80, 85, 127 f.
 — supposed early Judæan, 79 f.
 — the Southern, 121 f., 143 f.
 — — the Johannine supplement of,
 151 f.
 Mizvoth, 141
 Moffatt, 10, 84
 Monotheism, Jewish, 392
 Montefiore, Mr, 137, 305 f., 327,
 330
 Moore, Mr, 397
 Moses, 24 f., 99, 114, 137, 140, 156,
 162, 328 f., 384 f.
 Muirhead, Mr, 158
 Myers, Dr A. J., 353, 358
 Mystery of the Kingdom, 92
 Mythical view of Jesus, the, 396-397

N

- Nain, 93, 103, 336, 366, 368
 Nathanael, 71, 75, 78, 92
 Nationalist party in Palestine, 30, 51
 Nature, God's method of working in,
 351, 362, 372-373
 — Jesus' interest in, 41-42
 — laws of, 348 f.
 Nazarene, 23, 102
 Nazarenes, the, 50 f.
 Nazareth, 10-11, 17 f., 22-23, 25, 30-
 31, 33, 35 f., 44, 48, 51, 74 f., 80,
 93, 97, 102-103, 106, 174, 244, 253,
 341, 345, 368, 375, 377, 386, 394
 Nicodemus, 80, 83-84, 159, 274-275
 Ninevites, the, 144
 Nisan, 171, 216 f.
 Noah, 147

O

- Olives, Mount of, 171, 173, 178, 191,
 193, 210, 238

P

- Palestine, 18, 27-28, 32 f., 40, 111,
 115, 121, 171, 179, 258, 261-262,
 324, 366
 Pandera, Roman soldier, 14
 Papias, 86
 Parable of the fig tree, 176
 — of the father and two sons, 181
 — of the friend at midnight, 131
 — of the good Samaritan, 145-146,
 206
 — of the great supper, 132
 — of the lost sheep, 146
 — of the marriage feast, 182
 — of the Pharisee and publican, 137
 — of the prodigal son, 137, 146, 206,
 309
 — of the rich man and Lazarus, 137,
 310, 367
 — of the talents, 192
 — of the ten virgins, 192
 — of the wicked husbandmen, 181

- Parables of Jesus, 41 f., 303-304, 320
 Paradise, 271
 Paralytic, cure of, at Jerusalem, 154-
 155
 — — — at Capernaum, 90
 Parousia, 200, 387
 — in the spectacular sense illusory,
 206-207
 — spiritual interpretation of, 200 f.,
 207-208
 Passover, the, 35, 59, 79-80, 86, 101-
 102, 147, 157, 168, 171, 211-212,
 215 f., 241, 247, 258
 Paul, Apostle, 8-9, 11, 14, 92, 138, 199,
 202, 220, 225, 281 f., 293, 295, 297,
 331
 — and the subordination of Jesus to
 God, 394
 Paulinism, Jesus and, 331-332
 Pavement, the, 268
 Pentateuch, the, 38-39, 330
 Peræa, 28, 31, 54, 69, 121 f., 133, 156
 Personal appearance of Jesus, 47-48
 Personality of Jesus, 47 f., 379 f.
 Peter, Gospel of, 291
 — Simon, 8, 11, 71, 76 f., 86, 99,
 113, 119, 148, 191, 199, 213, 216,
 226-227, 229, 238, 245, 256-257,
 281-282, 285 f., 317, 342, 378, 394
 Phanael, father of Anna, 22
 Pharaoh, 24
 Pharisees, the, 24, 37-38, 45-46, 51-
 52, 57-58, 80, 88, 90, 96, 98, 101,
 109-110, 112 f., 117, 124, 128, 131 f.,
 135 f., 144-145, 155 f., 161 f., 167,
 171, 173-174, 176, 178, 182 f., 187,
 189, 199-200, 205, 218-219, 253,
 274, 278-280, 283, 302, 310, 315,
 322, 324, 325-327, 330-331, 338 f.,
 344 f., 362, 366
 Philip, Apostle, 71, 92, 188, 230
 Philip, son of Herod, 28-29, 69, 96-98
 Philo of Alexandria, 12, 37, 83, 258,
 279, 393
 Pilate, Pontius, Procurator of Judæa,
 29, 145, 242, 247, 249, 252, 256,
 257 f., 311
 Plato, 375
 Plummer, 59
 Potter's Field, 257

Prætorium, the, 257-258, 267-268
 Prayer, the Lord's, 131
 Pre-eminence of Jesus, 380 f.
 Pre-existence of Jesus, 375 f.
 Presentation of Jesus in Temple, 21
 Priests, the chief, 158, 180
 Prophecy and Jesus, 17, 194, 294, 374-375
 Prophet, Jesus as, 103 f., 174, 192, 318, 341, 377
 Prophets, the, 136, 142, 160, 200, 277, 301, 307
 Providence, Jesus and, 333-334, 362
 Psychotherapeutics, 351 f.
 Purification of Jesus' mother, 20-21

Q

"Q." (German *Quelle*), 66, 88-89, 125
 Quartodeciman Controversy, 218
 Quietists of the time of Jesus, 30
 Quirinius, Governor of Syria, 18 f., 29

R

Rabbi, title of Jesus, 75, 84, 102, 113, 173, 301
 Raka, 317
 Ramsay, Sir W., 19-20
 Rashdall, Dean, 138
 Redemption offering, 20
 Renan, 44, 307
 Repentance, 55-56, 104, 304, 311, 314, 331
 Restoration of dead, miracles of, 365 f.
 Resurrection, the, 165, 276 f.
 — reality of, 294 f.
 Revelation of God, Jesus', 389-390
 Riddle, Mr, 138
 Righteousness, Baptist's preaching of, 55-57, 60
 — the new, 314 f.
 Roman Church, 355

Romans, the, 168, 173, 176, 180, 182 f., 191, 215, 241-242, 244, 259 f., 264, 265, 268

S

Sabbath, the, 78, 113, 132, 135, 141-142, 154-155, 161, 218, 274, 321, 328
 Sacramentalism, 225, 272-273
 Sadducees, the, 58, 143, 144, 184-185, 218-219, 252, 299
 Salim, 69, 80
 Salome, sister of Mary, 75
 Samaria, 28, 40, 80-81, 123 f.
 Samaritan, parable of the good, 130
 — woman, the, 103
 Samaritans, the, 115-116
 Sanhedrin, the, 28, 83, 114, 167-168, 171, 178, 180-181, 211, 214, 241-242, 244 f., 258, 260, 273-274, 374
 Satan, 66 f., 106, 112, 129, 190, 228, 232, 310, 322, 381
 Saviour, the, 2, 17, 69, 88, 299
 Schechter, Dr, 141, 305
 Schmiedel, 3
 Schweitzer, 204-205
 Science and miracles, 350
 Scribes, the, 38, 46, 88, 90, 96, 101, 109-110, 112 f., 117, 128, 135 f., 155-156, 185-186, 187, 205, 305, 307, 315, 324-325, 328 f., 339-340, 380
 Sebaste, 28
 Seder, the, 216-217
 Self-development of Jesus, 39 f.
 Self-manifestation of Jesus, 374 f.
 Self-mastery of Jesus, 383
 Sepphoris, 32-33, 39-40
 Sermon on the Mount, 89 f., 127, 131, 144-145, 146, 204, 206, 236, 302, 308, 319, 325, 329, 362, 389
 Seventy, the mission of, 127 f., 302, 387
 Shammai, 307, 329-330
 Sheba, Queen of, 144
 Sheol, 276-277
 Shepherd, the Good, allegory of, 163
 Shunnamite woman, 367

Sidon, 91, 97, 115
 Siloam, pool of, 161
 — tower of, 145
 Simeon, 9, 16, 21-22, 52, 327
 Simon of Cyrene, 269
 Simon, the Canaanæan, 91-92
 Simon, the leper, 210
 Simon, the Pharisee, 93, 110, 211, 384,
 Sin, 309, 336
 — offering, 224
 Sinai, Mount, 100, 222
 Social and industrial conditions in the
 time of Jesus, 32 f.
 Socrates, 47
 Solomon, 144, 301
 — porch of, 162
 — Psalms of, 278
 Son of God, the, 1, 15, 61, 67, 69, 84,
 117-118, 163-164 f., 178, 189, 215,
 228, 233, 252, 337-338, 358, 374,
 378, 391
 Son of Man, the, 80, 135, 144, 146 f.,
 177, 187, 189, 215, 228, 252, 299,
 310, 328, 334 f., 374, 376 f.
 Sonship of Jesus, 62 f., 65-66, 378,
 387 f.
 Spirit, the Holy, 1, 13-14, 16, 41, 58,
 63, 66, 80, 112, 117, 135, 158, 169,
 187, 231-232, 235, 322, 344-345,
 348, 376, 381
 Spitta, 236
 State, the, in relation to kingdom of
 God, 321
 Streeter, Mr, 196
 Suffering, necessity of, 208-209
 Supernatural works of Jesus, 360 f.,
 369
 Superstition in New Testament age,
 357
 Supper, Last, 210 f.
 Suzanna, 93
 Swete, Dr, 303
 Sychar, 80
 Synagogue, example of Jesus' preach-
 ing in, 103-104
 Syria, 18 f., 28, 258
 Syro-Phœnician woman, 97, 115,
 344

T

Tacitus, 330
 Talmud, the, 50, 138, 143, 306-307
 Taxation, Roman, 29
 Teacher, title of Jesus, 102, 112, 226,
 261, 301 f.
 Telepathy, 297
 Temple, cleansing of, 79-80, 177-179
 — the, 20-21, 139, 152, 161-162, 170,
 174, 188, 190
 Temptation of Jesus, 66 f., 71
 Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,
 39, 67, 305
 Thaddæus, 92
 Theism, Hebrew, 333, 339, 349 f.
 Thomas, the apostle, 92, 291
 — Gospel of, 35
 Tiberias, 32, 33, 40, 53, 121
 Tiberius, Emperor, 32, 98, 183, 268
 Timothy, 37
 Torah, the, 37, 141, 325 f.
 Trachonitis, 28
 Tradition, Jesus' attitude to, 112 f.,
 326 f.
 — trustworthiness of Synoptic, 348 f.
 Transfiguration, the, 99-100, 147,
 189
 Treves, 352
 Trial of Jesus, 257 f.
 Trinity, the, 386, 390, 393
 Twelve, the, 91 f., 97, 116, 126, 128-
 129, 134, 146, 150, 174, 192, 212,
 285, 302, 324, 336, 367, 374
 Tyre, 91, 97, 115

U

Usener, 2, 115-116
 Universalism, 320-321
 Universe, mechanistic theory of, 348 f.

V

Varus, Governor of Syria, 28
 Verrall, Dr
 Vienne, 28

W

Walking on water, miracle of, 365
 Washing of disciples' feet, 225 f.
 Weiss, B., 4
 Weiss, Johannes, 18
 Wellhausen, 196, 368
 Westcott, 82
 Widow's mite, the, 188
 Wisdom, Book of, 279
 — of God, the, 152, 377
 Women, Jesus' attraction for, 44
 Wrede, 107
 Wright, C. J., 352

Y

Yetzer, 331

Z

Zacchæus, the publican, 134
 Zacharias, 16, 52-53, 327
 Zadok, the Pharisee, 30
 Zarephath, widow of, 367
 Zealots, the, 92
 Zebedee, father of John, 71, 75-76,
 78, 391