

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>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XVI. THE FORESHADOWINGS OF THE CROSS.

(1) IN the *Fourth Study* of this series, dealing with Jesus' acceptance of His vocation at His Baptism the conclusion was stated "that the vocation He was conscious of, and accepted, was that of a Saviour from sin by the sacrifice of Himself." In support of this conclusion it was argued that Jesus derived His ideal of the Messiahship from the *Servant of Jehovah*; that He fulfilled all righteousness in accepting the task of justifying many by bearing their iniquities; that the words ascribed to the Baptist regarding the Lamb of God were an echo of the communication Jesus had made to him. This does not mean, of course, that Jesus had a full and clear anticipation of all that the Passion would involve, that at all times His mind was occupied with His sacrifice, that the dark and drear shadow of the future blotted out the sunshine of the present; but it does mean that, although He was divinely guided step by step along the path of His ministry, Himself not knowing always what the way would be, yet He had a distinct prevision whither His Father was guiding Him; that, while He was made glad by the faith, and even surprised by the unbelief, of men, He was steadfastly recognizing that His ministry was not destined to end in any earthly success, or worldly triumph; that, although in His emotions varying notes of joy or grief were struck by the changeful experiences of His life among men, yet the undertone was the sense of a great good to be gained by the endurance of a great sorrow. For the sake of His disciples He exercised a restraint over His utterances, and His first disclosure to them should not be regarded as coinciding with His first discovery of the lot that was assigned to Him. There are obscure references,

which seem to have made no impression on the disciples, but which show that the expectation of His sacrifice was a constant element in His "inner life."

(2) In dealing in the *Eighth Study* with Jesus' challenge to the priesthood, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John ii. 19), the writer ventured to express a doubt of the correctness of the evangelist's interpretation, "he spake of the temple of his body" (ver. 21), and to suggest that in these words Jesus expressed His confidence that He could restore the religion that was being ruined by the priesthood. Further reflection has presented at least the possibility that, as Jesus afterwards so distinctly and emphatically connected the doom of Jerusalem with His own death as the Divine judgment on the human crime, He may even at this time have connected the overthrow of the temple which He here announces with the passion which He anticipated for Himself; and without going beyond the prophecy of the *Servant of Jehovah* He may have confidently expected His own triumph after His passion. "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong" (Isa. liii. 12).

(3) In the same *Study* it was maintained that the conversation with Nicodemus (John iii.) probably closed with verse 12 or even verse 10, and that it was very unlikely that verse 14, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up," could have been uttered to so unprepared and unsympathetic a hearer. This was regarded as a reflection of the Evangelists. To this assumption one objection, however, must now be noted. The term *Son of Man* is not used by the Evangelists of Jesus, but only by Himself. It is possible then that we have here a genuine *logion* of Jesus, which the Evangelist has woven into his own reflections. When or why it was

uttered we have no means of discovering. If it belonged to as early a period in Jesus' ministry as is here assigned to it, then it would indicate that the mind of Jesus was dwelling on the necessity of His death, and that by meditation on such analogies as the Old Testament presented, He was seeking the comfort that the assurance of its beneficent purpose could afford. But we cannot here go beyond a mere conjecture.

(4) A passage in regard to which there is no such obscurity is Jesus' answer to the censure of His disciples because they did not fast. "Can the sons of the bridechamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast" (Matt. ix. 15; cf. Mark ii. 19, 20, Luke v. 34, 35). In regard to this utterance two points deserve special notice.

In the *Eleventh Study on The Companionship of the Twelve* attention has already been called to the light which this utterance casts on the relationship of Jesus to His disciples. It was one of deep affection, close communion, and, at this time at least, entire satisfaction. Fasting would have been altogether inappropriate for them, as their mood was so joyous. Of the parting Jesus Himself anticipated they had as yet no expectation. He did not betray to them any sorrow He may have felt; but communicated to them a contagious joy. Probably He Himself at this period dwelt on "the joy that was set before him," Nevertheless this saying does reveal a very real element in His anticipated passion. It would involve His severance from those to whom He was very dear, and who for the good of their life had great need of Him. The shadow that fell over Him would then fall, even more drear, on them; and the sorrow that would come on them added weight to the burden that rested on Him. The circumstances of the utterance

are also significant. The criticism, against which He was defending His disciples, revealed an antagonism between His spirit and the traditions and customs of Judaism which could end only in mutual injury. It now became clearer to Jesus than it had been before in what way His sacrifice would be brought about. The figurative sayings about the new patch on the old garment, and the new wine in the old wine skins, are prophetic. His passion would be judgment to Judaism; a worse rent would be made in the garment; even as the wine would be spilled, so the wine-skins would be burst.

(5) An allusion to the value of His death is very distinctly made in John vi. 51: "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." It is very difficult, however, to accept this saying in its present form as an authentic utterance of Jesus. The difference between the Synoptic and Johannine discourses is often explained as due to difference of audience, the multitude in Galilee in the one case, or of the scribes of Jerusalem in the other; but this explanation is impossible here. This discourse is represented as addressed to the people that had been fed miraculously on the shores of the lake. Its contents are so unlike anything to be found in the Synoptic reports of the Galilean ministry, and resemble so closely later developments of doctrine, that while single sayings may be reminiscences, the development of the ideas suggested by them must be regarded as due to the reflection of the Evangelist. Is it at all probable that before Jesus had made any communication to His disciples about His passion, He should have referred thus to the value of His sacrifice in public utterance? Although *Westcott* maintains that the thought "is concentrated upon the Incarnation and its consequences generally,"

yet he does recognize that as regards the term "flesh" which "describes human nature in its totality regarded from its earthly side"—"the thought of death lies already in the word, but that thought is not as yet brought out, as afterwards, by the addition of *blood*." Commenting on verse 53 he says "the 'flesh' is presented in its twofold aspect as 'flesh' and 'blood,' and by this separation of its parts a violent death is presupposed." "By the 'flesh,'" he continues, "we must understand the virtue of Christ's humanity as living for us; by the 'blood' the virtue of His humanity as subject to death" (*Gospel of St. John*, pp. 106, 107). The subtleties of this commentary surely confirm the conviction that it was not thus Jesus taught the common people.

(6) The last two paragraphs of this chapter in the Fourth Gospel (verses 60 to 64, and 66 to 71) also raise a serious problem. The Synoptists do not give any distinct indication that any so serious crisis immediately followed the feeding of the five thousand. That an attempt may have been made by the multitude to compel Jesus to assume the rôle of political Messiah, as verse 15 indicates, is not in itself improbable; not more improbable is it that the attempt had the sympathy and the support of the disciples. His refusal would produce wide-spread disappointment, and even deep-rooted resentment; and to this the reference may be made in these passages. The Synoptic record represents Jesus as seeking after this incident more and more to withdraw Himself and His disciples from the multitude, and this course may have been due to His desire to escape popular antagonism as well as to His wish to instruct His disciples privately. We may conclude that the results of the feeding of the five thousand were such as to bring His passion appreciably nearer for His consciousness.

(7) The writer cannot, however, altogether rid himself of the impression that there are in these passages blended with memories of this crisis reminiscences of the later crisis at Cæsarea Philippi. Do not verses 68 and 69 sound like an echo of Peter's confession in Matthew xvi. 16 ? The difference can be explained by the substitution of the Johannine for the Synoptic vocabulary. If this be so, then Christ's detection of, and even allusion to, the part Judas was to play in the great tragedy may be traced back to this time. We must not suppose that Jesus foreknew Judas' betrayal when He called him to become a disciple : that assumption has intolerable moral difficulties ; but we may suppose that with His insight into the moral and spiritual conditions of others, He discovered the beginnings of estrangement and treachery in Judas even before Judas himself was fully aware of his change of feeling and aim. In this sense we may accept the Evangelist's statement in verse 64, " For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray Him." Jesus' refusal of the Kingship would be the first blow to Judas' loyalty ; the declaration of the approaching passion by Jesus would be the second. For we may suppose that this allusion to one of the twelve as a devil followed in the conversation at Cæsarea Philippi on the rebuke of Peter for his remonstrance. The first announcement did not contain any allusion to betrayal ; and we may thence conclude that it was the announcement itself that precipitated Judas' resolve, and that Jesus at once discovered that resolve, and alluded to it in the second announcement. But we have been led to anticipate what must be more fully discussed afterwards. His passion Jesus foresaw would involve not only separation from His disciples, and the antagonism of Judaism, but also the treachery of one of His chosen companions. We cannot estimate how much

this anticipation increased the pain with which He looked forward to the sacrifice before Him.

(8) Before we can deal with the three announcements of the Passion recorded in the Synoptists we must seek an answer to several questions. The declarations are so brief that we cannot but ask ourselves whether very much has not been omitted by the evangelical tradition. The teaching of Jesus must surely have been very much more frequent and more varied, when He was seeking to persuade and constrain His disciples to acquiesce in a decision regarding His own future which so offended their prejudices and disappointed their ambitions. Is not the explanation of the meagreness of the tradition to be found in this antagonism of the disciples? Their hostility to this teaching led them either to pay very little attention to it, or to dismiss it from their minds as soon as possible. It is evident from the course of events that Jesus failed to produce any deep impression upon their minds. What to Him was of supreme importance they disregarded; and can we doubt that this growing estrangement of His disciples hurt Him sorely? If there is this reason to account for the omission of much of Jesus' teaching at this time on this theme, we are led on to another question: How did the disciples remember and transmit these definite announcements? It is easy to dismiss them as prophecy after the event. It is impossible to affirm confidently that the evangelical tradition has not been affected by the history of the Passion; that the memory of Christ's predictions has not been blended with the remembrance of His experience; but, on the other hand, we cannot confidently deny that Jesus foresaw the course of events, and in such definite announcements forewarned His disciples, that, whatever influence the history may have had in the present form of the prophecy, there was a distinct remembrance in the disciple

circle that such prophecy had been uttered. That, as we shall afterwards see, there is a growing definiteness in the three announcements shows either great literary art in the Evangelists, or, what is more probable, that real predictions were remembered as marked from time to time by this greater detail.

(9) How are we to conceive the mental process of which these statements were the results? We have abandoned the old conception of prophecy as history known beforehand; we have come to regard the foresight of the prophets as due to insight both regarding the Divine purposes to be fulfilled and the historical conditions under which the fulfilment was to take place. Thus Amos' foresight of the fate of the Northern Kingdom was due to his insight into the Divine purpose to execute judgment on the sins of the nation, and into the function of the rising Assyrian power in the fulfilment of the Divine intentions. If we are to maintain our belief in the reality of the Divine *Kenosis* in the Incarnation, we must conceive the predictions of Christ in the same way. He had an infallible insight into the Divine purpose in His personal vocation, the salvation of men from sin by the sacrifice of Himself. This insight, it has been maintained, He possessed from the beginning of His ministry. The means by which that sacrifice would be brought about were probably discovered by His insight into the course of events. His own experience brought Him enlightenment regarding the actual conditions under which the sacrifice would be offered. The growing definiteness of His successive announcements to His disciples would, if this surmise is correct, be due to His own advancing knowledge, and not be a pedagogic device to communicate gradually to His disciples, as they were able to receive, the details from the beginning familiar to Himself. That He must die, and that a speedy resurrection must follow His

death, seems to have been the primary certainty. As He watched the progress of the antagonism directed against Himself one feature after another in His passion was anticipated by Him, and communicated to His disciples. To recognize such progress in His realization of what His passion would involve seems to the writer to invest the evangelical record of these announcements with a deeper personal interest.

(10) The first announcement (Matt. xvi. 21 ; Mark viii. 31 ; Luke ix. 22) was made after the confession of Jesus' Messiahship by Peter at Cæsarea Philippi. In addition to the constant feature in the predictions—death and resurrection—this lays the emphasis on rejection by the elders, and the chief priests and scribes, the three classes who constituted the national authorities. Jesus had already during the course of His ministry had abundant evidence of the hostility of these influential persons. Hitherto His popularity with the multitude had offered Him some protection, but the account Peter had just given of the perplexity of the public opinion regarding His Person (Matt. xvi. 14, "Some say John the Baptist, some Elijah ; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets ") showed Jesus that when on His coming to Jerusalem He would make the formal claim of Messiahship, He could not rely on any popular support, and there would be no hindrance to His enemies doing their will in regard to Him. It is true one way of escape still seemed open. He could regain His popularity by lowering His ideal, and by meeting the expectations of the populace. Had He done that, whatever the ultimate issue might have been, for a time at least, elders, priests, and scribes might have been held at bay. The severity of Jesus' rebuke of Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan ; thou art a stumblingblock unto me ; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men" (Matt. xvi. 23),

indicates that He did Himself feel tempted to use some means of escape, whether this, as is probable, or some other we do not know of. It need not be assumed that Jesus already foresaw that the Cross would be His lot. His reference to the disciple's denying himself, taking up His cross, and following Him (ver. 24) may be proverbial; or if not, Jesus was familiar enough with the Roman mode of execution to use one item in it as a vivid illustration of a general principle without our being compelled to assume that in using it He was thinking of the manner of His own death.

(11) The distinctive feature of the second announcement (Matt. xvii. 22-23; Mark ix. 31; Luke ix. 34) made on the return to Galilee after the Confession and the Transfiguration (an event which will be the subject of the next *Study*), is in the words, "The Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men." The statement seems to allow three interpretations. First it may be the surrender of the Divine Son by the Divine Father to His human persecutors and enemies that is referred to. The phrase "into the hands of men" would in this case be emphatic. In the Transfiguration Jesus may have received a clearer and a fuller intimation of the Divine will concerning His Passion. His "exodus which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem" (Luke ix. 30) was not to be like Moses' or Elijah's, but the Divine purpose would be fulfilled in a human crime. The communication to the disciples would be intended to do for the rest what the Transfiguration was intended to do for the favoured three witnesses, to assure them that Jesus was fulfilling the Divine will. A second interpretation is more obvious. It may be the betrayal by Judas that is referred to. It has already been suggested that even at Cæsarea Philippi the evil purpose may have begun to form in the soul of Judas? On the return to Galilee Jesus may

have detected still clearer indications of that purpose. Would not this intimation be not only a warning to the other disciples, but also an appeal to Judas? For we should do Jesus a serious moral injustice by assuming that He did not do all He could to restrain Judas, not by forcible prevention but by moral persuasion. Judas was, during these months, engaged in a serious contest with the love of His Master. The writer ventures to suggest a third interpretation, although he has not been able to discover whether linguistic usage allows or forbids it. It is offered in the hope that it may be corrected or confirmed. May not the reference be to the handing over of Jesus by the Jewish rulers after His rejection by them to the *Gentiles*? If Jesus did anticipate this, then it would become clear to Him that it would be by the Gentile mode of execution—the Cross—that He would die.

(12) The mood in which the third announcement (Matt. xx. 17-19; Mark x. 32-34; Luke xviii. 31-34) was made on the way to Jerusalem is indicated by Mark. "And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid" (x. 32). Bruce's comment deserves quotation: "The astonishment of the Twelve and the fear of others were not due to the fact that Jesus had, against their wish, chosen to go to Jerusalem in spite of apprehended danger (Weiss). These feelings must have been awakened by the *manner* of Jesus, as of one labouring under strong emotion. Only so can we account for the fear of the crowd, who were not, like the Twelve, acquainted with Christ's forebodings of death. Memory and expectation were both active at that moment, producing together a high-strung state of mind. . . . Filled with the varied feelings excited by these sacred recollections and tragic anticipations, He walks alone by preference, step and gesture revealing what

is working within and inspiring awe" (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*, i. 412, 413). In this announcement the features of the previous ones are repeated, and the last scene of scorn and shame, suffering and sorrow is vividly anticipated. Probably as soon as Jesus became certain that He would be handed over to, and suffer at the hands of, the Gentiles, His imagination would dwell on the details of the crucifixions which He had witnessed, until the complete picture of the tragedy stood clearly before His inner eye, and moved His deepest feelings. We may thus venture to trace the psychological process by which the Passion became more and more a distinctly anticipated reality for Jesus; for this does not involve any denial of a Divine illumination from the beginning to the end of the experience. It was not by earthly prudence, but by heavenly wisdom that He interpreted the course of events, even as the prophets of old had done, as indicating to Him step by step the path of His Father's will. What we must avoid is a *supernaturalism* that ignores the human thought, feeling, will, to which the divine wisdom, righteousness, and grace are imparted.

(13) The three formal announcements of the Passion have been dealt with one after another; but we must now turn back to a reference which is found only in Luke's Gospel (xiii. 31-33). Towards the close of the Galilean ministry the Pharisees conveyed to Jesus a warning that Herod intended to kill Him, and advised Him to leave Galilee. Whether their motives were friendly or hostile, whether the intention they ascribed to Herod was real or not, whether they were anxious for Jesus' safety or only desirous of getting Him away to Jerusalem where they expected still greater peril for Him, we cannot confidently determine. Jesus showed His contempt for Herod's cunning by His answer, two features of which are important

for our present purpose. The phrase "the third day I am perfected" (ver. 32) may mean either "soon I will finish my work of healing and teaching" or "soon I am perfected by a martyr's death." The second meaning is more probable. That martyrdom He felt must be accomplished in Jerusalem; "it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (ver. 33). This certainty made Him quite indifferent to Herod's threats. But whence this certainty? John, the greatest of the prophets before Him, had perished in Machærus. That might be "an offence against the fitness of things" (Bruce), but what assured Jesus that such an offence could not be repeated in His case? He was conscious of being divinely appointed as Messiah of the Jewish nation. His rejection, culminating in His death, and involving the doom of the nation, must be a national act, through the recognized rulers of the nation at the centre of the nation's life. A provincial ruler of doubtful title could not represent the Jewish nation, nor could it be held responsible for his act.

(14) How significant Jesus regarded His death as being is indicated by His declaration in response to the request of the sons of Zebedee and their mother. The ambition and rivalry of the disciples are rebuked by the example of Jesus. The highest honour is to be won by service, "even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life as a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28). His death is brought under the common category of the service which alone ensures greatness; but it is surely at the same time assigned a unique value in the phrase by which it is described, "a ransom for many." It is not the purpose of these *Studies* to expound Christian doctrines; and even if it were, any discussion of the significance of Christ's death for the doctrine of the Atonement from the standpoint of His "inner life" here adopted would need

to follow the *Studies on the Agony in Gethsemane* and the *Desolation of the Cross*. Meanwhile it must suffice for the writer to affirm very emphatically that he cannot believe that in these words Jesus is indicating a universal human function, but he must hold that Jesus in anticipating death looked forward to the necessary consummation of His unique personal vocation as Saviour of mankind. The phrase means at least that by His death there would be accomplished for mankind a deliverance which could not otherwise be effected, and that the value He Himself attached to this deliverance is to be measured by the sacrifice He was willing to endure to secure it.

(15) That in the parable of the householder (Matt. xxi. 33-44) Jesus refers to Himself as the Son, for whom the Father expects reverence, but whom the husbandmen slay in order that they may seize the inheritance, is beyond doubt or question. His own worth to God is here indicated, as also the severity of the judgment deserved by men capable of so great a crime as His death. His defence of Mary, when blamed with waste in anointing Him (Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9; John xii. 1-8), seems to throw some further light on His anticipation of His Passion. He commends the anointing as a good work wrought on Himself; He reminds His disciples of the approaching separation; He defends the act as a preparation for burial; He binds the memory of this deed with indissoluble bonds to the Gospel. What was its significance, then, which gave it such value? It cannot mean less than that Mary, anticipating the Passion of the Master, offered Him this token of her affection, sympathy, devotion to comfort and encourage Him. The disciples were unsympathetic and unresponsive; the Cross to them was a stumblingblock; but Mary had so learned from Jesus what His purpose was that by this symbolic act she welcomed Him as her Saviour

and her Lord. But we may ask, When had she learned these lessons? Does not the narrative in Luke x. 38-42 suggest the answer? The good part chosen by Mary which Jesus would not take away from her was to listen reverently, obediently, sympathetically, nay even appreciatively, as He spoke to her of what was the heavy burden on His own heart. That to Him was far better than the meat and the drink that busy Martha would prepare for Him. Surely we may allow ourselves to believe that Jesus, during these months of loneliness, when His disciples were in the deepest purpose of His life estranged from and opposed to Him, was not left altogether un comforted and uncheered; but found at least one loving and loyal heart that looked forward to His Passion even as He Himself did, as the consummation of His ministry in the fulfilment of His Father's will.

(16) The utterances regarding His death which are assigned to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel may be very briefly referred to. Reference has already been made to the Baptist's welcome of Jesus. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (i. 29), as probably an echo of Jesus' own teaching when He communicated to John His purpose to realize the ideal of the Servant of Jehovah. The saying about the Serpent in the Wilderness, already dealt with, may be compared with the later utterance, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself" (xii. 32), as both teach that the exaltation on the Cross was necessary for the fulfilment of His beneficent purpose. The necessity of the death for the spiritual life of mankind, taught in the passage already discussed (John vi. 51, "I give my flesh for the life of the world"), is also asserted in John x. 11, "the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep." This surrender of life is voluntary. "No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself" (ver. 18). This surrender of life is the

greatest proof of love. "Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends" (xv. 13). It is also a consecration of Himself to God for the consecration of His disciples (xvii. 19). The circumstances invest with peculiar interest the declaration, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone ; but if it die, it beareth much fruit" (xii. 24). The request of the Greeks seems to have moved Jesus deeply. It seems even to have suggested to Him "the possibility of a Gentile ministry as an escape from Jewish hostility" (see the *Fourteenth Study*, paragraph 10). Yet this possibility was dismissed, because He recognized the absolute necessity of His death to the fulfilment of His purpose. To be the world's Saviour He must be slain as the Jewish Messiah. The Fourth Gospel agrees with the Synoptics in asserting that Jesus regarded His death as necessary for the fulfilment of His purpose ; it lays special emphasis on the voluntariness of that death in love for man and obedience to God.

(17) This *Study* must be drawn to a close by a consideration of the institution of the Lord's Supper in its bearings on Christ's anticipation of His death (Matt. xxvi. 17-30 ; Mark xiv. 12-26 ; Luke xxii. 7-38 ; John xiii.-xiv.). The first point to be noted in this connexion is the repeated announcement of betrayal. How tender is the appeal and how solemn the warning to Judas ! but the last effort to rescue the traitor is in vain ; and Jesus is relieved when he withdraws. The second point is the prediction of the desertion of the disciples and of Peter's denial, which is represented by Matthew and Mark as spoken on the way to Gethsemane (xxvi. 31-35 ; xiv. 27-31), but by Luke and John as delivered in the Upper Room (xxii. 31-34 ; xiii. 36-38). This prediction is a proof of the moral insight and spiritual discernment of Jesus ; the secrets of the hearts of His disciples were not hid from Him. His words to

Peter, as recorded in Luke (xxii. 31-32), "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat ; but I made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not ; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren," show how serious was the peril for Peter that Jesus foresaw ; how earnest was His solicitude for him ; and how confident He was of an answer to His prayer. The prediction is further an evidence that Jesus anticipated that He would need to face His Passion without the sympathy or the support of any of His disciples. Nevertheless His confidence in a happy issue out of all His afflictions is unabated. This is the third point to be noted, He expects that these disciples, who will be scattered in doubt and fear, will be so restored to Him, that His dying commands will be sacred to them, and that they will be willing to remember His death not as an evil to be deplored, but as a good wherein they may rejoice. His approaching sacrifice He Himself is able to regard, and they will afterwards be able to regard, as invested with the deepest significance and highest value. It will be both the sign and the means of a new relation between man and God, of which the characteristic blessing will be the forgiveness of sin. In what sense the death of Jesus was the sacrifice of the new covenant cannot yet be discussed ; but meanwhile be it noted that Jesus faced His death as, not an evil to be escaped, but as a good to be welcomed.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.